Education in refugee camp contexts:
Making school on the margins of the nation-states[1]

Marion Fresia, Andreas von Känel & Anne-Nelly Perret Clermont

University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland.

Abstract

The delivery of education in refugee camps has become a key component of humanitarian programs. Since the late 1980s, camps have become the dominant way through which refugee movements are managed around the world (Agier, 2014). Children, the perfect embodiment of the innocent victim, are particularly targeted by humanitarian aid. When refugee situations become protracted and the temporary permanent, their learning structures tend to become actual schools made of an administration, a teaching staff, and a curriculum. Generally funded and coordinated by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), these camp schools contribute today to the schooling of almost 3,5 million refugee children (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2019a). Going beyond an idealized vision of education as a "basic human right" and an

---

[1] This article is a translated version of the following paper: Fresia, M., Von Kanel, A. & Perret-Clermont A.N. (2021, in press). "Les dispositifs éducatifs humanitaires: faire l'école dans les interstices des Etats-Nations", *Anthropologie et développement*, (52) 4

instrument of "protection," this article looks at the ways in which humanitarian aid contributes to establishing the school norm in the margins of the Nation-States while at the same time being closely intertwined with the politics of controlling human mobility. Based on the case studies of schools in two Congolese refugee camps (in Tanzania and Rwanda), we explore which registers of legitimization and understandings of the child they are built on; how they are governed and negotiated on a daily basis by multiple actors; and how they are perceived by the students. What emerges from this analysis is a variety of tensions that characterize the dynamics of these schools: they simultaneously include their students in and exclude them from the dominant social order; they victimize them at the same time as they project them as future citizens, and they (re)produce the conditions of their confinement while creating opportunities for certain socio-spatial mobilities

Keywords: refugees, education, norms, subjectivity, humanitarian aid, camps, East Africa

Introduction

Since the late 1980s, camps have become the dominant way through which states and humanitarian actors manage refugee[2] movements around the world (Agier, 2014). These spaces, which are the setting for a plethora of interventions, are intended to keep their inhabitants alive and manage their futures. Children, the perfect embodiment of the innocent victim, are particularly targeted by humanitarian aid. In the camps, they are supposed to be fed and cared for, but also to have access to education through learning structures that are supposed to be temporary (Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies, 2004). However, when refugee situations become protracted and the temporary permanent, these learning structures tend to be increasingly institutionalized and formalized. In many cases,

---

[2] We use the term "refugee" here as a legal and bureaucratic category, in reference to the definition of the refugee status given by the 1951 Geneva Convention: a person fleeing persecution who has cross an international border. This category does not reflect however the complexity of conflict-induced migration.

they become actual schools made of an administration, a teaching staff and a curriculum covering the primary and sometimes also the secondary levels. Generally funded and coordinated by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), these camp schools contribute today to the schooling of almost 3,5 million refugee children across the world (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2019b). They adopt either the educational curriculum of the refugees' country of origin, or that of the host country, or a mixture of the two, depending on whether or not the authorities of the host country are in favor of the refugees' formal integration into their territory. While these educational systems are tightly intertwined with encampment practices, they are also linked to the emergence of a new "school order" that has made universal access to education a global priority and "child victims of armed conflicts" a new target population to be reached. Camp schools thus reveal the growing interpenetration of two broader phenomena: on the one hand, the globalization of schooling that has successfully reached into the world's most marginalized spaces, and on the other, the expanded scope of the humanitarian field, which now incorporates sectors that were traditionally associated with development aid.

Although education has been recognized by the United Nations in 2007 as one of the major pillars of humanitarian aid, schools in refugee camp contexts have been the object of few ethnographic studies. At the crossroads of forced migration studies and anthropology of development in the Global South, and building on the growing literature on education in conflict situations (Paulson, 2011; Dryden-Peterson, 2016a), we propose to analyze the way in which these schools are legitimized, mobilized, and invested with different meanings. Beyond the humanitarian consensus on the benefits of education, we will try to understand which registers of legitimization and understandings of the child these schools are based on; how they are governed and regulated on a daily basis and how, finally, they are perceived by the students. This analysis will reveal a set of structural ambivalences that characterize the

practices of these systems, which simultaneously include their students in and exclude them from the dominant social order, victimizing them at the same time as they envision them as "ideal" political subjects, and contributing to the (re)production of the conditions of their encampment while creating opportunities for certain socio-spatial mobilities.

This reflection will be rooted in the context of sub-Saharan Africa, although educational systems geared specifically to refugee children have also been established in European and North American countries (Vitus & Lidén, 2010; Lems, 2019). We will present the main results of a collective research project[3] carried out from 2012 to 2016 in two camps for Congolese refugees, one in Rwanda (Gihembe) and one in Tanzania (Nyarugusu). In each of these two countries, ethnographic surveys were undertaken over two periods of six months each. Forty qualitative semi-structured interviews were carried out in each country with various stakeholders involved in the camp schools (students, parents, teachers, inspectors, school directors, school district authorities, UNHCR education and protection officers, and its implementing partners[4]). Class observations were conducted, both floating and targeting specific topics such as "history", "general culture" or "civic education", at both primary and secondary levels. In addition, close-up follow-up, over 2 years, of around 10 students and alumni aged between 14 and 25 in each country made it possible to understand their trajectories, and reveal the existence of student movements outside the camps. And finally,

---

[3] This project was funded by the Swiss National Scientific Foundation under the title "Education in spaces of exception: the social and political uses of school in Congolese refugee camps (Rwanda; Tanzania) " (project 100017_140475).

[4] The interviews were conducted in English or French with participants who had a command of those languages (humanitarian and educational staff, as well as educated teenagers); with other participants, they were carried out in the mother tongue of the interviewees (children and certain parents) with the help of an interpreter who was also a refugee. The challenges presented by the translation and the choice of the interpreter were the subject of very particular attention and reflexivity when analyzing the data.

additional complementary research was done on informal educational activities for young people led by NGOs or refugee associations within each camp.

In the following, we present the multiple rationalities in which camp schools are perceived, mobilized, and invested with meaning by different stakeholders. We will begin, however, by retracing the conditions of their emergence and providing a brief overview of the literature.

