

AFTERWORD

About Etchings, Place Acrobatics, and Spatial Fixes Rethinking the Relationship between Place, Marginality, and Mobility

Annika Lems

On a windy and treeless ridge in the Austrian Nock Mountains, at an elevation of about two thousand meters, a strange monument towers over lake Millstatt and its surrounding villages. Made up of thousands of stones collected from the surrounding environment, the pyramid-shaped sculpture can be seen from miles away. Locals have named it *Stana Mandl* (stony little man). In the summer months, when the snow has melted, hundreds of tourists and day hikers climb the steep and winding path leading up to the mountain ridge and toward the highest point, the Kamplnock. Every now and then hikers stop by the stony man sculpture to catch their breath before continuing on to the peak. Besides these occasional visits, however, the place is deserted. No plaque or signpost explains the presence of this odd monument. It is located in a place so remote that one cannot but wonder who on earth has gone into the effort of creating something so visibly present there.

As a teenager, I often asked myself this question. Growing up in one of the mountain villages close by, I renamed the figure *einsames Mandl* (solitary little man). For me the presence of the stony man monument on top of the deserted mountain ridge was a signifier of the remoteness of the area at

large. The region I grew up in is often typified as a rural outpost, a backwater place that never quite managed to adjust to the demands of a cosmopolitan world order. It is what this book's editors so poignantly describe as an "out-of-the-way" place (Drotbohm and Winters in the introduction). It is a place that is not just geographically removed from the urban centers of power but has, over the centuries, been ascribed a position of being politically, culturally, and ideologically "out-of-the-way."

When I left my small village of five hundred inhabitants to study anthropology in Vienna, I was confronted with the social consequences of being from a place that is labeled remote or, indeed, left behind. When fellow students detected my Carinthian accent, I often received pitying looks. These expressions of disapproval were followed by the remark that I must be one more Carinthian in exile (*Exilkärntnerin*), a commonly used phrase in Austria to describe people who have migrated from rural Carinthia to urban centers. It is based on the assumption that any broad-minded person must have the urge to escape the boredom and narrow-mindedness of the Nock Mountains in exchange for the openness and excitement marking life in the city. In the public Austrian imagination, Carinthia's social landscape is characterized by a small-town and backward mentality, a worldview fed by the place's supposed geographical and cultural isolation. In media commentary, cartoons, and comedies the figure of the slow, left-behind, and reactionary Carinthian is widespread—a pathetic country bumpkin who clings to antiquated ideas about place and belonging that the rest of the world has moved on from ages ago.

I have long struggled with the weight of these ascriptions. While the decision I took several years ago to return to the Nock Mountains and embark on an anthropology at/of home has enabled me to critically interrogate the ways ideas of remoteness are actively produced and reproduced, I have never been able to completely rid myself of the "place stigma" (Brigden in this volume) attached to my home region. While I can clearly see that centuries of being belittled, ridiculed, or simply overlooked by political and cultural elites has created an oppositional stance toward city people in the inhabitants of rural Carinthian mountain villages, I struggle to empathize with the social and political effects of this stubbornness. It has led to widespread support for right-wing parties and to the adoption of static, exclusionary ideas of belonging to place. Fed by racialized narratives about tradition and identity, many inhabitants of my home village are convinced that theirs is one of the last "authentic" places of Austrianness. This authenticity is based on the idea that the land they live on has always belonged to them, an indigeneity that is now believed to be under threat by the influx of foreign people and ideas. Given the prevalence of portrayals that inscribe Carinthia with a sense of sociocultural stasis—both through the trope of backward-

ness deployed by city dwellers and through the narratives of authenticity circulating among the local population—it is not an easy task to develop a new, critical lens, able to pierce through these powerful imaginaries.

