

Introduction

Nataša Gregorič Bon and Jaka Repič

We often think of today's world as being permeated with various movements: of people, things, information, ideas, etc. But we seldom think in that way about the places that might shift along with these movements. Here we have in mind movements that can be outlined either as geopolitical movements (global repositioning, resizing, merging and dividing of countries and regions during colonialism, post-colonialism (post-)communism, etc.), geomorphological movements (spatial changes due to earthquakes, floods, typhoons and various natural disasters or other geomorphological phenomena such as erosion, that have erased, drifted or shifted particular places on the world map) and, particularly, spatial movements and repositioning in the meshwork of social relations, which is the main scope of this volume. One example is found in the spatial processes in former Yugoslavia: both at its formation and later collapse, borders and relations between people and places changed, and these changes have had grave effects on the (im)mobility of people. Some were sedentarized (see Janko Spreizer, this volume), others exiled (see Repič, this volume) or displaced (Lofranco, this volume).

This book is based on the premise that it is not only people who move but that places also shift their locations in what can be seen as a 'meshwork' of spatial and social relations (cf. Ingold 2009, 2011). We approach places as produced by, and conceptualized through, social and spatial relations; when movements induce changes in relation configurations, they also alter the places and reposition them in this meshwork. All the chapters, in one respect or another, illustrate the various ways and modes in which people and places in a particular geographic, political, social and historic locale move, alter spatial and social relations, and generate 'relative locations'. Notions of mobility and movement are thus at the heart of our analysis, and we understand

them as vital processes that engage both being and surroundings in a way that continuously results in changes of places and locations as well as relations. We posit and explore places not as fixed points on geopolitical maps but as processes, continuously redefined and relocated within a particular social, political, historical and economic setting. Places are thus ever shifting in what Sarah Green has conceptualized as the 'whereness' or location of places, and are fundamentally relative (Green 2005). But this does not mean that everything is prone to change and discontinuity. There is also something that stays and continues. For example, the circularity of movements and migrations, addressed by several chapters, brings territorial continuity instead of spatial rupture (de Tapia 2010; Baldassar 2011).

In *Moving Places*, we are less concerned with the scope or intensity of mobility, and more with how people's movement, mobility and immobility generate different experiences of places. The key question is how people make places through movement. We analyse how people, things, ideas, etc., get (re)positioned in time and place. Movement not only entails mobility but also involves place-making, whereby locations and/or people are seen as either more central or marginal, while generating imaginations and imaginaries of roots and return, locality and belonging.

Movement and mobility are understood as the underlying precondition for migration. However, mobility also presents us with a face of power and inequality; while, for some people, movement is an accessible component to their lives, others are confronted with stiff restrictions, boundaries and control. Noel B. Salazar writes that migrants are often 'depicted as icons of movement', notwithstanding the fact that they do not spend much time moving at all, nor do they necessarily lead a mobile life (Salazar 2010: 3). This presents an important critique to the prevalent mobility discourses that argue, without adequate support from research data, how 'the whole world is on the move' (ibid.; cf. Friedman 2002: 33). Migration and movement are hardly novel processes, primarily characteristic of our contemporary world; rather, they go much further back in human history. Salazar and Smart (2011: ii) point out the historical meaning of mobility, and present groups of people in different areas in the world who used to be more mobile in the past than they are today. What differentiates the present movements from those in the past is their speed and the intensity of movement, both of which are inextricably connected with the fast development of communication and transport technologies as well as political and economic control (Salazar and Smart 2011: ii).

In this respect, Noel B. Salazar (this volume) focuses on a historically important mobility tradition called *merantau* in Indonesia. This traditional practice turns on the explicit demand to return and is thus fundamentally about one's relationship with 'home'. *Merantau* experience speaks of travels that draw people closer to, rather than pushing them away from, 'home'. Nowadays the process of *merantau* has led to migration, which has changed the practice of *merantau* and consequently shifted the meaning of 'home'. For many Indonesians, home no longer refers to a fixed locale, but at once merges mobility and immobility, giving rise to, yet again, a 'relative location'. While *merantau* has shifted from circular mobility into more permanent migration, modern travelling and communication technologies have decreased the geographical distance from the homeland. Many Indonesian migrants may have left their homeland, but they have not abandoned their home.

Movement in Anthropology

The anthropological scrutiny of movement, with its spatial, social and cultural implications, stipulates a paradigmatic shift away from boundedness, fixity and cultural and territorial essentialisms. Up until the 1990s, social sciences were predominantly marked by sedentarist logic that maps and roots cultures, peoples and societies in space and time. The sedentarist attitude to movement in European intellectual tradition was a legacy of the Cartesian-derived conceptualization of 'space', linked with cartography and other technologies of power (Kirby 2009: 2–3). Map making and map thinking conceived of the world as an array of bounded territories to be occupied, usurped or at least politically dominated. Conventional anthropology developed notions of culture, society and identity by presupposing their essential relations to fixed entities, territories or localities. This resulted in conceptualizations of homogeneous, coherent, durable and spatially bounded or defined cultures and social entities, such as ethnic groups, nations, etc. If we conceptualize movement as a mode of being in the world, then we also need to rethink the relations between culture, identity and place (cf. Rapport and Overing 2003: 261).

