



Home- places

Dwelling and
Habitability in
Critical Times

JOÃO BIEHL

FEDERICO NEIBURG

EDITORS

Homeplaces



Home- places

Dwelling and
Habitability in
Critical Times

DUKE

EDITED BY JOÃO BIEHL AND FEDERICO NEIBURG
UNIVERSITY
PRESS

© 2026 DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ∞

Project Editor: Livia Tenzer

Designed by Courtney Leigh Richardson

Typeset in Freight Text Pro Book by Westchester Publishing Services

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Biehl, João Guilherme editor | Neiburg, Federico G. editor

Title: Homeplaces : dwelling and habitability in critical times /
edited by João Biehl and Federico Neiburg.

Other titles: On habitability and livingness in critical times

Description: Durham : Duke University Press, 2026. | Includes
bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2026011320 (print)

LCCN 2026011321 (ebook)

ISBN 9781478039129 paperback

ISBN 9781478034162 hardcover

ISBN 9781478062738 ebook

Subjects: LCSH: Dwellings—Social aspects | Housing | Homelessness |

Equality | Home—Psychological aspects | Belonging (Social psychology)

Classification: LCC GN414 .H654 2026 (print) | LCC GN414 (ebook) |

DDC 307.3/36—DC23/eng/20260608

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2026011320>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2026011321>

Cover art: Anastasia Taylor-Lind / *5K from the Frontline*, Collecting firewood from abandoned
apartments in Krasnohorivka, Ukraine, 2021. Courtesy of A. Taylor-Lind.

DUKE
UNIVERSITY
PRESS

Contents

A Note on the Cover Art	ix
Acknowledgments	xi

Introduction. Oikography	1
JOÃO BIEHL AND FEDERICO NEIBURG	

Part I. Dehoused

1. Home Sentience	29
JOÃO BIEHL	

2. The Hostel	62
ANGELA GARCIA	

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

Part II. Homeostasis

3. The Laboring House 81
SUSAN HELEN ELLISON
4. The Dying Home 103
EUGÊNIA MOTTA

Part III. Afterlife of Slavery and War

5. The Prayer House 121
AYLUONNE TXAI TERESZKIEWICZ
6. Home Under Threat 146
SEBASTIÁN RAMÍREZ

Part IV. Disasters and Displacements

7. House-ing on the Move 173
FEDERICO NEIBURG
8. Dismantling and Reassembling Homes 188
THIAGO DA COSTA OLIVEIRA AND CARLOS FAUSTO

Part V. Domestic Experimentality

9. The Immune Home 235
ANN H. KELLY AND JAVIER LEZAUN
10. Home and the Human Machine 256
ALEXANDRA MIDDLETON

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

Part VI. Toxic Environs

11. The House Underfoot	277
CATHERINE FENNEL	
12. Post-Fallout Home	296
RYO MORIMOTO	
Bibliography	315
Contributors	337
Index	341



A Note on the Cover Art

The cover art shows a resident of Krasnohorivka, in the Donbas region of Ukraine, collecting firewood from abandoned apartments in 2021—the city’s seventh winter without heating. In their project *5K from the Frontline* (<https://www.5kfromthefrontline.com/>), photographer Anastasia Taylor-Lind and anthropologist Alisa Sopova describe the scene:

Since the outbreak of hostilities, the gas distribution station had been stranded in no man’s land. Authorities were reluctant to invest in front-line towns that might be attacked again or change hands. People were, for the most part, left to their own devices. To survive, many residents installed makeshift wood-burning stoves; those who couldn’t afford firewood salvaged furniture, doors, windows, and beams from abandoned apartments. The dull, suffocating cold of unheated rooms was

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

almost worse than the frost outside. The knowledge that there wasn't a single warm place in the entire town was the hardest part. In 2024, whatever remained of the town was demolished in battle and then occupied.

Here domicile and house-ing converge in a single frame: a home dismantled to make another home habitable. *Homeplaces* begins in this tension—the unrelenting work of crafting habitability from the very wreckage of dwelling.

x

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

A NOTE ON THE COVER ART

Acknowledgments

Homeplaces is the culmination of a long-standing collaborative project exploring the idea of home and homemaking in our beleaguered times, bringing together scholars of different generations, countries, institutional affiliations, and ethnographic commitments. The project began a decade ago as a collaboration between the Department of Anthropology at Princeton University and the Graduate Program in Social Anthropology at the National Museum of the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro in Brazil. Over the years, we have been fortunate to include more people and hold multiple meetings that have reinforced the project's intellectual cross-pollination, international scope, and experimental character.

We thank all the colleagues who accompanied and inspired us on this journey, as well as the institutions that supported us, especially the Brazil LAB at the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies (PIIRS), the

D

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

Princeton University Center for Human Values (UCHV), the Brazilian Center for Research on Culture and Economy (NuCEC), and the Brazilian Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPQ).

In March 2022, we had the privilege of hosting an advanced seminar at the School for Advanced Research (SAR) in Santa Fe, New Mexico. This fantastic weeklong gathering of intense and creative reflection helped us focus our collective concept making on “house-ing,” or home as a verb. It also gave us the joyous sense of having a book in the making. We are very grateful to our SAR hosts, Paul Ryer and Leslie Shipman.

xii

As this collective endeavor unfolded and *Homeplaces* took shape as a book, we were fortunate to have the wonderful support of a brilliant group of young anthropologists who contributed greatly to the research and exchanges of ideas: Naomi Zucker, Onur Günay, Nikhil Pandhi, Aaron Su, Aylunne Txai Tereszkiewicz, and Vinicius Cardoso Reis. Kendra Juskus’s keen editorial eye, sharp pen, and generous spirit gave the manuscript wonderful literary cohesiveness, enhancing diverse storytelling and the book’s inner connectivity.

Special thanks to Ken Wissoker, editor extraordinaire, for his enthusiasm for this project as well as for his vision and guidance throughout. We are grateful for the inspiring support that the reviewers and the stellar editorial team at Duke University Press provided in bringing *Homeplaces* to life.

The book benefited from the production support of the Brazil LAB at the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies and a generous publication subvention from Princeton University’s Committee on Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Our deep gratitude goes to photographer Anastasia Taylor-Lind and anthropologist Alisa Sopova for permitting us to place an image from their project *5K from the Frontline* on the cover of *Homeplaces*—a gesture as generous as the image itself is arresting.



JOÃO BIEHL AND FEDERICO NEIBURG

Introduction

Oikography

It is no accident that this homeplace, as fragile and as transitional as it may be, a makeshift shed, a small bit of earth where one rests, is always subject to violation and destruction. . . . For when a people no longer have the space to construct homeplace, we cannot build a meaningful community of resistance. —BELL HOOKS, “Homeplace: A Site of Resistance”

House-ing: On People Making Houses and Houses Making People

Destruction and erasure do not tell the whole story. The quest for dwelling creates homeplaces. Against end-times thinking and through cuts and bleedings, this book focuses on home as *house-ing*: the reciprocal process of people making houses and houses making people. We are engaged in a collective effort to think with and through the contingency, ingenuity, and indeterminacy involved in carving out places we call home amid ongoing calamity—from

D

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

environmental disasters, racialized segregation, police violence, and Indigenous and gendered servitude, to infectious and toxic landscapes, mass-engineering projects, and human displacement, to body mutilation and experimentation, familial escapes and fleeting sanctuaries, and the reckoning with ancestral wars.

