This is a repository copy of *En route : the mobile border migrant camps of Northern France*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/149473/

Version: Accepted Version

Book Section:
Katz, I. (2019) En route : the mobile border migrant camps of Northern France. In: Pieris, A., (ed.) Architecture on the Borderline: Boundary Politics and Built Space. Architext . Routledge , Abingdon . ISBN 9781138102828

This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge in Architecture on the Borderline: Boundary Politics and Built Space, on 25th June 2019, available online: http://www.routledge.com/Architecture-on-the-Borderline-Boundary-Politics-and-Built-Space-1st/Pieris/p/book/9781138102828.

Reuse
Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown
If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/

En Route: The Mobile Border Migrant Camps of Northern France

Irit Katz

In: Pieris A. (ed.), *Architecture on the Borderline*, 2019, Routledge.

The demolition of the makeshift camp in Calais known as 'The Jungle' at the end of October 2016 received significant media attention. Thousands of migrants,[i] fiercely supervised by French riot police, were seen queueing before being registered and then transferred by buses to reception facilities around France, where they could claim asylum or face deportation. At the same time, media crews entered the emptied camp to interview the migrants who held onto their dream to cross the Channel and arrive to the UK and therefore refused to be registered and taken elsewhere. The media remained in the area capturing how workers in hard hats and orange jumpsuits with sledgehammers and bulldozers pulled down the makeshift camp, identifying it as one of the key symbolic spaces of Europe's so-called 'migration crisis'.

In its geographical location, within the European continent yet on Britain's threshold, and in its existence between ambivalent practices and rhetoric of border control, institutional neglect, and *ad hoc* humanitarian care – the Jungle became a living testimony to the limited capacity and willingness of some European states to deal with the migrants in their territories and to the fortification of other states which try to hermetically close their borders in front of them. As a self-created informal urban-like environment which supported essential everyday needs, the Jungle also became the spatial manifestation of the resilience and resistance of the migrants and their supporters to these control practices and to their exposed situation (Katz 2017a). Yet the Jungle was not the only camp created in Northern France as a result of the collision between migration flows and border control practices. While many other informal makeshift camps were formed in the area, institutional camps created by state and municipal authorities have also appeared in adjacent locations, creating formal spaces of care and control.

This chapter examines the rapidly-evolving spaces of the makeshift and institutional border migrant camps created in Northern France between 2015 and 2017. While camps for forced migrants are often analysed as isolated and isolating spaces of containment which in many cases

endure for decades (McConachie 2016, Ramadan 2014), border migrant camps, as this chapter demonstrates, are often dynamic, hyper-temporary and highly connected spaces which make part of the ever-changing entanglements of intense border practices and migration flows. The geographical areas where these camps are located could be defined as what Zhang calls ‘mobile borders’ (Zhang 2017), the active border zones that are constantly altered by the interplay between bordering practices and the tempestuous mobilities which exceed them. Rather than establishing sites where the ‘state of exception’ is 'given a *permanent* spatial arrangement' (Agamben 1998, 169), these camps create a constantly changing spatial reality and a highly ephemeral constellation of formal and informal spaces which is reconfigured by the border conditions which they make part of.

The constant alternations in Northern France’s border camps are not only caused by their immediate location, but they also make part of a larger dynamic network of frontier spaces, borderscapes and en route spaces in France, Europe and beyond (Katz 2016). People, materials, knowledge, and support systems, are circulated in and between these spaces by the border practices of different state and non-state actors, the shifting vectors of migration flows, and the turbulent movements of camps’ residents to, from and between them. As these camps form the spaces where the journeys of migrants become visible when they are blocked, they also sometimes become political spaces of resistance and protest against exclusionary and abusive border regimes.

The movements and networks that materialise in these en route camps stand at the centre of this chapter. The analysis is based on a series of visits to these camps between June 2015 and April 2017 while also drawing on data collected in online and media contexts. Following the chapter’s first section which discusses border camps in their broad spatial and geopolitical meaning, the chapter focuses in the makeshift and institutional camps created in Northern France, in particular at the heart and outskirts of Calais, Dunkirk, and Paris (illustration 1). These camps are examined through a comparative analysis which reflects on their extreme and seemingly bipolar formal and informal spatial conditions and through the examination of the networks of governance, humanitarian aid, materialities and migratory human movements that work between them. It exposes both institutional top-down politics in showing how the state uses border spaces to halt,

deter and manage migrants, and informal bottom-up politics in illustrating how migrants shape and transform camps to contest the migration politics of the state and negotiate their status and further transnational movements.