This is not to suggest that studies of movement were entirely absent from the early anthropological horizon. On the contrary, Bronisław Malinowski, for example, wrote about the key role of sea voyage and the function of exchange and movement of shell armbands and necklaces in sustaining the Kula ring, reciprocity and

social institutions within and between the island communities in his pioneering study of the Kiriwina (Trobriand) Islanders (Malinowski 2005 [1922]). However, as Rapport and Overing argue, even when movement was part of an anthropological analysis, it was usually seen as an uncommon occurrence, almost an aberration, as in a ritualized journey outside ordinary space and time (Rapport and Overing 2003: 263). Moreover, human experiences of movement and their spatial implications, conceptualizations of places and relations between them, were for the most part neglected.

After 1990, a marked change can be seen within anthropology and social sciences more generally towards movement. Many scholars became occupied with the various forms of mobility that reflect the general engagement with diversity, intensity, scopes and pervasiveness of global flows of modernity and their 'implications for human life and culture' (Hannerz 1996: 4). Anthropological studies of transnational migrations and connections not only addressed issues relating to mobility and increasing changes in the modern world because of their obvious and pervasive nature, but also because they understood that movement and change are in fact basic 'reviving undercurrents circulating throughout social life' (Kirby 2009: 1). The ideas of flux in mobility and of new social forms have come to the forefront of research topics in anthropology (Hannerz 1997). New concepts, such as transnationality and hybridity, were formulated, and new methodologies devised, which, taken together, have changed our understanding of culture and place in the global system (e.g., Hannerz 1997, 1998; cf. Marcus 1995).

Salazar and Smart contend that numerous discourses of globalization and cosmopolitanism, which prevailed after the end of the Cold War, traversed into discourses of mobility (Salazar and Smart 2011: ii). While mobility increasingly represents the normative of the present, the attachment to a particular place is in these discourses often conceptualized as 'a digression or resistance against globalizing forces' (ibid.). The processes of mobility and immobility are always interrelated and interdependent, even 'two sides of the same coin' (see Salazar, this volume). Inspired by Cunningham and Heyman (2004), Salazar and Smart point to the political and economic processes that influence (im)mobility of people. The global flows and the means of their control (i.e. border-crossing policies) bring not only mobility and cultural connections but also immobility and disconnections. The polity borders exemplify the ways in which mobility and immobility or enclosure join (see Cunningham and Heyman 2004: 295). In this context and from a Euro-American

vantage point mobility is interpreted as the ‘normal’ part of contemporary life, while immobility is seen as something ‘pejorative’ and negative. In other social contexts and situations, such as the forced migration of refugees, the immobility is conceptualized as a more positive and favoured act than mobility (Ballinger 2012; see also Lofranco, this volume).¹ In such contexts, immobility is expressed in claims of rootedness and belonging, with their associated feelings of safety and being at home. It can be reflected as a right to, or as Janko Spreizer shows for Roma people in Slovenia, even a claim towards, immobility (see Janko Spreizer, this volume). The renaming of places and dividing of people, their immobility or enclosures enforced by polity borders could also be perceived as displacement of people and their meaningful places (see Lofranco, this volume).

Place-Making

Plato and his student Aristotle conceptualized place as central to our understanding of the world. According to Aristotle, everything that exists has to have a place or has to be located somewhere (Casey 1996: 52). In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the study of spatial notions re-emerged in philosophy and other social sciences and humanities. These early studies of space and society, which were based on a positivistic approach and coupled with functionalism, were, in the 1970s, critically rethought by human geographers (Tuan 1974, 1977; Relph 1976) and behavioural geographers (Lowenthal 1961; Brookfield 1969; Gould and White 1974; Gold 1980), and later also by some ‘new’ archaeologists and anthropologists, especially in the fields of landscape and heritage studies (e.g., Bender 1993; Tilley 1994; Bender and Winer 2001). Space, place and society were no longer postulated as separate and autonomous, but as mutually related concepts.

One of the influential spatial scholars is the neo-Marxist thinker Henri Lefebvre (1991 [1974]) who defined space as being always produced, never separated from its producing forces or the labour that shapes it. He understood space as being an inevitably social and cultural process and argued that there is a dialectical relationship between space and society, which merges them into a continuous, contingent and irreversible process. He conceptualized space as an interrelation between spatial practices (perception of space), reproduction of space (conception of space) and representational space (lived space). It cannot be viewed as absolute or ‘a space-in-itself’,

nor does the notion of space contain a space within itself (1991: 299). Lefebvre refused to differentiate between place and space, since this would reduce the meaningfulness of spatial terms used in a particular local community.