In *Homeplaces*, anthropologists move across a range of landscapes and histories, taking the house to be a built shelter, a collection of relations, affects, memories, and moralities, and a lively nexus within neighborhoods, communities, and larger political, economic, and ecological systems. We explore how lifeworlds and imaginations are shaped by homemaking. The places we live in are simultaneously open and closed, composed of hard-won certainties and overwhelming uncertainties. They are places of shelter and entrapment, of autonomy and interdependence, where hierarchy and care coexist, and desire lingers.

What do ethnographies of housed and dehousing subjects thus bring into view? And what comes into play when the house itself becomes the subject of ethnography?

In the aftermath of the devastating 2010 earthquake in Port-au-Prince, Haiti, we find houses realized at diverse scales, with the homeless living in temporary camps and in movement. They belong to unstable, yet persistent, configurations of houses articulated against the backdrop of the plantation and Black geographies. Victims of the Fukushima nuclear disaster in Japan move between their contaminated homes and new settlements, reclaiming irradiated ancestral objects to restore a sense of belonging. Displaced by Brazil's largest hydroelectric dam complex, riverbank dwellers re-Amazonize their new concrete houses. Here, their intricate use of debris and plants subverts the sameness of a massive housing development.

In a feverish Rio de Janeiro engulfed by racist police violence, favela residents mourn the deaths of young Black men, which led to the demise of entire families and the dying of homes. In the rapidly urbanizing outskirts of La Paz, Bolivia, Indigenous women navigate servitude and leverage kinship ties to plot a house of their own for themselves and their loved ones. Farther north, in the hills of Soacha, a town south of Bogotá, Colombia, the war-displaced rural poor are now targets of social cleansing by militias. While some houses are marked as harboring deviants to be killed, an atmosphere of fear pervades the neighborhood and the unprotected intimacy of all dwellings.

In the persistently segregated American Southeast, the restoration of a nineteenth-century prayer house by a Black Gullah Geechee community is an act of returning to and reclaiming home ecologies and transcendence. It is also a political claim to alternative livability in a contaminated landscape. Some eight hundred miles away, in Chicago, people refuse to leave collapsing buildings that are filled with unresolved repair needs. Instead, they eke out an existence amid mold, refuse, weeds, rodents, and dogs that roam vacant units and the same common grounds that also nourish enjoyable gardens.

Consider how domestic and laboratory spaces bleed into each other, and how technologies both rehouse and reshape science. After losing limbs in work-related accidents, Swedish subjects in an experimental study redesign the terms and uses of their neuroprosthetics through an embodied domestic science. Meanwhile, local malaria scientists in Tanzania are paying attention to bodily movements in peridomestic spaces. This is prompting experimenters to reorient technocratic prevention away from the indoor-insecticidal approach and toward the design of protective communal atmospheres. Mosquitoes expose the fantasy in public health of controlling the home, which is inextricably linked to social relations, material underpinnings, and interspecies actants.

And see how young people in the American Southwest, scarred by historical violence and dispossession and dismissed as seedy, create fables of home and intimacy with strangers in temporary communal spaces where they are together and alone with the unknown. Finally, for the impoverished and unlettered elderly heirs of a bygone settler war in southern Brazil, the ancestral home is more than just a memory. It is a residual, shared sentience that invokes the spirit of nature and the healing power of storytelling.

The housed and the dehousing, as well as homes as ethnographic subjects, shift our perception toward relationality. With their incompleteness and openness to worlds and ways of life beyond the domestic sphere, they challenge our restrictive notions of habitability and livingness. Contrary to the idea that we “build and have built because we dwell,”¹ in *Homeplaces* we explore how people actively create provisional forms of dwelling amid ongoing calamity in historically shaped territories.² These are not returns to an authentic past. Rather, they are dynamic quests and adaptations to critical times.

While dislodging the dominance of crude universals, the immanence of house-ing also detonates restrictive concepts, such as the domicile. Bourgeois

ideology enshrines the home as private, stable, and bounded—the natural refuge of the nuclear family, sealed away from others and from history. Hardened into the sociological category of the household, this fiction underwrites public policies on housing, reproduction, and public health that are at once disciplinary and exclusionary.³

Our ethnographic approach reveals that houses are never static entities, but rather “live forms” that are constantly remade through human and other-than-human interactions.⁴ Displacement, violence, and environmental degradation force individuals to devise fluid house-ing strategies and creatively appropriate technologies. Thus, through participation in multiple intellectual lineages and cross-pollinations, *Homeplaces* grounds abstract notions of dwelling in the tangible, sensory realities of people struggling to endure in precarious environs, maintain livability, and find some form of transcendence.

The book’s title references bell hooks’s idea of “homeplace,” which she developed in the book *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*.⁵ For hooks, “homeplace” refers to the ways Black women have historically created and maintained domestic spaces that serve as sites of resistance and healing against white supremacist oppression.⁶ These spaces were not merely physical homes, but rather, they represented safe havens where Black individuals could affirm their dignity and humanity, where “all that truly mattered in life took place.”⁷ They were sites for nurturing counterhegemonic worldviews, spaces for “renewal and self-recovery, and communities where cultural practices and knowledge could be preserved and transmitted.”⁸ hooks emphasized that these homeplaces were political constructions deliberately created as spaces of mutual affirmation and healing from racist domination.

Yet implicit in hooks’s account is the fragility of such spaces. Homeplaces had to be made and remade precisely because they could be—and often were—unmade. We extend her concept to foreground this transience: homeplace in our framing is not an achieved ideal but an ongoing, often unsettled endeavor. It is at once a site of solidarity and of tension, a refuge shadowed by displacement, a place of healing that still bears the imprint of the violence it resists.⁹ The embodied dwellings examined in *Homeplaces* are not bounded units. Instead, they are entangled in various affective, institutional, and para-infrastructural configurations.¹⁰ These house-ings exhibit multiscalar and metamorphic characteristics that transcend biopolitical capture and

escape the binary of subjection and resistance. At their heterotopian best, these real places—unfolding across generations and through fragile webs of relationships—offer us an alternative perspective and encourage us to recognize ongoing efforts to repair the increasing precariousness that affects much of the world.¹¹ They embody life's insistence against decay and destruction. Lively yet dying, they serve as counterpolitical harbingers, defying ever-encroaching tyranny.

Oikography

We put forth *oikography* as an ethnographic approach that deconstructs ideological premises and statistical assumptions about homes and homemaking. The term oikography combines two ancient Greek roots: *oikos* (house or household) and *graphia* (drawn or written). We created this term to describe the methodological approach and theoretical orientation of this book to field research centering on how people create homes and how homes create people, as well as on the associated storytelling and representational practices. While countering universalizing assumptions about home and homemaking, oikography helps us approximate the plasticity and relationality of households across space and time. It also illuminates domestic spaces as critical nodes where microlevel practices connect to macrolevel processes.