By analysing the changes in these camps over a certain period, I highlight two main observations. The first is that border camps are highly versatile spatial entities that respond not only to migration flows and to the state politics and practices which aim to control them, but also to the complex material, human and political realities created by their very existence. These versatile and highly responsive spatial entities could be identified as what Weizman calls 'elastic geography' which makes part of 'dynamic, constantly shifting, ebbing and flowing' borders (2007, 6-7), creating flickering frontier spaces of conflicting agendas and actions. The second is that camps are indeed isolated and isolating spaces yet at the same time they are strongly connected to various social and material networks of migration flows and humanitarian support which connect between them on an urban, national and transnational basis. Understanding the connected spatialities, geographies and socio-politics of these makeshift and institutional border camps can illuminate the conflicting border politics and practices that form, reshape, and enacted through them. They also reveal the camp itself as a tactical spatial instrument used in the ongoing struggles over Europe's borders, a tool which is shaped by networks and powers that work far beyond their specific spaces and geographies.

Migration flows, borders and border camps

The proliferation of institutional and makeshift camps during Europe's 'migration crisis' did not create a new phenomenon in the area. Camps have long been forming part of Europe's 'border spectacle', whereby the 'illegality' of the migrants 'is rendered spectacularly visible' (De Genova 2013, 1181). The maps created by Migreurop (2016) powerfully illustrate the present-day archipelago of institutional camps in Europe and around it., carceral spaces which make part of the coercive technologies aimed at controlling mobility and 'governing life' (Minca 2015, 75-76). These maps and the statistics they present also indicate the intensifying use of these camps. Although between 2011 and 2016 the number of camps has slightly dropped due to temporary

closures or state policies which encourage large centres, their capacity has actually increased from 32,000 to 47,000 places.

Whereas institutional camps are components in the states' formal border regime, makeshift camps such as the Jungle are created as by-products of heavily controlled borders or temporarily blocked migration routes that create 'bottleneck spaces' of enduring suspension (Katz 2016). These camps are created by the actions and inactions of at least two national entities; the one which blocked its borders and the one in which the migrants are 'stuck' and abandoned. Some of these camps are indeed formed next to border crossing such as the Idomeni camp near the Greek-Macedonian border, where more than 10,000 migrants lived through the winter of 2015-16. Others are formed in more isolated locations along smuggling routes, where migrants wait to be taken across borders by smugglers or human traffickers, such as the camp near the village of Norrent-Fontes and near Angres in northern France where migrants from sub-Saharan Africa and Vietnam waited to be smuggled to the UK (Bulman 2016, Gentleman 2017). These border makeshift camps are not a new spatial feature in Northern France. Years before the recent Jungle camp was created in Calais, other camps in different typologies and scales were formed in the area following the opening of the Channel Tunnel in 1994 (Reinisch 2015).

Border camps are not only formed in blocked or heavily supervised national border 'lines' or near routes leading to them, but also in cities where internal border control points often operate. 'The city is but a stopover, a point on the synoptic path of a trajectory' writes Paul Virilio (1977, 31), and the current 'pixelation of the border' (Ribas-Mateos 2015, 25) from contour lines to points that control networks is primarily evident in cities which create junctions of migration flows and where modes of 'local border control' (Lebuhn 2013, 38) are being practiced. Makeshift camps are often created at the centre and outskirts of metropolitan areas by migrants who either use the city as a jumping-off point to other destinations or when they wait to enter the official states' reception systems. Over recent years informal camps were created, demolished and reappeared in central European cities such as Paris, Rome, Budapest, Belgrade, Brussels and Athens, many of them in or near train stations as a central node of transnational mobility, and in port cities such as Calais, Dunkirk and Patras.

The spatial features of institutional and makeshift camps are inherently different yet their spaces are often closely connected. Institutional camps are usually formed as instrumental efficient spaces of multiple, repetitive and portable pre-fabricated shelters with basic infrastructures designated to provide the minimal needs of their inhabitants. These camps form rigid and often alienating spaces where the migrants are tightly controlled and managed. Differently, most of the makeshift camps are created literally as 'make-shift' spaces of informal practices and precarious character (Vasudevan 2015, 340). They are composed of basic tents and frail shelters made of simple available materials such as tarpaulin sheets, blankets and sleeping bags stretched over a frame of timber studs or branches. Water is often provided through adjacent amenities such as service stations or train stations, toilets are substituted by the nearby landscape, and bonfires or paraffin lamps and stoves are used for light, cooking and heating. When these perilous camps grow, local and international humanitarian organisations often step in to provide basic amenities such as water tanks and portable toilets. In some cases, informal 'public institutions', businesses and facilities are added, providing for the everyday needs of their inhabitants.

In many cases, makeshift and institutional camps are not formed in isolation from one another but have mutual constitutive relationship. In Calais, following the appearance of the first informal encampments during the 1990s, the first institutional camp was opened in 1999 by the French Red Cross in Sangatte, close to the Eurotunnel entrance (Reinisch 2015). Similarly, a container camp was created by the French governmnet at the heart of the recent Jungle camp in Calais, and formal camps were also opened in Grande-Synthe and in Paris after the endurance of makeshift camps at the heart of these cities. The opposite process, when makeshift camps are created near institutional camps also happen, such as the makeshift camps and structures formed outside the institutional Gradisca camp in Italy, where the resident of the formal semi-carceral camp spend time and socialise during the day (Atlin and Minca 2017, 38).