In contrast to Lefebvre, who focused on the spatial production, Michel de Certeau (1984) centred his attention on the individual practices of everyday life. He differentiated between the 'spatial strategies' through which the dominant powers deploy their discipline and control, and 'spatial tactics' used by groups or individuals to avoid the nets of discipline. While space (*espace*) is the effect of operations that 'orient it, situate it, temporalize it, and make it function in a polyvalent unity of conflictual programs or contractual proximities', place (*lieu*) is the 'order (of whatever kind) in accord with which the elements are distributed in relationships of coexistence' (1984: 117). In other words, space is 'actuated by the ensemble of movements deployed within it', place is an 'instantaneous configuration of positions' (*ibid.*). Spatial operations, such as walking, storytelling, remembering, writing and reading, were the key processes for studying place and space, which constantly transforms places into spaces and spaces into places (1984: 118).

Tim Ingold (1993, 2000) looks at the production of place from a 'dwelling perspective'. In defining the concept of dwelling, he refers to the etymological meaning of the term, as it was proposed by Heidegger (Ingold 2000: 185). 'To build' or in German *bauen* comes from the Old English and High German word *buan*, meaning 'to dwell' (*ibid.*). Dwelling encompasses one's life in a place, which means that an individual's perspective of himself is always set in an environment. The knowledge, which is defined as the generative potential of a complex process, of the environment is continuously formed alongside movements of a human being in the world (2000: 230). 'We know *as we go*, not *before we go*' (*ibid.*, italics original). In his later work, Ingold opposes the concept of space: it is 'the most abstract, the most empty, the most detached from the realities of life and experience' (Ingold 2009: 29) and instead suggests using the term 'world' (Ingold 2011: 142).

Tim Ingold's place is 'delineated by movement, not by the outer limits to movement' (Ingold 2009: 34, cf. 2011). A variety of ways and directions that movements produce are drawn into sets of lines creating a meshwork or a 'world' of dwelling. Human dwelling unfolds in a meshwork of lines, not a network of points or places (Ingold 2011: 10). Ingold's inspiring conceptual relations between movement, which he calls *wayfaring*, and places, shows that places

are made through wayfaring, hence movement is a process most intrinsic to human life. Further extension of his argument leads us to another issue: relationality.

Despite their different approaches, Doreen Massey similarly views space as a product of relations between people, places and things. But unlike Ingold, Massey (2005) argues 'for space' and defines it as a product of interrelations or simultaneity of stories-so-far: space is 'an emergent product of relations'. She understands space as 'the social dimension', because it unfolds as interaction whereas time unfolds as a change (Massey 2005: 61). Unlike various scholars who concur that we live in spatial times (Laclau 1990; Jameson 1991), Massey argues that time is injected into the spatial and thus the space should be thought of together with time. She defines space as 'the dimension of multiple trajectories, a simultaneity of stories-so-far' (Massey 2005: 24). Space is lively and constitutes 'multiplicity of durations' (Massey 2005: 24). In paraphrasing her words, places discussed in this volume, the Indonesian archipelago (Salazar), island of Guernsey (Lulle), Buenos Aires (Repič), a southern Albanian village (Gregorič Bon), the Manchineri reserve in Western Brazil (Virtanen), Sarajevo (Lofranco), etc., are each on a different trajectory, yet, at a given moment or period in time, they might also be in contact with each other. But these relations do not mean that they form the same time-space. Time and space form multiple durations and trajectories which are irreversible. In other words, 'space is not static, nor time spaceless' (Massey 1994: 264). Space and time are different yet inextricably linked dimensions.

Homecoming, for example, evokes uniquely spatial times as experience of place is bound with temporality of movement and absence. Gregorič Bon (this volume) shows how Himara people who have moved to Athens affirm their roots of belonging with routes of annual returning home. Slovenians in diaspora also affirm or alter relations with their (parental) homeland: returning reconfigures relationships between social memories, actual experiences and aspirations towards home-place (Repič, this volume). Janko Spreizer (this volume) shows how denial and claim of autochthony of Roma people is grounded in the temporality of their movement and settling. Movement, thus, always happens in space and time. This volume shows how different modes of movements carve out the perspective of time, which can move backward in the past, stay still in the present, move forward into the future or constitute a rhythm of bouncing back and forth.

Mobility is a complex process and thus should always be understood as the continuum between movement and stasis. To begin with this perspective, we take up three interrelated themes that

regularly come up in discussions of mobility and movements: (a) roots and return, (b) centre-margin implications, and (c) claims of locality and belonging.

Roots and Return

Returning is a form of mobility that stems from specific conceptualization of places (e.g., home, homeland). Migration and transnational studies occasionally focus on the issues of return, but, more extensively, the topic has been explored within diaspora studies and studies of violence, displacement and repatriation. In migration studies, return is sometimes discussed in conjunction with transatlantic migration, for example seasonal labour migration between Southern Europe and the Americas or other forms of ‘counter-currents’ accompanying any major migration phenomena. Still, the conventional take on migration coming from this discipline sees migration as a once-and-only occurrence (Gmelch 1980: 135), rather than as a process with diverse and far-reaching consequences. King and Christou are right to point out that, until recently, migration studies have often exaggerated their focus on immigration and overlooked the question of return (King and Christou 2011). All other forms of return were largely neglected. This is because migration studies often argues that there is no analytical value in exploring return migration as a distinct category, since the transnational research paradigm has, once and for all, reconceptualized emigration and return. Return, in other words, can be analysed just as ‘another kind of immigration’ (Čapo Žmegač 2010: 241).

