



Proposed theatre

# IZMJESTANJA: of space Protupovijesti arhitekture i izbjeglištva

RAZGOVOR S  
ANDREWOM HERSCHEROM

*Wash area*

*PIT*

Potential kitchen site

*WOMEN WASH AREA 4*

Hygiene Kiosk

82

ANA DANA BEROŠ  
DUBRAVKA SEKULIĆ

Potential kitchen site

INTERVIEW WITH  
ANDREW HERSCHER

*3 more cable pumps*

# DISPLACEMENTS: Counter-Histories of Architecture and Refugeehood

Potential kitchen site

Potential kitchen site

*Shelter*  
*Area*

*PA*



U knjizi *Izmještanja: arhitektura i izbjeglištvo* (*Displacements: Architecture and Refugee*) od samog početka zauzimate kritičko stajalište prema humanitarnom radu dobročinstva. Koncept „izbjegličke krize” očito je difamiran kao naziv za pojavu koja ustvari ne prijeti izbjeglicama, nego se tiče onih koji se osjećaju ugroženi njihovom prisutnošću. Koga ta kriza ustvari pogađa i zbog čega? Je li izbjeglica doista, kako piše Giorgio Agamben, jedini zamislivi predstavnik nadolazeće političke zajednice Europe i šire?

ANDREW HERSCHER ... Kao što je Friedrich Engels istaknuo prije stotinu godina, ono što se u Njemačkoj nazivalo „stambenom krizom” nije bila kriza radništva, koje se ionako uvijek moralo boriti za vlastiti dom, nego kriza građanstva, koje se osjećalo ugroženo pripadnicima radničke klase bez ili s nedovoljno stambenog prostora. Rekao bih da ono što se danas naziva izbjegličkom krizom u Europi ustvari nije kriza koja pogađa izbjeglice, čija je egzistencija

po definiciji krizna, nego kriza stanovništva Europe, političara i institucija koje govore u ime tog stanovništva koje se osjeća ugroženo prisutnošću izbjeglica.

To znači da ni rješenja koja se nude za takozvanu izbjegličku krizu, arhitektonske ili druge prirode, ustvari nisu rješenja za probleme izbjeglica, nego za probleme onih koji se osjećaju ugroženi izbjeglicama. U arhitekturi mnoga od tih rješenja poprimaju oblik „boljih izbjegličkih logora” – ali boljih za koga? Smatram da ti logori u biti nisu bolji za izbjeglicu, čija je primarna težnja prestati biti izbjeglica, nego bolji za društveni poredak koji je ugrožen pojavom izbjeglice. Ukratko, ono što nam se nudi kao odgovori na takozvanu izbjegličku krizu ustvari su pokušaji da se zaštite europsko bogatstvo i povlastice, a ne da se zaštite prava i boljitak izbjeglica. Što se tiče izbjeglice kao paradigmatškoga političkog subjekta našega doba i predstavnika nadolazeće političke zajednice – mogli bismo razmotriti destabilizirajuće učinke izbjeglica po naizgled

In the book *Displacements: Architecture and Refugee*, from the very beginning, you establish the critical position towards the “do good” humanitarianism. The concept of “refugee crisis” is clearly dismantled, as a phenomenon not threatening refugees themselves, but a crisis facing those who feel threatened by refugees. Who is indeed affected by this crisis and why? Is really a refugee, as Giorgio Agamben suggests, the only thinkable figure to represent the coming political community of Europe and beyond?

ANDREW HERSCHER ... Just like Friedrich Engels pointed out, a hundred years ago, that what was called “the housing crisis” in Germany was not a crisis for the working class, who had always struggled for housing, but a crisis for the bourgeoisie, who were threatened by the unhoused and underhoused members of the working class, I would say that that what is today called “the refugee crisis” in Europe is not so much a crisis for refugees, whose existence as such

is by definition a crisis, but a crisis for European populations and the politicians and institutions that speak for those populations, who feel threatened by refugees.

This means that the solutions being offered to the so-called refugee crisis, architectural and otherwise, are not solutions to the problems of refugees, but to the problems of those threatened by refugees. In architecture, many of those solutions take the form of “better refugee camps” – but better for whom? I would suggest that these camps are in essence not better for the refugee, whose primary ambition is not to be a refugee, but better for the social order threatened by the presence of the refugee. In short, what we see in responses to the so-called “refugee crisis” are attempts to protect European wealth and privilege, rather than protect refugee rights and well-being.

As for the refugee as the paradigmatic political subject of our time and figure for the coming political community – we could look at the

moćne nacionalne, pa čak i međunarodne institucije u aktualnoj takozvanoj krizi, koji su jasan dokaz te političke subjektivnosti: način na koji prisutnost izbjeglice toliko snažno destabilizira te stabilne, pa čak i fosilizirane institucije.

U tom smislu normativna putanja od izbjeglice do građanina – putanja koja je u praksi uglavnom blokirana ili ometana – mogla bi predstavljati ograničenje za političku subjektivnost izbjeglice i postnacionalnu zajednicu kakvu spominje Agamben. U arhitektonskom pogledu ta je putanja prijelaz iz logora u grad. Možemo li zamisliti drugu putanju, koja bi mogla voditi na nekakvo drugo mjesto, u kojemu prava i sigurnost ne bi ovisili o građanskom statusu? Prisjetimo li se da je europsko bogatstvo neodvojivo povezano s europskom kolonizacijom i da golema većina osoba koje traže azil u Europi dolazi iz zemalja koje su bile kolonije imperijalističkih europskih velesila, a mnoge su među njima i poprišta suvremenih europsko-američkih vojnih intervencija, možda ćemo poželjeti

gledati na izbjeglice u Europi ne kao na potencijalne europske građane, nego kao na moguće subjekte dekolonizacije koja tek mora nastupiti, u Europi kao i drugdje.