These 'border camps' or 'en route camps' are the materialization and a very visible reminder of the fundamental inequality that stands at the core of liberal citizenship. While the transnational mobility of citizens is almost defined as a right that produces the nation's values of freedom, there are always the 'unspoken Others' (Cresswell 2006, 161) who are mobile only in informal and illegal ways and whose mobility is regularly hindered. While the mobility of the migrants in

these camps is being prevented, they are also institutionally abandoned without any formal provision in a form of necropolitical 'violent inaction' (Davies *et al.* 2017). Yet at the same time this prevention of mobility, coupled with institutional neglect and brutality, also creates alternative forms of humanitarian support of non-profit organisations. These organisations themselves create an ever-changing socially, professionally, spatially and materially mobile compositions and networks which support the 'other side' of the legal and authorised movements, sustaining the fractured mobility of the ones that their routes are blocked and their informal survival mechanisms are demolished over and over again.

The versatile geographies and spatialities of Northern France's border camps

The camps in Northern France are part of a transnational network, a versatile global infrastructure in which unwanted populations are suspended and often internally circulated (Katz 2017b). They also make part of the French camp system where migrants are admitted in different facilities such as reception centres (CADA) and ad hoc reception and orientation centres (CAO) where they can apply for asylum, or administrative detention facilities and centres (LRA, CRA) where migrants wait before deportation (Cosi 2017).

Tracing the spatial and governmental dynamics of the camps in Northern France can reveal their specific roles as part of the French-UK border apparatus as spaces which not only host 'people on the move' but are also moving themselves – materially, spatially, geographically, socially and politically – in relation to the various powers that create and change them. In the next three sections I will examine the makeshift and institutional camps formed in and around Calais, Dunkirk and Paris, and the relations between them, highlighting the meaning of their spaces, locations, and forms of governance in relation to the forces that work within and upon them.

Calais Jungle camp and Container camp (2015-2016)

From spring 2015 the Jungle camp in Calais grew rapidly, sometimes at a pace of 150 people arriving each day, accommodated at its peak a population of 10,000 migrants. The Jungle started as a tent camp, similar to many other makeshift camps that appeared in Europe during that

period. Yet, with the efforts of its inhabitants and the non-profit organization and volunteers supporting them, a more substantial built environment has gradually replaced the flimsy tents on the soaked sandy ground. Within a few months the Jungle has developed to form a small shanty-town serving many of the migrants' everyday necessities. A vibrant 'high street' was created, with dozens of grocery stores, restaurants, barber shops and bakeries while other 'public buildings' were added including places of worship, a library and a language school (Katz 2017a, 6). Despite the deplorable conditions in the Jungle and the limbo situation of its residents, for many migrants the camp became a place of social belonging; 'I keep coming back to the Jungle. I miss it', said Ahmid, a Sudanese refugee, while adding that he could not 'bear to be alone at the CADA' and reflecting on the sense of fraternity in the Jungle (Calais mag 2016, 7).

The sense of belonging that some of the migrants have experienced in the Jungle was grounded in the camp's distinct spatiality. The Jungle was initially formed in 'neighbourhoods' according to the national origin of its inhabitants, consisting hubs of Eritrean, Darfurian, Afghan, Syrian and other nationalities. While these have gradually blurred as the camp densified, it was still possible to identify the intangible architecture the migrants carried with them and rebuilt in their informal temporary location, such as the Darfurian semi-circular traditionally-shaped compounds, the Afghan restaurants with elevated hookah lounges, and the Orthodox Ethiopian church with its raised roof sections and turquoise coloured entrance gates. Graffiti, flags of home and destination countries and other signs and symbols, created an additional layer to many of the shelters and buildings in the camp, manifesting the migrants' identities and political agency with statements calling for 'no borders' and against racial discrimination (Katz 2015). Hundreds of volunteers from France, but mainly from across the Channel, have arrived to support the migrants in the Jungle, including architects and builders who constructed shelters and other buildings in the camp.

Many of the migrants in the Jungle have continued to visit the urban centre of Calais for their everyday needs, using bicycles to quickly cover the distance. While anti-migrant right-wing demonstrations were held in Calais' centre and members of far-right militia have attacked migrants and volunteers in the camp, Calais' residents and business-owners have received the migrants with a mix of caution, understanding and support. While a café owner has admitted that

following requests of local clients ‘we don't serve them [the migrants] anymore’, a local drugstore owner said he ‘don't make them pay, because of what they're going through’ (Calais mag 2016, p.12-13).

The Jungle is usually examined as an informal camp, however several institutional actions were involved in its creation and function. The camp was created in its specific location following the involvement of Calais Centre-Right mayor Natacha Bouchart in January 2015, who issued a directive that all migrant makeshift camps that were scattered in and around the city be dismantled while limiting the formation of new encampments to a specific location and insuring their temporary appearance and function. The chosen area was a derelict site in the outskirts of Calais beyond a busy highway, next to the then newly-opened Jules Ferry migrant centre, where 100 women and children were accommodated and other migrants were allowed to use the toilets and showers and could receive one hot meal a day. In November 2015, when about 6,000 migrants lived in the Jungle, the local authorities were ordered by the French court to provide further for the migrants by installing essential facilities and infrastructures such as portable toilets, street lighting, and communal water stations in the camp (Katz 2017a).