On the contrary, we argue that an analysis of various return mobilities, root migration or migration to an ancestral homeland, as well as tourism, pilgrimages etc., can yield important insights into the specific modes of return. In this, we forward some of the arguments already made within recent migration studies, with their emphasis on transnational connections, diasporic identities as well as return mobilities. These have addressed issues of culturally essentialist concepts of ‘roots’, home and ancestral/parental homeland, and the political role of nation states and diasporas in return movement in novel ways (see e.g., Brah 1996; Rapport and Dawson 1998; Repič 2006, 2012; Jansen and Löfving 2009a, 2009b). There is, however, a pressing need to focus more on the emic perspective of movement and explore how people define their position in relation to particular places and their cultural meanings (especially home and homeland as assertion, or denial, of roots and autochthony).

Diaspora studies, in particular, have placed great emphasis on the concepts, memories and imaginaries of home and homeland, the myths of return (e.g., Anwar 1979; Clifford 1997; Brubaker 2005), but also on practices and politics of building and maintaining ties with homeland (remittances, economic relations, kin obligations, etc.), and various return mobilities and home-making (Rapport and Dawson 1998; Ahmed 1999; Ahmed et al. 2003).

In this volume, Aija Lulle focuses on return mobilities and relational spaces of mobility experienced by Latvian migrant workers on the Channel island of Guernsey. Her exploration of ways in which migrants experience mobilities, opportunities and constraints of limited/temporal embeddedness in Guernsey leads her to approach movement as a process, a life trajectory or a way of being, while the places to, and through which, people move are seen to be relational spaces of mobility. Narratives of home and places of residence encapsulate this relationality and blend layers of spatial positioning, concepts of temporality and returning. Similarly, Jaka Repič explores relations between conceptualization of roots and homeland, and mythology, politics and practices of return mobilities in the Slovenian diasporic community in Argentina. Return is often referred to as tracing roots and represents movement between spatial and temporal dimensions, comprising layers and sediments of experiences, memories and imaginaries. Home and homeland are explored as places not spatially fixed but produced through relations and movement. Multi-placedness of home among the Slovenians in Argentina is apparent in their imaginaries, memories and return mobilities. Return also instigates changes in spatial relations as well as relations between social memories, present experiences and aspirations for future mobilities.

Myths of return are often expressed in sedentarist logic of rootedness, from which human beings are supposed to derive their culture and identity. Cultural and national essentialisms are reflected in discourses and concepts of roots, home or homeland that are constructed as spatially as well as culturally meaningful concepts. If people have voluntarily or compulsorily left their home (were uprooted), their or their descendants' return represents emplacement. Aspirations and mythology of eventual return are often manifested in the *construction of homeland* as well as in the process of *home-coming* or 'regrounding' (cf. Ahmed 1999; Olwig 2002; Ahmed et al. 2003; Stefansson 2004).

Studies of returning and home orientation therefore problematize spatial and cultural essentialisms, and advance our understanding of transnational or diasporic identification processes and related issues of fixity and mobility. They also address the temporal dimension, i.e.

relations between different referential points on the time axis (see Lulle; Repič, this volume). In movement, especially in displacement, temporality is often implied in experiences of discontinuity and loss: home is left behind not only in another place but also in another time (Jansen and Löfving 2009b: 15; see also Lofranco, this volume).

Return mobilities encompass return migrations of first-generation migrants as well as of their descendants, but also visits to reconnect with relatives, tourism and travel, pilgrimages, etc. Nataša Gregorič Bon analyses the relationship between rootedness and movement to and from a number of villages in the Himara area of southern Albania. She explores how the seasonal return of Himara people to their natal villages, their visits to the coastal plains and pilgrimages to Stavridi shape their feelings of home and belonging. The return movements and pilgrimages are seen as tropes of a route with temporal and spatial implications related to the emigrant's claims to roots and their home. In today's shifting economic and political relations, the meaning of home relates as much to a group's sense of rootedness in that particular location as it does to their continuous movements and migrations.

Movement and mobility cannot be understood without the role of the body. While the interest in the body movement has long existed within anthropology (e.g., Mauss 1973), several studies of various kinds of movement, such as physical labour (Keller and Keller 1996), sports (Dyck and Archetti 2003), dance (Williams 1997), and other modes of body movement have mainly focused on the movement of material bodies (see McDonald 2011). In this volume we discuss the body movement as dynamically embodied action (see Virtanen, this volume).