Oikos, with its multiple senses and significations—including house, family, estate, patrimony, private space, and economic and moral spheres and related social hierarchies—opens up our imagination to many possible forms of dwelling, entrapment, exclusion, and becoming in the worlds people are thrown into. The *oikos* is similarly constituted by a set of dynamic relationships between bodies, buildings, rules, infrastructures, and other nonhuman elements (be they geophysical and biochemical matters, construction materials, or spiritual entities) as well as between intimacy, publicness, and the *polis* (Greek city-state or political community). Seen from this perspective, the house is a vital nexus between material, political-economic, affective, and aesthetic forces at work, and it is a place where public life and private life blur and these very terms are recast. When the word is combined with the Greek suffix *graphia*, as is the case in oikography, matters of the house are also inextricably linked to recordkeeping, archiving, and regimes of visualization, including the ethnographic account.

The concept of house-ing is central to each essay in this collection. It refers to the sensory processes by which people and houses mutually constitute one another. As a gerund—a verbal noun—house-ing elicits the home as a dynamic human-nonhuman entity shaped by intricate interplay between stability and instability, boundaries and flux, and stillness and movement. Engaging with house-ing in critical times prompts the question: What prospects remain for the “modes/genres of being human” under such persistent duress?¹² This approach also opens new vistas onto the shifting ground of the social, material, political, and moral.

6 Our collective oikography intentionally engages with house-ing in contexts of chronic precariousness (exacerbated by emergencies and new uncertainties) in the global South and among vulnerable communities in the global North, seeking to advance creative comparative work on the anthropology of the house. As we worked on this book together, the figure of the house became increasingly important for understanding today’s most pressing planetary issues—from the governance of epidemic and pandemic life to the limitations of technocratic responses to climate-related disasters, to the dynamics of ongoing brutal wars.

The COVID-19 pandemic has thrown the house and its significance to public health and the economy into sharp relief. The tensions between mobility and immobility and between protection and risk that run through where we live have become central to debates about which labor is essential to life, whose life is worth saving, and who is destined to die, in hospitals or at home. As evidenced by the ongoing conflicts in Ukraine, Palestine, and Sudan, to name a few, the house is also increasingly being utilized as a strategic target—not only to enact collective annihilation and expand colonial occupation, but also to extinguish the enduring forms of liveliness that homes sustain.¹³ A recent report by the United Nations special rapporteur on the right to adequate housing calls for “domicide”—the massive, arbitrary destruction of civilian housing in violent conflict—to be prosecuted as a crime against humanity.¹⁴

For most of our subjects, who have experienced a history of dehousing and rehoming, the notion of stability as a counterpoint to crisis is, at the outset, untenable: They have not inhabited or experienced bounded or intact dwellings in contradistinction to breakdowns or critical events. People’s house-ing efforts, rather, speak to the *longue durée* of critical times and to creative repertoires of material and affective “mediants.”¹⁵ Oikography is thus attuned to

such multirelational efforts to instantiate provisional homeplaces: grounds from which to gauge the past, make the present habitable, and forge future horizons. Designating an emplaced yet embattled and energetic milieu, *oikos* subverts and overflows. House-ing dynamics are more confounding and generative than hegemonic theoretical schemes account for.¹⁶

The contributors to *Homeplaces* work in a wide range of languages, each of which has different words for *house*, animated by local senses and meanings—*casa*, *maison*, *kay*, *nyumba*, 家, *Haus*, *hus*, and *home*. Yet, in our comparative and juxtapositional work, we take the Greek *oikos* as a common starting point, particularly because the term and its troubled history conjure up the house as a site where domination is legitimized and inscribed in the bodies of enslaved people—men, women, and children—challenging us to focus on patriarchy, racialization, exploitation, and hierarchy as integral to processes of house-ing. As we foreground the *oikos*, we remain alert to the shifting and uneven relations between the domestic and the political—between *oikos* and *polis*. Moreover, *oikos* serves as the etymological root for many innovative arrangements: *oikos* + *nemein* = *oikonomia* (“economy”), referring to the management of the house and of material resources in general; and *oikos* + *logos* = *oikologia* (“ecology”), referring to the interactions of organisms and their physical environments.¹⁷

The essays that compose this book evince an ethos of incompleteness and an invitational quality. Excerpted from ongoing studies and longer writings, the chapters resemble the porous houses and actions they describe. They are filled with unsettled figures who come and go, haunted by their pasts and uncertain about their lives in the future. Simultaneously illuminating the emergent and the otherwise and reckoning with structural and historical recognition, they might well be called oikographic short stories.

Taken together, our essays articulate an ethnographic approach to contemporary house-ing efforts at the generative intersection of five strands of research, always rooted by local concepts and practices: (1) the anthropology of kinship, patriarchy, care, and violence; (2) the economic dynamics of households related to the provision of shelter, the circulation of money, and the use of technology; (3) the anthropology of public policies and infrastructures concerning housing and services, risk and health, security, and rights and citizenship; (4) human and other-than-human alignments and the house as a material entity acting on residents and the environment, eliciting varying degrees of agency; and (5) the anthropology of aesthetics and poetics,

showing how figures of home and forms of homemaking constitute the house as a kind of sensory archiving machine that shapes affective pasts and the stories and trajectories of tomorrow.

Each oikography in this collection reflects a collaborative mode of knowing—copresence and coknowledge—through the figure of the house as a verb over time. Attention to the multifaceted nature of house-ing requires ethnographic agility and humility on the part of the fieldworker. It also requires an openness to traversing people's labor and imagination—a home-place for thought and interference, if you will.

8

Politics of Homemaking

The multiplicities of the house complicate our understanding of the intimate and the political as well as of the blurring of the two. In her seminal work *The Human Condition*, philosopher Hannah Arendt traces the shifting roles of public and private life from ancient Greece to the postwar modern period in which she was writing. She argues that ancient political thought took the division between public and private spheres—the *polis* and the *oikos*—and the distinction between activities related to the common world and those related to the mere maintenance of life as self-evident and axiomatic. However, with the emergence of the social sphere in the modern age, the line between the public and the private became “entirely blurred.”¹⁸ The economic question of individual life and species survival has ceased to be an apolitical household affair and has been integrated into a “gigantic, nation-wide administration of housekeeping.”¹⁹ In this early articulation of biopolitics, formerly domestic matters become collective concerns, and the two spheres are reconfigured. No longer separate or opposed, they “constantly flow into each other like waves in the never-resting stream of the life process itself.”²⁰

With the blurring of boundaries, both spheres are destabilized. Society's overwhelming intrusion into the private sphere hijacks the household for the sake of the good life of the *polis*. “Mass society,” Arendt writes, “not only destroys the public realm but the private as well,” thereby depriving people not only of their place in the world but also of “their private home, where they once felt sheltered against the world.”²¹ Without the protection of the private realm, people experience “a rebellion of the heart.”²²

Arendt was deeply troubled by the modern experience of worldlessness—the erosion of a shared world—and the diminished capacity for critical thinking and action that resulted from the destruction of public and private spaces. This left people vulnerable to totalitarian manipulation and unable to take collective responsibility for their shared human condition.