Yet the interventions of the French authorities were not limited to minimal acts of control and provision, but were also pursued through violent acts of destruction and construction. In January 2016, 125 white shipping containers were installed and surrounded by a fence in a bulldozed area at the heart of the Jungle. Equipped with heating and bunk beds for 12 people each and pierced with windows, the containers were placed in a rigid grid, creating the basic structure of the new institutional camp. The management of the humanitarian Camp d’Accueil Provisoire (le CAP, translated as temporary welcome camp), which was initiated by the French government and supported by the financial aid of the European Commission, was put in the hands of La Vie Active which also managed the Jules ferry migrant centre.

Many migrants refused to move into the Calais CAP camp despite the poor living conditions in the Jungle, saying that ‘containers are the same as jail’ (BBC 2016). One of the main reasons they resisted relocation was the requirement for registration with the prefecture. During registration, potential inhabitants were obliged to allow a biometric scan of their hands as the

camp's turnstile gates opened only by an identified handprint. This process entailed significant legal implications following the Dublin III Regulations which assign responsibility for asylum seekers to the first EU state in which they made an identifiable claim. A registered biological handprint was therefore problematic for migrants who hoped to eventually claim asylum in the UK. In addition, the CAP camp lacked important amenities for the migrants such as cooking facilities and other basic services, and many migrants who moved there continued to depend on the Jungle for their everyday needs and social activities. These camps were therefore not only connected in their geographical proximity but also through their institutional and informal spatial entanglements (illustration 2) which answered different necessities of their inhabitants.

The establishment of the CAP on the Jungle's former imprint was only another step in the spatial changes imposed by French authorities, including further waves of demolitions of the Jungle's southern and eastern parts in late February and early March 2016, and eventually the liquidation of the entire makeshift camp in October 2016. These demolitions violently reshaped the camp while heavily influencing the lives of the migrants there (illustration 3). These violent acts, which damaged the camp's physical, social and cultural fabrics, could be described as a form of 'urbicide' which deny the migrants 'their collective, individual and cultural rights' to a city-like environment (Graham 2002, 642). These demolitions have also pushed many migrants to relocate, initiating human and spatial movements which created significant chain reactions between and within the border camps in the area.

While humanitarian rhetoric was employed to justify the Jungle's gradual demolitions, these actions have in fact increased the precariousness of life there; after the demolition of the camp's southern part, which had sheltered over 3,400 people, 129 unaccompanied minors could not be found, and days after the Jungle was entirely 'evicted' refugee children were still sleeping rough in the demolished site. Unaccompanied minors, as 'the archetypical object of humanitarian care' (Zhang 2017, 18), were hosted in the CAP container camp during the Jungle's final demolition (UNHCR 2016). A drone footage of the Jungle's location months after its demolition, with the container camp isolated at the heart of the now empty site (Jungle News 2017), indicates the full transformation of this border area from a deplorable yet humanly-created and well-networked makeshift camp to a sterilized zone completely controlled by the state.

The Jungle was therefore not only a makeshift border camp created because of the migration controversies in the area around the Channel Tunnel. It was also in itself a site where contradicting border practices of control and care, abandonment and resistance, have materialised. The assemblage of mobility governance, strategies of resistance, and humanitarian support, have created the Jungle's spatiality in ongoing negotiations over boundaries, practices, relationships, and identities, which were continuously reshaped, like borders themselves, in a 'manifold and in a constant state of becoming' (Parker and Vaughan-Williams 2012, 728).

Grande-Synthe (Dunkirk) Basroch and Linière camps (2015-2017)

The camps which were created, changed, erased and reappeared in Grande-Synthe, a suburb near Dunkirk around 35km east of Calais, make a different example of geographical shifts, spatial transformations and social interactions in Northern France campscapes. In 2006 a makeshift migrant camp was set up on a plot of land in Grande-Synthe called Basroch designated for future development. The camp usually consisted of a few dozen people who made their way illegally to the UK through the Dunkirk port. In the summer and winter of 2015, however, numbers soared from around 100 migrants in August to over 2,500 in December including 200 children who lived there in squalid conditions, entirely exposed to the freezing European winter. The camp, as expressed by one of the inhabitants, 'wasn't even suitable for animals' (Woensel Kooy 2016, 17). Around 90 percent of the refugees in the camp were Iraqi Kurds, and the rest were migrants from the Middle East and Asia, whom several non-profit organisations such as Emmaüs Solidarité and Medecins Sans Frontières (MSF) were struggling to support (MSF 2016). While in the Calais Jungle the authorities allowed the migrants to build temporary shacks, Grande-Synthe's local authorities limited the construction of similar shelters in the camp.