Accordingly, Pirjo Kristiina Virtanen explores various forms of movement of Manchineri Indians of Western Amazonia in Brazil who move between their own village and places outside it. She focuses on the embodied experiences of movement. Movement and corporeal transformations are important elements of Manchineri well-being, for example during hunting and looking for forest resources, which play a crucial part in their everyday lives. The same holds true for moving to urban areas and interacting with non-Indians. These enable the embodying of non-Indians' ways of making new knowledge and power, as in conducting politics. While the centres of encounters with the non-kin contribute to economic, political, cultural and social sustenance, places of the kin are valued as places of maximization of relatedness and maintain the centrality in the Manchineri's view of the world.

Relations: From Centre to Margin and Back Again

‘Places are like ships, moving around and not necessarily staying in one location’ (Sheller and Urry 2006: 214). They are relational and evolving processes as ‘people are never alone with their places and never constitute them as places on their own’ (Green 2005: 90). In their various ways of moving through, in and between particular places, and through distinctions between these movements, people ascribe different meanings to places that are subjected to spatial hierarchy.

Miha Kozorog’s chapter shows the ways in which migration out of a small Slovenian town in Cerkno and a concomitant lack of inbound movement can lead to spatial peripherality and marginality as a related structure of feeling. His study of local music festival organizers from small towns situated on the ‘periphery’ of Slovenia shows them as seeking to turn their towns into ‘cosmopolitan places’ and constitute themselves as ‘being at home in the world’. Behind this kind of place-making stands the organizers’ lingering feeling of marginality, stemming from lack of movement and from geographical peripherality. Feelings of marginality motivate the organizers of a jazz festival to bring in international crowds, move their place out of a peripheral position by making it a festival location and putting it on the global (jazz) map. Kozorog demonstrates how, for the time of the music festival, the festival organizers see their once peripheral towns as central nodes of global musicscapes as people come from various parts of the world. Once the music festival is over, these temporarily ‘cosmopolitan places’ bounce back into the periphery (but not entirely) and become local towns again, lacking, according to the music festival organizers, movement and centrality.

In contrast to Kozorog who shows how festival organizers intentionally induce the global movement of festivalgoers to counter the marginality of the place, Alenka Janko Spreizer’s chapter illustrates how the frequency of movement can engender marginality of people and places. She demonstrates how a self-proclaimed discipline of ‘romology’ is, in fact, based on the myth of Roma people as ‘restless nomads’ and grounded in the sedentarist logic that roots people in space and time, but serves the state policy of discrimination, and constitutes the Roma people as a marginal group inhabiting, or moving through, marginal places. Roma people’s social marginality is grounded in their past movements and even essentialized in romological discourses, and state and local policies.

However, discourses of sedentarism and marginality also enable the Roma people from Krško in Slovenia to make their own claims of being an 'autochthonous ethnic population' of Slovenia. These claims are based on Roma people's narratives about their past movements and present homecomings through which they appropriate their place of dwelling and reconstitute their locality and belonging.

Status and power that pertain to places are continuously renegotiated in what Green defines the 'whereness' or location of places (Green 2005: 13). Some places are thus perceived as being more central or marginal than others. The festivals as crossroads of paths and cultures where different people and ideas from various places meet and intersect (see Kozorog, this volume), the Roma people's narratives about past movements and present homecomings (see Janko Spreizer, this volume), and the Manchineri movements outside their reserve (see Virtanen, this volume), are all examples that give credence to such relative, moving places.

Some people and places are more mobile than others and many remain immobile. On the positive side, mobility as 'ability to move' is a form of social capital creating feelings of freedom (see Gregorič Bon, this volume) and/or cosmopolitan subjectivities (e.g., tourists, modern nomads) (see Kozorog, this volume), while on the negative side, it can be associated with deprivation and suffering, as for example with economic migrants, refugees and other modes of displacement (see Janko Spreizer; Lofranco, this volume). Indeed, there is a world of difference between those who can move freely (apparent especially at border crossings), and those whose movements are restricted: between tourists and economic migrants; between those who move voluntarily and those who are forced to move, and, ultimately, between those who move and those who stay behind. The kind of spatial hierarchy inherent in people's movements and locations constitutes, in Massey's (2005) terms, geography of power/knowledge. Following on from Green (2005) and Massey (2005), the centre-marginality dimension that is made through (im)mobility can be seen as interrelated and interdependent.

An increase in the multitude and scope of global and transnational relations has done much to eradicate the classical concepts of distances by bringing marginal places into central positions, as for example in Kozorog's case. Massey calls these moments where the spatial is no longer bounded and there is no difference between near and far, centre and margin, as events marking 'the end of modernity' (2005: 70; 92). Her analysis pertains to broader, geographically-based conceptualizations where the spatial is often seen to exclude

the social, at least in people's everyday experiences and practices. Massey's conceptualization of marginality importantly moves beyond binary oppositions and the modernist confidence in clear spatio-temporal dimensions, which, according to her, are part and parcel of the same problem. Instead of clear-cut sets of opposite binaries, Green introduces the notion of 'relational fragmentation' where 'every fragment is a fraction, a part of something else, and it is the relationship between the parts, their fundamental interrelationality as it were, that renders something fractal' (Green 2005: 130). Places, in this perspective, can then be seen as marginal given one set of social, political and historical determinations (see Kozorog, this volume), and central given another (see Virtanen, this volume). The difference between centre and periphery is thus porous, dependent on the mutual relations and on the vantage point.