Oikography allows us to consider Arendt's philosophical account from a more nuanced perspective, tracing her insights into the real consequences of shifting configurations of the *oikos-polis* for human experience and political life into the here and now. This approach eschews totalizing claims in favor of close attention to the politics of domesticity and domestication.²³ Through the lens of house-ing, we can critically think and write about power, insurgency, the nature of social change, and agency in the present moment. This approach also provides a means of creatively challenging the blanket application of dominant theoretical frameworks associated with settler colonialism, neoliberalism, biopolitics, and control societies.²⁴

By taking the house as an ethnographic subject, we can focus on form and structure without losing sight of how social fields emerge and transform over time. This brings us closer to the places where the boundaries between public and private life, and between the human and nonhuman, become blurred, now that fantasies of the good life in the *polis* have collapsed.²⁵

Contemporary theorizations of materiality as a means of rethinking the political and our place within it are helpful here, to a point. In *Vibrant Matter*, for example, political theorist Jane Bennett writes against “the idea of matter as passive stuff, as raw, brute, or inert,” and against the supposed “division of meaning” that separates “dull matter (it, things)” from “vibrant life (us, beings).”²⁶ She argues that matter itself is vital, lively, and, in its own way, agentic. She is less interested in the specifics of human action than in the broader forms of “distributive agency” that characterize different actants (as Bruno Latour puts it) and the ways in which they make a difference in the world.²⁷

The call for attention to the vibrancy of matter and its “thingly power” offers another entry point or perspective for oikography.²⁸ In this conceptual framework, the house is regarded as a material entity, and it is understood in relation to its capacity to act on and through its human and other-than-human inhabitants, as well as its impact on the surrounding milieu. However, while the house does indeed “make things happen,” focusing solely on the material place fails to acknowledge the intricate webs of systems, decisions,

and human agencies that determine who can live in the house and how. To bring these machineries into view—and with them the questions of “ethics, accountability, normativity, and political critique”—the house must be peopled, so to speak.²⁹

Environmental Attunements

10 These matters are not new territory for anthropology. In fact, there is a rich archive of anthropological work that directly or indirectly sheds light on homemaking as generative social domain. Time and again, even when anthropologists have not explicitly focused their studies on houses, the home-making they have encountered in the field has challenged them to slow down analytically. Throughout the anthropological record, there are hints of the agency of the house in expanding conceptual work on the nature of social life and in breaking open modes of representation.³⁰

In his early twentieth-century armchair monograph, *Seasonal Variations of the Eskimo*, Marcel Mauss, for example, offers detailed descriptions of Inuit territory and housing and living arrangements. He is attentive to the ways in which “the material form of human groups . . . affects different modes of collective activity.”³¹ Mauss meticulously outlines how the settlement “takes on quite different forms according to the seasons.”³² Describing the contrasting dwellings and organizational forms that characterize the summer and winter seasons—from concentrated single-family tents to dispersed multifamily longhouses—the anthropologist elucidates a close relationship between morphology and the social group itself.

There is a plasticity to Mauss’s human-environment analysis (to which *Homeplaces* subscribes) that refuses facile determinisms. He does indeed frame his project against the geographical determinism of the then-popular anthropogeography, arguing for a more nuanced attention to the entanglements of inhabited, built, and lived worlds: “The land factor,” he writes, “must be considered in relation to a social context in all its complex totality.”³³

In his account of seasonal variations in residence and human-animal livingness patterns, Mauss refuses to view houses and social groups as fixed, bounded entities. Instead, he recognizes how these entities are reconfigured over time in response to different forms of sociality and activity that are related to the territory itself and changing environmental factors.³⁴

Such land-based dynamics are evident in the diasporic Haitian mobile landscapes studied by Federico Neiburg as well as in the stories of peoples facing nuclear disaster in Japan and dam-related resettlement in Amazonia, as demonstrated by Ryo Morimoto and Thiago da Costa Oliveira and Carlos Fausto, respectively, in their essays. Here, dwellings are permeable, adaptable, and influenced by contested histories, land use, and management. They flow through “vicinage,” as João Pina-Cabral would say, echoing South African anthropology of the 1960s.³⁵ They are made and remade through eco-biosocial connections and are inflected by expert knowledge and power relations. Thus, in contrast to Mauss’s stable environment/seasonality, house-ing under ongoing calamity is suffused with world-historical violence and the “runaway nature” of the Anthropocene, technocratic intervention, and scientific experimentation.³⁶

Homeplaces challenges the fantasy of a stable and analytically graspable social morphology and advocates against a mere cataloging of losses. Instead, it emphasizes the negative plasticity at play in house-ing, namely the dissolution of forms, bodies, and buildings that has been long and intensely underway and is always situated. This dissolution is the very material with which people create a sense of habitability and keep house-ing alive. Our collective ethos is powerfully exemplified in Catherine Fennell’s essay on “the house underfoot” in Chicago’s late-industrial racialized urban ecologies, in which she describes houses constructed from ruins. People exert agency over ravaged, worked landscapes, and living is a continuous process of domesticating corroding spaces while securing the right to housing.

More than resilience is at play here. In Thiago da Costa Oliveira and Carlos Fausto’s photographic essay, we witness the “bricolage” of Amazonian riverine communities displaced by a gigantic clean energy and urban development project.³⁷ Countering the company’s cataloging of land appropriation and ruination, the anthropologists and their cameras accompany the displaced as they recover experiences from their former lifeworld and rebuild their new cinderblock/homogeneous residences with the debris of a space that no longer exists. All sorts of technocratic equivocations are fleshed out, and resettlement has a method of its own. Here, the homeplace is a testament to the stubborn human will to domesticate the time of displacement.

Houses bleed. In their essay, set in Tanzania, on the domestic as a global health research infrastructure, Ann H. Kelly and Javier Lezaun present

houses as inherently leaky sites of multispecies coexistence. As a kind of immune and atmospheric system, houses are conduits for the transmission of disease since the homely is communal and unfolds beyond the walls. In line with some of Mauss's key insights, the ethnographies of house-ing reveal expansive diasporic subjects scarred and shaped by the shifting landscapes and geographies they or their codwellers have traversed. In Mauss's striking human-animal rendering, one could "compare these individuals with the long antennae extended forward by a creature that is itself extraordinarily distended."³⁸

12 In Alexandra Middleton's essay, we see that the house and its experiments allow for human distension. By following neuroprosthetic test subjects into their households, she shows how the experimental object is integrated into domestic routines and social interactions. This integration restores the users' abilities, reconstructs a familiar sense of home, and skillfully subverts the experiment and its expectations. Traversing such domestic experimentation and contestation within, against, and beyond technoscience, we land on the leakage and uncontainment of house-ing and its subjects.

