

Calling for an end to indefinite detention: the spatial politics of Refugee Tales

David Herd

The University of Kent

ABSTRACT

Founded in 2014 by Gatwick Detainees Welfare Group, Refugee Tales is a civil society project that calls attention to the fact that the UK is the only country in Europe that detains people indefinitely under immigration rules, and which in so doing calls for that policy to end. The way the project makes its call is by sharing the stories of people who have experienced detention, and the way it shares those stories is in the context of a public walk. Written from within the project, the purpose of this article is to try to articulate the spatial politics of Refugee Tales. Taking as its starting point the ‘hostile environment’ that successive immigration acts have constructed for the person who seeks asylum in the UK, the argument opens by identifying the way the policies that constitute that environment deliberately impede human movement. The article then considers how, as ‘A Walk in Solidarity with Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Detainees’, Refugee Tales offers a practical counter to such policy driven assaults on a person’s movement. To understand the substance of that counter-action, the article draws on Thomas Nail’s theory of kinopolitics as a means of understanding alternative images of mobility. Finally, with reference to Hannah Arendt, the article identifies the connection between movement and story. It is by making the link between story and movement, a link that hostile immigration policy implicitly understands, that Refugee Tales has arrived at a spatial practice that helps open the argument for political change.

Keywords

walking, stories, indefinite detention, hostile environment, kinopolitics

A walk in solidarity

To give the project its full title, Refugee Tales is “A Walk in Solidarity with Refugee Tales, Asylum Seekers and Detainees.”¹ The purpose of the walk is to call attention to the fact, to call out the fact, that the UK is the only country in Europe that detains people indefinitely under immigration rules, and in that process to call for the policy to end. The way the project makes its call for legal and political change is by sharing the stories of people who have experienced detention, with that sharing taking many and multiple forms. Not less crucial, however, than the talking and the story telling is the fact of walking.² It is in the walking that the solidarity is constituted. Or more precisely, it is in the walking that a space emerges that constitutes the project’s political ground. To understand this (and it is important to say that the project itself is still working to understand it) it is necessary to think about the degree to which the person who seeks asylum in the UK finds their movement controlled. To that end, the essay opens with a consideration of the UK’s ‘hostile environment’ from the point of view of movement. It will then

try to say what is happening when the walk itself moves. Where this takes us, I think, is to an appreciation of the relation between movement and story. What the repressive structures of the UK's asylum system demonstrate is the deep connection between those forms of circulation, between movement and story. It's for that reason that the asylum system obstructs both. Where the essay arrives is at a reading of the Refugee Tales project that inflects, or reflects, Thomas Nail's theory of kinopolitics. It is as a walk in solidarity, in other words, that Refugee Tales does its work.

The hostile environment

To start with, it is necessary to understand the nature of the hostile environment the UK has constructed for the person who seeks asylum, to which end I want to offer a report. During the summer of 2014 I visited a property in Barking, East London. The property was owned by the *Clearsprings* group, "an established provider of outsourced [...] accommodation services to the Home Office since 2000."³ From 2014 to 2015 it was home to two men, both housed under Section 4 of the 1999 Asylum and Immigration Act, the terms of which provided accommodation for so-called failed asylum seekers. Section 4 of the 1999 Act has since been repealed by the Immigration Act of 2016. In future, unless they can demonstrate 'destitution plus', which is to say hardship over and above the normal effects of destitution, people in the UK whose asylum claims are deemed to have failed will be rendered homeless. But this was before the new legislation and so both men still had an entitlement to be housed. Dismayingly, but not uncommonly, in the summer of 2014 the Clearsprings property was experiencing an infestation.