Claims of Locality and Belonging

Mobility and movement are also closely bound up with identity-formation processes, often reflected in claims of locality and belonging. Nadia Lovell (1998) argues that these claims have gained in importance, ever since displacement, dislocation and dispossession have become common themes of the present world. In the globalizing world, ever more people claim their identities as deeply rooted in the local, thus the link to a particular locality gives a strong territorial capacity (Geschiere 2009). Even though Appadurai claims that locality has lost its ontological mooring, seeing it as 'primarily relational and contextual' (1996: 204) rather than spatial, we argue that spatiality still presents an important mooring to which people link their claims of belonging.

In this view, Zaira Lofranco explores *locality* by showing interconnectedness between movement and spatial relationality and positionality. Her ethnographic focus in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, is on the Inter Entity Boundary Line established partly during the war and formalized by the Dayton peace agreement in 1995, an ethnic boundary that separates the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina from the Republika Srpska (the Serbian republic). She analyses the various forms of movement, from displacement and ethnic cleansing during the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina to contemporary practices of border crossings by those Sarajevo residents who were displaced or forcibly relocated because of ethno-national politics aiming to produce ethnically homogeneous urban

spaces. During the war, the ethnic boundary was marked by military control, violence, displacement and ethnic cleansing. Movement was heavily restricted across the line imposed by the military. After the war, the line eventually became largely invisible, but it remained an important factor in daily movements and crossings, reaffirming ethnic, social and urban divisions and hierarchic spatial organization and spatial practices, such as street naming, etc. The production of locality and thus relational spatial positions are inherently connected to movement, which is understood not merely as a change of position in a geographical space, but as a sociocultural dynamic.

Claims of locality and belonging are part of power relations or political and state assertions of power. They are manifested in the use of culturally and spatially essentialist concepts that presuppose important links between locality, culture and belonging or identity. Roots and autochthony are often politically instigated concepts that give rise to claims of spatial appropriation, belonging, denial of belonging or even social exclusion (cf. Geschiere 2009). Citizenship politics depends on enforcing the link between the individuals and the state as a spatial referent. Changes in citizenship politics can restrict or encourage movement within the state and across its borders as well as bring about changes in spatial relations, i.e., distant places can become reachable and familiar places can drift away from people's imaginaries and itineraries. Several of the chapters touch upon the influence of citizenship politics on changes in spatial relations. Aija Lulle shows how Latvia's inclusion in the EU facilitated their citizens' back-and-forth migration between Latvia and Guernsey, regardless of their diverse personal motivations. Most explicitly in this volume, Thomas Fillitz shows the imminent role of the state in determining relationships between citizens, foreigners and national territory, and producing, restricting or reversing migration flows, thus affecting individual experiences of movement and places. He explores relations between the state, politics of roots and belonging, citizenship and mobility in the Ivory Coast, West Africa. He shows that cultural rooting is a constitutive process to local productions of contemporary modernity. In different periods between the 1960s and early 2000s, state ideologies of brotherhood extending across borders gradually gave way to essentialist concepts of roots and autochthony, imposed by nationalist and citizenship politics for goals of social differentiation and exclusion. Political transition, from a state that did not differentiate between its citizens and foreigners (citizens from neighbouring states) to a nation state based on cultural concepts of autochthony and ethno-cultural citizenship, had important

consequences for internal and transnational mobility and politics of cultural rooting. State ideologies of inclusion initially produced massive internal and transnational migration, whereas the shift towards the ideology of autochthony not only limited immigration but also brought about a highly selective access to power, land and resources. Moreover, state ideologies controlled movements and changed processes of spatialization, e.g., from customary land of autochthonous communities to liberalization of access to land and later towards state sovereignty over it.

Moving Places brings several case studies pertaining to place-making, (non-)movement and (im)mobility from scholars working on Albania, Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazilian Amazonia, Guernsey, Indonesia, the Ivory Coast and Slovenia. Despite the fact that national territories often play a significant role in the way that people experience their movements and places (see Fillitz, this volume), our primary interest is to explore various local contexts and not respective national territories. We aim to show how multiple relations between people and places constitute different place-times and relative locations. Taken together, contributors to this book highlight how places and their locations are continuously shifting and are redefined through (non-)movements and vice versa. As one of the most immanent processes of human life, movement has various dimensions and modes. By addressing the specifics of a particular regional and social locale, each chapter in its spatial and temporal dimensions simultaneously illustrates stories of physical (non-)movements and moving places.