**Prema riječima antropologinje Liise H. Malkki, izbjeglice ponajprije valja shvatiti kao „epistemičke objekte u izgradnji” – proizvode znanja i moći koji se oblikuju u diskursima koji uključuju i arhitekturu. S druge strane, izbjeglice su učinjeni nevidljivima u povijesti arhitekture, u smislu društvene proizvodnje arhitekture. Vi to u svojoj knjizi formulirate iskazom da izbjeglica još nije doveo povijest arhitekture u krizu. Kakav je odnos tog povijesnog ignoriranja i političke isključenosti izbjeglica? Koje su protupovijesti arhitekture koje obraćaju pozornost na izbjeglice?**

ANDREW HERSCHER ... Rekao bih da povijest arhitekture manje-više ide ruku pod ruku s nacionalnom državom u predstavljanju izbjeglica, a često i imigranata,

destabilizing effects of refugees on seemingly powerful national and even international institutions in the current so-called “crisis” as clear evidence of this political subjectivity: the way the presence of the refugee is so threatening to such stable, even fossilized institutions.

In this sense, the normative trajectory of refugee to citizen – a trajectory that in practice is usually blocked or deferred – might represent a containment of the refugee’s political subjectivity and the post-national political community that Agamben refers to. Architecturally, that trajectory represents a move from camp to city; could we imagine another trajectory that might lead to another sort of space in which rights and security are not predicated on citizenship? And when we consider that the wealth of Europe is inextricably linked to European colonization and that the vast majority of people seeking asylum in Europe come from countries that were colonized by imperial European powers, many of those same countries the sites of contemporary

Euro-American military interventions, we might want to understand the refugees in Europe not as potential European citizens as much as potential agents of a decolonization that, in Europe as elsewhere, is still to come.

**According to the anthropologist Liisa H. Malkki refugees are best understood as “epistemic objects in construction” – products of knowledge and power shaped in and by discourses that include architecture. On the other hand, refugees are made invisible in architectural history, in the meaning of social production of architecture. In your book you put it as the refugee has not yet put the history of architecture into crisis. What is the relationship between this historical neglect and the refugee’s political exclusion? What are the counter-histories of architecture that take account of the refugee?**

ANDREW HERSCHER ... I would say that architectural history has more or less marched in lock-step with the nation

kao osoba koje ne pripadaju, a ne kao osoba čija je prisutnost ključna za dotične države i utkana u njihovu povijest. Izbjeglice su jednako strane povijesti arhitekture kao i državama u kojima se te povijesti pišu i čitaju. I dakako, to je samo jedan od mnogobrojnih načina na koje je povijest arhitekture oblikovana politikom nacionalne države – politikom koju povijest arhitekture transkribira dok se bavi onime što smatra vlastitim poslom.

Knjiga *Izmještanja* nastoji, na sasvim preliminarni način, predložiti moguće protupovijesti arhitekture koje neće shvaćati izbjeglice i druge protagoniste masovnog izmještanja stanovništva kao iznimke u globalnom modernitetu, nego kao sastavni dio tog moderniteta. Ja vidim taj sastavni dio u arhitektonskoj povijesti masovnoga socijalnog stanovanja, modernog grada i logora – sve su to oblici arhitekture moderniteta, no također, kako nastojim pokazati, arhitekture koja se na važne načine razvila kroz susrete s izmještenim osobama.

state in posing refugees, and often immigrants as well, as people out of place, rather than as people whose presence is crucial to the places of the state and enmeshed in the histories of those states.

Refugees are as foreign to architectural history as they are to the states in which those histories are written and read. And of course, this is but one of the many ways in which architectural history has been shaped by the politics of the nation-state – politics that architectural history transcribes as it goes about what it understands to be its own business.

*Displacement* tries, in very preliminary ways, to suggest some counter-histories of architecture that take the presence of the refugee and other figures of mass population displacement not as exceptional to global modernity but as constituent of that modernity. I see that constituency in the architectural history of mass housing, the modern city, and the camp – each an architecture of modernity but also, I try to suggest, an architecture

Arhitektura izmještanja poprimala je razne oblike kroz povijest, uključujući – ali ne isključivo – izbjeglički logor kao normativnu formu. Uspostavljajući tri različita prostorna pristupa – izbjeglički grad, izbjegličko stanovanje, izbjeglički logor – povezujete ih s pitanjem radne snage i radne rezerve, u prošlosti i danas. Doista, kako na arhitekturu izmještanja utječu nacionalna i međunarodna podjela rada, budući da se izbjeglicu priznaje samo u odnosu na njegov radni potencijal?

**U TOM SMISLU LIK IZBJEGLICE BACIO JE U DRUGI PLAN LIK RADNIKA U GLOBALNOJ VOJSCI REZERVNE RADNE SNAGE I MISLIM DA MOŽETE JASNO UOČITI TAJ DVOSTRUKI IDENTITET U NEKIM NOVIM NACRTIMA ZA „BOLJE IZBJEGLIČKE LOGORE”, KOJI ĆE NAVODNO POMOĆI IZBJEGLICI TAKO ŠTO ĆE JOJ OMOGUĆITI ULAZAK NA TRŽIŠTE RADNE SNAGE.**

**IN THIS SENSE, THE FIGURE OF THE REFUGEE HAS MASKED THE FIGURE OF THE LABORER IN THE GLOBAL RESERVE ARMY OF LABOR AND I THINK THAT YOU CAN SEE THIS DOUBLE IDENTITY BECOMING EXPLICIT IN SOME NEW SCHEMES FOR “BETTER REFUGEE CAMPS” THAT ARE PREMISED ON HELPING THE REFUGEE BY PROVIDING HER ENTRY TO THE LABOR FORCE.**

that developed in important ways through encounters with displaced people.

The architecture of displacement takes several forms throughout history, including but not limited to the camp as the normative form. In setting up three different spatial approaches – the refugees city, the refugee housing, the camp – you connect them to the question of labour – and reserve labour, both historically and today. Indeed, how is the architecture of displacement shaped by national and



ANDREW HERSCHER ... U onom dijelu svijeta koji ističe svoju globalnost radna je snaga jedna od rijetkih stvari koja ne može samo tako prelaziti granice, iako su inače učinjene dovoljno protočnima da omogućuju slobodnu razmjenu kapitala, ideja, proizvoda i tako dalje. Mislim da je ta nemogućnost povezana s potrebom da se zadrže podjele rada i izrabljive populacije radne rezerve.