I- Between the Globalization of the Camps and the Globalization of Schooling

The interest of humanitarian actors in children displaced by armed conflicts is not new; it dates back to at least the 1920s, when Save the Children was created. Beginning in the 1950s, a couple of different United Nations agencies began to support education programs designed to help these children: the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA) in Palestinian camps and the UNHCR, which in the late 1960s developed secondary scholarship programs for a minority of them. The refugees themselves often established their own informal schools in their places of exile. The late 1980s, however, were marked by an important turning point: the unprecedented development, on a global scale, of primary and sometimes secondary educational systems intended specifically for children living in refugee camps and coordinated by the UNHCR and its NGO partners (Dryden-Peterson, 2011). This turning point must be understood in the light of two parallel movements: on the one hand, the globalization of camps, which became the dominant political option for managing displaced populations, and on the other, the globalization of the school, which became the most legitimate structure for learning and transmitting knowledge.

In sub-Saharan Africa, the economic crises linked to the politics of structural adjustment, as well as the declining geopolitical interest in welcoming refugees, caused more

and more host countries to prefer encampment policies over integration (Milner, 2009; Turner, 2010). The model of the "camp" financed by the international community started to spread over the continent, also because it was seen by western donor countries as a way to contain human mobility in the Global South (Cambrézy et al., 2008). Thus, it is most of all the national and international willingness to confine displaced persons while waiting to be able to repatriate them, but also the difficulty of integrating them into public infrastructures already weakened by the politics of structural adjustment, that encouraged the development of educational systems intended specifically for the children of the camps. The progressive emergence of a new "globalized schooling order," however, also constitutes an explanatory factor. With the adoption of the International Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1989 and the organization of international conferences on the topic of "Education for All," a global consensus emerged in the 1990s around the imperative of creating universal access to education by the year 2015. Thus, children who were not in school (having never gone or having been taken out) were identified as an urgent problem to be solved, with particular attention being paid to girls and to "child victims of armed conflict" (Machel, 1996). The notion of an "educational partnership" (Petit et al., 2010) was then put forward by the United Nations agencies, which called on all of the international actors—public, private, and community-based—to contribute to the global effort to create universal access to schooling. It is thus in this context of a race to meet the specific targets of Education for All that humanitarian organizations (such as UNHCR, the International Rescue Committee, the Jesuit refugee service, etc.), in addition to the agencies that had traditionally been active in the field (such as UNICEF), began to play an increasingly important role in the field of education. Long considered as a development rather than a humanitarian issue, education was eventually recognized in 2007 as the fourth pillar of humanitarian action. In addition to being a fundamental right, it has been described as a means of protecting refugee children from

multiple "vulnerabilities" and "risks." It has also been characterized as a way to restore their sense of "routine and normalcy"; to address their "psycho-social needs"; to offer them a "safe and secure" recreational space; and to "convey messages to them of peace and reconciliation based on human rights" (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2003; Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies, 2004). Concretely, these developments have led humanitarian actors to play an increasing role in the delivery of education in what has been named "emergency, conflict or post-conflict situations" (Dryden-Peterson, 2016a). Their main mode of intervention has been to finance temporary learning spaces: spaces that work in parallel to public schools, and which modes of functioning and degree of formalization vary depending on whether they are set up within countries in conflict (for internally displaced persons), or within refugee camps in neighboring countries.

Even though they have proliferated, humanitarian educational systems have not been the subject of many ethnographic studies. In the field of anthropology of development, most of the attention has been focused on the reshaping of public schools that was brought about by the Education for All movement. Thus, in Africa, a number of analyses have investigated the consequences of the transformation of school from a public good managed by the state in the 1960s and 1970s to a "global" good managed by an ever-increasing diversity of international, non-governmental, and community-based actors (Anderson-Levitt, 2003; Bierschenk, 2007; Fichtner, 2012; Petit et al., 2010; Lange, 2003; Poncelet et al., 2010). However, the entry of humanitarian actors into this globalized educational field has received less attention, apart from the work of a few scholars (Chelpi-den-Hamer et al., 2010; Dryden-Peterson, 2016b; Monaghan, 2019; Murseli, 2019).

Within forced migration studies there are also few ethnographic studies on schools in refugee camp contexts. Following on Agamben's work (1995), attention has long been focused specifically on the rationales of exception and of the deprivation of rights that are at

work in the governance of the camps, thus leaving unexamined other rationales that are a priori more inclusive, such as the desire to guarantee access to education. Recently, however, several studies have emphasized the fact that humanitarian action in refugee camp contexts aims not only to keep bodies alive, but also to make ideal micro-societies out of the camps and to transform their inhabitants into "ideal" citizens: autonomous, participatory, and committed to human rights (Turner, 2010). As such, humanitarianism can also be seen as part of broader biopolitical projects aiming at creating "ideal political subjects" (Krause & Schramm, 2011, p. 118) and engaged in "global social engineering" (Bierschenck, 2007). Other studies have also begun to address the modes of socialization of young people growing up in the camps (Chatty, 2010; White, 2012; Grayson, 2017), showing the importance of the role played by NGOs in socializing them to the language of children rights (Epstein, 2012) and in the production of an ambivalent figure of the refugee child, constructed in turn as a purely innocent victim, a potentially threatening actor (in the male version of the figure), or a potential agent for the promotion of peace.

Beyond development and forced migration studies, there is, however, a specialized field of research on education in emergency, conflict and post-conflict situations. The Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE), which brings together members of UN agencies, NGOs, and academic circles, has, in particular, started in 2015 a journal (Journal on Education in Emergencies) that publishes practitioner and scholarly work on the subject. Within this field of research, the analytic approaches raise on the one-hand policy-oriented questions such as issues of access, quality, safety, certification, and learning outcomes of education in emergencies (Kirk, 2009; Mundy & Dryden-Peterson, 2013; Piper & al., 2020). On the other hand, many studies have been looking at the connections between education, armed conflicts, and the promotion of peace and transitional justice (Davies, 2004; Paulson, 2011; King, 2014; Ramírez-Barat & Duthie, 2016). Here, education has often been

described as double-sided (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000). In the positive version, when it is supervised or managed by international organizations, it appears as having the potential to protect children in situations of armed conflicts, to restore a routine, or to rebuild peace in post-conflict situations (Crisp et al., 2001). In the negative version, on the other hand, when it is managed solely by states, education is described as a potential vector of physical violence or a site for the possible manipulation of history and the ethnicization of social relations. While this literature has widely contributed to go beyond the idealized view of schooling as a "right", and deepen our understanding of the complex relationships between education and conflict, it has sometimes tended to oppose public education systems that potentially breed violence, to educational systems that are potentially better when they are managed or have been reformed by the agents of international aid, whose supposed moral neutrality or superiority is not always questioned (Lanoue, 2006;Versmesse et al., 2017).