Jaka Repič is Associate Professor and Researcher at the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana. He writes about Slovenian diaspora in Argentina and return mobilities. His earlier research includes rural-urban migration and informal settlements in Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea, and ethnicity issues among the Roma in Slovenia. He is the author of *‘Tracing the Roots’: Transnational Migrations between Argentina and Europe, Urbanisation and Construction of Ethnic Communities in Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea* and co-editor of *Places of Encounter*.

Nataša Gregorič Bon is a Research Fellow at the Institute of Anthropological and Spatial Studies of the Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts (ZRC SAZU) and Assistant Professor at the Postgraduate School ZRC SAZU. She has published widely on spatial anthropology, Europeanization, movement

and mobility in southern Albania. She is the author of *Spaces of Discordance: Space and Place in the Village of Dhërmi/Drimades, Southern Albania* (ZRC Publishing House), which is also translated into Albanian. She is a book review editor for the *Anthropological Notebooks* journal.

Acknowledgements

The idea for this book emerged from discussions at the *Beyond Essentialisms: Challenges of Anthropology in the 21st Century* conference, organized by the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology at the University of Ljubljana in November 2010. Some of the contributors to this volume took part in the conference, while others were part of the COST IS0803 Action *Remaking Eastern Borders in Europe* chaired by Sarah F. Green, University of Helsinki. Without these two events, this book would not have been possible. The book is also partly a result of the Bilateral Collaboration between the republics of Slovenia and Finland, entitled *Movement and Spatial Construction*, and the project *Ethnography of Land and Water Routes*, both funded by the Slovenian Research Agency. We are grateful for its support. We thank all the contributors for their invaluable help, patience and comments on chapters. Our gratitude goes to Ana Jelnicar and Linda Bates for their masterful proofreading. The editors are grateful to their institutions, the Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts and the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology at the University of Ljubljana for financial assistance and support throughout this project.

Notes

1. Ballinger also draws attention to different concepts related to (im) mobility such as emplacement, displacement, replacement, etc., which invite various meanings in particular linguistic contexts.

References

- Ahmed, S. 1999. 'Home and Away. Narratives of Migration and Estrangement', *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 2(3): 329–47.
- Ahmed, S., C. Castañeda, A. Fortier and M. Sheller (eds). 2003. *Uprootings/Regroundings. Questions of Home and Migration*. Oxford and New York: Berg.
- Anwar, M. 1979. *The Myth of Return. Pakistanis in Britain*. London: Heinemann.
- Appadurai, A. 1996. *Modernity at Large*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Baldassar, L. 2011. 'Italian Migrants in Australia and their Relationship to Italy. Return Visits, Transnational Caregiving and the Second Generation', *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 20(2): 1–28.
- Ballinger, P. 2012. 'Borders and the Rhythms of Displacement, Emplacement and Mobility', in T.M. Wilson and D. Hastings (eds), *A Companion to Border Studies*. Malden, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 389–404.
- Bender, B. (ed.). 1993. *Landscape. Politics and Perspectives*. Oxford: Berg.
- Bender, B. and M. Winer (eds). 2001. *Contested Landscapes. Movement, Exile and Place*. Oxford and New York: Berg.
- Brah, A. 1996. *Cartographies of Diaspora. Contesting Identities*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Brookfield, H.C. 1969. 'On the Environment as Perceived', *Progress in Geography* 1: 53–80.
- Brubaker, R. 2005. 'The "Diaspora" Diaspora', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28(1): 1–19.
- Casey, E. 1996. 'How to Get from Space to Place in a Fairly Short Stretch of Time. Phenomenological Prolegomena', in S. Feld and K. Basso (eds), *Senses of Place*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, pp. 13–52.
- de Certeau, M. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clifford J. 1997. 'Diasporas', in M. Guibernau and J. Rex (eds), *The Ethnicity Reader. Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Migration*. Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press, pp. 283–90.
- Cunningham, H. and J. Heyman. 2004. 'Introduction. Mobilities and Enclosures at Borders', *Identities. Global Studies in Culture and Power* 11: 289–302.
- Čapo Žmegač, J. 2010. 'Return Migration. The Changing Faces and Challenging Facets of a Field of Study', *Ethnologia Balkanica* 14: 227–45.
- Dyck, N. and E.P. Archetti. 2003. *Sport, Dance and Embodied Identities*. Oxford: Berg.
- Eriksen, T.H. 2007. *Globalization. The Key Concepts*. Oxford and New York: Berg.