U tom smislu lik izbjeglice bacio je u drugi plan lik radnika u globalnoj vojsci rezervne radne snage i mislim da možete jasno uočiti taj dvostruki identitet u nekim novim nacrtima za „bolje izbjegličke logore”, koji će navodno pomoći izbjeglici tako što će joj omogućiti ulazak na tržište radne snage. Uzmimo, na primjer, inicijativu za „izbjeglički grad”, u kojemu bi izbjeglički logori bili konstruirani kao posebne ekonomske zone. Ondje gdje transformacija izbjegličkog logora u tvornički grad pod krinkom posebne ekonomske zone postaje „rješenjem” humanitarnog problema možemo uočiti da se taj problem vrti oko izvlačenja viška vrijednosti iz

izbjeglica umjesto da štiti njihova prava i nudi im sigurnost.

Prihvatni gradovi predstavljaju se kao mjesta za izbjeglice i migrante, dok se odnos humanitarizma i urbanizma rekonfigurira: kapitalistički grad, koji je nekoć i sam bio žarište humanitarnih problema, sada je postao rješenje tih istih problema. U svojoj knjizi pokazujete kako to nije nikakva novina, nego se ustvari može smatrati povratkom na pristup razvijan u viktorsko doba u Ujedinjenom Kraljevstvu – a iluzornost tog pristupa donekle je dovela do politizacije arhitekata u ono vrijeme, kao i do dovođenja kapitalizma u pitanje kao mogućeg rješenja. Ukazivanje na tu vezu moglo bi pomoći ljudima da prestanu tražiti rješenja za probleme isključivo na kapitalističke načine. Upravo je to slijepa točka u konceptu prihvatnog grada koji kritizirate u svojoj knjizi. Jesmo li u eri neoliberalizma doista došli do toga da društvenu patnju shvaćamo samo

international division of labour when the refugee is being recognized only in relation to its labor potential?

ANDREW HERSCHER ... In that part of the world that proclaims its globality, labor is one of the few things that cannot flow freely cross borders, borders that have otherwise been dissolved to permit the free flow of capital, ideas, products, and so forth. I think that this inability is tied to the need to maintain divisions of labor and maintain exploitable populations of reserve labor.

In this sense, the figure of the refugee has masked the figure of the laborer in the global reserve army of labor and I think that you can see this double identity becoming explicit in some new schemes for “better refugee camps” that are premised on helping the refugee by providing her entry to the labor force. Take, for example, the “refugee city” initiative in which refugee camps would be constructed as special economic zones. Here, where

the transformation of the refugee camp into a factory town in the guise of a special economic zone becomes a “solution” to a humanitarian problem, we see that this problem revolves around the extraction of surplus value from refugees rather than protecting refugee rights and providing refugees security.

Arrival cities are being posed as places for refugees as well for migrants, while the relationship between humanitarianism and urbanism is reconfigured: the capitalist city that was once itself a humanitarian emergency has now become a solution to humanitarian emergencies. In the book *Displacements* you show how this is not a novel development, but can be in fact seen as the reversal to the Victorian time and approach – the fallacy of this approach, to a certain extent, leads to the politicization of architects in that period and challenges capitalism as the solution. Is pointing to this connection something that might enable people to stop searching for solutions to

**... kao izazov koji se može prevladati s pomoću  
samodiscipline, rada i kreativnosti?**

ANDREW  
HERSCHER ... Slažem se s time da su neoliberalni odgovori na društvenu patnju usredotočeni na mogućnost potrebitih osoba da prevladaju svoje stanje s pomoću samodiscipline, kreativnosti, marljivosti i rada – odnosno, čine potrebite osobe odgovornima za pomoć sebi samima – a takvi odgovori povezuju prihvaćanje izbjeglica i ono što nazivamo prihvatnim gradovima (engl. *arrival cities*) s njihovim regrutiranjem u razvoju i gentrifikaciji tih gradova. Mislim da fascinaciju neformalnom izbjegličkom arhitekturom i urbanizmom – kako u logorima tako i u prihvatnim gradovima – možemo promatrati u tom neoliberalnom svjetlu.

Kako pokušavam pojasniti u *Izmještanjima*, ova fascinacija dovodi do povijesno izokrenute situacije, budući da je grad kao mjesto nedostatka stambenog prostora i nejednakosti, koji su za reformatore 19. stoljeća predstavljali humanitarne probleme,

danas, u 21. stoljeću, postao rješenje za humanitarne probleme, mjesto gdje izbjeglice i imigranti mogu uložiti svoju kreativnost i energiju kako bi se uspeli na razinu produktivnih građana.

Problem je s tom izokrenutom situacijom u tome što u gradovima, gdje je stambeni prostor, osobito po povoljnoj cijeni, vrlo rijetka pojava, izbjeglice i imigranti pojačavaju potražnju za dostupnim stanovanjem te se uključuju u natjecanje za nj s drugim obespravljenim populacijama, a to dodatno povećava stambenu nejednakost. To, dakako, ide na ruku vlasnicima nekretnina, a na uštrb onih urbanih populacija koje nemaju dovoljno ili uopće nemaju stambenog prostora.

**Govoreći o smještaju i stanovanju izbjeglica, pišete kako je moderna arhitektura u određenoj mjeri izbjeglička arhitektura. Na primjer, Le Corbusierov *Maison Dom-Ino* odražava suvremene norme radničkog stanovanja kao masovni stambeni kompleks za radničke obitelji, no i**

**... the problems only in capitalist ways? The arrival city concept of which you are critical of in the book has that as a blind spot. Have we really come to a sole understanding of the suffering, in the era of neoliberalism, as a challenge to overcome a suffering position by self-discipline, work and creativity?**

ANDREW  
HERSCHER ... I agree that neoliberal responses to social suffering focus on the capacity of the suffering to overcome their condition by self-discipline, creativity, industry, and work – to make the suffering responsible for their own relief – and, in so doing, these responses tie the acceptance of refugees in what are called “arrival cities” to their recruitment in the development and gentrification of these cities. I think that we can see the fascination with the informal architecture and urbanism of refugees – both in camps and in arrival cities – in this neoliberal light.