Instead, the municipality of Grand-Synthe, led by the Green Party mayor Damien Carême, invited MSF to design and build a more adequate refugee camp in the area. The camp, named Linière, was opened in March 2016, and the organization Utopia 56, which until then was mostly involved in managing rock concerts, was put in charge of its management. While the Basroch makeshift camp was located at the centre of Grande-Synthe, the Linière camp was created on a

long strip of land to the east of the town, enclosed along its length by a railway and a highway, with its narrow openings supervised by police and volunteers. Differently from the CAP camp in Calais, Linière was not a closed camp, and volunteers, visitors, migrants, as well as human smugglers (Woensel 2016, 35), could enter and exit it without close supervision. The increased distance of the camp from Grande-Synthe town's centre was one of its main faults according to its inhabitants. The camp, which was designed to host 1,500 migrants, was constructed by identical timber huts for four people, nicknamed 'chicken houses' by the migrants. Their layout was much less dense and rigid than that of the CAP container camp and, being made of timber, the huts could also be easily modified by their dwellers.

Indeed, only a few days after the camp was populated, many huts underwent different processes of construction, some doubling their size with the help of volunteers who brought materials and assisted in the building process (illustration 4). These volunteers, many of whom arrived from the Jungle, have also built other facilities in the camp such as communal kitchens and a school, bringing with them essential donations of building materials, food and clothes, indicative of the social and material connections between the camps in the area. Similar to the Jungle, although at a different scale, small stands where migrants sold soft drinks, cigarettes and other items, have quickly sprouted across the camp, reflecting the agency of its inhabitants. Yet for many of the camp's residents who wished to cross to England and re-establish their lives there, living in the camp was an almost unbearable reality: 'This place is driving me crazy' stated Diyar, an English literature student from Kurdish Iraq; 'Despite the bad situation of Kurds in Iraq, I would rather be there now than stuck in France. I had a life there […]. And look where I am now' (Woensel Kooy 2016, 37).

The camps in Grande-Synth present a different spatial and geographical process of change and intersections between formal and informal typologies to the camps in Calais, yet they were both created by a constant evolution of interconnected formal and informal actions and typologies (see also Katz 2017a). These camps, similar to others in Northern France, were also connected through networks of volunteers, materials, and smugglers that moved between them. Yet another significant connection was formed with the final demolition of the Jungle that pushed many of its inhabitants to move to the already overcrowded Linière camp. In April 2017 a clash broke

between a group of Afghan migrants, who joined Linière following the Jungle's demolition and created their new accommodation in the camp's communal kitchen quarters, and between a group of Kurdish migrants who were first to inhabit the camp and objected this spatial transformation. This violent fight over space between members of two ethnic groups have sparked a fire that within hours burnt the camp to the ground. Thus, despite the interdependency of these groups due to their shared predicament, co-habitation was also filled with tensions over the scarce resources and eventually caused their total destruction. The turbulent movements of the border campscapes in the area was therefore not only caused by the contradicting interactions between regimes of migratory control and the ones who resist them, but also by violent interactions between the migrants themselves.

Paris makeshift and institutional migrant camps (2015-2017)

The creation of the Linière MSF camp in Grande-Synthe, the first municipally-initiated refugee camp in France, inspired the Socialist mayor of Paris Anne Hidalgo to initiate a similar humanitarian response to the dozens of makeshift camps created in the city. On May 2016 Hidalgo announced the creation of the first refugee camps in Paris, to ameliorate the 'shameful' 'unhealthy and dangerous' conditions of the city's makeshift camps. She added that these camps have 'become a source of disturbance for residents in the neighbourhood' (Dewan 2016), yet 'disturbance' was a gentle word to the considerable hostility toward the migrant camps at the centre of Paris due to the resultant degradation of the physical environment and the large presence of migrants that the municipal authorities preferred to orient far from the city's bourgeois neighbourhoods. The initiative in Paris was envisioned as a 'welcome centre' which would reflect the moral hospitable values of the city: 'Paris will not stand by and do nothing as the Mediterranean becomes a graveyard of refugees', declared the mayor, adding that 'these migrant camps reflect our values' (Henley 2016).

Several makeshift migrant tent camps have existed in Paris for years yet grew rapidly and multiplied since spring 2015, where migrants lived in deplorable conditions and in very rough urban locations at the heart of the city. The Metro La Chapelle camp, for example, was surrounded by heavy traffic from literally every side. Located on a traffic island between the two

lanes of the busy Boulevard de La Chapelle, it was also placed under the number 2 metro railway line with the consistent deafening noise of the trains passing on the metal bridge just above the camp's tents (illustration 5). The Boulevard itself also functions as a bridge located above the Gare du Nord railway tracks. With their exposed flimsy tents and mattresses, the migrants in the camp were barely protected from the harsh urban surrounding of this juxtaposition of multiple traffic routes. While local Parisian and French charities such as Emmaüs Solidarité have supported the migrants, they suffered from multiple difficult conditions such as the lack of basic facilities like toilets and water taps which also caused a heavy smell of urine in the camp.