- Friedman, J. 2002. 'From Roots to Routes. Tropes for 'Trippers'', *Anthropological Theory* 2: 21–36.
- Geschiere, P. 2009. *The Perils of Belonging. Autochthony, Citizenship, and Exclusion in Africa and Europe*. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.
- Gmelch, G. 1980. 'Return Migration', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 9: 135–59.
- Gold, J.R. 1980. *An Introduction to Behavioural Geography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gould, P. and R. White. 1974. *Mental Maps*. England: Penguin Books.
- Green, S.F. 2005. *Notes from the Balkans. Locating Marginality and Ambiguity on the Greek-Albanian Border*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Hannerz, U. 1996. *Transnational Connections. Culture, People, Places*. London and New York: Routledge.
- . 1997. 'Flows, Boundaries and Hybrids. Keywords in Transnational Anthropology'. Retrieved 28 September 2014 from <<http://www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk/working%20papers/hannerz.pdf>>
- . 1998. 'Transnational Research', in H. Bernard Russell (ed.), *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. Walnut Creek and Lanham: Altamira Press, pp. 235–56.
- Ingold, T. 1993. 'The Temporality of the Landscape. World Archaeology', *Conceptions of Time in Ancient Society* 25(2): 153–74.
- . 2000. *The Perception of the Environment. Essays in Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London and New York: Routledge.
- . 2009. 'Against Space. Place, Movement, Knowledge', in P.W. Kirby (ed.), *Boundless Worlds. An Anthropological Approach to Movement*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 29–43.
- . 2011. *Being Alive. Essays on Movements, Knowledge and Description*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jameson, F. 1991. *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Jansen, S. and S. Löfving (eds). 2009a. *Struggles for Home. Violence, Hope and the Movement of People*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books.
- . 2009b. 'Introduction. Towards an Anthropology of Violence, Hope and the Movement of People', in S. Jansen and S. Löfving (eds), *Struggles for Home. Violence, Hope and the Movement of People*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 1–23.
- Keller, C.M. and J. Dixon Keller. 1996. *Cognition and Tool Use. The Blacksmith at Work*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- King, R. and A. Christou. 2011. 'Of Counter-Diaspora and Reverse Transnationalism. Return Mobilities to and from the Ancestral Homeland', *Mobilities* 6(4): 451–66.
- Kirby, P.W. 2009. 'Lost in "Space". Anthropological Approach to Movement', in P.W. Kirby (ed.), *Boundless Worlds. An Anthropological*

- Approach to Movement*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 1–27.
- Laclau, E. 1990. *New Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time (Phronesis Series)*. London: Verso.
- Lefebvre, H. 1991 [1974]. *The Production of Space*, trans. D. Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lovell, N. (ed.). 1998. *Locality and Belonging*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lowenthal, D. 1961. 'Geography, Experience, and Imagination. Towards a Geographic Epistemology', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 51: 241–60.
- Malinowski, B. 2005 [1922]. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific. An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagos of Melanesian New Guinea*. London: Routledge.
- Marcus, G.E. 1995. 'Ethnography in/of the World System. The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 95–117.
- Massey, D. 1994. *Space, Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 2005. *For Space*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Mauss, M. 1973. 'Techniques of the Body', *Economy and Society* 2: 70–88.
- McDonald, E. 2011. 'Transnationalism. Bodies-in-Motion. Experiences of Momentum in Transnational Surgery', in F.E. Mascia-Lees (ed.), *A Companion to the Anthropology of the Body and Embodiment (Blackwell Companions to Anthropology)*. Malden and Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 481–503.
- Olwig, K.F. 2002. 'A Wedding in the Family. Home Making in a Global Kin Network', *Global Networks* 2(3): 205–18.
- Rapport, N. and A. Dawson (eds). 1998. *Migrants of Identity. Perceptions of Home in a World of Movement*. Oxford: Berg.
- Rapport, N. and J. Overing. 2003. *Social and Cultural Anthropology. The Key Concepts*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Relph, E. 1976. *Place and Placelessness*. London: Pion Limited.
- Repič, J. 2006. 'Po sledovih korenin'. *Transnacionalne migracije med Argentino in Evropo*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- . 2012. 'Les Slovēnes d'Argentine. Le concept de patrie dans la construction d'une communauté diasporique', *Ethnologie française* 42(2): 231–40.
- Salazar, N.B. 2010. *Envisioning Eden. Mobilizing Imaginaries in Tourism and Beyond (New Directions in Anthropology Series)*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books.
- Salazar, N.B. and A. Smart. 2011. 'Anthropological Takes on (Im)mobility', *Identities. Global Studies in Culture and Power* 18: i–ix.
- Sheller, M. and J. Urry. 2006. 'The New Mobilities Paradigm', *Environment and Planning* 38: 207–26.

- Stefansson, A.H. 2004. 'Homecomings to the Future. From Diasporic Mythographies to Social Projects of Return', in F. Markowitz and A.H. Stefansson (eds), *Homecomings. Unsettling Paths of Return*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, pp. 2–21.
- de Tapia, S. 2010. 'New Migratory Configurations. Transnationalism/s, Diaspora/s, Migratory Circulation', in C. Audebert and M.K. Dorai (eds), *Migration in a Globalised World. New Research Issues and Prospects*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 127–144.
- Tilly, C. 1994. *A Phenomenology of Landscape. Places, Paths and Monuments*. Oxford: Berg.
- Tuan, Y.-F. 1974. *Topophilia. A Study of Environmental Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 1977. *Space and Place. The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Williams, D. 1997. *Anthropology and Human Movement. The Study of Dances*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.