As I try to suggest in *Displacements*, this fascination

enacts a historical reversal insofar as the city of housing scarcity and inequality that was a humanitarian emergency for 19<sup>th</sup> century reformers, has become, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the solution to humanitarian emergencies, the place where refugees and immigrants can deploy their creativity and energy to rise up into productive citizens.

The problem with this reversal is that, in cities where housing and especially affordable housing is scarce, refugees and immigrants exacerbate demand for affordable housing, enter into competition with other disadvantaged populations, and housing inequality increases. This, of course, is to the benefit of property owners and at the cost of underhoused and unhoused urban populations.

**When talking about refugee housing, you write that modern architecture was, to a certain extent, refugee architecture. For instance, Le Corbusier's *Maison Dom-Ino* reflects contemporary norms for workers' dwellings, as mass housing for working**



izbjegličke obitelji – sredstvo da se u poslijeratnom razdoblju osigura smještaj nekadašnjim izbjeglicama. U uvodu *Izmještanja* kažete kako se knjiga može interpretirati i kao revizija temeljnih načela moderne arhitekture. Zbog čega je bilo važno da knjizi date i taj okvir? Zbog čega je takva protupovijest važna u ovom trenutku? Naučili smo da je tek pojava „masovne naturalizacije” izbjeglica nakon Drugog svjetskog rata, očito jedinstvena u povijesti, zainteresirala profesionalnu arhitekturu za izbjegličko pitanje. Pa zbog čega onda tema izbjegličkog stanovanja nestaje s dnevnog reda arhitekture te se zamjenjuje logorom kao normativnim prostorom za smještaj izbjeglica?

ANDREW HERSCHER ... Sudbina projekta *Maison Dom-Ino* u arhitektonskom diskursu i povijesti bila mi je zanimljiva zbog toga što izrazito dobro pokazuje ideološku dimenziju arhitektonskog modernizma, koja oblikuje njegov diskurs i historizaciju – poimanje modernizma kao napretka, kao dijela

class families, but also refugee families – means to provide post-war housing to former refugees. In the introduction to *Displacements* you say that the book reads as the revision of basic postulates of the modern architecture. Why was it important for you to frame the book in this way? Why is such a counter-history important at this moment in time? We learned that only post-WWI phenomenon of “mass naturalization” of refugees, as clearly exceptional in history, introduced refugees to professional architecture. In the end, why the refugee housing disappears from architectural agendas, only to be substituted by the camp as a normative space to accommodate refugees?

ANDREW HERSCHER ... The career of the *Maison Dom-Ino* in architectural discourse and history was interesting to me because it markedly reveals an ideological dimension of architectural modernism that shapes the discourse and historicization of that modernism—the notion of modernism as progress,

civilizirajućeg procesa koji će ukloniti nasilje iz svakodnevnog života. Izvlačenjem projekta *Maison Dom-Ino* iz konteksta rata i masovnog izmještanja stanovništva te njegovim upisivanjem u kontekste formalnog i prostornog istraživanja, jer to je ono što je učinila povijest arhitekture, povijest je civilizirala i projekt i modernizam koji je on promicao. U *Izmještanjima* sam, dakle, napisao kako naizgled kritička tvrdnja da se modernizam projekta *Maison Dom-Ino* temelji na „njegovu karakteru arhitekture o arhitekturi” uklanja nasilje iz te arhitekture jednako tako kao što moderna država navodno uklanja nasilje iz svakodnevnog života. Time se ta tvrdnja može shvatiti i kao aspekt općenitije tendencije, koja postoji kako u povijesti arhitekture tako i u nacionalnoj i međunarodnoj politici, da se izbjeglicu marginalizira,

**IZBJEGLICE SE STROŽE KONTROLIRA BIOMETRIJSKIM MARKERIMA NEGO BODLJIKAVOM ŽICOM, ČAK I AKO IM SE NAIZGLED DOPUSTI DA ŽIVE I RADE U GRADOVIMA UMJESTO LOGORIMA.**

**REFUGEES ARE CONTROLLED EVEN MORE SECURELY WITH BIOMETRIC MARKERS THAN WITH BARBED WIRE FENCES, EVEN AS THEY ARE SEEMINGLY ALLOWED TO LIVE AND WORK IN CITIES INSTEAD OF CAMPS.**

as part of a civilizing process that withdraws violence from everyday life. By extracting the *Maison Dom-Ino* from the context of war and mass population displacement and inscribing it in contexts of formal and spatial research, which is what architectural history has done, that history has civilized the project and the modernism it advanced.

In *Displacements*, then, I wrote that seemingly critical claim that the *Maison Dom-Ino*’s modernism rests on “its existence as architecture about architecture” extracts violence from that architecture as surely as the modern state supposedly extracts violence from everyday life. In so doing, that claim can also be understood as an aspect of the more general tendency, in architectural history as in national and international

da ga se učini nepripadajućim. Otvoriti povijest arhitekture za njezino trajnije bavljenje izbjeglicama i izmještenim osobama znači predložiti drugačiju politiku.

U *Izmještanjima* nalazimo tvrdnju kako arhitektonska genealogija izbjegličkog logora obuhvaća i prostore humanitarnog rada i prostore zločina protiv čovječnosti: vidjeli smo to nedavno, 2015. godine, u slučajevima gdje se izbjeglice s Bliskog istoka smještalo u nekadašnje koncentracijske logore u Njemačkoj. Već je 1943. Hannah Arendt u eseju *Mi izbjeglice* ukazala na ignorirano ili potisnuto poistovjećivanje izbjeglice i zatočenika, pri čemu su obojica aspekti „novoga ljudskog bića”, osobe bez države, koja je samo ljudsko biće jer je lišena prava i povlastica koje bi joj osiguralo državljanstvo. Možete li objasniti tu isprepletenost socijalne pomoći i održavanja biološkog života u arhitekturi zatočeništva i povijesti izbjegličkog logora?