Paris' makeshift camps appeared, grew, and were cleared on a regular basis, creating an internal movement of sub-standard urban ephemeral spaces which sometimes hosted thousands of migrants. 'Where can we go to in this freezing weather?' asked Sultan, a 22-year-old refugee from Afghanistan who lived in a camp of more than one thousand migrants under Stalingrad Metro bridge in winter 2016; 'We are chased from place to place', he described, 'They never help us. They just come every time take our tents and just leave us out in the cold' (Urer 2016).

Following Mayor Hidalgo's declarations, two municipal camps were created in the northern and southern parts of Paris, the first for men and the second for women and families. The camp in Northern Paris, named Centre Humanitaire (humanitarian centre) Paris-Nord, also nicknamed as *La Bulle* (the bubble), was opened in November 2016 at a former railway depot at the city's 18th *arrondissement* near Porte de la Chapelle. The camp includes a day centre for migrants in an extravagant curved inflatable structure coloured in yellow and grey (illustration 6), a day clinic, and a hall accommodating 400 male migrants for usually five to ten days. The hall, which was previously used as a train logistics hub, has been divided into sections by prefabricated transportable shelters marked in different colours, each section also containing a canteen, toilets and showers (Paris-Nord 2016). The centre in Southern Paris, named Centre d'hébergement d'urgence (emergency accommodation centre) Paris-Ivry, was opened in January 2017 to accommodate 400 women and family members for up to three months. It was built on a site of an abandoned factory of the city's Water Department and consists of prefabricated timber shelters for 3-7 people, six yurts used as canteens, and a language school (Paris-Ivry 2017).

According to the architect Julien Beller who designed the Paris-Nord centre, the aim was to plan 'a dignified and beautiful space' which will 'create an example of how our cities can be more hospitable' (Paris-Nord 2016). This attitude of urban humanitarian hospitality was also reflected in the organisations that were invited to manage the centres – the charity Emmaüs Solidarité that was involved in supporting the makeshift camps in Paris and Grand-Synthe, and Utopia 56 that helped manage the Linière camp there. Both appointments also reflect institutional and humanitarian networks across France's border camps.

However, a closer look at both the urban location and planned duration of the Parisian camps, together with the administrative procedures and the urban attitude towards migrants that accompany them, suggests complexities beyond the initial humanitarian intentions. Similar to the camps in Calais and Grande-Synthe, the centres in Paris are also inherently temporary in two ways. First, the migrants stay there for only a short period, a few days or months, and second, both projects have an expiry date – June 2018 for Paris-Nord and January 2021 for Paris-Ivry – as the city has designated these sites for different future uses. Another similarity between the Parisian camps and the other border camps is their marginal location. While the migrants of both the Jungle and the Linière camp were pushed to the outskirts of Calais and Grande-Synthe beyond physical borders of busy traffic routes, the centres in Paris also push the migrants to the margins of the capital – Paris-Ivry is located in a southern industrial zone beyond the *périphérique* ring-road while Paris-Nord is located at the furthermost limits of the city's central administrative area, bounded between the *périphérique* to its north and the busy Boulevard Ney to its south, not very far from the northern *banlieues* where many immigrants live.

While the architecture of these camps project urban spectacles of hospitality, their marginal location in the city push the migrants out of sight and mind. The decisive policy of intolerance to makeshift camps in other parts of the city, which accompanied the establishment of these centres, reflects escalating hostility towards the migrants in Paris. The limited size of the northern centre failed to answer the basic needs of the migrants, leaving many with no appropriate solution, and informal camps were constantly forming on the adjacent boulevards (Camilli 2017). Since the opening of the centres, however, the authorities in Paris have become intolerant of informal camps, and have conducted sudden mass evictions, blocked areas with rocks and metal fences,

four kilometres of which have been erected in a few months, and closed certain public water fountains. ‘It's an architecture of hostility and inhospitality’, reflected a Parisian urban architect who wished to remain anonymous as The City of Paris is one of his clients (Couvelaire 2016).

In addition, the collaboration between municipal and state authorities in funding the Parisian camps have imposed a problematic layer of administrative surveillance in them. While the bubble itself is an open day centre, a warm bed for a few nights in the hall is conditioned by a fingerprinting procedure. To be accepted for the hall the migrants must go to the prefecture’s Centre d’examen de situation administrative (Cesa, Centre for administrative status review) opened in the nearby police headquarters, where fingerprints reveal whether migrants are ‘Dublin’ or not. This means that, similar to the CAP container camp in Calais, migrants have to register their biometric data to receive a warm bed. Non-Dubliners are dispatched to reception facilities around France where they can apply for asylum, while the others may face deportation.

In September 2017, Utopia 56 decided to leave the Paris-Nord project, arguing that ‘the administrative treatment of the refugees within the centre is anything but humanitarian’ and that it ‘has become an administrative trap for many refugees’ who ‘eventually end up in a deportation procedure’ (Utopia 56, 2017). In this manner, the welcome centre with its architectural and Parisian values of hospitality has become a conditioned urban gateway to the French asylum or deportation systems, alongside the myriad of conflicting practices that materialise in the ever-changing border camp spaces of Northern France.