The first man, whom we will call A, was from Guinea, a country which, since the end of the French colonial period, has been governed by a series of authoritarian regimes. A is Fulah, or Fulani, the Fulah being a tribe that stretches across some twenty West African countries but which in Guinea is an ethnic minority. As such the Fulah have been repeatedly vulnerable to the governing regime of the moment. When I first met A, in 2009, it was shortly after Moussa Dadis Camara had seized power in Guinea in a coup, following which he had ordered the massacre of 157 opposition protesters demonstrating at a rally in a football stadium in the capital Conakry. The second man, R, fled Iran in 1997. He left along with his family, with the intention of reaching Germany, travelling through Europe in the back of a truck. At some point on the journey he was separated from the other members of his family and so while they made it to Germany, R ended up in northern England. Since R did not possess official travel documents, he had been unable to relocate to Germany in the 18 years up to the time I met him. Nor, however, had he been deported, though he had been detained pending deportation. Nor had he been granted leave to remain. In Barking he kept chickens and a family of cats in what looked like an effort to conjure a feeling of some kind of belonging. There seemed no prospect, after 18 years, that his case would be resolved.

Their national differences aside, the two men shared a common set of circumstances. As people seeking asylum they were not allowed to work – a condition that had applied for 12 years and 18 years respectively. In the absence of permission to work, they received subsistence level financial support: £35 per week, £5 per day. Crucially, rather than receiving cash or a payment into their bank accounts – accounts it would become illegal for them to hold following the 2016 Immigration Act – the payment was made by weekly top-up to a form of voucher known as an Azure Card. The card carried restrictions in that it could only be used to purchase designated items at designated outlets. Public transport was not listed as an item on which the card could be spent. At which point the relation of space to the construction of non-personhood begins to emerge. For the men in question, the nearest designated outlet was two miles from their house and since they were unable to use public transport they had to walk that distance to obtain any provisions. In some cases, for people in their circumstance, occasional access to public transport might be afforded: on the days that they were required to report their continued presence at a Home Office reporting centre. There is variation, however, case by case, with some asylum seekers having to walk several miles in order to sign at their nearest centre.

Such reporting was a source of ongoing anxiety, since it was when they reported that they were most likely to be re-detained. The asylum seeker is designated permanently detainable and so without prior process or explanation people frequently find themselves taken back into detention. The sense of precarity this produces is acute and is compounded by the fact that at any point a person accommodated under Section 4 provision can be relocated. Relocation can be to anywhere in the country, the Home Office term for the process being ‘dispersal’. The consequence of such dispersal is that any community a person might have been able to establish is abruptly broken up. The significance of this, in turn, is that such community sometimes constitutes the basis (under Article 8 of the European Convention of Human Rights) for an individual’s claim to the right to remain.

My point is this: the house in Barking constituted, represented, and was situated at the intersection of what must properly be understood as a systematically negated space; a space whose rules of engagement have the effect of rendering those who occupy it non-persons. Writing about such a negative ordering of space in a colonial setting, Frantz Fanon observes that “The colonial world is divided into compartments” (Fanon 1965, 29). Such a compartmentalized world, he goes on to state, “is inhabited by different species,” where “what parcels out the world is to begin with the fact of belonging to or not belonging to a given race” (Fanon 1965, 30,31). How the spatial practices of the colonial situation map onto contemporary asylum settings, the degree to which they have been re-imported through the immigration system, requires further discussion.⁴ Suffice to say here that, for the two men in question, a ruthlessly enforced compartmentalization formed part of their experience of space, witness the fact that they were only allowed to shop at certain outlets.

Quite what terms are required to describe such negative contemporary spaces is a question we need to consider. It is worth noting immediately, however, that Fanon's sense of compartmentalization, while catching the systemic quality of the current situation, does not suggest an account of the way human movement through space is controlled. Thomas Nail's term for such control is "kinopolitics," being "the theory and analysis of social motion: the politics of movement" (Nail 2015, 24). Nail's emphasis on motion is helpful in allowing one to grasp the way contemporary movement through space – not simply space itself – is negatively constructed. What really one needs to imagine, however, is how such compromised mobility felt, or was intended to feel; what it meant for the individuals concerned that their relation to space was so intrusively managed.