ANDREW  
HERSCHER ... U eseju *Mi izbjeglice* Arendt je pisala o načinu na koje to „novo ljudsko biće” njegovi neprijatelji smještaju u koncentracijske logore, a prijatelji u izbjegličke logore. Istaknula je brisanje razlike između zatočenika i izbjeglice, a ja smatram da se razlika jednako briše i između mjesta zatočenika – koncentracijskog logora – i mjesta izbjeglice – izbjegličkog logora. U povijesti arhitekture vidim brisanje te razlike između arhitekture koja se gradi kako bi se pomoglo onima koji pate i arhitekture koja se gradi kako bi se zatočile i ogradile populacije od kojih se osjeća prijetnja. U određenom smislu te su arhitekture istovjetne jer se osobe koje pate oduvijek doživljavaju kao prijeteće. U ovom potonjem primjeru, i to je moja hipoteza, prijetnja koju predstavljaju osobe koje pate sastoji se u njihovu nesudjelovanju u radnoj snazi, tako da je pomoć jednaka vraćanju njezina primatelja na nadničarski posao. Fascinantno je, iako strašno, vidjeti kako je nesposobnost za pružanje gostoljubivosti poprimila arhitektonski

politics, to marginalize the refugee, to render the refugee out of place. To open architectural history to architecture's sustained engagement with the refugee and the displaced is to suggest a different politics.

In *Displacements* there is a claim that architectural genealogy of the camp encompasses both spaces of humanitarianism and spaces of crimes against humanity: We have witnessed it in recent cases of accommodating refugees from the Middle East in former Nazi concentration camps in Germany, in 2015. Already in 1943, Hannah Arendt, in her essay *We Refugees*, pointed to the disregarded or repressed identity between the refugee and the detainee, each an aspect of a “new human being”, a stateless person, who was only a human being, bereft of the rights and privileges bestowed by citizenship. Can you explain the intertwining of provision of social relief and maintenance of biological life within the architecture of confinement and the history of the refugee camp?

ANDREW  
HERSCHER ... In *We Refugees*, Arendt wrote about the way in which this “new human being” was put into concentration camps by their enemies and refugee camps by their friends. She suggested a blurred distinction between detainee and refugee and I think there is a similarly blurred distinction between the place of the detainee – the concentration camp – and the place of the refugee – the refugee camp. In architectural history, I see that blurring in the history of spaces built to provide relief to the suffering and spaces built to contain and confine threatening populations. In a sense, those spaces were interchangeable because the suffering were and are regarded as threatening. In the last instance, and this is a hypothesis, the threat the suffering posed was their non-participation in the labor force, so that relief was equivalent to the restoration of its recipient to wage labor. It is fascinating, if not horrifying, to see how the inability to offer hospitality has taken architectural form; for example, there is a counter-history of architectural



oblik; primjerice, postoji protupovijest arhitektonske apstrakcije koja je povezana sa željom da se primatelji pomoći smješteni u radnim centrima i logorima liše vizualnog užitka, jer obje su institucije smatrane mjestima koja ne bi trebala mamiti svoje stanovnike da ondje dugo ostanu. Suvremeni globalni aparat izbjegličkih logora, od njihove koncentracije na Globalnom jugu, što je moguće dalje od mjesta globalne povlaštenosti, do njihova arhitektonskog oblikovanja koje ih otkriva kao mjesta nadzora i zatočeništva, također odražava taj sraz pomoći i zatočeništva. Smatram da skandal vezan uz događaj kada je izbjeglicama s Bliskog istoka dodijeljen smještaj u nekadašnjim nacističkim koncentracijskim logorima u Njemačkoj odražava povijest te veze. U Njemačkoj se rasprava vrtjela oko toga jesu li mjesta koja su dodijeljena izbjeglicama ustvari bila koncentracijski logori ili ne; no bez obzira na to jesu li ili nisu, sama činjenica da je ta razlika bila toliko važna odražava još uvijek živ strah od „novoga ljudskog bića” o kojemu je

pisala Hannah Arendt i mjesta koja taj novi čovjek zauzima.

Agambenovu tvrdnju da „danas temeljna biopolitička paradigma Zapada nije grad nego logor” stoga valja protumačiti s fokusom na brisanju granica između grada i logora: baš kao što logori postaju nalik na gradove, tako i gradovi sve više sličje logorima. U svojoj knjizi analizirate „kuponski humanitarizam”, koji, kako kažete, nije samo stvorio nov odnos humanitarnosti i stambenog tržišta nego također mijenja poimanje nadzora u gradu, koje se polagano uvlači i u strategije koje se primjenjuju na druge ranjive zajednice u društvu. Možete li reći nešto više o tim inovacijama i o tome u kojoj mjeri na taj aspekt Vašeg istraživanja utječe drugi veliki istraživački projekt kojim se istodobno bavite – projekt posvećen fenomenu „crno i pošasti” (engl. *black and blight*) i onome što se događa u Detroitu, gdje nedemokratski izabrani službenici nametnuti kao

abstraction that has to do with the denial of visual pleasure to recipients of relief in workhouses and camps, both of which were supposed to be places that did not tempt their occupants to remain in them for long periods of time.

The contemporary global apparatus of refugee camps, from their concentration in the Global South, as far as possible from the sites of global privilege, to their design as spaces of control and confinement, also reflect this conjunction of relief and confinement. The scandal of Middle Eastern refugees being assigned housing in former Nazi concentration camps in Germany I think reflects the history of this conjunction. In Germany, the discussion revolved around whether or not the places the refugees were assigned were actually concentration camp; whether or not they were, the very fact that this distinction was important speaks to a still-vivid anxiety about Arendt’s “new human being” and the places this new human occupies.

Agamben’s claim that “today it is not the city but rather the camp that is the fundamental biopolitical paradigm of the West” must therefore be read with attention to the increasingly blurry relationship between the city and the camp: just as camps are becoming like cities, cities are becoming like camps. You analyse in the book “voucher humanitarianism” which as you state, not only brought a new relationship between humanitarianism and the housing market, but also changed the notion of the control in the city, which slowly seeps into the policies applied to other vulnerable communities in a society. Can you tell us something more about the new innovations, and how much is this aspect of your research informed by your other big research project you are conducting at the same time – the one on “black and blight” and the experience of what is happening in Detroit where the non-democratically elected officials imposed as the emergency management due to a financial