Conclusive remarks on a continuously changing reality

Flickering between existence and non-existence, between abandonment, fierce biopolitical control, unconditioned care and generous hospitality, the border migrant camps of Northern France are created and recreated according to constantly changing factors. Although the camps in Calais, Dunkirk, and Paris are very different cases of border camps, they also present striking similarities which indicate their broader political meaning. First, all of these camps are temporary spaces; while most of the camps discussed in this chapter no longer exist, the institutional camps in Paris have a clear expiry date. The inherent ephemerality of these camps

creates an ongoing human, spatial and material movement which shifts between processes of rapid creation, change and demolition. The second similarity is that all of these camps are spaces of exception formed outside France's normal governmental and spatial order. They were created and evolved through ad hoc actions of multiple actors, including municipal and national authorities, the French court, local and international NGOs, and the migrants themselves. Third, while border camps are often created in rural areas, many of these camps are distinctively urban. They are not only created by within cities, but they are also initiated *by* cities, while being actively pushed to their urban margins. Forth, these camps were formed, evolved, and functioned as a constant negotiation between the formal and the informal; while in the Jungle an institutional camp was erected at the heart of the makeshift camp yet its residents continued to use its informal facilities for their everyday needs, in Dunkirk an institutional camp replaced the makeshift camp and then itself evolved through a process of informalisation, and in Paris the institutional camps were created to replace the informal, yet makeshift camps were created just outside their gates. The fifth characteristic is that these camps were isolated and isolating spaces, while at the same time they were spaces which were highly connected through human and material networks exchanging and redistributing migratory movements, volunteers, building materials, donations of food and clothes, as well as governance practices.

These different characteristics reveal these border camps as highly mobile spatial materialisation of a fierce political struggle which takes place between multiple actors and through various spatial practices, yet behind it stand two opposing forces. The first is the top-down institutional power that aims to control, suspend and deter unauthorised migrants in different manners. The second is the bottom-up power of the migrants themselves and those who support them which form and transform camps as part of their efforts to contest institutional (anti)migration politics while negotiating their rights, sometimes through the space of the camp itself. This struggle materialises in the different formal and institutional camp spaces, in the relations between them, and in their turbulent mobilities which are also generated by factors far beyond their immediate contexts. These camps are the 'spaces on the move' which became the tactical instrument used by and for the 'people on the move' in both institutional actions *and* the resistance to them. The camp itself, as a space which could be quickly created, changed and demolished by both the

powerful and the powerless, makes one of the pivotal instruments in the ongoing struggle between these powers which form the ever-changing borderscapes of Northern France.

Reference list

Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Atlin, R. and Minca, C. (2017). The Ambivalent Camp: Mobilities and Excess in a Quasi-carceral Italian Asylum Seekers Hospitality Centre. In: J. Turner and K. Peters, eds., *Carceral Mobilities: Interrogating Movement in Incarnation*. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 30-43.

BBC News (2016). Calais 'Jungle' migrants resist container move. [online] BBC News. Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-35322374 [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Bulman, M. (2016). Hundreds of Refugees Return to 'Secret Camps' Near Calais in Bid to Reach the UK. [online] Independent. Available at: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/calais-refugees-secret-camps-migrants-france-jungle-a7488196.html [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Calais mag (2016). Reinventing Calais: English Version. [online] le PEROU. Available at: http://www.perou-paris.org/pdf/Actions/CALAIS_16_mag_anglais_ONLINE [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Camilli, E. (2017). Reception of migrants in Paris crumbles at Porte de la Chapelle. [online] Open Migration. Available at: https://openmigration.org/en/analyses/reception-of-migrants-in-paris-crumbles-at-porte-de-la-chapelle/ [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Cosi (2017). Types of Accommodation, France. [online] Forum Réfugiés, Asylum Information Database (aida). Available at: http://www.asylumineurope.org/reports/country/france/reception-conditions/housing/types-accommodation#footnoteref4_kzm533x [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Couvelaire, L. (2016). En Ile-de-France, des grilles pour empêcher les migrants de s'installer. [online] Le Monde. Available at: http://www.lemonde.fr/societe/article/2016/12/23/en-ile-de-france-des-grilles-pour-empecher-les-migrants-de-s-installer_5053191_3224.html#LrgtYW9AWK1EwZBj.99 [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Cresswell, T. (2006). *On the move: Mobility in the modern western world*. London and New York: Routledge.

Davies, T., Isakjee, A., and Dhesi, S. (2017). Violent inaction: The necropolitical experience of refugees in Europe. *Antipode*, 49(5), pp. 1263–1284.

De Genova, N. (2013). Spectacles of migrant 'illegality': the scene of exclusion, the obscene of inclusion. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(7), pp. 1180-1198.

Dewan, A. (2016). Paris to open its first urban refugee camps this year. [online] CNN. Available at: http://www.cnn.com/2016/09/06/europe/france-refugee-camp/index.html [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Graham, S. (2002). Bulldozers and bombs: the latest Palestinian–Israeli conflict as asymmetric urbicide. *Antipode*, *34*(4), 642-649.