Social reality is, of course, much more complex, layered, and fragile than any of the ascriptions and discourses surrounding out-of-the-way places such as my home village. The stony man sculpture is a powerful visual reminder of this. Throughout my fieldwork, the stony man kept surfacing in people's stories as the remnant of a peasant past marked by hardship, exploitation, and serfdom. Rather than reveling in an idyllic past of static and authentic belonging, the monument opened the window to a different, much more mobile understanding of out-of-the-way places and the people inhabiting them. I learned that the monument had been erected by workers of the garnet quarry in the Lucknergraben, a valley close by. In the nineteenth century the garnets from this area were highly sought after by Bohemian jewel cutters, who turned them into valuable gemstones. Because of their deep red color, inhabitants of the Nock Mountains call these stones "blood drops" (*Blutstropfen*). As the mines were located in a remote, unpopulated rift, the workers had to walk long distances across the mountains to get to their workplace. They often had to deal with dangerous weather conditions, wading through deep snow or seeking refuge from summer storms. To create a signpost that would help comrades find their way, the workers walking past there erected the stony man sculpture. They did not do so in one go. It evolved bit by bit, with the workers adding a few new stones every time they crossed the ridge. The "stone carvers" came from all walks of life. While some stemmed from the surrounding mountain villages, others came from faraway valleys and countries. In people's stories they appear as nameless "*Kanaltaler*" (people from the Val Canale in Italy), "*Laibacher*" (Slovenians) or "South Tyroleans"—poor and adventurous young men who flocked to the Nock Mountains in search of a better life. Many of them settled down in the area, founded families, and eventually became part of the communities. While the stories of these migrants have largely been erased from collective memory, they have carved their presence into the landscape through the stony man. They have, to use Wendy Vogt's powerful metaphor, "etched" themselves into place, turning the sculpture into an archive of the stories each stone has to tell about the man who carried it up the ridge almost two centuries ago and placed it in a carefully balanced equilibrium.

The stony man sculpture harbors a different historical perspective of my home village and its supposed out-of-the-wayness. It allows for stories to emerge that do not picture the Carinthian mountains as geographical and cultural barriers but as crucial nodal points, as gateways for mobility and cross-border exchange. It is often via the presence of the stony man that people tell me stories that unsettle dominant depictions of my home village

as a static place of ethnic uniformity or backwardness. Consider the story Walter, a man in his eighties, told me one afternoon as he took me on a tour through his vegetable garden. He had spent the past six months portraying himself to me as a “true local,” often complaining about newcomers disturbing the historically entrenched relationship between locals and the land. This afternoon, this static portrayal of the place and his own position within it started to sway. As I reported what I had learned about the stony man sculpture’s history, Walter acknowledged the imprints migrant workers had left on the community by explaining to me why so many people in the village carried Italian family names. He also pointed out names that had originally been Italian or Slovenian but, over time, had become Germanized. The villagers carrying these family names were the descendants of people who had crossed cultural and geographical boundaries to settle down in this area. In Walter’s stories a picture emerged of the village as a continuously moving web of sociocultural relations, of a place that, at times, had been a highway for migrant mobilities. Tales about the quarry workers led to stories about women who had migrated to the village from faraway mountain valleys to work as maids, farm hands, or cooks. Gauging my interest in these mobile histories, Walter delved deeper and deeper into his repository of stories, eventually reaching into his own life story. He revealed that his parents were not born and bred in the region but had migrated there from Slovenia. The ensuing stories about their struggle to become accustomed to the new place, learn a new language, and establish an economic foothold created a more complicated picture of his own emplacement in the village. Rather than confirming static ideas of home and localness, it infused the entire place and the people inhabiting it with movement.

The stony man, far from being a signifier of loneliness and isolation, encapsulates all these stories about movements and encounters. It stores the mobile history of a so-called out-of-the-way place, making visible that it is and has always been connected to the rhythms and movements of the rest of the world. The monument is also testament to the relationships emerging along mobility pathways. A product of collaborative efforts by local and migrant workers, it shows how social landscapes are literally set in motion.

Anthropological Waymarks

Similar to the stony man monument, I see this book as an important anthropological signpost, an epistemological waymark amid an academic landscape that, over the last decades, has largely overlooked the role of marginal or transitory places in global transformation processes. Ideas of movement,

speed, and cosmopolitanism have mainly been written into the domain of the metropolis (Herzfeld 2015: 239; MacClancy 2015: 2), but this book allows us to see otherwise. It helps us see the multilayered, complex, and often deeply ambiguous social relationships that emerge in places labeled as transient or marginal. Like the stony man monument, the book can be described as an archive of the often-overlooked stories, histories, and experiences of movement and interconnection making up such out-of-the-way places. It brings to the fore the twofold role of movement in their everyday (re-)shaping: the marks that passersby leave on places and the people inhabiting them, as well as the ways the presence of migrants—however fleeting—manages to destabilize static and simplistic understandings of place. In tracing the materiality and sociality of places that are marked by fluidity and precariousness, the book demonstrates that migratory movements do not occur in a spatial lacuna. They are inextricably linked to the historical, social, and material particularity of the places that migrants move through.