### izvanredna uprava zbog financijskog sloma grada ograničavaju i mijenjaju mogućnosti građana u odnosu na grad?

ANDREW  
HERSCHER ... Mislim da su to dva različita pitanja. Prvo je pitanje o inovacijama u humanitarnom radu. Ono što mene zanima u vezi s tim inovacijama jest način na koji se izbjeglice integriraju u stambeno tržište i radnu snagu, potičući i monetizirajući izbjeglički status kao trajno stanje. Primjerice, u različitim oblicima takozvanoga kuponskog humanitarizma (engl. *voucher humanitarianism*) izbjeglicama se daje sklonište i sredstva za hranu na debitnim ili bankomatskim karticama, no uporaba tih kartica regulirana je biometrijskim markerima poput skeniranja očne šarenice. Izbjeglice se strože kontrolira biometrijskim markerima nego bodljivakom žicom, čak i ako im se naizgled dopusti da žive i rade u gradovima umjesto logorima. Drugo je pitanje o odnosu humanitarnog urbanizma i urbanizma štednje u Detroitu. Nisam siguran mogu

li reći nešto specifično o tom odnosu, osim da se možda oba mogu smatrati aspektima neoliberalnog urbanizma, budući da se zasnivaju na monetizaciji krize i onome što Naomi Klein naziva kapitalizmom katastrofe (engl. *disaster capitalism*). U takozvanoj izbjegličkoj krizi, baš kao i u takozvanoj financijskoj krizi Detroita, obespravljani su ti koje se iznova obespravluje; u izbjegličkoj krizi to obespravljenje poprima oblik humanitarnog kapitalizma, a u financijskoj krizi oblik kapitalizma štednje. Kriza omogućava naizgled depolitizirane oblike krizne uprave, bili oni vezani uz humanitarni rad ili uz mjere štednje. Zanimljivo je također da su oba slučaja dala suvremenoj arhitekturi mogućnost da si pripiše društveni značaj i polaže pravo na političko djelovanje. Problem je u tome što je u oba slučaja projekt sprječavanja društvene patnje politička slijepa ulica.

Dotičući se pitanja protupovijesti, u svojoj knjizi destabilizirate ustaljene narative i pokazujete

### collapse of the city are limiting and changing the possibilities citizens have in relation to the city?

ANDREW  
HERSCHER ... I think that there are two questions here. The first question is about new innovations in humanitarianism. What is interesting to me about these innovations is how they are integrating refugees into the housing market and labor force and thereby furthering and financializing the ongoing permanence of refugee status. For example, in various forms of so-called voucher humanitarianism, refugees are provided funds for food and shelter on debit cards or ATM cards, with use of these cards premised on biometric markers like iris scans. Refugees are controlled even more securely with biometric markers than with barbed wire fences, even as they are seemingly allowed to live and work in cities instead of camps. The second question is about the relation between this humanitarian urbanism and the austerity urbanism of Detroit. I am not sure I can say

anything very specific about this relation except that perhaps they are each understandable as an aspect of a neoliberal urbanism premised upon the financialization of crisis or what Naomi Klein calls "disaster capitalism." In both the so-called refugee crisis and the so-called financial crisis of Detroit, that is, it is the dispossessed who are once again dispossessed; in the refugee crisis, this dispossession takes form in humanitarian capitalism and in financial crisis it takes form in austerity capitalism. Crisis allows for seemingly depolitized forms of crisis-management, whether those of humanitarianism or those of austerity. It is interesting, too, that both cases have presented contemporary architecture with opportunities to endow itself with social meaning and political agency. The problem is that, in both cases, the project of preventing suffering is a political dead-end.

By tackling counter-history in the book you are destabilizing the established narratives and showing



važnost znanja o tome što je izbrisano iz kanona moderne arhitekture, budući da nam to može reći daleko više o aktualnom stanju od isprane verzije koja nam se servira. Ono što nam se servira jest interpretacija o izvorištu moderne arhitekture u „čistom” arhitektonskom projektiranju, usredotočenom na proizvodnju i gradnju novog. U jednom razgovoru koji smo vodili povodom Vašeg istraživanja fenomena „crnog i pošasti” rekli ste kako želite da „pošast” postane sinonimom za rasizam. U oba aspekta Vašeg istraživanja krajnje ste skeptični u pogledu vlasništva nad nekretninama kao magičnog rješenja koje će omogućiti uključivanje isključenih i zajamčiti njihovo prihvaćanje u sustav. Možete li nešto više reći o tome?

ANDREW HERSCHER ... Termin „pošast” ustvari je naziv za bolesti bilja, a ušao je u američki diskurs o gradu u vezi s imigrantima i Afroamerikancima, nebijelcima za koje se smatralo da im nije mjesto u gradovima

na koje pravo polažu bijelci. Ono što se dogodilo jest da je ta „pošast” početkom 20. stoljeća postala tehničkim terminom među novim stručnjacima poput developera i urbanista, gdje je počela označavati prostore koje nebijelci moraju zauzeti u gradovima strukturiranima po načelima rasnog kapitalizma. Profesionalizacija pošasti kao naziva za urbani nered omogućila je rasnom kapitalizmu da djeluje bez iskazanog rasizma – drugim riječima, gradovi su mogli premještati ljude tamne puti, a to su i činili, pod izlikom da se bore protiv takozvane pošasti. U tom se smislu i „izbjeglicu” može shvatiti kao tehnički termin za osobe kojima tu nije mjesto pa prema tome i kao termin koji dopušta isključivanje prema kriteriju rase, etničke pripadnosti ili vjere, koje će se odvijati na prividno neutralne načine.

U Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama kuće koje je obuzela „pošast” mogu biti oduzete vlasnicima, uništene ili prodane developerima koji će, kako se pretpostavlja, izgraditi zgrade koje mogu podići vrijednost nekretnine i zaštititi četvrt od pošasti

the importance of knowing what is erased from the canon of modern architecture which can tell us much more about the contemporary condition than the whitewashed version that we are served with. What we are served with is the interpretation of the origin story of modern architecture related to the clean thinking process focused on the production and disregard of social reproduction, which lead to abandonment of thinking about maintenance, as if that is not a regular domain of architects and architecture. In one conversation we had in relation to your research on “black and blight” you said you wanted to make blight synonymous with racism, and in both pieces of research you are more than sceptical about the solutions in which property ownership is offered as the magical solution that enables inclusion of the excluded and a guarantee of their acceptance in the system. Can you elaborate on that?