In our work, we look at the schools that are managed by humanitarian agencies the same way that we see any other educational system: as spaces that are never neutral, but rather fundamentally political, in which a certain ideal of society and of what a good "political subject" should be is projected. In our case, schools located in refugee camps are rooted in the politics of exclusion of "undesirable" migrants (Agier, 2008). They offer a privileged field from which to observe the way in which political subjectivities are produced and negotiated on the margins of the nation-states. Our study thus interrogates the ways in which humanitarian educational systems are "inhabited" by social actors. It builds on research which has looked at how the purposes of refugee education are understood and acted upon by stakeholders (Kelcey, 2019), and how refugee youth negotiated their educational path (Dryden-Peterson et al., 2019; Bellino et al., 2018). More generally we see our work as a continuation of the studies that approach schooling in the Global South in an empirically

anchored way, rather than a normative one (Anderson-Levitt, 2003; Charton & Fichtner, 2015).

II- Establishing a Schooling System on the Margins of the State: An Ambivalent Normalization

The inhabitants of the camps we studied are from Kivu, in the Eastern part of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). The violent conflicts that have affected this region since 1994 have caused hundreds of thousands of Congolese to flee to five neighboring countries: in 2005, there were 54,000 of them in Rwanda and 64,000 in Tanzania (Vlassenroot & Huggins, 2005; Guishaoua, 2004). Those who are now in Rwanda are mainly from the Banyarwanda group and come from North Kivu, while those in Tanzania come from South Kivu and belong to the Bembe group5. In Rwanda, while some sought refuge among the local population, the majority of those who fled later were settled in three camps (Kiziba, Gihembe, and Nyabiheke) set up by the UNHCR (see United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2007). In Tanzania, the majority was grouped into two camps, Nyarugusu and Lugufu, located in the Kigoma region6. Since the conflicts of the 1990s, Tanzania's asylum policy has become more restrictive, conditioned upon the systematic encampment of the displaced persons (Milner, 2009). In this section, we present the ways in which the educational systems emerged in these camps, the actors involved in their governance up to 2016, and the objectives that were assigned to them, between the (re)establishment of the schooling norm and the logics of exclusion.

---

[5] While we are aware of the socially constructed and politically manipulated dimension of these ethnic appellations, we use them here only in their "emic" sense, as categories of identity that are used by the actors themselves to designate themselves.

[6] Lugufu was closed in 2009 and the remaining refugees were transferred to Nyarugusu.

A "Separate" School Bureaucracy

The educational systems in the camps of Congolese refugees in Rwanda and Tanzania were established in the years 1996 to 1997. These systems, which began as "spontaneous" schools launched by Congolese teachers with the financial support of the students' parents and of church networks, then quickly began to be financed and supervised by the UNHCR and its NGO partners[7], first informally and then within the framework of a "memorandum of understanding" with the Ministries of Refugee Affairs, themselves dependent of the Ministries of Interior (Bird, 2003). This support resulted in the construction of numerous educational infrastructures within each camp, the delivery of school supplies, the formal institution of a recruitment and training system for the teaching staff chosen from among the refugees, and the establishment of links between these schools and the ministries of education of their host countries or country of origin in order to obtain curricula, organize exams, and receive diplomas. Thus, with the arrival of the humanitarian actors, a veritable educational bureaucracy emerged in the camps. In Tanzania, at Nyarugusu, a complete educational system from primary through upper secondary (16 schools in total) was already set up for a camp of 70,000 persons and 30 000 students in 1996; in Rwanda, meanwhile, at Gihembe, one primary school and one lower secondary school were established for a population of 14,000. In Rwanda, access to upper secondary education was secured by the institution of a scholarship system funded by the UNHCR and its NGO partner, the Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS), in order to allow the refugee students to continue their schooling outside the camp, in Rwandan schools. When this scholarship program was interrupted in 2012 for lack of funds,

---

[7] In Tanzania, the UNHCR established a contract with World Vision Tanzania and the International Rescue Committee for implementing its education program. In Rwanda, the UN agency first contracted the Jesuit Refugee Service and then the Adventist Development and Relief Agency.

the students' parents, along with support networks outside the camp (churches, relatives who had stayed in the DRC, and family in the diaspora), mobilized to finance a community school by the name of "Hope School" to allow students to finish their secondary education within the camp, an initiative that demonstrates the strong mobilizing capability of the populations for the sake of education (Poncelet et al., 2010). Although they exist on a register identified as temporary, these schools have allowed for the schooling of two generations of children. In both Rwanda and Tanzania, these students also have access to university scholarships funded by Germany via the UNHCR (DAFI program).

With the exception of Hope School, the schools in these camps were multi-stakeholder systems involving foreign donors, international organizations (UNHCR), local and international NGOs, governmental bodies, the teaching staff, and parents. While the teaching staff and the school principals, all of whom were refugees, took care of the daily administration of the schools and managed the classes, the UNHCR and its partner NGOs played a crucial role in the structure of the organizations: they controlled the financing of the schools and the recruitment, training, and payment of personnel; they imposed certain regulations; they produced statistics for the schools; and they negotiated questions of accreditation and certification with the ministries of education. For the state stakeholders, the central position granted to humanitarian organizations in the management of the schools was legitimized by a vision of the camps as exceptional spaces, where ordinary laws are temporarily suspended and the care of their inhabitants is delegated to the "international community." Nevertheless, these schools, far from being independent, remained closely connected to the authorities of the host countries and incorporated into broader state objectives of control over human mobility. Thus, their particularity lay less in the fact that they were financed and coordinated by agents of international aid—which is, in fact. the case for numerous private and public schools in sub-Saharan Africa—than in the fact that they

were under the responsibility of the ministries of the interior (refugee affairs) and not of the ministries of education. It is the ministries of the interior that played a key role in the choice of educational curricula, generally in close discussion with the UNHCR. Thus, in Tanzania, the ministry of the interior prescribed a policy of "education for repatriation"—in other words, that the refugee schools should follow the Congolese curriculum—with the aim of discouraging any lasting settlement of refugees on its soil. This was in line with the UNHCR's own policy, which, at the time, recommended that camp inhabitants should follow the curriculum of their country of origin (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2003). In Rwanda, on the other hand, in an ambivalent stand, the authorities pushed for the adoption of the Rwandan curriculum (which became English-speaking as of 2009) : their aim was to encourage the emergence of a Congolese elite educated in Rwanda and with an investment in Rwandan interests, yet without granting refugees full citizenship status, because permanently integrating them into the country would be likely to heighten the pressure on the country's land resources, which is already explosive (Pourtier 2009). In both cases, the direct participation of the ministries of the interior, though it is not very visible at first glance, attested to the tight interweaving of the humanitarian educational systems with broader geopolitical issues (linked to the Kivu War) and with the asylum policies of the host countries (and how favorable they are towards the integration of refugees).