Even though some of the places the book focuses on are located in relative distance to urban centers of power, their sense of remoteness is not defined by geographical coordinates. The out-of-the-wayness of the places represented in the chapters is actively produced through their social, historical, or political marginalization vis-à-vis domains of power and influence. A refugee hostel in an eastern German town, a migrant shelter in Oaxaca, a bus station in Accra, a hopelessly overfilled refugee vessel, a gym in a fenced-in (and -out) El Salvadorian neighborhood, a tiny vegetable patch amid Kampala's densely built-up suburbs, a migrant vendor on a street in Rome, an asylum courtroom—the places the book zooms in on are marked by a sense of temporariness, edginess, and nervousness. Like the stony man monument, they are often not places at which people choose to be. Rather, they can be described as thresholds, as in-between places, which bear the promise of catapulting the people occupying them someplace else. By taking the particularity of such threshold—or, as the editors put it, “along-the-way” (Drotbohm and Winters, introduction to this volume)—places seriously, the chapters make visible the “sociabilities of emplacement” (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2016: 21) they can give rise to, as well as the many dead ends they can create for newcomers who are excluded, stigmatized, or pushed out-of-the-way even further. In keeping the focus on people's everyday engagements with place, the book highlights that the social ties created in such an environment can be deeply unstable. At best, the relationships formed there can be a source of communality and solidarity. At worst, however, these relationships can be marked by friction, distrust, and hostility, thereby exacerbating migrants' precarious emplacements.

Creating anthropological waymarks that allow us to see these complex dynamics is not an easy undertaking. It involves a conscious act of “unlearn-

ing” dominant ideas about mobility and place that have marked anthropological debates since the 1990s. As Schapendonk and Davids point out in their chapter, to be able to take notice and make sense of the interplay between mobility and place in an academic environment that has treated them as oppositional conceptual entities for so long necessitates a large degree of epistemological and theoretical flexibility. After more than two decades of theoretical fixation on global interconnectivity, hypermobility, and social fluidity, it has become increasingly difficult to locate the transient character of social life, to literally see it *taking place* somewhere. While mobility is commonly conceptualized in terms of excitement, progress, and acceleration, place has come to be associated with boredom, uniformity, and stasis. It has opened up an analytical fissure between place and mobility that has been so consequential that it has become incredibly difficult to think beyond it.

This analytical opposition has been the result of two interconnected developments. On the one hand, it is linked to the mobile turn that swept through the humanities and social sciences from the early 2000s with great force, leading to a focus on the inherently mobile character of social life (Hannam, Sheller, and Urry 2006). It has led to a fascination with fluid, dynamic, and instable ways of life, epitomized in the important epistemological role the figure of the migrant has come to occupy in anthropological research and writing. But the relative absence of place in mobility research can also be linked to wider processes of postcolonial reckoning, resulting in a skeptical view of place-based prisms. Propelled by critiques of the colonial ordering of knowledge systems, anthropologists came to question the ways they had fixated the people they studied in “authentic,” “native,” or “traditional” places, turning them into prisoners of bounded, static, and immovable identities (Appadurai 1988: 37). As a result of these debates, scholars began to question the spatial politics marking ethnographic fieldwork and let movement become an intrinsic part of their self-understanding (Malkki 1995; Gupta and Ferguson 1997). This step was of crucial importance for the decolonization of anthropological knowledge production. However, as I have pointed out in more detail elsewhere (Lems 2018), these efforts of de-essentializing place by bringing movement into the picture did not lead to more complex readings of the links between place and mobility. Instead, place nearly receded from anthropological view altogether. Rather than thinking of mobile people as moving through historically, socially, and politically specific places, they came to be conceptualized as “space travelers” (Lems 2018: 14)—as hypermobile subjects moving through boundless, fluid, and open-ended space. Wary of the racist, exclusionary, and colonial historical baggage attached to place-based frameworks, anthropologists (and scholars from other disciplines) opted to focus on movement in and of itself.