In the house and at the reporting centre, the principal poles of their existence, the intention clearly was that they should experience a state of permanent anxiety. Elsewhere, as they made their journeys, whether between the house and the reporting centre, or from the house to the shops, the effect of being compelled to walk everywhere was both attritional and fundamentally divisive. In and of itself the walk to and from a designated outlet signified their segregation, as did both the time it took but also the time they might allow it to take given the absence of any other purposeful activity. In every principal situation, in other words, but also in every transition between situations – at every step along the way – the relation to space was so purposefully and profoundly negative (experienced as it had been over many years) as to shape and invert the individual's personhood itself.

Standing behind these aggressively delineated everyday spaces, giving meaning and force to their negative architectonics, is the institutional fact and spatial reality of indefinite detention. Such detention is, in theory, an administrative provision, reserved for people whose deportation or removal to their country of origin is imminent, or at least pending. In practice it is a deeply arbitrary and a frequently protracted experience. Since 2007, one trigger for such detention has been sentencing. In the event that a non-citizen commits a crime – whether they are an asylum-seeker, a failed asylum seeker, or a person with limited leave to remain – and where the crime attracts a sentence of twelve months or more, then they automatically become liable for deportation and are therefore detained the moment their sentence ends. There are many ways one might contextualize this practice: by observing, for instance, that the precarity of the asylum process tends to criminalise the individual, typical offences being illegal working or the use of false papers. Either way, for the non-citizen caught in this context, the sentence served for an offence is not the end of the matter, but a trigger for further, and this time indefinite, incarceration.

Equally likely, however, as Teresa Hayter observed in *Open Borders: The Case Against Immigration Controls*, "people may be picked up in the street, on the underground or at work, or their houses may be raided in the early hours" (2000, xvii). Such methods of detention have been documented by various projects, with the various different accounts confirming both the

systemic nature of the practice (in that the patterns are clearly discernible) and also its arbitrariness (in that the individual is neither warned nor, of course, charged). At the point of detention, the person detained will frequently only be allowed to take the clothes they stand up in; not, for instance, any medication they might be using, or any evidence that might help secure their release. More fundamentally, given that immigration detention is indefinite, they will not know when they will be released. Periods of detention can be short, a matter of days, or perhaps weeks, but equally a person can be detained for months and years. The longest period the Refugee Tales project knows a person to have been detained is 9 years.⁵ Of all of those detained, over 50% are released back into ‘the community’. What ‘the community’ refers to, in this context, is the negative spatial reality encapsulated by the situation in Barking. Even so, and the euphemism notwithstanding, the fact of their release plainly begs the question, why such people were detained in the first place.

The larger argument of the project is that detention constitutes a defining feature of the period through which we are currently living. This is best indicated by the scale on which the practice is increasingly used. In 1973, 95 people were indefinitely detained under immigration rules in the UK. By 1988 that number stood at 2166 (Wilsher 2012, 88). In the year ending June 2017, according to Home Office statistics, over 27,000 people were detained across a detention estate that includes 10 immigration removal centres and has recourse to various prisons.⁶ It is a growth that is mirrored elsewhere in the Anglophone world. In the US, for example, the daily (not annual) detention population increased from 2,200 in 1985 to 33,400 in 2008, in which year the total number detained was 378,582 (Wisher 2012, 68, 77). A similar graph can be drawn in the case of Australia, which, as has been well reported, externalizes the process by the practice of off-shoring detention and where (unlike in the US and the UK) detention is mandatory for all non-citizens without a valid visa.