Integrating Students into a "School and National" Order

Although they were nested in a politics of exclusion, the humanitarian educational systems were nevertheless presented by the humanitarian actors and the teaching staff as being, above all, an effort to "normalize" the situation of the children, which is understood in terms of a double abnormality. Displaced by war, the children were in fact perceived as being "out of place," disoriented, disaffiliated, and psychologically traumatized by the experience of violence, which was also seen in terms of exceptionality (Daiute, 2010). They were also

described as "out of school," potentially vulnerable to all the forms of exploitation (sexual exploitation, forced labor, military recruitment) that supposedly ran rampant in the camps, which were painted as menacing places where idleness, promiscuity, and all kinds of trafficking lied in wait. For the humanitarian institutions and the teaching staff, the school was seen as making it possible to recreate the conditions of what is considered a normal childhood. And in fact, at both Gihembe and Nyarugusu, the camps' schools helped to incorporate the children into a broader dominant order: on the one hand, by providing them free access to education, they integrated the children into a school order that has now been globalized; on the other hand, by arranging for them to learn the official curricula, the schools affiliated the children with the system of nation-states from which they are otherwise excluded. This shows the significant role played by humanitarian actors, in both establishing the school norm and producing a national order within peripheral spaces (the camps) situated on the margins of the nation-states. The school norm is built on a western-centered representation of childhood, where children are supposed to spend all their time in scholastic learning and to experience violence as an unusual phenomenon, rather than a commonplace one. The national norm (Malkki, 1995), meanwhile, is built on a sedentary and state-centered vision of identity and belonging, which sees displacement only in terms of uprooting and dispossession, and identity as necessary related to a national territory.

This "normalizing" project, which attempts to integrate the children into a dominant order, is still, however, fundamentally ambivalent, and always marked by exceptionality. In the camps, despite they were perceived as bearers of a set of universal rights such as the right to education, children remained indeed first and foremost positioned as "refugees", whose status could justified their exclusion from the public schools of their host society. Their schools remained placed under the authority of the ministries of the interior and could be closed at any moment, for example as a way to push the refugees towards repatriation, as this

was done in Tanzania with the closing of the Mtabila camp in 2009. In addition, the agreements between the authorities and the UNHCR about the recognition of diplomas remained fragile and always subjected to renegotiation by the state. The external funding sources on which they depended could also be interrupted at any moment, by when donors would move on towards new emergencies. The fragility and exceptionality of these schools were also expressed in the status of the teaching staff. Considered "volunteers" by the humanitarian agents, invested in the good of "their" community, the teaching staff was paid only with motivational bonuses, two or three times less than the civil servants of the host countries' public schools, for equivalent work and with equal qualifications. The exceptionality of these schools was eventually reflected in the materiality of their infrastructures, which was extremely run-down, both because the initial investments were made in a provisional context and, in the case of Tanzania, because the authorities had prohibited any reinforcement of the buildings.

Our case studies thus shade light on the ambivalence of humanitarian educational systems in camp contexts: while conveying projects of "normalization" aiming at including refugee children in a wider dominant order, they contribute at the same time to perpetuate or legitimize logics of exclusion towards them. Exceptionality and normalization actually works as two sides of the same coin, because it is in fact the construction of refugee children as a "problem" in the "normal" order of things (they are seen as "out of place", and "out of school"), that legitimizes both their exclusion and the effort to reintegrate them into the norm. Camp schools thus remain intertwined with the wider structural ambivalence of the camp system itself, its inhabitants being, in the name of national sovereignty, excluded from the

national order and from a number of political and socio-economical rights but at the same time, perceived as potential future subjects to be educated, if not disciplined (Turner, 2010).

III- Negotiated Educational Systems and Issues of Identity and Memory

Beyond the ambivalent projects of normalization that legitimize them, how are humanitarian educational systems regulated, negotiated, and inhabited by the various actors on a day-to-day basis? Governed by formal norms, these schools also develop their own "practical norms" (Olivier de Sardan, 2010). They constitute plural spaces where different moral orders and political projects confront each other. Although the negotiated dimension of the school's space is not specific to these schools, it is exacerbated here by the fact that certain regulations originate with actors—the humanitarian agents and the interior ministries—that are not always perceived as legitimate by the teaching personnel. In this section, we will show, by way of example, how certain disciplinary regulations required by the UNHCR are contested, but also how the educational curricula can be the object of renegotiations.

In Tanzania, the school regulations imposed by the UNHCR on the basis of its "protection mandate" attracted our particular attention. The humanitarian agents were not only helping to formalize an educational bureaucracy in the camps connected to the Congolese system. They were also trying to transform it. They were doing this, first, by formally prohibiting, in the name of children's rights, certain educational practices such as the exclusion of pregnant girls, the expulsion of students who failed twice, and corporal punishment; and, second, by developing, within the schools or as extracurricular programs, activities to raise awareness about children's rights and about reporting procedures, which could lead the children to question the hierarchical relationships between teachers and

students and between parents and children and to denounce "abuses" of their rights to the humanitarian authorities. Through these injunctions, the humanitarian agents were envisioning the students not only as future citizens of a state into which these young people were eventually supposed to reintegrate but also as political subjects here and now, citizens of the world who were supposed to know and claim their rights as they are set out in international conventions.