Henley, J. (2016). Paris mayor plans official camp for homeless refugees. [online] The Guardian. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/may/31/paris-mayor-plans-official-camp-for-homeless-refugees [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Jungle News (2017). The Empty Jungle. [video]. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dU3fpY7igp4&feature=youtu.be&app=desktop [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Katz, I. (2015). From Spaces of Thanatopolitics to Spaces of Natality – A Commentary on 'Geographies of the Camp'. *Political Geography,* 49*,* pp. 84-86.

Katz, I. (2016). A network of camps on the way to Europe. *Forced Migration Review*, 51, pp. 17-19.

Katz, I. (2017a). Between bare life and everyday life: spatialising the new migrant camps in Europe. *Amps: Architecture_Media_Politics_Society*,12(2), pp.1-21. Available at: http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/uclpress/amps/2017/00000012/00000002/art00001 [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Katz, I. (2017b). A Global Infrastructure of Camps. [online] MoMA medium. Available at: https://medium.com/insecurities/the-global-infrastructure-of-camps-8153fb61ea30 [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Lebuhn, H. (2013). Local border practices and urban citizen- ship in Europe: Exploring urban borderlands. *City*, 17, pp. 37–51.

McConnachie, K. (2016). Camps of containment: a genealogy of the refugee camp. *Humanity*, 7(3), pp. 397-412.

Migreurop (2016). Map of Camps. [map] Migreurop. Available at: http://www.migreurop.org/IMG/pdf/migreurop_carte_en_hd-compressed.pdf [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Minca, C. (2015). Geographies of the Camp. *Political Geography*, 49, pp. 74-83.

MSF (2016). France: Update on relocation of migrant camp in Dunkirk. [online] MSF. Available at: http://www.msf.org/en/article/france-update-relocation-migrant-camp-dunkirk [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Parker, N., and Vaughan-Williams N. (2012). Critical border studies: Broadening and deepening the 'lines in the Sand' Agenda. *Geopolitics*, 17(4), pp.727–33.

Paris-Ivry (2017). Emergency Center Paris-Ivry, Ivry-Sur-Seine 94200. [online] Arsenal TV. Available at: http://www.pavillon-arsenal.com/en/videos/10686-emergency-shelter-paris-ivry.html [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Paris-Nord (2016). Migrant Reception Center', Porte De La Chapelle, Paris 18. [online] Arsenal TV. Available at: http://www.pavillon-arsenal.com/en/videos/10520-migrant-reception-center.html [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Rajaram, P. K. and Grundy-Warr, C. (2008). *Borderscapes: Hidden geographies and politics at territory's edge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ramadan, A. (2013). Spatialising the refugee camp. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 38(1), pp. 65-77.

Reinisch, J. (2015). 'Forever Temporary': Migrants in Calais, Then and Now. *The Political Quarterly*, 86(4), pp. 515–522.

Ribas-Mateos, N. (2016). *Border Shifts: New Mobilities in Europe and Beyond*. London: Springer.

UNHCR (2016). Transfer of residents out of "the Jungle" site in Calais, France. [online] UNHCR. Available at: http://www.unhcr.org/news/briefing/2016/10/580f1d664/transfer-residents-jungle-site-calais-france.html [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Urer, E. (2016). Interviews with refugees and migrants in Paris. [online] Anadolu Agency/Getty Images. Available at: http://www.gettyimages.com/detail/video/interviews-with-refugees-and-migrants-at-stalingrad-news-footage/621031324 [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Utopia 56 (2017). Utopia 56 is leaving the Paris Humanitarian Center. [online] Utopia 56. Available at: http://www.utopia56.com/en/actualite/utopia-56-is-leaving-the-paris-humanitarian-center [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Vasudevan, A. (2015). The makeshift city: Towards a global geography of squatting. *Progress in Human Geography*, 39(3), pp.338-359.

Virilio, P. (2007) [1977]. *Speed and Politics*. Los Angeles: Semiotext.

Weizman, E. (2007). Holl*ow Land: Israel's Architecture of Occupation*. London: Verso.

Woensel Kooy, E. van (2016). Living In Between: How Refugees and Volunteers in Negotiation (re)Construct Citizenship and Humanitarian Care in the Camps of Grande-Synthe, France. [online] Master thesis, Utrecht University. Available at:

https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/339252 [Accessed 20 April 2018].

Zhang, C. (2017). Mobile Borders and Turbulent Mobilities: Mapping the Geopolitics of the Channel Tunnel. [online] *Geopolitics*. Available at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14650045.2017.1379994 [Accessed 20 April 2018].

[i] In this chapter, I use the term 'migrants' as the most accurate shorthand to describe the situation of the inhabitants in these camps. On the problematic and changing categorisation of 'refugees', 'asylum seekers', 'forced migrants' and 'economic migrants', see Crawley et al. (2016). The term 'people on the move' employed by the UN also acknowledges the arbitrariness of the division between refugees and migrants.