That detention in the UK structures the negative spaces that constitute the non-person’s environment flows from the fact that at any point, at any given moment, the asylum seeker can be re-detained. At any point, in other words, and in any setting, the individual might be returned to that defining space of non-recognition, where their vulnerability to the processes of the state is immediate and absolute. Hannah Arendt provides an account of such vulnerability when she observes that her concern is with “the arbitrariness by which victims are chosen, and for this it is decisive that they are objectively innocent, that they are chosen regardless of what they may or may not have done” (Arendt 1979, 6). Arendt was not right about everything, but she was clear on the question and effects of non-personhood. As she put it in *The Origins of Totalitarianism*:

In comparison with the insane end-result [...] the process by which men are prepared for this end, and the methods by which individuals are adapted to these conditions, are transparent and logical. The insane mass manufacture of corpses is preceded by the historically and politically intelligible preparation of living corpses. (Arendt 1979, 447)

One thing, as Arendt well knew, does not necessarily follow from another. In the UK, however, it has to be understood that in its production of negative space, the deliberate construction of a hostile environment has amounted to the “preparation of living corpses”. It is in response to that hostile environment, and to the fact of indefinite detention in particular, that Refugee Tales undertook to walk.

The walk

Refugee Tales first walked in 2015. The purpose of that walk, as of every subsequent walk, was to call for an end to indefinite detention. The 2015 walk started in Dover, within sight of the Dover Immigration Removal Centre (since closed) and ended in Crawley, within spitting distances of the immigration removal centres at Gatwick Airport. The route followed the North Downs Way, one long section of which is the Pilgrims Way, and everywhere we stopped we shared the stories of people who had experienced detention. Events were open to the public and each one was standing room only. The walk was a success in the sense that we made more people aware of the scandal of indefinite detention.

The original intention was that we would walk once, the hope being that the world would take notice and a change of policy would quickly ensue. That we have continued to walk is due to two main reasons. The first is that the world didn’t change, that it became clear a great deal more had to be done to achieve the project’s political aim. (Politically, of course, the world did change in that four-year period, in all kinds of disturbing ways, many of which have made the call for an end to indefinite detention more urgent.) The second reason we undertook to walk again is that, in ways we could not have predicted, a community formed in the process of walking that had no intention of simply dispersing. Since that time we have walked each summer: from Canterbury to Westminster, from Runnymede to Westminster, and from St Albans to Westminster. This year’s walk, by way of variation, goes from Brighton to Hastings along the UK’s southern coast, which is to say we are walking the border. At every stop of every route we have shared the stories of people who have experienced detention with the general public. Each walk also has incorporated a series of talks. In 2017, because we were starting at the site of the signing of the Magna Carta, we had a series of talks on due process. In 2018, to mark its 70th anniversary, we had talks on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This year the title of the series is *Beyond the Border*. The point of the talks is to reimagine the frameworks that govern the spaces through which we walk. In all kinds of ways and all kinds of senses the project is peripatetic.

It is that peripatetic value, the quality of the project that comes of walking, that is important to try to articulate. In one sense that value is obvious. For those people who walk whose asylum claims remain unresolved, people who live in the circumstances described in the first part of this essay, the walk – and the series of walks that take place during the year – constitute a respite from social isolation. The point, remember, of the hostile environment, is

to effect segregation. The walk, which constitutes a mix of people who are and are not seeking asylum, is a refusal of that segregating act. A second sense in which the value of the walk is relatively obvious lies, I think, in the nature of the movement itself. There is a difference, this is to observe, between an isolated movement through a hostile environment, and a walk in solidarity with a community of friends. Where that difference lies is in the relation to the territory itself, a territory that in the moment of walking can be said to have been reclaimed. A person's relation to an environment is, after all, an imaginative construction, where the dominant construction in the present moment is effected by the discourse of nation. Such a construction is not overturned by a collective walk, but it is countered. For everyone involved, what the walk constitutes is a temporary reconstruction of the relation to space, framed briefly not by hostility but by the act of welcome.