The mobile turn has brought about important theoretical advancements in anthropology and the social sciences. It has allowed anthropologists to move beyond simplistic understandings of belonging, tradition, and authenticity, instead foregrounding the complex globally entwined transformation processes that constantly reshape people's sense of who they are. It has also enabled anthropologists to question their own role in the production of knowledge and highlight how people come to be labeled as different, exotic, or other. Yet, as important as the critiques of the place-centrism and stasis marking classical anthropological texts were for the discipline, they had the side effect of creating a conceptual divide between mobility and place. This divide is not a new or overlooked theoretical impasse. It has been noticed and commented on by many mobilities scholars, including key proponents of the new mobilities paradigm (e.g., Creswell 2006; Sheller 2014; Sheller and Urry 2016). In this vein, David Bissell (2007: 278) stressed that a one-dimensional focus on mobility often reproduces productivist models of subjectivity, whereby speed and acceleration are presented as ultimately positive attributes. This creates an opposition between "productive" modes of being marked by mobility and "unproductive" modes, which are marked by stasis. He noted that in many contemporary social science texts it appears "somehow 'better,' culturally, economically or politically, to be mobile than immobile" (Bissell 2007: 279). As a result, being immobile and *in situ* has come to be treated as a form of being left behind in a world marked by speed and accelerated change (Xiang 2007). Other scholars have noted the obsession with "flow speak" (Bude and Dürschmidt 2010: 482) provoked by the mobile turn, called for a more nuanced understanding of people's balancing acts between mobilities and moorings (Hannam, Sheller, and Urry 2006: 2), or urged for a political economy approach to transnational movements in order to capture the "regimes of mobility" (Glick Schiller and Salazar 2013) that enable the mobility pathways of some while violently blocking those of others. Yet, even though these critiques have marked the field of mobilities research from early on, they have not managed to undo the conceptual divide between mobility and place. The absence of place in mobilities research does not just make visible the dominant role mobile tropes have come to occupy in social theory. It illustrates the grave difficulty to think beyond modern analytical categories in which movement, acceleration, and progress lie at the very heart of the world as we know it (Savransky and Lundy 2022).

In recent years, however, the scattered critical remarks and periodically reappearing doubts about academic mobile imaginaries have started to accumulate and gain momentum, growing into a recognizable sense of unease among anthropologists and mobilities scholars. This is expressed in ongoing engagements with the racialized inscriptions accompanying the

academic production of knowledge about “key figures of mobility” (Salazar 2017), such as migrants or refugees (Ramsay and Cabot 2021; Dahinden 2017). This sense of unease also finds expression in the increased scholarly interest in people whose everyday lives are not marked by speed, excitement, and dynamism but by boredom, stuntedness, and existential vertigo (Knight 2021; Salazar 2021; Bachelet 2019; O’Neill 2017). Leading on from feminist and intersectional critiques (e.g., Conlon 2011; Sheller 2015), the field of mobilities studies has come to redefine itself as one of im/mobility studies, thereby making visible the tension between movement and entrapment characterizing our time. Three decades after the de-essentialization of place became a prominent feature in the theorization of migratory movements, a growing chorus of scholars now stress that it is high time that mobile concepts and categories are subjected to the same level of critical scrutiny. They question the uncritical (re)production of mobile figures such as the migrant or refugee, arguing that they might have allowed migration scholars to move their research beyond the village and into boundless global space. However, it has (yet again) led to forms of othering and exoticization and to the incarceration of groups and people labeled “mobile” into (racialized) identities, such as “migrant” or “refugee” (Ramsay 2020).

This book is situated in the midst of this buildup of unease. Its editors and authors are deeply critical of the divide between mobility and place that has been the side effect of a one-dimensional focus on mobility in terms of progress and forward movement. They make visible the tensions between movement and stasis inherent in their interlocutors’ struggles and experiences of out-of-the-way places. While recognizing the importance of displacements in a world marked by global inequalities, they question the conceptualization of mobility as a one-way street that only affects (racialized) migrant bodies. Building on recent critical ethnographic research that highlights the dispossession, disempowerment, and marginalization that affects the lives of both migrants and non-migrants (Çaglar and Glick Schiller 2018; Ramsay 2021), the authors look for the social relations that can be found in the nooks and crannies of globalized capitalist societies. Far from being inconsequential or parochial, these nooks and crannies turn out to be fruitful empirical and epistemological points of departure. The conscious decision to start their work of theorization from a peripheral perspective (see Drotbohm and Winters, introduction to this volume) allows the authors to disentangle hardened mobility biases, thereby creating a new analytical repertoire to assess the relationship between mobility, immobility, and place(-making). I therefore see every single chapter as a waymark directing the reader beyond well-trodden theoretical paths. Like the stony man sculpture, they unearth stories and experiences that require effort on

the side of the ethnographer in order not to be overlooked or overheard. Taken together, the waymarks scattered throughout this book point the direction to a theoretical horizon in which emplacement and mobility no longer contradict each other but constitute and, indeed, condition each other.