Cry for Home

When anthropologist Franz Boas commissioned his student Zora Neale Hurston to enter the "homely life" of southern Black communities and capture elements of their "true inner life" in the mid-1920s, Hurston rushed back to her hometown of Eatonville, Florida.³⁹ Little did Boas know that the budding ethnographer/writer and her interlocutors would collaborate polyphonically to create a multigenerational record of African American life and insurgent subjectivities. Through exchanges in residences, gardens, porches, and other communal spaces, they crafted a bold methodological and theoretical detour from the emerging science of culture/cultural relativism (championed by figures such as Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead), pivoting to a sensory and literary anthropology that in turn yielded insights into the power of refusal as well as the dynamics of affective states and domestic politics.⁴⁰

This is the theory behind "our tactics," Hurston writes in *Mules and Men*, drawing from both her pioneering ethno-poetic fieldwork in one of the country's only all-Black towns and her own novelistic sensibility: "The white

man is always trying to know into somebody else's business. All right, I'll set something outside the door of my mind for him to play with and handle. He can read my writing but he sho' can't read my mind. I'll put this toy in his hand, and he will seize it and go away. Then I'll say my say and sing my song."⁴¹

The anthropologists of *Homeplaces* embrace Hurston's critique, which is rooted in radical ideas of Black agency and justice that have too long been relegated to the periphery of the discipline. We also leverage the potential of the detour she opened up with her dehousing and rehoused interlocutors and their trajectories as they experimented with form, genre, technique, and textuality, thereby affirming the capacious power of storytelling and the multiple senses of home that "the soul lives by."⁴²

In the opening essays, João Biehl and Angela Garcia return to where they were raised, in southern Brazil and the American Southwest, respectively, to reckon with their ancestral sense of home and the ruptures and heterotopias wrought by world-historical violence and the reconfiguration of family complexes. In both auto-oikographies, the image of the house does not provide an illusion of stability and belonging amid daily uncertainties; rather, it serves as a platform for departures. People live discontinuously, "from one map to the next," and the desire for domesticity is a multitemporal, recuperative journey through displacements that can open onto new universes of reference.⁴³

In Biehl's return to a dwelling that no longer exists, we see an incarnated home sentience that unlettered farmers forged against the specter of death and are left to ponder the mysteries of the intergenerational transmission of surges of survival. These flickering, homespun traces and poetic trails relentlessly delineate expansive cartographies of belonging and promise, transcending the racialization and necropolitics conjured by the ruling classes, and continually animated by storytelling.⁴⁴

The main subject of Garcia's essay is the Mother Road, a house-turned-brothel-turned-hostel set against the backdrop of America's infrastructural booms and busts, migratory cycles, and marginalizations west of Albuquerque's historic downtown. In this transient communal space, we encounter the fantasies, sensory experiences, and relational endeavors of a once-dehoused young woman—the anthropologist herself—who worked as a maid as she attempted to queer a domesticity of her own making. Garcia's literature has rescued this experience of living alone together in the narrowest of spaces.

It enables us to reconsider the wound of unhomeliness and the power of alternative house-ing as well as the unknown and unspoken that accompany social life.⁴⁵

The “cry for home” is a constant theme in Zora Neale Hurston’s most iconic ethnographic interlocutor, Cudjo Lewis, the last known survivor of the brutal transatlantic slave trade.⁴⁶ Equally constant is his sense of being a displaced “cartographic subject,” unmoored from ancestral coordinates yet ceaselessly yearning for connection.⁴⁷ Hurston’s *Barracoon: The Story of the Last “Black Cargo”* is set at the home of Cudjo (as she mostly refers to him) in Plateau, Alabama—originally named Africatown following the US Civil War.⁴⁸ This personal reckoning with “the most dramatic chapter in the story of human existence” begins with an open house: “It was summer when I went to talk with Cudjo so his door was standing wide open,” Hurston writes.⁴⁹ A hybrid of ethnographic study and oral history, *Barracoon* (the term for the structure used to temporarily shelter Africans who were to be sold and exported) is the result of a series of visits that Hurston made to Kossula (Cudjo’s African name) in the late 1920s. At that point, Kossula lived alone and gardened; his wife and children were gone. In Hurston’s words: “This is the life story of Cudjo Lewis, as told by himself. It makes no attempt to be a scientific document, but on the whole he is rather accurate.”⁵⁰ She writes,

But I knew he was somewhere about the house before I entered the yard, because I had found the gate unlocked. When Cudjo goes down into his back-field or away from home he locks his gate with an ingenious wooden peg of African invention.

I hailed him by his African name as I walked up the steps to his porch, and he looked up into my face as I stood in the door in surprise. He was eating his breakfast from a round enameled pan with his hands, in the fashion of his fatherland.

The surprise of seeing me halted his hand between pan and face. Then tears of joy welled up.

“Oh Lor’, I know it you call my name. Nobody don’t callee me my name from cross de water but you. You always callee me Kossula, jus’ lak I in de Affica soil!”⁵¹

Over the course of several months, Hurston and Cudjo had frequent conversations (some of which she captured on film), shared meals, and forged

a strong bond over his reminiscences. In *Barracoon*, the anthropologist recounts Cudjo's journey as "contraband flesh" and relays his yearnings in their original vernacular.⁵² Although Hurston wrote the story a few years after their interactions, the oral nature of the book's language as well as its racially charged editorial concerns prevented its publication at the time. It would not appear in print until nearly a century later.⁵³

Cudjo himself punctuates the story around the figure of the house and the violence of being dehousing. His narrative moves back and forth between his ancestral home in Africa ("De old folks dat live two hund'ed year befo' I born don't tell me de fater [remote ancestor] rule nobody"); his capture and time spent in the barracoon ("We all lonesome for our home"); the dehumanization of the Middle Passage on the *Clotilda* ("We looker and looker and looker and looker and we doan see nothin' but water. Where we come from we doan know. Where we goin, we doan know"); and his life as a slave in the United States ("We say we born and raised to be free people and now we slave").⁵⁴ Cudjo also reflects on his experience as a free man in a foreign land in the "afterlife of slavery" ("Why doan you give us piece dis land so we kin buildee ourself a home?").⁵⁵

In Ayluonne Txai Tereszkievicz's essay, we learn how Black communities created and maintained communal religious spaces during and in the wake of the plantation to express their cry for home and a sense of transcendence while addressing disenfranchisement. The anthropologist returns to North Carolina, where her once-enslaved ancestors worked the land before fleeing northward. There, she traces the role of a historic prayer house blending African and Christian traditions as an evolving place of refuge—a "being-at-home . . . far beyond the bounds of an explicitly domestic space" and a "central atlas of survivals and possibilities"—for Gullah Geechee captives and their descendants. The long-standing Gullah community continues to face inequities tied to their land: dispossession through development, lingering chemical toxicity from industrial activity on the repurposed plantation, and uncertainty regarding environmental remediation. For residents, the restoration of the chapel embodies the desire voiced by Cudjo: to have a "piece dis land so we kin buildee ourself a home."⁵⁶ The ancestral, spiritual place of origin embodies the power of creation in those marshes and the ability to transform what could be into what is, namely Black freedom and repair beyond injury.

Toward the end of *Barracoon*, Cudjo agrees to let Hurston take his portrait. “I’m glad you takee my picture. I want see how I look,” he says. “Once long time ago somebody come take my picture but they never give me one. You give me one.” Cudjo is dressed in his best suit, but he takes off his shoes. He explains: “I want to look lak I in Affica, ’cause dat where I want to be.”⁵⁷ He also asks to be photographed in the cemetery among his family’s graves.