ANDREW HERSCHER ... The term “blight” – originally the name

of plant diseases – entered American discourse on the city in the person of immigrants and African-Americans: non-white people understood to be out of place in cities claimed by white people. What happened was that “blight”, in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, then became a technical term in the new professions of real estate development and urban planning, where it named spaces that non-white people were forced to occupy in cities structured by racial capitalism. The professionalization of blight as a name for an urban disorder allowed racial capitalism to work without explicit racism – in other words, cities could and can displace people of color by fighting so-called blight. In this sense, “refugee” can also be understood as a technical term for people out of place and, as such, a term that allows exclusions based on race, ethnicity, and religion to proceed in seemingly neutral ways. In the United States, blighted houses can be taken from their owners, destroyed, and the property sold to developers who will supposedly construct buildings that can raise property values and protect

– visoke cijene nekretnina smatraju se, naime, poticajnim za održavanje zgrada, sprječavaju pošast i jamče da će pravi ljudi boraviti na pravim mjestima. Možda normativna putanja od izbjeglice u logoru do građanina u kući odražava sličnu koncepciju privatnog vlasništva kao prostornog medija društvene reprodukcije.

Čini se da u svojem radu odbacujete pitanje ljudskih prava u obliku u kojem trenutavno postoji – ono što povezuje Vaše istraživanje o izbjeglicama i „pošast” jest kritika humanitarne ideje da će se uvjeti promijeniti bude li moguće uvijek iznova uvjeriti većinu u ljudskost izbjeglice, migranta i Afroamerikanca u SAD-u. Vaš rad odbacuje tu ideju ljudskih prava koja je usidrena u humanitarnom pristupu. Koja bi bila alternativa tom pristupu pitanju ljudske slobode, „ljudske emancipacije” koja može biti ukorijenjena u ropstvu i isključenju? Također se kritički odnosite prema konceptu ljudskih prava. U toj kritici prava,

što je s konceptom prava na grad i prava na stan? Oba su koncepta relevantna za Vaša istraživanja, a posebno prvi, „pravo na grad”, iako se danas ponekad spominje u korpusu ljudskih prava, ne potječe iz koncepta „humanitarnih” ideja, već je izveden iz marksističke kritike kapitalističkog grada, prvo u radu Henrija Lefebvrea, a zatim Davida Harveyja. Postoji li način da se ta dva koncepta spase ili moramo izgraditi argumentaciju za jednakopravni grad i pristup stanovanju na drukčijim osnovama?

ANDREW HERSCHER ... Humanitarni rad i mjere štednje temelje se na krizi; ako su to glavni načini za ovladavanje krizom i njezinu monetizaciju, onda također obilježavaju mjesta gdje se krize događaju: „zone skrivene nestabilnosti”, da se poslužimo riječima Frantza Fanona, gdje se mogu razviti novi oblici suživota, nove političke subjektivnosti, nove teritorijalnosti.

U kontekstu humanitarizma želio bih ovdje

the neighborhood from blight-high property values, that is, are understood to incentivize building maintenance, prevent blight, and guarantee that the right people occupy the right places. Perhaps the normative trajectory from refugee-in-camp to citizen-in-house reflects a similar conception of private property as the spatial medium of social reproduction.

In your work, you seem to reject the question of human rights in the form in which it exists at the moment – what connects both your research on the refugee and “blight” is the critique of the humanitarian idea that the conditions will change if the majority can be convinced over and over again in the humanity of the refugee, migrant, and African American in the US. Your work rejects that notion of human rights embedded in the humanitarian approach. What would be the alternative to this approach to human freedom, “human emancipation” which can be rooted in

slavery and expulsion? You are also critical of the concept of human rights, what about the concept of the right to the city, and/or right to housing, which can be seen as connected to both pieces of your research, which – especially the first one as developed by Lefebvre and later picked up by Harvey – do not have the origin in the human rights concept and approach? Is there a way to salvage those two as concepts, or we need to build the argument for an equal city and access to housing on different grounds?

ANDREW HERSCHER ... Humanitarianism and austerity are each premised on crisis; if they represent dominant ways in which crisis is managed and financialized, they also mark the places where crises are, in Frantz Fanon’s words, “zones of occult instability” where new ways of living together, new political subjectivities, new territorialities can emerge. In the context of humanitarianism, I would here point to the work of Sandi Hilal and Alessandro



spomenuti rad Sandi Hilal i Alessandra Pettija, koji razmišljaju o izbjegličkom logoru u kontekstu dekolonizacije arhitekture. Što se tiče politike štednje u Detroitu, postoji niz paralelnih primjera u kojima su privatizacija i obespravljenje sponzorirali oblikovanje novih, samoodređujućih kolektiva, novih prostora poput zona bez gentrifikacije i bez deložacija te novih političkih zahtjeva povezanih s pravom na zemlju i vodu kao javna dobra.

Vaš rad isprva se ticao razaranja, primjerice onih ratnih, no s vremenom ste prešli na „razaranje“

**U TOM SE SMISLU I „IZBJEGLICU” MOŽE SHVATITI KAO TEHNIČKI TERMIN ZA OSOBE KOJIMA TU NIJE MJESTO PA PREMA TOME I KAO TERMIN KOJI DOPUŠTA ISKLJUČIVANJE PREMA KRITERIJU RASE, ETNIČKE PRIPADNOSTI ILI VJERE, KOJE ĆE SE ODVIJATI NA PRIVIDNO NEUTRALNE NAČINE.**

**IN THIS SENSE, “REFUGEE” CAN ALSO BE UNDERSTOOD AS A TECHNICAL TERM FOR PEOPLE OUT OF PLACE AND, AS SUCH, A TERM THAT ALLOWS EXCLUSIONS BASED ON RACE, ETHNICITY, AND RELIGION TO PROCEED IN SEEMINGLY NEUTRAL WAYS.**

Petti, who are thinking about the refugee camp in the context of decolonizing architecture. In the context of Detroit’s austerity, there are a number of parallel examples in which privatization and dispossession have sponsored the formation of new self-determining collectives, new spaces like gentrification-free and foreclosure-free zones, and new political claims for land and water commons.