However, it was not so much against their host country, which was practicing an asylum policy of encampment, that these young people were meant to mobilize, as it was against their own community and its "traditions," at whose door was laid the responsibility for their everyday problems (Fresia & von Känel, 2016). And yet these injunctions were regularly the object of controversy and protests from the teaching and administrative staff: the prohibition against corporal punishment, as well as the increased risk of sexual relations between students and teachers being reported, were seen as undermining their authority, which had already been so greatly eroded by their refugee status and insecure working conditions. The rights assigned to children, especially those assigned to girls, were more generally understood as expressing the imposition of a new moral order that was judged to be decadent and libertarian. In order to minimize the effects of this new order, the school administration had, notably, reacted by introducing other socially conservative disciplinary measures, directed in particular towards girls: the reintroduction of uniforms, a ban on makeup and short haircuts, but also the temporary exclusion of pregnant girls, who were considered responsible for their pregnancies, in spite of the prohibition of this practice by the UNHCR. Thus, the school authorities, strongly influenced by the presence of the churches, set themselves up as guardians of a local moral order in opposition to the international humanitarian agents. At the same time, though, the teaching staff appropriated the language of children's rights to promote the educational institution to the students' parents and to

remind the parents of their duty to send their children, including girls, to school. Reproducing, in this case, the discourse of the humanitarian agents according to which the parents, characterized as "ignorant," must be "hold accountable," the school authorities presented themselves as the bearers of a civilizing mission aimed at ensuring the modernization of the entire society.

In Rwanda, we observed similar tensions around school regulations introduced by the UNHCR, ranging from resistance to a reappropriation of the discourse around children's rights. In this case, however, there were some additional dynamics around the renegotiation of the educational curriculum. At Gihembe, the imposition of the Rwandan curriculum in the camp schools, and the transition to English as the principal language of education in 2009, were, indeed, not accomplished without resistance from the teaching staff. While the teachers saw an advantage in this for facilitating their students' access to higher education in Rwanda, they were also afraid, at the same time, that it would only further promote the perceived assimilation of the camp's youth, with the risk that if they returned to the DRC, this would perpetuate the accusations that their community, using Rwanda's official language (English), were not "true" natives but rather Rwandans. At the primary and lower secondary levels, therefore, the teachers introduced more hours of French classes than were part of the Rwandan curriculum. But it was at the community-organized Hope School that the curriculum was modified the most: for one thing because this school, not being accredited, offered more room for maneuvering; and also because it was created by a young intellectual elite that, having studied outside the camp thanks to the UNHCR's university scholarships, had returned to the camp politicized and with preoccupations that included fighting against the risk that the youth would forget its Congolese origins and, above all, the massacres that had been perpetrated against their community. This young elite, therefore, added to the Rwandan curriculum courses on Congolese history and the teaching of the Congolese

national anthem, in addition to French courses. This elite also created several cultural

associations to promote traditional songs and dances from South and North Kivu and was

behind the organization of commemorations of the massacres of Congolese Tutsis in 1996–

1997, in which it involved the students in the camp8. Thrusting the students back into ethno-

nationalist kinds of identity and into the history of the Kivu conflict, the Hope School's

founders nevertheless also drew on a much broader and more syncretic repertoire when they

addressed their "brothers and sisters," ranging from the more universalist vocabulary of

human rights to that of religion or even of entrepreneurship.

In Tanzania, we did not observe any efforts by the teaching staff to renegotiate the

curriculum within the schools. Confronted with several attempts by certain political groups

established in the camp to introduce into the lessons references to the recent history of the

conflict or to "patriotism" as a civic attitude to be privileged, the school administration

instead took a stand against any redefinition of the official Congolese curriculum—which, at

the time of our study, was entirely silent on the subject of the undeclared war in Kivu. The

administration's stance was that the school should be neutral and contribute to social

harmony by avoiding the transmission to the children of discourses that could generate

feelings of hatred. But the challenge of preserving the connection with their country of origin

was also not as great in the Tanzanian camp as it was in Rwanda, because in Tanzania the

children did follow a Congolese curriculum and daily rituals (such as the national anthem)

that constantly projected them into a future as citizens of the DRC. The students and their

---

[8] In Rwanda, the politicization of the students and the educational space was also marked by infiltration attempts on the part

of the M23 militias, which sought to enlist young people in the Kivu War and to sell them their success model; this was a

taboo subject that was extremely difficult to broach but was hinted at in stories involving students who "disappeared from

one day to the next" to "try their luck" in Kivu.

parents had mixed reactions to the administration's position: they saw it as the expression of a certain bureaucratic neutrality that, while welcomed to some, appeared to others to be part of the larger depoliticization of the camp space where the inhabitants were not allowed, in principle, to develop political activities.

The teaching staff itself, acting sometimes as entrepreneurs of identity and memory, sometimes as agents of modernization or guardians of a certain moral order, thus also continually shaped the camp school system and negotiated the mandates stemming either from the authorities of the host country (i.e., the choice of curriculum) or from the humanitarian agents (i.e., the disciplinary regulations). Nevertheless, the teachers and the humanitarian organizations shared the same goal of providing a direction to a group of young people that they both perceived by turns, on the one hand, "traumatized" or "endangered" (by the loss of a connection to the nation-state, by assimilation, or by a new moral order considered to be decadent) but also, on the other, "threatening." At the same time, they both placed their hopes for a better world in this youth, envisioning them as potential political subjects, vectors of a positive transformation: called, by the humanitarian agents, to promote a social order that respects human rights within their "community" (understood in a de-nationalized way), the youth was at the same time called by some of their teachers to be future citizens, or even "patriotic" leaders of their country of origin, a country that they often did not even know.

IV-Reproduction of the Margins and Socio-Spatial Mobilities

In this final section, we are interested in the place occupied by the camp schools in the students' trajectories and representations, as well as in the way in which the students navigated among the various projections that were made about them. We have emphasized

the perspectives of young men and women between the ages of 15 and 25 so as to have a minimum of distance from their trajectories. We present here some summary points, without being able to reproduce all of the subtle differences within the diversity represented here.