Theoretical Horizons

This book shows that, when approached from a peripheral perspective, new and unexpected dimensions of social life in a globalized world order come into view. In what follows, I want to draw out some of the most inspiring, interesting, and innovative waymarks I have found along the way.

One such waymark is the relationship between place, mobility, and temporality. A recurring theme in many of the chapters is the stubborn refusal of marginal places and the people occupying them to be relegated to positions of insignificance. This is powerfully captured in the efforts people invest into bestowing transitory places with meaning, to carve, or “etch” (Vogt in this volume) their presence into place. The two chapters focusing on migrant shelters bring to the surface the crucial role of temporality in such stubborn acts of place-making. In Eichner’s case, it is the conscious attempts by shelter staff to give a history to a rundown and unattractive place designed to be a short-term solution for young asylum seekers. By decorating the walls with the handprints and names of former residents, by documenting the activities taking place there, and by creating an annual event commemorating the opening of the shelter, the staff try to establish a sense of temporal continuity. In giving the shelter a history, the workers do not just refuse to accept the place’s out-of-the-wayness. They also refuse to forget the stories of the people who have passed through there, instead valuing them as building blocks of the shelter’s story and identity. Vogt introduces the metaphor of “etching” to capture the dynamics whereby out-of-the-way places and the people occupying them refuse to be disappeared. By starting from the decidedly place-based angle of a shelter housing Central American migrants on their way to someplace else, she highlights the social connections, memories, and stories that stick around, even if the people who brought them there have long since left. In this reading, the material and story traces left behind in migrant shelters (such as the hands of former residents decorating the walls of the German refugee shelter) are not insignificant. They carve the presence of people who found themselves there along-the-way into place, thereby turning transitory landscapes into repositories of accumulated knowledge and experience.

Another waymark the book creates is to treat place-making as an intersubjective effort. Rather than solely focusing on mobile figures such as

the migrant, they take into account all the actors occupying out-of-the-way places and the ways they interact with one another, thereby shaping the place's ever-shifting identity. The authors are careful not to fall into the epistemological trap of equating intersubjectivity with harmonious and conflict-free relations. They show that place-making can involve acts of solidarity and collaboration but that it can also be steeped in conflict, hostility, and exclusion. In Gutiérrez Rivera's chapter, the relationships forged between asylum seekers and their legal advocates are fragile. While the lawyers' work is motivated by a sense of solidarity with their clients, they have to work within the constraints of a migration regime that requires them to fix mobile people into particular identities through "strategic acts of place-making." As is also visible in Eichner's chapter, such fragile relationships can simultaneously engender two seemingly counterintuitive moves. On the one hand, the social bonds formed in transitory places can function as a springboard to emplacement. On the other hand, they can be experienced as forms of restraint, propelling migrants to rebel against the straitjacket of identity they are forced into by engaging in acts of spatial disobedience. Stasik's ethnography of a bus station in Accra is a remarkable example of how the sociabilities emerging in a transitory place can act as door openers for emplacement. The interactions he details between newcomers and long-term occupants show how important intersubjective dynamics are in people's place-making efforts. The social ties established in a place as fleeting as a bus station create spatial, material, and social coordinates that allow newcomers to find their way in unknown territory and eventually build a life for themselves. Similarly, Brigden's chapter shows how the residents of a heavily stigmatized neighborhood work together to create a place of respite, a place they co-own. At the same time, the example of the gym is also an important reminder that the relationships forged in out-of-the-way places should not be romanticized as harmonious or equal. Rather, marginalized places are often occupied by marginalized people—a marginalization that is produced along gendered, classed, and racialized social coordinates. It creates unequal relationships to place: while some people can navigate places effortlessly, others are confronted by roadblocks that keep them from laying a claim on them.