A subtler value, I think, has to do with the relation between language and movement. In its extreme negativity, the hostile environment is shaped, or one might say hollowed, by a series of absences. Critical to that hollowing is the absence of story, the exclusion of which is integral and systemic to the process as a whole. Exactly how that exclusion takes place will be considered in the final part of this essay. What needs to be spelt out here is that, by contrast with a relation to the environment shaped by the expulsion of story, the walk has come to constitute a context the story intricately informs. This is partly, of course, to do with the fact that in various ways stories are shared each evening. Partly also it is to do with the physiology and shared fabric of the walk. Either way, the result is a space in which stories circulate and re-circulate, told and heard in such a way that they become the basis of the collective's experience. The fact that the project carries stories in this way, across ground that has been designated hostile, means that in the moment of walking at least, but perhaps also in the aftermath, the dominant rhetoric has been contested and the collective relation to the environment reclaimed. Thus whereas the hostile environment constitutes a depiction of the relation between movement, geo-political ground and story – where movement and story are thwarted so the myth of sovereignty can be preserved – what the project recalls is that movement, ground and story are intimately connected, that environments are formed as stories travel and the people telling them pass through. It is in the process of telling and hearing stories – of the stories being heard – that the solidarities which constitute the project are formed, with the community thus functioning as an ongoing political experiment. As the project walks, in other words, the relation to the environment is temporarily re-drawn, with the stories, as they travel, providing new co-ordinates.

A politics of walking

To understand the spatial politics of Refugee Tales – to understand how by its dynamic relation to space it has had some measure of political effect – it is necessary to consider how movement itself intersects with politics. One account of that intersection is given by Thomas

Nail in *The Figure of the Migrant*, the first of his two-volume theory of movement, in which he analyses societies primarily as ‘regimes of motion’ (Nail 2015, 24).

In taking movement as his starting point, Nail has two broad objectives. The first is to document and analyse the principal historic forms of expulsion that have caused forced movement in order to describe how, historically, the migrant has been produced. Nail identifies expulsion with forms of expansion, and therefore, in the moment of capital, with the forms of clearance that, as he argues, continue to constitute the first move in the process of accumulation. Nail’s second objective is to show how migrations, whether forced or otherwise, have produced their own movements, counter-movements and, crucially, understandings of human movement. To read human movement only from the point of view of displacement, as he argues, is to give explanatory primacy to place and therefore to render the migrant always secondary and suspect. By contrast, to analyse from within the history of movement itself is to arrive at what one can term figures of the migrant, which is to say images of movement that the fact of migration takes one towards. The migrant, this is to say, while rendered deeply vulnerable by the processes of expulsion that form their condition, is not only, or not exclusively, the product of historical reality. They are also, through their movement and in their thought and action relating to that movement, generators of new formations that challenge the realities by which they have been exposed.

In moving from the first of these objectives to the second, from the analysis of forms of expulsion to the positive figures of movement, Nail concentrates attention on the meaning of the foot. As he puts it, all such forms of motion are the “social expression of a more general ‘pedetic’ social force,” where “pedesis (from the PIE root -ped, meaning ‘foot’) is the first motion of autonomous self-transport: the motion of the foot. Pedetic motion is the force of the foot – to walk, to run, to leap, to dance” (Nail 2015, 125).

It is through such pedetic motions, as Nail sees it, that politics of movement can and do emerge. As he puts it, “It is precisely the irregularity and unpredictability of certain figures of the migrant that are capable of giving birth to a new form of social motion not defined by expulsion” (Nail 2015, 126).

This is not to imply that *Refugee Tales* was modeled on Thomas Nail’s theory. It is to suggest that Nail’s theory affords a way of understanding the form that *Refugee Tales* has taken. The project was driven by the fact that the stories of people who had been doubly expelled – by the regime from which they had escaped and then, in the act of arbitrary detention, by the regime, the UK, to which they had fled – were almost entirely unknown. When we started walking, in other words, few people were aware that the UK was the only country in Europe that detained people indefinitely under immigration rules. The project has continued because the fact of walking alongside has been powerful for everybody concerned, has been driven, in other words, by a solidarity that has emerged from expulsion. In its own very localized, but also globally conscious way, *Refugee Tales* is a social motion that echoes Nail’s

thought. Driven by the fact of expulsion, by the fact that the hostile environment has caused people to be doubly displaced, the project has found itself articulating a different form of movement. Moreover, it is a movement, crucially, through which solidarity has formed and from which political momentum has been achieved. To understand that fact, however, to understand how the walk has become a mode of politics, one has to understand the connection, in the hostile environment, between movement and story.