Almost all of the young people whom we met saw school as a source of power and dignity, but also as a crucial step in the realization of their multiple aspirations. As illustrated by the name of Hope School, school is above all synonymous with hopes: the hope of leaving the camps, of achieving a respected social status, of ensuring a better life for oneself and one's family, of developing one's intellectual or moral capacities, of being able to enjoy a certain level of autonomy, of playing an important role in one's community, etcetera. These hopes, however, went hand in hand with the perception that academic success was not enough to guarantee social success and with the consciousness that even with a degree, there would be discrimination to face in trying to land employment in the formal sector. Within the camps, the figure of the intellectual as a model of success was thus subject to the same relative depreciation as can be observed in contexts outside the camps elsewhere on the African continent (Banégas & Warnier, 2001). Here, however, it was reinforced by the experience of exclusion that these young people already knew or anticipated in the formal job market, and which they attribute above all to their refugee status, even though that access was equally difficult for local nationals.

While school in general tended to be valued, the camp schools were nevertheless not very well regarded in comparison with educational systems outside the camps: they were perceived as being of lower quality, given that their infrastructures were precarious and the teaching staff, according to the students, neither well trained nor highly motivated given their salary conditions. In Rwanda, Hope School was seen as the "poor people's school". Better-off families preferred to send their children to school outside the camp, in private or public Rwandan schools but sometimes also in the DRC, at Goma, where there were relatives who

were likely to take them in. This kind of academic mobility outside the camp was particularly visible in Rwanda, and facilitated by the fact that the students in the camps followed the same curriculum as Rwandan schools and that they had access to secondary-level scholarships in order to study outside the camp. But it could also be seen in Tanzania, on an informal basis for secondary school and officially for access to the university, through the UNHCR's higher-education scholarship program. Thus, although the humanitarian educational systems anchored the children in the camps, they also offered some resources that allowed them to transcend the borders of these spaces. In addition, the school camps were often integrated into family support networks that were strongly marked by their transnational character: children whose parents had stayed in (or returned to) the DRC, for example, may be sent to the camp to stay with the extended family that lived there in order to receive schooling at a lower cost, or vice versa. The humanitarian educational systems, like the camps and the resources that they offer, were thus also integrated into the regional economy of the African Great Lakes Region and into largely transnationalized individual and familial strategies.

Although they did offer privileged spaces to young people from which they could project themselves into a normalized life and, for a small minority, the possibility of officially leaving the camp through scholarships, the humanitarian education systems nevertheless also contribute to the reproduction of the camp bureaucracy and the refugees' conditions of encampment. The NGOs offered positions in education, but also in health work and in social work within the camps. Thus, in both countries, students oriented their studies at least partially with respect to these potential outlets within the camps, generally preferring the options of social work or pedagogy and the humanities. In fact, a certain number of graduates either remained in or returned to the camp, at least for a while. Even if the market conditions with the humanitarian agencies would not seem to be very attractive, because the refugees were limited to the status of "volunteer," they did offer a regular income that was difficult to

obtain outside of the camp, while also serving as a springboard for obtaining a university scholarship (investment in the camps being one of the criteria for receiving those scholarships) or for acquiring skills that could be used outside the camps in the NGO sector. However, the camp did not, by a long shot, constitute the entire horizon of the young people's imagination or practices. In reconstructing their trajectories, we observed that a certain number of them, mostly men, also sought to "make a life" in cities in Tanzania, Rwanda, Congo, or other countries in the region. Their life stories were often characterized by frequent geographic movements and changes of context, which also led them to constantly give new meaning to their situation. Added to that were future hopes tied to resettlement in the United States, which announced in 2014–2015 that it would be prepared to welcome almost all of the refugees from the Gihembe camp in the coming years, as well as about 30,000 people from the Nyarugusu camp.

Navigating Among Contradictory Injunctions

With respect to the projections made onto the young people in the camps, we saw different dimensions emerging from our two case studies. In Rwanda, it was their relationships to ambivalent assignments of identity that was particularly interesting. Recalled to their Congolese identity by some of their teachers and by their refugee status, these young people were at the same time envisioned as "Rwandan" by the Rwandan curriculum, which emphasized a de-ethnicized post-genocide national identity (Rutayisire et al., 2004). These multiple identity referents were at the same time sources of opportunity in the transnationalized space of the African Great Lakes Region but also potentially, because of the essentialisms that they assumed, synonyms for a difficulty in finding one's place between a "country of origin" that some of them did not know and a "host country" that considered them second-class citizens in spite of their education, which was close to that of the Rwandans themselves. Thus, in this case, school reproduced the liminal position of the

Kinyarwanda-speaking populations of the Kivu which were considered, both in Congo and in Rwanda, neither truly Congolese nor truly Rwanda, never truly at home in the national order. It was also, surely, to escape this liminal position that some hopes were projected onto a future life in the United States.

In Tanzania, we observed, above all, the way in which the students positioned themselves with respect to the models of citizenship projected in the space of the school. On the one hand, some of them claimed for themselves the critical registry of children's rights, knowing that it could facilitate their access to resources within the aid industry. Others, however, seek to distance themselves from discourses that were too provocative and to re-moralize the language of human rights, conscious of the controversies and uneasiness that that language elicited within their community. Thus, some made a distinction between a "responsible" and "irresponsible" use of the voice of the child, linking children's rights with duties as well, such as the duty, when formulating demands, to make sure that they were socially acceptable and that they took the responsibility of the child into account.

However, in both Tanzania and Rwanda, beyond the futures and identities that were projected onto them at school, the students' "social becoming" was also, all along their trajectory, woven out of numerous other contexts (family, economic life, churches, political or armed groups, etcetera). We were not able to investigate all of these instances of socialization within which the students evolved, nor the multiple models of success, more or less contradictory, that circulated there. However, it became clear that the young people themselves, far from inhabiting the simple subjectivity of "victims," mobilized a variety of resources (material, social institutional, moral) with which to build their futures.

*

By approaching them as spaces embedded in wider politics of mobility and social engineering, our research has explored humanitarian educational systems beyond policy-

oriented issues of access, quality or certification. From that perspective, camp schools appear to be full of contradictions: invested with normalizing projects, they remain closely articulated to logics of exception; closely articulated to encampment policies and producing elites which contributes to the reproduction of the camp, at the same time they also promote—though only for a minority—spatial and social mobilities which transgress encampment. Finally, while these systems tend to reproduce identity referents that are reified, ethnicized, and anchored in a national order, they also project young people as de-nationalized and de-historicized citizens, who are meant to make the "community" and its "traditions," rather than the politics of exclusion directed at them, responsible for the difficulties they faced. These observations thus lead us to emphasize the ambivalent role played by these humanitarian education systems in the reproduction and legitimization of the camp.