Building on this thought, another important waymark emerges: the political economy of place-making in transitory environments. Many authors approach this question by shedding light on their own emplacements within the transitory social landscapes they study. By making her own presence in the Romero community and in the gym a subject of investigation, Brigden shows how important it is not to overlook the ways structural racism and disempowerment affect the places anthropologists declare to be their field sites. It means that the opportunities for place-making in transitory places

are not distributed equally, just as the opportunities for movement or for staying put are not the same. To make the political fault lines of out-of-the-way places visible in our writing, Brigden suggests that it is necessary to continuously “trespass across writing *about* place-making and writing *in* place” (Brigden in this volume). As Schapendonk and Davids show in their chapter, this heightened sensitivity can appear in the form of an uneasiness or impotence in the face of the systemic injustices marking contemporary regimes of im/mobility. It creates radically uneven place experiences, for while anthropologists of mobility occupy a position of privilege and can navigate the places they study with relative ease, the people they work with often have to invest an enormous amount of energy and skill to overcome the legal and social hurdles that are put in their way. Schapendonk and Davids therefore argue that it is important to make visible the distinct experiences ethnographers have of places compared to the people they encounter because of the different positions they occupy in regimes of im/mobility. Ramsay’s unsettling discovery that components of the mobile phone with which she recorded an interview with Congolese refugees had been sourced from the area they were displaced from is a poignant example of the layers of displacement anthropologists might find if they take the political economy of place seriously. It also makes visible the unequal terms migrants’ movements and halts are based on, thereby echoing feminist debates about who has the capacity to become mobile or stay put and at whose expense (Ong 1999).

An important fourth waymark is the historical and political production of out-of-the-way places and people. In this vein, Ramsay’s chapter shows that the out-of-the-wayness of the people who find themselves in transitory places such as migrant shelters or refugee camps is not inevitable. Rather, their displacements are often the predictable outcomes of capitalist modes of extraction, which consciously produce marginalized people and places. She makes the important observation that it is paramount to acknowledge the politically and historically charged nature of both mobility and place: while we need to capture the existential importance of place attachment in mobile people’s lives, it is equally important not to overlook the fact that their movements are often not the outcome of a human urge for freedom or boundless mobility but of historically entrenched patterns of dispossession. This is also echoed in Missbach and Hoffstaedter’s chapter. They show that some of the places refugees get pushed into are so out-of-the-way that they do not allow for place-making to occur. By confining Rohingya and Vietnamese refugees to boats for long stretches of time, making it impossible for them to disembark, they are confronted with a consciously created situation of strandedness or out-of-the-wayness. The “non-places” refugees are banned into disallow the creation of social ties, making it impossible for any form of place-making to occur.

The key theoretical insight I take away from this book is that we should no longer look at places in opposition to mobility, or to use Schapendonk and David's words, that we need to move from a "mobility-*versus*-place" lens to a "mobility-*with*-place" lens. The example of Abdoulah, the street vendor in Rome, whose presence was vehemently questioned by a local waiter shows that the "place acrobatics" (Schapendonk and Davids, this volume) occurring in the places migrants and refugees move through should by no means be romanticized. In a political landscape marked by the rise of right-wing parties and nativist ideas, migrants increasingly are confronted with the hostile reactions of people who declare themselves to be the sole owners of the place. To navigate such vexed relationships, migrants are often forced to engage in place acrobatics rather than choosing to become involved. By looking into the nooks and crannies of a globalized world order, the book reveals that the relationships people form with marginalized places do not occur through grand gestures or transformative actions. They appear in the form of everyday acts of repair—through spatial "fixes" (Ramsay in this volume) that create small moments of respite. Mama Patrick's attempt to grow a vegetable garden amid the alienating surroundings of urban Kampala is one example of how people attempt to fix their relationship to place. The utilization of the gym membership card as a local passport facilitating the movements of people whose mobility is stigmatized as dangerous or unruly, is another one. In doing so, gym members attempt to repair a system directed against them.

None of the spatial fixes presented in the book appear as ultimate solutions to a world marked by histories of structural inequality and dispossession. Yet I believe that we need to cherish them. Like the workers who assembled the stony man statue in my home village two centuries ago, these spatial fixes show the steps people take to repair the out-of-the-wayness of their situation. In doing so, they put to the test hardened academic stereotypes that relegate mobile people to a position of marginality and that treat certain places as peripheral.

Annika Lems is a senior lecturer in social anthropology at the Australian National University in Canberra, Australia. She has published extensively on questions of place, displacement, and belonging, including two monographs: *Being-Here: Placemaking in a World of Movement* (Berghahn Books, 2018) and *Frontiers of Belonging: The Education of Unaccompanied Refugee Youth* (Indiana University Press, 2022).