Your work started on destruction, namely war destruction, but in time it has moved to “destruction” by other means, policies,

drugim sredstvima: politikom, segregacijom i strukturalnim nasiljem. Možete li nešto reći o tom razvojnom procesu?

ANDREW HERSCHER ...Moja je prva pomisao kako taj proces nije toliko napredovanje koliko lutanje – kroz razna mjesta, zaposlenja i također do neke mjere karijere. Drugim riječima, slijed tema kojima se bavim jednostavno odražava moju životnu putanju. Bio sam razočarani arhitekt i doktorand na polju povijesti arhitekture kada sam otišao na Kosovo nakon rata i završio radeći za misiju Ujedinjenih naroda. Moja prva knjiga, *Nasilje na djelu (Violence Taking Place)*, bila je neka vrsta prerađivanja mojih iskustava povezanih s poslijeratnom upravom na Kosovu, kao i pokušaj da napišem arhitektonsku povijest razaranja. To mi se činilo temom od sporedne važnosti u većini konteksta povijesti arhitekture – ili čak pojavom koja uništava povijest arhitekture prije nego što predstavlja predmet povijesnog istraživanja – no upravo je to povijesno

segregation, and structural violence. Can you reflect on that progression?

ANDREW HERSCHER ...My first reflection is that this movement seems much less a progression than a drift – a drift across places, jobs, and also to some extent also careers. That is, the sequence of topics I have worked on simply reflects my life trajectory. I was a disenchanted architect and doctoral student in architectural history when I went to Kosovo after the war and ended up working in the United Nations Mission there. My first book, *Violence Taking Place*, was a sort of working-through of my experience in post-conflict governance in Kosovo as well as an attempt to write an architectural history of destruction. This seemed to me a topic of marginal importance in most contexts of architectural history – or even a phenomenon that destroyed architectural history rather than comprising an object of historical study – but it was precisely that historical study that violence against architecture, in and out of war,

istraživanje bilo ono što je nasilje protiv arhitekture očito zahtijevalo, u ratu i izvan njega, i ono što je moja knjiga nastojala ponuditi.

Moje prvo akademsko zaposlenje odvelo me na Sveučilište u Michiganu, koje je smješteno u mjestu Ann Arbor, sedamdesetak kilometara od Detroita. U Detroitu sam se susreo s drugim pojavama, koje se obično predstavljaju kao marginalne, iznimne ili izvanjske urbanoj povijesti i povijesti arhitekture, no činile su mi se daleko važnijima za održavanje prostornog reda nego što se to obično smatra.

Urbana pošast, primjerice, jedna je od takvih pojava: iako se obično predstavlja kao rezultat sloma gradskih sustava, ispravnije bi bilo smatrati je proizvodom tih sustava, na taj je način nastojim istražiti u svojem trenutačnom radu.

Možda je ono što povezuje ovaj pomak s ratnih razaranja na razaranja od strane rasnog kapitalizma to što mi se činilo da oboje zahtijeva arhitektonsku povijest, povijest koja se neće moći svesti na druge povijesti u kojima se to razaranja razmatra samo

usputno, ako se uopće razmatra. U tom smislu zanimalo me postaviti pitanje za koga je arhitektura historizirana ili što je to historizirana „arhitektura” – što god se navodilo da taj pojam znači. Nadam se da sam se, nastojeći odgovoriti na to pitanje, pridržavao onog čuvenog Brechtova naputka: ne kreći od dobrih starih stvari, nego od loših novih.

-  
RAZGOVOR S ANDREWOM HERSCHEROM MOŽE SE POSLUŠATI U EMISIJI *STVARNOST PROSTORA* NA TREĆEM PROGRAMU HRVATSKOG RADIJA, TE PRISTUPITI NA MREŽNIM STRANICAMA [HTTP://RADIO.HRT.HR/EP/RAZGOVOR-S-ANDREWOM-HERSHEROM/236901/](http://radio.hrt.hr/ep/razgovor-s-andrewom-hersherom/236901/)

seemed to solicit and that *Violence Taking Place* tried to offer.

My first academic job took me to the University of Michigan, which is located in Ann Arbor, a town about 45 miles away from Detroit. In Detroit, I encountered other phenomena that are usually posed as marginal, exceptional, or exterior to architectural and urban history but that seemed much more crucial to the maintenance of spatial order than usually understood. Urban blight, for example, is one of these phenomena; while it is usually understood as the result of urban systems breaking down, it more accurately can be understood as a product of those systems and this is how I am trying to explore it in my current work. Perhaps what relates this move from the destruction of war to the destruction of racial capitalism is that both seemed to me to solicit architectural histories, histories that are irreducible to the other histories within which this destruction is regarded

in passing, if it is even regarded at all. In this sense, I have been interested in asking for whom or what is “architecture” – whatever this term is enlisted to mean – historicized. In trying to answer this question, I hope I have kept faith with Brecht’s famous instruction: “don’t start with the good old things but the bad new ones”.

-  
INTERVIEW WITH ANDREW HERSCHER IS AIRED WITHIN *REALITY OF SPACE* RADIO BROADCAST AT THE THIRD PROGRAMME OF CROATIAN RADIO AND AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING AT [HTTP://RADIO.HRT.HR/EP/RAZGOVOR-S-ANDREWOM-HERSHEROM/236901/](http://radio.hrt.hr/ep/razgovor-s-andrewom-hersherom/236901/)





Proposed theatre

School space

WASH area 3  
for male

Potential kitchen site

WOMEN WASH  
AREA 4

Hygiene Kiosk

Potential kitchen site

③ more cable pumps

Potential kitchen site

Potential kitchen site

P1





ZRAČNA SNIMKA IZBJEGLIČKOG LOGORA  
CHERSO, SJEVERNA GRČKA, U BLIZINI  
GRANIČNOG PRIJELAZA IDOMENI, 2016.  
FOTO: PRIVATNA ARHIVA ANE DANE BEROŠ

AERIAL VIEW OF THE REFUGEE CAMP  
CHERSO, NORTHERN GREECE, IN THE  
VICINITY OF IDOMENI BORDER PASSAGE,  
2016. PHOTO: ANA DANA BEROŠ  
PERSONAL ARCHIVE