In present-day Haiti, Cudjo’s words “where we goin, we doan know” resonate deeply.⁵⁸ The interconnected histories of African capture, the Middle Passage, plantation enslavement, *marronage*, anti-imperial rebellion, and all forms of systemic violence have given rise to a shared sense of displacement and an unknown journey’s end. The tension between captivity and the impulse to escape and rebuild lives is vividly captured by the concept of “configuration of houses,” as articulated by the Haitian anthropologist Louis Herns Marcelin.⁵⁹ According to Marcelin, the sense of home is always plural and tied to “a set of houses linked by an ideal of family and ancestry” that modulates “sense systems in territories that have been historically and socially constituted.”⁶⁰

House-ing is on the move, as we learn from Federico Neiburg’s essay. In beleaguered Haiti, the house is an emplacement of movement and tension as well as an ancestral and contemporary relational process. People have learned to keep their deceased loved ones close through the configuration of their houses, known as *lakou*. Even when physically destroyed by natural disasters and violent political economies, the *lakou* figure continues to nourish a sense of land ownership, collective belonging, and mutual obligation that drives the centrifugal and diasporic dynamics of house-ing. As Cudjo yearned: “I want to look lak I in Affica.”⁶¹

Domicide

What is the grip of the world-historical on house-ing? How do we address the disfiguring and refiguring effects of this siege on our thinking and writing about the reciprocal relationship between homes and people?

In their seminal work on “uprooting” in the context of the French efforts to suppress the Algerian anticolonial struggle in the 1950s, Pierre Bourdieu and Abdelmalek Sayad chronicle the displacement of over a quarter of the largely rural population.⁶² Hundreds of thousands of families were resettled

and confined into heavily policed, concentration-like “regroupment camps” or fled to the alien urban environment of the capital city, Algiers.

The young Bourdieu and Sayad met in a colonial milieu and forged a bond that became a form of creative intellectual resistance. While Bourdieu, a philosophy student at the time, was serving in a French army research unit in Algiers, Sayad, a sociology student, was engaged in anti-occupation movements. Their wartime friendship led to an unexpected collaboration that transformed them both into ethnographers of people who had been uprooted, left houseless, and trapped. In turn, these subjects held a mirror to the young scholars’ own sense of out-of-placeness and desire for belonging and transformational social knowledge.⁶³

17

In *Homeplaces*, we strive for a decolonial and anticolonial scholarly and political engagement as well. Colonial oppression deprives people of the protection of a home, and this dispossession leaves its mark on disjointed bodies. As Bourdieu and Sayad poignantly observe, “It is the body language, the way one stands, looks, or walks, that expresses bewilderment better than words.” While landless peasants sat idle, without the rhythms and toil of the land, desperate women and tired children wandered in search of “a piece of bread or a can of water,” exposed to the gaze of the armed forces and foreigners.⁶⁴

Here and elsewhere, colonial power implodes domestic autonomy and restructures inhabited space. The housed subject of the embattled present becomes a thing of the past—“a new framework of existence that marks colonial possession on the ground.”⁶⁵ Those who have breathed a “life of proximity” among neighbors are now valueless and abruptly thrust into a “world of anonymity.” However, these displaced and highly surveilled bodies and souls also find ways to collaborate in “opening up new horizons,” as Frantz Fanon writes in *The Wretched of the Earth*.⁶⁶

Meanwhile, in the name of maintaining peace, the policeman and the soldier put oppression and domination into practice, bringing “violence into the home and into the mind of the native.”⁶⁷ This is what every Algerian—dehoused or threatened at home—felt in their hearts: “Colonialism is not a thinking machine, nor a body endowed with reasoning faculties. It is violence in its natural state and it will only yield when confronted with greater violence.”⁶⁸ Officials tortured Algerians in the cellars and vacated houses to extract information about the anonymous resistance and the homemade weapons that had been fashioned to overthrow colonial rule and end the brutality

of civilization.⁶⁹ The victims' cries of pain rose into the domestic spaces of orderly citizens, solidifying a sensorium of terror and generalized complicity with dehumanization.

The use of violence against houses as a way of controlling territory and mind remains a present-day technology of power throughout our volatile world.⁷⁰ In Sebastián Ramírez's essay we learn how paramilitary groups that terrorized rural Colombian populations during the country's brutal civil war have mutated into criminal organizations controlling vast peripheral areas inhabited by refugees on the outskirts of the capital, Bogotá. Even during "peace accord" times, the war machine continues in order to maximize illicit economies and a shadowy para-sovereignty. Militias target those who cannot pay their drug-related debts or protection fees, as well as LGBTQIA+ people and community leaders deemed socially dangerous and eradicable, with threatening pamphlets and graffiti. This cleansing horrorscape renders the everyday inhospitable, turns the neighborhood into a siege zone, and transforms the threatened house into a prison. The only refuge left for people is to be seen in order to be dismissed, to be named in order to be erased, and to be fixed in order to disappear.

Set amid the unrelenting gang violence, police violence, and racism in Rio de Janeiro, Eugênia Motta's tragic oikography reveals how a house intended to shelter urban poor families becomes a place of calamitous harm. Beginning with the brutal murder of a young Black man involved in petty crime—a "bad death"—we witness the house spiral into one affective, moral, and medical crisis after another. At the center of this "dying home" is Maria, a grieving mother grappling with her inability to safeguard her loved ones and the very idea of motherhood as a generative force. Maria's own death and the resulting dispersal of kin ultimately reveal the house as an organism that lives and dies and harbors relatedness and expansive social projects, whose incompleteness and abrupt interruption continue to interpellate the anthropological imagination.

Habitability

Houses are gendered and engendering. In the early 1970s, while Pierre Bourdieu famously reified the "traditional" Kabyle house (by then already dismantled by the colonial/anticolonial war) as the embodiment of a cosmological

system in which space organizes structural relationships (complementary, tense, and hierarchical) between the sexes, feminist scholars were peopling houses again with the practices of real women characters, who were both objects of domination and house makers on their own terms.⁷¹

In her ethnography *Women of Value, Men of Renown*, set in the Trobriand Islands, Annette Weiner powerfully challenged Bronisław Malinowski's early theory of value, developed concerning the circulation of kula objects by male argonauts.⁷² Weiner entered people's houses and chronicled how women were custodians of food and the kula objects. Through their care and public display, women added value and communicated a distinct cosmic order.⁷³ In this context, the gendered configuration of houses and labor actively defied the idea of a male-centered politics as well as the production of value and knowledge consecrated by male ancestral researchers (excluding women and the agency of the house).

Following Weiner's pioneering work, scholars creatively adopted the gendered house as a generative locus to rethink and queer classic anthropological subjects, such as the household, kinship, and the political.⁷⁴ As Janet Carsten notes in *After Kinship*, the intimacy of houses "jumbles up" what anthropologists tended to separate: "In the sometimes haphazard 'side by sideness' of what happens in the house, we can begin to understand how ideas about bodies and about gender come to structure social relations."⁷⁵

Houses and ideas of home not only structure social relations but also unleash relational plasticity, which is key to the work of sublimation and the creation of alternative life projects. In Susan Helen Ellison's essay we meet Brisa, a Bolivian domestic worker (*criada*) who embodies centuries of Indigenous domination and servitude and yet creatively redeploys asymmetrical relations and ambivalent kinship ties in pursuit of her own place and a dynamic future. In this "oikobiography," we see how the master's house is composed of differentiated spaces that allow for abuse and secrecy, as well as for commensality and the forging of tactical calculations and reciprocity. We also witness the calvary of the laboring house, embodied by the *criada*, as a forward-looking perseverance and an aspirational drive to build, brick by brick, a place that will finally feel like home.