In deciphering these tensions, our research contributes to the debates over the nature of the camps (deleted for sake of anonymity), which have long been seen only through the paradigm of Agamben's "bare life" and the idea that refugees are excluded from every kind of political participation. By studying one segment of the camp bureaucracy in depth, we have shown, like other recent studies (Oesch, 2017), that the structure of the camp cannot be reduced to this one logic. The production of "bare life" is accompanied, at the same time, by the production of "potential" political life (Agier, 2008) or a "campzenship" (Sigona, 2014), which, although it remains precarious and unfinished, aims to reincorporate refugees into the world of nation-states and into a moral order governed by human rights. A great deal of effort is put into this objective, making the school an interesting object for thinking about the types of political subjectivities that are constructed on the margins of the nation-states.

Finally, our research contributes to the debate on the transformations of African educational systems. Within the specific field of development studies, the literature has so far

mainly focused on the role of the classic actors in development aid or the growing role of private actors. Yet it has paid less attention to the logic of emergency that intrudes on the educational field and legitimizes the intervention of yet other actors (the UNHCR, ministries of the interior). We show how humanitarian actors have, at least until recently, been less interested in reforming national educational policies at the governmental level than it is in establishing the school norm in marginalized zones, with a relatively weak interaction with national educational systems, though never completely disconnected from them. While humanitarian organizations connect camp schools to national bureaucracies to obtain, for instance, their formal recognition, they also tend, at the same time, to short-circuit those bureaucracies by establishing diverging school regulations or curricula, legitimized with the fiction of the camp as an "extraterritorial" space. Nevertheless, these educational systems always remain temporary and subjected to politics of control over human mobility. Thus, the camp schools are "separate," liminal schools, neither integrated into the national educational administrations nor completely excluded, and yet constituting integral parts of the larger dynamics of the globalization of the school order and the diversification of the kind of actors involved in the educational field. The recent policy change of the UNHCR, now wishing to find an alternative to the camp model and to promote the integration of refugees into public systems (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2012 and 2019a, Dryden-Peterson et al., 2019) raises the question of the future of these schools and of the role that the humanitarian actors will play in the governance of public schools located within areas that host refugees.

References

Agamben, G. (1995). *Homo sacer. Le pouvoir souverain et la vie nue*. Paris: Seuil.

Agier, M. (2008). *Gérer les indésirables. Des camps de réfugiés au gouvernement humanitaire*. Paris: Flammarion.

Agier, M. (2014). *Un monde de camps*. Paris : La Découverte

Anderson-Levitt, K. (2003). *Local meanings, global schooling: Anthropology and world culture theory*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Banégas, R. & Warnier, J.-P. (2001). Nouvelles figures de la réussite et du pouvoir. *Politique africaine, 82*(2), 5-23.

Bellino, M. J.,& Dryden-Peterson, S. (2018). Inclusion and exclusion within a policy of national integration: Refugee education in Kenya's Kakuma Refugee Camp. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 40*(2), 222-238.

Bierschenk, T. (2007). L'éducation de base en Afrique de l'Ouest francophone. Bien privé, bien public, bien global. In T. Bierschenk, G. Blundo, Y. Jaffré, & M. Tidjani Alou (Eds.), *Une anthropologie entre rigueur et engagement. Essais autour de l'œuvre de Jean-Pierre Olivier de Sardan* (pp. 251-277). Paris: Karthala.

Bird, L. (2003). *Surviving School: Education for Refugee Children from Rwanda 1994-1996*. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Bush, K. D., & Saltarelli, D. (Eds.). (2000). *The two faces of education in ethnic conflict: Towards a peacebuilding education for children*. Florence, Italy: UNICEF, Innocenti Research Centre.

Cambrézy, L., Laacher, S., Lassailly-Jacob, V., & Legoux, L. (Eds.). (2008). *L'asile au Sud*. Paris: La Dispute.

Charton, H., & Fichtner, S. (Eds.). (2015). Faire l'école [Dossier]. *Politique africaine, 139*, 7-121.

Chatty, D. (2010). *Deterritorialized youth. Sahrawi and Afghan refugees at the margin of the Middle East*. New-York: Berghahn books.

Chelpi-den-Hamer, M., Fresia, M., & Lanoue, E. (2010*). Education et conflits : les enjeux de l'offre éducative en situation de crise : introduction. *Autrepart, 54*, 3-22.

Crisp J., Talbot C., & Cipollone D, 2001, *Learning for a Future: Refugee Education in Developing Countries*, Geneva, UNHCR.

Daiute, C. (2010). *Human development and political violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, L. (2004). *Education and conflict: Complexity and Chaos*. Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer.

Dryden-Peterson, S., Adelman, E., Bellino, M. J., & Chopra, V. (2019). The Purposes of Refugee Education: Policy and Practice of Including Refugees in National Education Systems. *Sociology of Education, 92*(4), 346-366.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2011). *Refugee Education. A Global Review*. Geneva: UNHCR.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2016a). Refugee education: The crossroads of globalization. *Educational Researcher, 45*(9), 473-482.

Dryden-Peterson, S. (2016b). Policies for education in conflict and post-conflict reconstruction. In K. Mundy, A. Green, B. Lingard, & A. Verger (Eds.), *Handbook of Global Education Policy* (pp. 189-205). Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons.

Epstein, A. I. (2012). *Maps of desire: Refugee children, schooling, and contemporary Dinka pastoralism in South Sudan* (PhD thesis). Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Fichtner, S. (2012). *The NGOisation of Education. Case Studies from Benin*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.

Fresia, M., & von Känel, A. (2016) Beyond state of exception? Reflections on the camp through the prism of refugee schools. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 29(2), 250-272.

Guishaoua, A. (Ed.). (2004). *Exilés, réfugiés, déplacés en Afrique centrale et orientale.* Paris: Karthala.

Grayson, C. L. (2017). *Children of the Camp: The Lives of Somali Youth Raised in Kakuma Refugee Camp, Kenya.* New York: Berghahn books.

Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies. (2004). Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies Handbook.

Kelcey, J. (2019). "Incredibly Difficult, Tragically Needed, and Absorbingly Interesting": Lessons from the AFSC School Program for Palestinian Refugees in Gaza, 1949 to 1950. *Journal on Education in Emergencies, 5*(1), 12-34.