Story as a principle of movement

The degree to which Refugee Tales constitutes a politics, or has effected a political intervention, should be neither over- nor under-stated. It should not be overstated because it is a single-issue campaign working relentlessly and stubbornly in one corner of the political universe. It should not be understated because whereas, when the project started to walk, few people were aware of the UK's policy of indefinite detention, now, at the time of writing, there is an amendment tabled in parliament that, if passed, could bring an end to the policy, an amendment which has a strong chance of achieving support. This change in the discourse is by no means, I repeat by no means, solely due to the work of Refugee Tales. It is due to the work of many activists and many organisations, including Refugee Tales activists, who have been campaigning on the issue for many years. There seems no question, however, that the walk and the talk it has generated, has helped contribute to the change of discourse. As and when the legislative change does occur it will be an event of note. The power to detain at the border, as a function of immigration control, was introduced into British law in the 1905 Immigration Act. That power was formally assigned to the discretion of the Secretary of State in the 1971 Immigration Act. To curtail that power will be to end a two-tier legal system that has been in operation for over a century and which explicitly builds the state of exception into the fabric of UK law.

To understand how Refugee Tales has contributed to this process of change, it is necessary, I think, to register the power at the intersection between movement and story. Administratively, which is to say at the level of the asylum and immigration policy, that intersection is well understood. Thus, at the same time as the person who seeks asylum finds their movement micro-managed into negation, so their story is systematically expelled. It takes a while to recognize this, but eventually various different elements of the process add up. Consider the fact that if one enters an Immigration Removal Centre as a visitor, or NGO representative, or potential bail surety, or friend, one cannot take a pen and paper into the building. One's phone, keys, drugs, weapons, one can understand. To be prohibited from taking in pen and paper is as if to enter a non-inscriptive zone. Add to this the fact that institutionally adjacent spaces, notably the tribunals in which the individuals' appeals are heard, also fall outside of inscription. Consider the fact, for instance, that the bail hearing, whereby an individual might be released from detention, is not a court of record. While the

judge will issue a determination, in which some account of the proceedings is given, there is no full transcript and therefore the words of the appellant are not on record. This is true, also, of the deportation appeal hearing, on which occasion the individual's future security is at stake. In such settings, in other words, the exclusion is linguistic; there is no account of the situation that registers the appellant's contribution to the proceedings. Consider also the fact that, in so far as the individual does present their story, that story is weaponised against them. Thus if, for instance, having first given an account of the experience in, say 2003, and then, when called on 12 years later to account for the same experience at a different moment in asylum process, the appellant departs from their original telling in any way, then that divergence will be used to discredit the whole case. Or consider the fact, as asylum seekers report that one of form of the asylum interview consists of an official asking approximately a hundred questions, and then, when they have finished, asking the same hundred questions again. These processes do not simply silence, they turn the story against itself, weaponising the process of the narration such that the language itself cannot be entered. This should put us on notice, that the spatial production of non-personhood is intrinsically linguistic. A person's movement can be compromised or prevented because their access to the language is prevented, because their externality to the language makes it possible to dismiss them from space.