Surprisingly, Claude Lévi-Strauss also embraced the house as a flexible analytic capable of transcending entrenched theoretical principles—including his own—and offering new perspectives on affiliation and collective life.

Unlike the traditional anthropological focus on descent, the house—and the ensuing “house societies”—is a hybrid social form that can change over time.⁷⁶ For Lévi-Strauss, the house is a “moral person,” composed of material and immaterial goods that bind groups of people together.⁷⁷ In this framework, the traditionally rigid binaries of bloodlines, descent laws, and marital structures are no longer oppositional, but rather “tactics to be used simultaneously or alternately” (as Brisa and numerous characters of *Homeplaces* do).⁷⁸ The house borrows the language of kinship while simultaneously subverting it and forming new combinations. Such house-ing “allows us . . . to better understand how categories deemed incompatible can blend together,” thus providing a window into the workings of time and the entanglements of human and more-than-human becomings.⁷⁹

In Ryo Morimoto’s essay, set in the aftermath of the Fukushima nuclear disaster, the elderly Naoko navigates the traditional layout of her house, which includes room for ancestral spirits, amid the excesses wrought by irradiation. Despite biopolitical warnings, she moves between her evacuated and temporary residences. This movement resurfaces and strengthens a domestic sensorium fundamental to Naoko’s moral ideal of a satisfying death and a place of rest in the afterlife—things that cannot be technocratically redomesticated. Isotopes can coexist with humans, and houses never die completely. Like us oikographers, house-ing continually enters and reenters people’s lives, even where and when habitability is threatened.

Livingness: Grounding Incompleteness

As we dehouse the planet, what practices of habitability and humanness emerge from the house?

By attending to the quest for homeplaces and the grounds of dehousing and house-making, we gain partial and meaningful insight into the shifting geographies and crossroads that shape livability.⁸⁰ Thus, the *oikos* is not only lively ontologically but also as a material manifestation—both closed and open—of the larger historical, social, political, and economic forces into which it is folded, and by which its own agentive properties are animated and sustained over time.

The ethnography of house-ings foregrounds incompleteness and unfinishedness. It offers us a means of charting the dynamics of habitability

through time. This approach allows us to pay attention to material forms and the changes they mediate, to what is fluid and to what is fixed or bleeds, and to what people desire and do with mobility or stasis. Adopting this perspective allows us to consider multiple temporal registers simultaneously, addressing ancestry, the *longue durée* of history with its inheritances and ruptures, and the politics of domestication in the present moment.

Throughout *Homeplaces*, we focus on house-economic-ecological interconnections, think with and through the praxis of house-ing, and pursue six broad arcs of inquiry into this dynamic verb and related syntax: who, what, where, when, why, how?

21

- *Who constitutes the housed, the dehoused, and the in-between subject?* How does a focus on the housed/dehoused subject detonate ideas of the self, the governed, and the liberal subject? Who participates in domestication once we destabilize the anthropocentric?
- *What materialities and decays unfurl within the house, and what sensoria do they produce?* What surfaces when we attend to the physicality and bleeding of the house, and to house-ing as an archiving operation, that memory alone cannot capture?
- *Where are homes possible and where are they impossible?* Which places and forms of habitability and livingness emerge from attempts to dwell in uncertain and inhospitable environs? What third spaces or liminal zones are created?
- *When are homeplaces made?* In what ways do houses and their rhythms serve as an escape from the past and a platform from which to venture into the future? When do places we call home become moral arbiters, and how do their existence and demise affect the world?
- *Why do houses and the senses of home take the forms they do?* This question is as much about sense making and “the right to opacity” as it is about changing political and technological landscapes.⁸¹ What drives a good life, the transcendence of harm, and the achievement of repair through domestic relationships, labor, and calculations?
- *How do housed and dehoused subjects perform the work of scaling and narrate their relational efforts at habitability?* How can this multitude of conceptual, political, and poetic imaginings refigure anthropological

D

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

INTRODUCTION

knowledge making and enable new forms of inscription, storytelling, and visual representation?

Homeplaces emerges from our collective and ongoing engagement with the hard-to-pin-down multiplicity of house-ings that sets peoples, worlds, thoughts, and imaginations in motion. We treat houses in both their singular and plural forms. People operate with the concept of “the house” or “my home,” so notions of singularity and belonging matter. Social life happens along and among houses, with houses also territorializing political collectives. Furthermore, we pay close attention to the immanent, sensory ways in which this manifold *oikos* inhabits people. We view the domestic realm as an organism, a lively dynamic of openness and closeness that transforms spaces into generative states of incompleteness. In house-ing, incompleteness is not a lack but rather a drive to relate to other houses or ideas of home. The agency of houses and peoples is intertwined as they continuously shape each other and their environs.

The essays of *Homeplaces* offer creative ways of reconceptualizing the relationship between the self, the house, the world-historical, and sensoria in the praxis of habitability, belonging, experimentation, and durability. Against the backdrop of horror and renewal, myriad temporal rhythms and gestures of intensification, resurfacing, leakage, and bleeding coalesce into collective noticing of a livingness that nourishes a different kind of insurgency and political possibility for the world.

NOTES

We want to thank the editorial guidance of Brad Weiss, Christopher Nelson, and Heather Paxson, who helped us publish a colloquium on our first collective set of reflections on the ethnography of house-ing (Biehl and Neiburg, “Oikography”).

1. Heidegger, “Building Dwelling Thinking,” 146. Martin Heidegger’s essentializing concept of dwelling—“Only if we are capable of dwelling . . . can we build” (158)—has been criticized for its Eurocentrism and ahistoricism. Anthropologists such as Tim Ingold and James F. Weiner have shown that the philosopher’s German romantic dwelling does not take into account the various place-making practices that have been documented in different societies. See Ingold, *Perception of the Environment*; J. Weiner, “Anthropology Contra Heidegger.”

2. As Malcolm Ferdinand pointedly notes in *Decolonial Ecology*, “Heideggerian dwelling assumes a totalized Earth and a solitary man, immobile in his dwelling” (6).

Researchers working in urban settings and with migrant and refugee populations have further challenged Heidegger's place-bound conception and politically dangerous universalism by documenting how meaningful dwelling can emerge in transient conditions (Chavez, *Latino Threat*; Hage, *Diasporic Condition*; Joseph, "Maisons diasporas et maisons locales"; Olwig, *Caribbean Journeys*). On provisional forms of dwelling, see Guedes, "Interstícios, distâncias"; and Mello e Souza, "Formas provisórias de existência."

3. On the bourgeois ideal of domicile, see Elias, *Court Society*, chap. 1; on the disciplinary dimension of house and housing, see Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*; on the colonial roots of the disciplinary concept of domicile, see Mitchell, *Colonising Egypt*, chap. 3; and on the friction among local concepts of home and statistical concepts of domicile, see Motta, "Resisting Numbers."