King, E. (2014). *From classrooms to conflict in Rwanda*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kirk, J. (Ed.). (2009). *Certification counts. Recognizing the learning attainments of displaced and refugee students*. Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning.

Krause, K., & Schramm, K. (2011). Thinking through political subjectivities. *African Diaspora, 4*(2), 115-134.

Lange, M.F. (2003). École et mondialisation: vers un nouvel ordre scolaire? *Cahiers d'études africaines, 43*(1-2), 143-166.

Lanoue, E. (2006). *Education, violences et conflits armés en Afrique subsaharienne: Bilan critique de nos connaissances et perspectives de recherches.* Paper presented at the Colloque international: Education, Violences, Conflits et Perspectives de Paix en Afrique, Yaoundé 6-10 mars 2006.

Lems, A. (2019). Being inside out: The slippery slope between inclusion and exclusion in a Swiss educational project for unaccompanied refugee youth. J*ournal of ethnic and migration studies, 46*(2), 405-422. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2019.1584702

Lems, A., Oester, K., & Strasser, S. (2019). Children of the crisis: Ethnographic perspectives on unaccompanied refugee youth in and en route to Europe. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies, 46*(2), 313-335. doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2019.1584697

Machel, G. (1996). *Promotion and protection of the rights of children. Impact of armed conflict on children. Report of the expert of the Secretary-General, Ms. Graça Machel, submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 48/157*. New York: The United Nations.

Malkki, L. (1995). P*urity and exile: Violence, memory and national cosmology among Hutu refugees in Tanzania.* Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Monaghan, C. (2019). Asking 'why' and 'how': A historical turn in refugee education research. *Journal on Education in Emergencies, 5*(1), 35-61.

Mundy, K., & Dryden-Peterson, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Educating Children in Conflict Zones: Research, Policy, and Practice for Systemic Change. A Tribute to Jackie Kirk*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Milner, J. (2009). *Refugees, the State and the politics of asylum in Africa*. Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.

Murseli, H. (2019). L'Éducation en situation de conflit en République centrafricaine: les espaces temporaires d'apprentissage en question. *Cahiers de la recherche sur l'éducation et les savoirs, 18*, 73-93.

Oesch L. (2017). The refugee camp as a space of multiple ambiguities and subjectivities, *Political Geography*, *60*, 110-120.

Olivier de Sardan, J.P. (2010). Développement, modes de gouvernance et normes pratiques (une approche socio-anthropologique). *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue canadienne d'études du développement, 31*(1-2), 5-20.

Paulson, J. (Ed.). (2011). *Education, conflicts and development*. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Petit P. & Comhaire G. (Eds.). (2010). *Le partenariat à l'épreuve du terrain.* Louvain-Laneuve: Academia Bruylant.

Piper, B., Dryden-Peterson, S., Chopra, V., Reddick, C., & Oyanga, A. (2020). Are Refugee Children Learning? Early Grade Literacy in a Refugee Camp in Kenya. *Journal on Education in Emergencies, 5*(2), 71-107. doi:10.33682/f1wr-yk6y

Pourtier, R. (2009). Le Kivu dans la guerre: acteurs et enjeux. *EchoGéo*, *Sur le Vif*. doi:10.4000/echogeo.10793

Poncelet, M., André, G., & De Herdt, T. (2010). La survie de l'école primaire congolaise (RDC). *Autrepart, 54*, 23-42.

Ramírez-Barat, C., & Duthie, R. (Eds.). (2016). *Transitional justice and education: Learning peace.* New-York: Social Science Research Council.

Rutayisire, J., Kabano, J., & Rubagiza, J. (2004). Redefining Rwanda's future: the role of curriculum in social reconstruction. In S. Tawil & A. Harley (Eds.), *Education, conflict and social cohesion* (pp. 315-362). Geneva: UNESCO, International Bureau of Education.

Sigona, N. (2014). Campzenship: Reimagining the camp as a social and political space. *Citizenship Studies, 19*(1), 1-15.

Turner, S. (2010). *Politics of Innocence: Hutu identity, conflict and camp life.* New York: Berghahn Books.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2003). *Education field guidelines*. Geneva: UNHCR.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2007). *Global report*. Geneva: UNHCR.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2012). *Education strategy 2012-2016*. Geneva: UNHCR.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2019a). *Refugee education 2030: A strategy for refugee inclusion.* Geneva: UNHCR.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2019b). *Stepping Up*, *Refugee Education in Crisis*, Geneva, UNHCR.

Versmesse, I., Derluyn, I., Masschelein, J., & De Haene, L. (2017). After conflict comes education? Reflections on the representations of emergencies in 'Education in Emergencies'. *Comparative Education, 53*(4), 538-557.

Vitus, K., & Lidén, H. (2010). The status of the asylum-seeking child in Norway and Denmark: comparing discourses, politics and practices. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 23*(1), 62-81.

Vlassenroot, K., & Huggins, C. (2005). Land, migration and conflict in eastern DRC. In C. Huggins & J. Clover (Eds), *From the ground up. Land rights, conflict and peace in sub-Saharan Africa* (pp. 115-194). Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies.

White, A. (2012). 'Every Wednesday I am happy': Childhoods in an Irish asylum centre. *Population, Space and Place, 18*(3), 314-326.

Kanel and A. Payot. And thanks also to the journals "Outlines" and "Anthropologie et développement", for accepting to publish simultaneously two versions of this contribution in English and French.

About the authors

Marion Fresia is professor of anthropology at the University of Neuchâtel. Her research focuses on the encounters between asylum bureaucracies, humanitarian aid and displaced persons. She has conducted ethnographic fieldwork both within refugee camps in West and East Africa, as well as in several UNHCR offices.

Andreas von Kanel is an anthropologist. He has worked as a Phd student at the University of Neuchâtel, within the SNSF funded research project "Education in spaces of exception: the social and political uses of school in Congolese refugee camps". He has conducted extensive fieldwork in Nyarugusu refuge camp in Tanzania.

Anne-Nelly Perret-Clermont is professor emerita of psychology and education at the University of Neuchâtel. She conducts research with a socio-cultural approach of thinking, learning and vocational training as contextualized activities sustained or hindered by institutional settings that offer different types of thinking spaces and opportunities for development.