For a philosophical account of the connection between movement and story, one might return to the work of Hannah Arendt. To cut a long-story very short, having documented the processes of expulsion that resulted in the phenomenon of mass statelessness that followed the Second World War in *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Arendt sought to articulate a theory of arrival in *The Human Condition*. Her name for that process, for the process of arriving, was "natality." What natality represented, as a political principle, was the fact of "the constant influx of newcomers who are born into the world as strangers" (Arendt 1958, 9). Arendt, this is to observe, sought to articulate a politics in which the fact of arriving was central and welcome, and in which accordingly the medium of the story had a critical place. As she put it, "With word and deed we insert ourselves into the human world, and this insertion is like a second birth" (Arendt 1958, 178). There are many reasons to argue with Arendt, but in so far as she articulated a connection between movement, which is to say arrival, and word, which is to say story, she observed an intimacy which the administrators of asylum put to good use: that in so far as being heard is a mode of arrival, so story is intimately connected with movement, that the one is enabled by and enabling of the other.

It is this intimate connection that Refugee Tales, like many collectives before it, has happened upon. It is a link, I think, that captures the imagination, since people understand what it means to walk and talk. It is a great distance, of course, from that understanding to the larger re-imaginings that are required, imaginings in which the relations between individuals and territories can be re-mapped. Arguably, though, exactly where one has to start is with the

underlying insight: that movement and story are mutually enabling practices.

Notes

¹ For a virtual impression of the project see www.refugeetales.org. Accessed May 26, 2019.

² The stories shared by Refugee Tales have been published in three volumes by Comma Press: *Refugee Tales I* (2016), *Refugee Tales II* (2017), and *Refugee Tales III* (2019). The principal form in which the tales are presented is a co-production between the subject of the tale and an established writer. As is explained at length in the Afterword to each volume, this narrative mode is necessary to preserve the anonymity of individuals facing multiple threats. Many writers have given very generously of their time in helping to share these tales, including (among many others) Abdulrazak Gurnah, Ali Smith, Dragan Todorovic, Kamila Shamsie, Marina Warner, Monica Ali, Neel Mukherjee, Patience Agbabi, and Steve Collis. As the project has developed, and as a small number of the people who have experienced detention have been able to secure some kind of leave to remain, it has become possible for certain people to share their stories as first-person testimonies. These first-person tales are published in volume III.

³ See <http://www.ready-homes.co.uk/>. Accessed May 26, 2019.

⁴ This question receives extended consideration in my forthcoming monograph *Making Space for the Human: Persons, Non-Persons, Movement in the Postwar World*. For an excellent examination of comparable questions from an Italian perspective, see Dal Lago 2012.

⁵ In August 2012 “prisons inspector Nick Hardwick discovered a Somali man in Lincoln prison who had been in immigration detention for nine years beyond the end of his sentence, because he had been ‘forgotten’.” See Webber 2012. See also <http://www.irr.org.uk/news/revealing-the-impact-of-immigration-detention/>. Accessed May 26, 2019.

⁶ For UK immigration detention statistics up to June 2017, see: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/immigration-statistics-april-to-june-2017/how-many-people-are-detained-or-returned>. Accessed May 26, 2019.

References

- Arendt, Hannah. 1958. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- . 1979 [1950]. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1965. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington. London: Penguin Books.
- Hayter, Teresa. 2000. *Open Borders: The Case Against Immigration Controls*. London: Pluto Press.
- Herd, David, and Anna Pincus, eds. 2016. *Refugee Tales*. Manchester: Comma Press.
- . 2017. *Refugee Tales II*. Manchester: Comma Press.
- . 2019. *Refugee Tales III*. Manchester: Comma Press.
- Nail, Thomas. 2015. *The Figure of the Migrant*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Wilsher, Daniel. 2012. *Immigration Detention: Law, History, Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

David Herd is a poet, critic, and activist. His work on the politics of movement has been widely published in Europe and North America and he is currently completing a book entitled *Making Space for the Human: Persons, Non-Persons, Movement in the Postwar World*. His collections of poetry include *All Just* (Carcanet 2012), *Through* (Carcanet 2016), and *Songs from the Language of a Declaration* (forthcoming from Periplum Press). He is Professor of Modern Literature at the University of Kent and co-organiser of the project *Refugee Tales*.