REFERENCES

- Appadurai, Arjun. 1988. "Putting Hierarchy in Its Place." *Cultural Anthropology* 3(1): 36–49.
- Bachelet, Sebastien. 2019. "Looking for One's Life: Trapped Mobilities and Adventure in Morocco." *Migration and Society* 2(1): 40–54.
- Bissell, David. 2007. "Animating Suspension: Waiting for Mobilities." *Mobilities* 2(2): 277–98.
- Bude, Heinz, and Jörg Dürschmidt. 2010. "What's Wrong with Globalization? Contra 'Flow Speak'—Towards an Existential Turn in the Theory of Globalization." *European Journal of Social Theory* 13(4): 481–500.
- Çağlar, Ayse, and Nina Glick Schiller. 2018. *Migrants and City-Making: Dispossession, Displacement, and Urban Regeneration*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Conlon, Deirdre. 2011. "Waiting: Feminist Perspectives on the Spacings/Timings of Migrant (Im)mobility." *Gender, Place and Culture* 18(3): 353–60.
- Creswell, Tim. 2006. *On the Move: Mobility in the Modern Western World*. New York: Routledge.
- Dahinden, Janine. 2016. "A Plea for the 'De-migranticization' of Research on Migration and Integration." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39(13): 2207–25.
- Glick Schiller, Nina, and Ayse Çağlar. 2016. "Displacement, Emplacement and Migrant Newcomers: Rethinking Urban Sociabilities within Multiscalar Power." *Identities* 23(1): 17–34.
- Glick Schiller, Nina, and Noel B. Salazar. 2013. "Regimes of Mobility across the Globe." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 39(2): 183–200.
- Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson (eds.). 1997. *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hage, Ghassan. 2000. *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*. New York: Routledge; Annandale, NSW: Pluto Press.
- Hannam, Kevin, Mimi Sheller, and John Urry. 2006. "Editorial: Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings." *Mobilities* 1(1): 1–22.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 2015. "The Village in the World and the World in the Village: Reflections on Ethnographic Epistemology." *Critique of Anthropology* 35(3): 338–43.
- Knight, Daniel M. 2021. *Vertiginous Time: An Anthropology of Time and the Unforeseen*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Lems, Annika. 2018. *Being-Here: Placemaking in a World of Movement*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- MacClancy, Jeremy (ed.). 2015. *Alternative Countrysides: Anthropological Approaches to Rural Western Europe Today*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Malkki, Liisa. 1995. "Refugees and Exile: From 'Refugee Studies' to the National Order of Things." *Annual Review in Anthropology* 24: 494–523.
- Ong, Aihwa. 1999. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- O'Neill, Bruce. 2017. *The Space of Boredom: Homelessness in the Slowing Global Order*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Ramsay, Georgina. 2020. "Time and the Other in Crisis: How Anthropology Makes Its Displaced Object." *Anthropological Theory* 20(4): 385–413.
- Ramsay, Georgina. 2021. "Displacement and the Capitalist Order of Things." *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development* 12(3): 368–79.
- Ramsay, Georgina, and Heath Cabot. 2021. "Deexceptionalizing Displacement: An Introduction." *Humanity* 12(3): 286–99.
- Salazar, Noel B. 2017. "Key Figures of Mobility: An Introduction." *Social Anthropology* 25(1): 5–12.
- . 2021. "Immobility: The Relational and Experiential Qualities of an Ambiguous Concept." *Transfers* 11(3): 3–21.
- Savransky, Martin, and Craig Lundy. 2022. "After Progress: Experiments in the Reevaluation of Values." *Sociological Review* 70(2): 217–31.
- Sheller, Mimi. 2014. "The New Mobilities Paradigm for a Live Sociology." *Current Sociology* 62(6): 789–811.
- . 2016. "Uneven Mobility Futures: A Foucauldian Approach." *Mobilities* 11(1): 15–31.
- Sheller, Mimi, and John Urry. 2016. "Mobilizing the New Mobilities Paradigm." *Applied Mobilities* 1(1): 10–25.
- Xiang, Biao. 2007. "How Far are the Left-Behind Left Behind? A Preliminary Study in Rural China." *Population, Space and Place* 13(3): 179–91.