4. Stewart, "Precarity's Form," 8. See also Ingold, "Building, Dwelling, Living."

5. Hooks, "Homeplace."

6. The concept of homeplace aligns with the experiences of *marronage* and *quilombos*—independent communities formed by escaped slaves to resist slavery across the Americas. See Price, *Maroon Societies*; Santos, *Colonização, quilombos*; and Dealdina, *Mulheres quilombolas*.

7. Hooks, "Homeplace," 41.

8. Hooks, "Homeplace," 49. See also Morrison, "The Site of Memory."

9. Our approach engages with a growing body of ethnographic work on the plight of the dehousing and the struggle to make home, including Jason De León's *The Land of Open Graves*, Matthew Desmond's *Evicted*, Didier Fassin and Anne-Claire Defossez's *Exile*, Brian Goldstone's *There Is No Place for Us*, and Nicholas Shapiro's *Homesick*.

10. See Das and Das, "How the Body Speaks"; Steedman, *Landscape for a Good Woman*; and Kopper, *Architectures of Hope*.

11. On "heterotopia," see Foucault, "Of Other Spaces."

12. On "modes/genres of being human," see Wynter, "Un-Settling the Coloniality," 331.

13. See Munira Khayyat's *A Landscape of War* and "Introduction: Another Season of War in South Lebanon."

14. See Rajagopal, "Domicide"; and Porteous and Smith, *Domicide*.

15. Appadurai, "Mediants, Materiality, Normativity."

16. See Bachelard, *Poetics of Space*; and Douglas, "Idea of a Home."

17. See l'Estoile and Neiburg, "Governing the House"; and l'Estoile, "Can Economic Anthropology Escape?"

18. Arendt, *Human Condition*, 28.

19. Arendt, *Human Condition*, 28. See also Zelizer, *Social Meaning of Money*, chap. 2; Morduch and Schneider, *Financial Diaries*; and Zalom and James, "Financialization and the Household."

20. Arendt, *Human Condition*, 33.

21. Arendt, *Human Condition*, 59.

22. Arendt, *Human Condition*, 39.

23. See Colomina, "Domesticity at War."

24. See Deleuze, "Postscript on Control Societies."

D

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

25. See Berlant, *Cruel Optimism*.
26. Bennett, *Vibrant Matter*, vii.
27. See Latour, *Reassembling the Social*, 50; Bennett, *Vibrant Matter*, ix. Things, Bennett argues, possess vital powers, serving “not only to impede or block the will and designs of humans but also to act as quasi agents or forces with trajectories, propensities, or tendencies of their own” (viii). Citing Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s “material vitalism” as inspiration, Bennett is interested in the way such agencies reverberate, trying to “bear witness to the vital materialities that flow through and around us” (x). From this attention to “thing-power” as a “productive, positive power,” matter becomes an active force that intervenes in the world and the public sphere. See also Connolly, *World of Becoming*.
28. Bennett, *Vibrant Matter*, xiii. See also Miller, *Home Possessions*.
29. Appadurai, “Mediants, Materiality, Normativity,” 221. See also Fischer, “Peopling of Technologies.”
30. See, for example, Carsten and Hugh-Jones, *About the House*; Beeckmans et al., *Making Home(s) in Displacement*; Frost and Selwyn, *Travelling Towards Home*; and Stolz and Alderman, *Houses Transformed*.
31. Mauss, *Seasonal Variations*, 20. See also P. Dawson, “Seeing Like an Inuit Family.”
32. Mauss, *Seasonal Variations*, 36.
33. Mauss, *Seasonal Variations*, 21. For another instance of seasonal transhumance patterns, see Claude Lévi-Strauss’s accounts of Kwakiutl mythologies as commentaries on the human-land-sea relations in “The Story of Asdiwal,” and Marshall Sahlins’s account on sea-land patterns of politics in both the Pacific and the Aegean in “The Stranger-King.”
34. Ingold, *Perception of the Environment*. See also Liboiron et al., “Toxic Politics”; and Walley, *Exit Zero*.
35. Pina-Cabral, “Partible Houses.” See also Cortado, “La force du regard.”
36. See Petryna, *Horizon Work*.
37. Lévi-Strauss, *Savage Mind*, chap. 1.
38. Mauss, *Seasonal Variations*, 52.
39. Boas, foreword to *Mules and Men*.
40. See Benedict, *Anthropologist at Work*; Mead, *Coming of Age*; and Hurston, “You Don’t Know Us Negroes.”
41. Hurston, *Mules and Men*, 10.
42. Hurston, *Mules and Men*, 10.
43. Deleuze, “What Children Say,” 63. See also Barthes, *How to Live Together*.
44. See Biehl, *Jammerthal, o Vale da Lamentação*; and Munn, “The ‘Becoming-Past’ of Places.”
45. See Garcia, *The Way That Leads Among the Lost*.
46. Hurston, *Barracoon*, 98.
47. Biehl and Locke, “The Anthropology of Becoming,” 55–57.
48. See Brown, *Descendant*.
49. Hurston, *Barracoon*, 40, 52.
50. Hurston, *Barracoon*, 38.

51. Hurston, *Barracoon*, 52.
52. Hurston, *Barracoon*, 40.
53. Womack, "Contraband Flesh."
54. Hurston, *Barracoon*, 55, 95, 96, 101.
55. Hartman, *Lose Your Mother*, 6; Hurston, *Barracoon*, 109. See also Hartman, *Scenes of Subjection*.
56. Hurston, *Barracoon*, 109.
57. Hurston, *Barracoon*, 131.
58. Hurston, *Barracoon*, 96.
59. Marcelin, "A linguagem da casa." See also Comerford and Neiburg, "A casa e a invenção da família."
60. Marcelin, "A linguagem da casa," 37.
61. Hurston, *Barracoon*, 131.
62. Bourdieu and Sayad, *Uprooting*.
63. See Pérez, *Bourdieu and Sayad Against Empire*.
64. Bourdieu and Sayad, *Uprooting*, 156.
65. Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 23.
66. Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 23.
67. Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 37.
68. Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 61.
69. Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth*, 275.
70. See Said, *After the Last Sky*; and Weizman, *Forensic Architecture*.
71. Bourdieu, "Berber House."
72. A. Weiner, *Women of Value*. See also Munn, *Fame of Gawa*.
73. A. Weiner, in *Women of Value*, asks: "When the role of women is being publicly dramatized, what statement is a woman making about the structure of the social and cosmic order?" (18).
74. See Yanagisako, "Family and Household"; Guyer, "Household and Community"; Humphrey, "No Place Like Home"; and Weston, *Families We Choose*.
75. Carsten, *After Kinship*, 26.
76. Lévi-Strauss, "Maison," 435. See also Carsten and Hugh-Jones, *About the House*; and Joyce and Gillespie, *Beyond Kinship*.
77. Lévi-Strauss, *Paroles données*, 190. See also Motta, "O que faz o dinheiro da casa," 6.
78. Lévi-Strauss, "Maison," 436.
79. Lévi-Strauss, "Maison," 436. See also Biehl and Locke, *Unfinished*.
80. See McKittrick, "I Lost an Arm."
81. Glissant, *Poetics of Relation*, 185.

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS