NON-HOME:
A THEORETICAL APPROACH
TO MIGRANTS’ DWELLINGS

Abstract: In this article we introduce the notion of non-home as an attempt of meaningful insight into the migrants’ dwelling constructed from elements of different provenance (family homes, social housing institutions, etc.), depending on tenants housing experiences, definitions (knowledge) and the very materiality of a living space. In developing the idea of a non-home we refer to the theoretical concepts of non-places and heterotopias.
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Ne-domov:
Teoretický přístup k bydlení migrant

Abstrakt: V tomto článku představujeme pojem ne-domova jako pokus o smyslupný náhled do bydlení migrantů, jenž je zkonstruováno z prvků různé provenience (rodinné domovy, instituce sociálního bydlení apod.) v závislosti na obyvatelských zkušenostech nájemníků, definicích (vědění) a samotné materialité prostoru obydlí. Při rozvíjení myšlenky ne-domova se odvoláváme na teoretické koncepty ne-míst a heterotopí.
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Introduction

The article is a theoretical approach to analyzing specific living arrangements of internal migrants. Here we are going neither to discuss the wide theoretical questions of migration processes nor to implement particular theories used to explain this phenomenon. Various contemporary studies place migration as a central category of social scrutiny. For us in this text migration is just a promising field of biographical experience offering both a change of a life situation and a fruitful reflexivity of interviewees. We introduce the notion of non-home as an attempt of meaningful insight into migrants’ dwellings. This notion captures interrelations between space and knowledge. Basing on our studies of migrants’ dwellings we claim that this very phenomenon shows how both space and knowledge are constitutive and interdependent actants in social relations. In order to scrutinize space one is to follow narratives concerning it and, in reverse, study how these very narratives influence spatial organization. Relating it to migrant dwelling, dwelling practices depend on a culturally established ideal of home, which is embedded in material construction of house as well as assumed number of family members (social roles), confronted with a reflexive recognition of present living conditions by unrelated tenants. Non-home is not a typical, family housing formation nor it is a lodging or other institutionalized form of housing (e.g. a dorm, a boarding school or barracks). This type of housing is not only a contemporary phenomenon – researchers from the Chicago School (an Ecological School) explored a form of voluntary and group housing widespread among migrants in the United States of America; Polish sociologists approached the phenomenon related to internal migrations.
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Both American and Polish researchers examined male workers migrants determined by economical factors which defined migration as a must, not as a choice. Contemporary economical perspective (*together is cheaper*) is still relevant but basing on collected data we can insist on introducing a cultural perspective which extended and transgressed the economical one. Our respondents’ (being usually in their 20s and 30s) stage of life may be described as a waiting-room before the *real* life (associated with a family, home, stability and everyday routine) or a conscious decision for staying in the waiting-room.

Migrants’ dwelling is a phenomenon which transgresses popular housing formations such as family or cohabitation, founded on economic, consumption and cohousing community. Contrasting with lodgings, there are no asymmetrical rights. It seems similar to hybrid housing formations (a dorm, barracks or a monastery), which embody features of a family home and public social institutions, but it also differs because in migrants’ dwellings the features orchestrating housing practices are non-institutionalized: they differ depending on the migrants’ dwellings and their sources come from daily needs of inhabitants. Hence, there is no migrants’ housing social discourse or narratives which migrants would apply, no typical housing practices. Migrants’ dwellings are *bricolages*, constructed from elements of different provenance (family homes, social housing institutions, etc.), depending on inhabitants housing experiences and their daily needs.

In the Polish migrants’ dwelling the inhabitants occupy all rooms by 1, 2 or 3 persons in each one, have a partly shared economic and social life and usually equal rights and obligations concerning household duties. Contemporary migrants’ dwelling phenomenon is not only related to migrations but gradually becomes an alternative to a typical middle-class ‘normal’ pattern of housing in various Western countries. Economically speaking, the latest economic crises and growing housing prices push un-related people to inhabit together in the USA. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey 2009 data shows that in non-family households live 8,1% of males and 6,1% of females (this is not a cohabitation category). Culturally
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6 Haya EL NASSER – Paul OVERBERG, “Census: Households Get Fuller.” *USA Today*, Friday October 1st, 2010, p. 3A.
speaking, Jürgen Hasse points out a growing number of alternative housing patterns such as post-commune or subdivisions of caravans where people decide to live and intentionally form a community based on shared needs, values (ecology for instance) or creative ‘self-presentations’.\(^7\) In Germany, the so called Wohngemeinschaft\(^8\) becomes popular not only among students but also working, independent adults who are not related to bohemia or so called creative environments.\(^9\) In Poland, analogues of these housing patterns remain unexplored. Our research attempted to fill this gap. We focused on relationships between inhabitants of migrants’ dwellings, their housing practices and sources of patterns, as well as on how inhabitants interpret, modify and submit to housing space.

The concept of a “non-home” is a tool to both describe and analyze relationship between migrants and their living space in the context of culture promoting home as a place of living. The concept results from our empirical studies. Between 2003 and 2008 we carried out 50 IDIs (supplemented by visual methods) in Poland and Ireland with adults with higher education - this made up a ground for the scrutiny. A life scenario of these informants at this point assumes a social stability or at least a need for such stability. Moreover, we intentionally focused on this cohort and not on migrants from lower classes (construction workers, for instance) in order to omit a widespread research agenda assuming that a researcher from a higher class scrutinizes informants from the lower classes (this risky ”class-descendant” approach results in many drawbacks, for instance: projection of researcher categories on a living-world of informants or certain “exotization” of the individuals under scrutiny).

\(^{7}\text{HASSE, Unbedachtes Wohnen, p. 181.}\)
\(^{8}\text{Wohngemeinschaft can be translated as the dwelling community, which in Polish means an institution of common maintenance of multifamily building by the flats owners, in turn in German it means common living of unrelated persons in one flat. Cf. Hartmut HÄUßERMANN – Walter SIEBEL, Soziologie des Wohnens. Eine Einführung in Wandel und Ausdifferenzierung des Wohnens. 2. Auflage. Weinheim und München: Juventa Verlag 2000, p. 326 passim.}\)
\(^{9}\text{The popularity of the form resulted in the institutionalized service offers such as national internet service for parties subletting the flat, looking for a flat and looking for co-tenants: www.wohngemeinschaft.de.}\)
Spatial contexts in housing studies

For the last decades of the 20th century the spatial turn has influenced humanities and sociological theories resulting in putting the spatial turn in the very center of a scrutiny. It is still unclear, who was the first to decree this revolutionary approach in the comprehension and the related advancing of the space to the analysis axis.

Perhaps its necessity, like the Durkheim's social fact “was hanging in the air”, was detectable in the atmosphere or was legible or demanded for explication by many researchers at once. Karl Schlögel perceives this moment as follows:

We can conclude on the change of the paradigm that at the moment of its advent or emergence in the circulation, it somehow dissimulates that the new paradigm always existed but most failed to notice. By nature, it is convincing, obvious, logical. It superseded everything artificial and invented. Testing period was over. After the accomplishment of the transformation it appears that it should always be like this and should inherently never be different. New interpretation, new key, deprivation of qualities not as such but as the interpretation patterns and linguistic standards. It is characterized by gentleness, ease, the power of interpretation and the obviousness.

Undoubtedly, one of the progenitors of this change of approach was Michel Foucault. In his essay published in 1984 and elaborated substantially earlier “Of Other Spaces”, he defined the 19th century as the one focused on temporal dimension, whereas “our era” were recognized as focused around spatial orders, more simultaneous and relation oriented. The development of afterthought putting the space as a centre of speculations is evident in today’s urban studies or in the resiliently developing area of sociology of architecture. Focus on spatial phenomena resulted also, among others, drawing the researchers’ attention to transformations and particular forms of this spatiality and their cultural meaning.

12 SCHLÖGEL, W przestrzeni, p. 56.
Analyses of housing frequently set as a benchmark home together with its connotations. A home is a concept working in physical, economical, social and emotional registers; it is related to a sphere of social practices and habits. Comprehensive study of the concept transformations might be found elsewhere, let us here mark only the most relevant associations of home. First, a home associates with intimacy and privacy which distinct the private and the public spheres. Second, home space, its architecture, is constructed for a family and a home connotes the familiar. Third, a home is a place of legitimate sexual intercourse, it implies close bodily relationships between inhabitants. It is worth mentioning 19th century hygiene discourse that interrelated cleanness, health and hygiene with moral living. Fourth, a particular room (an office, kitchen, living-room, etc.) is dedicated to different functionalities and sometimes different authorized users from the group of household members and guests (e.g. the latter ones do not enter the bedroom nor the wardrobe, the kitchen is traditionally a women's domain, etc.). The home setup envisages the division of social roles and tasks allocated to particular family members, which supplement each other, maintaining the family-home machinery in operation. The notion of the home is undoubtedly connected with particularly comprehended “mine-ness” and comfort resulting not necessarily from the uniqueness of the architecture, equipment and the arrangement (these are usually similar) but rather from the selection made from the available options.

Fifth, a home vehicle distributes social roles and obligations ascribed to a particular inhabitant; the roles and obligations are interrelated and interdependent to keep a home machinery working. Sixth, a concept of home entails a specific selfness and comfort.

Our main challenge in the research was to effectively and consciously drift away from the concept of a home in order not to project the home associations (and housing practices related to them) on migrants’ dwelling and research agenda; not to see migrants’ dwellings as a home. Additionally, our aim was not to deconstruct the concept – a measure close to the one we encounter in case of feministic critics and gender perspective, revealing the patriarchic oppression of home machinery against women or activities

of artistic nature. Our reference to the concept of home is quite different, forasmuch we do not describe the home – this too obvious statement (for some time not so obvious even for us, though) perfectly puts the judgments exhibited here in relevant order. In other words, we do not intend to crush nor disintegrate the monolith of homeness, which was perfected by our culture during the last few centuries. We intend to avoid it instead. Our aim is to take a look at the migration dwelling as a specific form of living, without incriminating it with a more or less conscious comparison to the traditional home together with its whole burden of its furnishing. Taking into consideration the spatial turn described below, we would like to transgress the thinking ruts and try to omit the handy, worn-out categories which come by themselves and as a result, to more adequately grasp the substance of the described phenomenon. Therefore we aim to design possibly autonomous description category covering the migration dwelling in its spatial uniqueness. In our opinion, the best reflection of this notion is non-home. We have to admit that for a relatively long period of time we were not able to grasp its substance fully, yet finally, with seven years of work, repeated series of scrutiny and the conceptual effort allowed us to perfect the notion of non-home which miraculously set the scattered threads in place. The most inspiring from the viewpoint of our further deliberations are the attempts to grasp some difference – defined differently by various authors of the spatial characteristics by the non-home notion. A concept of a non-home locates itself closely to notions of non-places discussed by a few authors. Thus, before proposing and defining our term, let us review non-places literature.

**Non-places and heterotopias**

The first of the authors whose theoretical ideas we would like to examine is a French philosopher and historian, Michel de Certeau. According to Michel de Certeau, examples of non-places are proper names of streets, parks, squares or subway stations, etc. They are arbitrarily added to places which originally have nothing to do with them. The imposed names cover their vision matter of a place. “A strange toponymy that is detached from actual places and flies high over the city like a foggy geography of meanings
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15 This monolith, however, is subject to various weakening influences.

16 We could as well add the graffiti, large format advertisements and ambient advertisements.
held in suspension, directing the physical deambulations below.”¹⁷ So if it is assumed that the place constitutes the (stable, orchestrated, legible, single-dimensional) configuration of the architectural, material components, then non-place would have been an imposed semantic order emerging from outer provenance, not derived from it, although with real effects. The hypothetic, “clean” reading of the architecture (supposing we can imagine something similar on the palimpsest of the city) is superimposed by a multitude of new meanings which are introduced in the comprehension of the inhabitants by the names, then those might indeed influence the directions, pace and preferences of the passer-bys (de Certeau picturesquely wrote on “magnetic field of trajectories”¹⁸. The names “they clothe with a word”,¹⁹ but what’s more profound, “and, by naming, that is, by imposing an injunction proceeding from the other (a story) and by altering functionalist identity by detaching themselves from it, they create in the place itself that erosion or nowhere that the law of the other carves out within it”.²⁰ This apprehension relates to the previously invoked definition of an orchestrated and stable place, where the components do not superimpose each other and are composed side by side; therefore the non-place is an infringement of this clear order written in the text of the architecture itself by the duality accomplished in it.

The duality is also related to non-places by means of narratives on the past and urban legends or reminiscences which refer to the long forgotten times with no physical traces. These legends “haunt urban space like superfluous or additional inhabitants”,²¹ composing some kind of “suspended symbolic order”²². To some extent they are invoked and activated from the non-existence by the narration which embeds the reminiscing reality in the virtually contemplated, experienced places: “Here, there used to be a bakery. That’s where old lady Dupuis used to live.”²³ However it is not completely clear whether de Certeau connects this mechanism with non-places or rather perceives it as the essence of the very places. On the one hand, narratives of the past are structured by the similar rule that organizes proper names – coverage of first-order, literal meanings by the second-order meanings which

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 104.
¹⁹ Ibid., p. 105.
²⁰ Ibid.
²¹ Ibid., p. 106.
²² Ibid.
²³ Ibid., p. 108.
derive from a different order. In the names they emerge from another reality, not connected to a given place, such as the names of heroes or statesmen, adjectives composed from the names of foreign cities or countries, baptizing the streets or squares.

In the urban legends the second-order meanings come from the past which is finished: “Stories about places are makeshift things. They are composed with the world’s debris.” But according to de Certeau the coverage is also the very nature of the place, “that it is composed by these series of displacements and effects among the fragmented strata that form it and that it plays on these moving layers.”

Matthias Däumer, Annette Gerok-Reiter i Friedemann Kreuder tend to interpret both these cases – proper names and urban legends and reminiscing narrations as well – as a feature of non-places in de Certeau’s concept. The authors criticize de Certeau’s notion claiming that the rupture between the place and its semantic layer (or a narrative on the past) is too definitive, as for instance street names might be not incidental and hence might relate to physical features e.g. the Station Street relates to the train station, the Theatrical Square is the place where the theatre is located, the Royal Duct connects royal residences etc. The tales about the past are much less connected to the places – to summon de Certeau’s example: in fact there was a bakery, and old lady Dupuis used to live there indeed. According to them, the non-places in the apprehension of de Certeau are not the non-places without any physical relevance but those which originate by connecting the narration to the physical existence of the place and describe this transgressive relocation. The decisive criterion is that the non-placeness emerges by narration, which is indeed connected with the physical existence of the place, but it semantically transgresses the place.

Equally interesting and intellectually prolific notion of the non-places was created by a well-known French anthropologist Marc Augé. He puts up the opposition between places in traditional comprehension called here the anthropologic places and the very non-places. “If a place can be defined as relational, historical and concerned with identity, then a space which can-
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not be defined as relational or historical, or concerned with identity will be a non-place.” 28 According to this way of comprehension, the non-places would be characteristic for the age of hypermodernity which marks our contact with space as well as the derivative of this contact – our condition.

A world where people are born in the clinic and die in hospital, where transit points and temporary abodes are proliferating under luxurious or inhuman conditions (hotel chains and squats, holiday clubs and refugee camps, shantytowns threatened with demolition or doomed to festering longevity); where a dense network of means of transport which are also inhabited spaces in developing, where the habitué of supermarkets, slot machines and credit cards communicates wordlessly, through gestures, with an abstract, unmediated commerce; a world thus surrendered to solitary individuality, to the fleeting, the temporary and ephemeral. 29

in the author’s opinion becomes fragmented hypermodern world and the non-places are its characteristic measure. Augé reasons that any places and non-places are some ideal types and rather seldom exist in their clean form, 30 multiplication of non-places and our more intensive contact with them according to their rules engenders irreversible identity transformations. In other words, the man of non-places is someone different than the inhabitant of anthropologic places.

The name of a non-place labels two complementary albeit separate realities: spaces constituted in relation to certain goals (transport, transit, trade, leisure) and the relations which are maintained by the individuals with those spaces. “As anthropological places create the organically social, so non-places create solitary contractuality.” 31

This way, the non-places are fateful in social consequences, to be more specific – are socially counterproductive. Without this feature to build the identity, relations or allowing to take roots in the history separate its users or passengers from each other, locking them up in their own individuality and unsociability. These non-places described by Augé are by far the transit spaces and the means of transport i.e. airports, bus/train stations, motorways, airplanes and trains as well as hotels and supermarkets. They establish

29 Ibid., p. 78.
30 Ibid.
31 Ibid., p. 94.
characteristic rules of communication and circulation in those spaces which are designed for the individuals interacting only with the texts originated by such consigners as legal entities or public institutions (airports, airlines, Ministry of Transport, commercial companies, traffic police, urban government) whose presence is more or less tangible.32

Figuratively one might conclude that the non-places are non-tangible, however they are full of people, and often crowded and overfilled such as trains, refugee camps or jammed roads, there is no connection either inside or between them, excluding the aforementioned government traffic rules or quasi-individualizing information on neighboring touristic attractions superseding the interaction with themselves. For non-places belong to nobody, i.e. no one identifies with them and does not treat them as a mean of self-identification, except maybe the service personnel for whom they constitute just a workplace. As pointed out by Ewa Rewers, discussing the figure of the airport, one of the non-places: “cosmopolitan, random wave of passengers does not constitute a new society and the airport is not a human habitat.”33 Non-places do not create the identity in the form of group connection of individuals to the society. Because of this lack of common potential, no one takes pictures of the non-places. They do not possess this identity attractor present in the case of pyramids, gothic castles or landscapes. Unless someone is interested in their technological aesthetics, which occurs rather seldom. People taking pictures of themselves at the airport do not take the picture of the airport, they catch the emotional moment of departure or arrival of friends or relatives; duty gates, queues for handing the luggage or duty-free shops are not being taken pictures of.

As we already mentioned, Augé sets the opposition of the non-place and the anthropologic place; the latter category may obviously include home in its traditional comprehension. He writes: “thus we can contrast the realities of transit (transit camps or passengers in transit) with those of residence or dwelling.”34 So in this conceptual framework the non-places connected with living could be defined as those related to temporary residence, usually short-term and usually treated as such; in general they are equipped with professional administration governing such a non-place. Following the author’s notion we mean refugee camps, hotels, hostels, sobering-up stations,

32 Ibid., p. 96.
34 AUGÉ, Non-places, p. 107.
So as the “utopias are sites with no real place.” The further part of our article will be focused on consideration how far and where the Augé concept might relate to migrants’ dwellings or some of their parts. If it proves adequate, the clear opposition between the transit world and the residential world shall be rethought.

The third category which we would like to invoke in the context of non-place is the category of Foucault’s heterotopias. This is all the more justified as we already mentioned in the beginning – the very author as one of the first XX century thinkers declared shifting the weigh in constituting the notion of modern human condition from temporal to spatial realm which, in his opinion, evolved into an axis bonding our life.35 Following the Matthias Däumer, Annette Gerok-Reiter and Friedemann Kreuder “a heterotopia is then a subcategory of non-place characterized by the subsequent factors: first – it is dependent on particular cultural coding of a given place and second – it acquires its existence by changing the plane of comprehension from the fundamental one to the culturally conscious one.”36 For Foucault himself, the heterotopia is, next to the utopia, a particular form of space escaping from evident definition and evokes the need of particular inspection. So as the “utopias are sites with no real place.”37 which “present the society itself in a perfected form, or else society turned upside down, but in any case these utopias are fundamentally unreal spaces,”38 then the heterotopias are referred to by the author as the virtually existing areas, usually secluded and delimited with regard to the “normal” space, nevertheless ordained with different rules than the space. As Foucault says there are probably in every culture, in every civilization, real places – places that do exist and that are formed in the very founding of society – which are something like counter-sites, the kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within the culture are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted. Places of this kind are outside of all places, even though it may be possible to indicate their location in reality. Because these places are absolutely different from all the sites that they reflect and speak about, I shall call them – by way of contrast to utopias – heterotopias.39

35 FOUCAULT, Of Other Spaces, p. 2.
37 FOUCAULT, Of Other Spaces, p. 3.
38 Ibid., p. 3.
39 Ibid., p. 3–4.
Referring to the example of theatre, cinema and above all the garden – traditional Persian garden engineered according to the strictly developed, symbolic notion – the French philosopher perceives that the “heterotopia is capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible.”\textsuperscript{40} This semantic abundance, sometimes – as in the theatre – marked with silently shared conventionality or quasi-reality is accompanied by particular temporal reality. The existence in the heterotopia is connected with particular form of departure beyond the standard timeline, adjournment of the time and surrender to a different temporal order. Foucault calls it heterochrony and substantiates:

Heterotopias are most often linked to slices in time – which is to say that they open onto what might be termed, for the sake of symmetry, heterochronies. The heterotopia begin to function at full capacity when men arrive at a sort of absolute brake with their traditional time.\textsuperscript{41}

Contrary to the approach presented by Marc Augé who perceived his imagined a non-place as a particular spatial characteristic of hypermodernity developing together with it, in Foucault’s opinion, the heterotopias existed always, in every culture and every society, they might, however, have a different form and be able to evolve in time.\textsuperscript{42} The only regularity drawn by the author in this context is the gradual disappearance of heterotopias of crisis and increase in the importance of heterotopias of deviation,\textsuperscript{43} which is not, however, the subject of our paper. Other works of this researcher re-echo here which can be perceived as the analyses of the very heterotopias of deviation in the form of a clinic, prison or psychiatric hospital. However, the most momentous examples called upon here by Foucault such as the cemetery, the brothel or colony do not succumb to this temporal regularity which itself is not too important for the author either.

Matthias Däumer, Annette Gerok-Reiter and Friedemann Kreuder attempt to reconstruct the nature of heterotopia based exactly on the example of the cemetery. On one hand it is a specific place located in the city and on the other hand – also a sacred space of contact with the death, so in this case we have a necessity to change the coding of the comprehension according to the religious key. The authors write “admittedly, we shall conclude on the

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., p. 6.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., p. 1.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., p. 5.
lack of independence from physical data, after all, the cemetery operates as a cemetery only in its physical boundaries; the deciding point here indeed is the transgression (accentuation by MŁ, MJ). Non-place in this meaning is created here by cultural seclusion of some area and simultaneous change in the option of its comprehension (Wahrnehmungsoption).

On the strictly secular plane of comprehension, a cemetery is nothing more than the place, simply an area planted with trees: only by the historically conditioned cultural knowledge change of the comprehension plane to the transcendent-religious one, the place receives its non-placed characteristics.

Based on all three notions invoked here, the authors of the work entitled Unorte. Spielarten einer verlorenen Verortung attempt to investigate the substance, the deepest nature of the non-place, such communized characteristics which orders many thinkers in various theories to isolate some areas from others and describe them as special ones. One can of course pose many doubts to such practice. The most important one is the danger, and in particular the necessity to reduce, delete the nuances to the benefit of similarities, any common points, even if these similarities would occupy only incidental positions in the analyzed notions, anyhow not always the key positions.

Leaving those – justified – doubts on the side, let’s take a closer look at what constitutes a non-place, according to the aforementioned researchers. In their opinion it is possible to distinguish some general rule for creating the non-places present in every referenced theory, however with preserving different distribution of accents and different theoretical surrounding, if we may put it this way. Däumer, Gerok-Reiter and Kreuder prove:

The starting point is undoubtedly physically indicatable place. However, this place is always dismissed to oblivion by transgressive displacement, beset anew or defined using separation and demarcation so as a result it is not appearing as a place nor as a space, but the very – depending on specific prerequisites – non-place.

The effect of such key transgress performed on a physically existing place is an ontological hybrid (Zwitter) of specific nature for which the non-place can be taken.

---
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Understandings of contradicted space

After this review of examples – by all means incomplete and selective – for engineering the spatial contradicted categories we will attempt to summarize the above deliberations so that we could be able to proceed using the drawn conclusions to the afterthoughts on our pivotal notion of non-home.

It appears that the most interesting are those forms of contradicted space which (what is implied by their noun form) refer to the very nature of the contradicted phenomenon. In fact one might conclude that they emerge only by contradicting some characteristics but at the same time they introduce new information or additional contexts, transgressing the clear contradiction itself. What and how it is being contradicted in them?

We believe that it is possible to work on three planes. The first one relates to the particular characteristics of the place itself such as the semantic duality or even semantic multiplication. Let’s leave aside the deliberation whether the source of this abundance is included in the limits of the very non-place or whether it comes from the outside and is somewhat added, contributed to it. It might be – as was shown by the aforementioned examples the law of the other one (in proprietary names) or the palimpsest of the past – in such case we will be experiencing the duality or the existence of different, superimposed and non-compatible places in one, as desired by Michel Foucault. The effect is the aforementioned ontological hybrid, in which we encounter the non-convergence between the physical existence and the meanings resulting from it and the culturally determined method of its comprehension which provides additional and actually decisive code. As we believe, in case of definition of non-home, the valid thought would be the one how this cultural determination emerges and where its source and its semantic potential come from.

Another plane which opens in this analysis of spatial contradicted category is the process of its particular creation, therefore the non-placement. This area includes for example the reflections on specific places which were transposed into the state of non-placement, e.g. by changing their user’s context context. Let’s take as an example the French familistere which evolved from the complex of dwellings into some kind of a museum of the notion of proletarian habitation. The non-placement may also be the process of implementing additional, separate meanings or discourses into organized, semantically developed and hitherto synonymous place. The theme can be investigated also on the macro level, where the non-placement is the destiny of a growing number of places (e.g. more and more unified train
stations or shopping malls), when the newly developed places are designed as non-places (motorways, airports ...) from the very beginning, or when such non-places acquire pivotal role for human experience. The most general plan of afterthought subdued to this theme returns to some vision of historic changes, to the assumed transition from the modern age to the postmodern or hypermodern age which is characterized by the growth of non-places and their intensified influence on human being. Then the natural point of reference is the modernistic past; it constitutes a subject of comparisons, automatic anticipations or the essence of traditional methods of definition which uncover their inappropriateness.

We’re just one step away from the third plane of developing the non-places. Here, the researcher’s attention heads for the relation between the non-place and the human being. The traditional anticipation in this regard was expressed by Marc Augé in the aforementioned notion of anthropological places which are also equipped with the identity, relations and historical functions. Non-place or the dislocated place can be perceived as the one which is acting differently in the context of individual’s identity and its social relations and a particular type of identification which is brought by the past. The contradiction refers to the traditionally comprehended and socially anticipated function of the place which is expected to define and root us also in particular universe of meanings. That’s why cutting these connections off means “solitary contractuality” for the human being.

**Space and knowledge. The notion of non-home**

The non-home is not a non-place in any of the described meanings. In other words, none of the above discussed notions encompass the characteristics of the non-home accurately, appropriately and completely, nevertheless they may constitute a source of inspiration and valuable theoretical support for us. Thus the need for defining the non-home arises anew.

Definitional approximation of a non-home should probably be started with the statement that non-home is neither a straightforward nor more sophisticated antithesis of home. In other words, the sole negation of everything what creates the category of home does not consist of an accurate nor sufficient material in order to define the non-home. It is rather a conglomerate of components transferred straight, transferred and inverted from home or redefined and acquired from beyond this resource. In purely
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physical comprehension, a non-home is usually an apartment in a block of flats or tenement. Its layout, internal seclusions, sanitary equipment include the notion of the designer or the architect, who designed the space having the family in mind. As Grażyna Woroniecka points out, introducing family as the default occupant at the conceptual stage was an obvious designer’s assumption designing the flats in order to fulfill the officially defined requirements, in specific the tasks ascribed to the family itself.50

So the default tenant, including his practices is built-in into the physical space, containing and conveying its message. Furthermore, the space itself pre-codes the behaviors and actions and even the patterns or values multiplied and preserved by the defined tenants. Following the path suggested by theoretic afterthought of the sociology of architecture one has to notice an everyday, unconscious influence of the sole corporeality of the place and inscribed discourses for creating the lives of inhabitants. As Heike Delitz points out “in various societies, there are many different types of developments that connect the individuals to various objects into socio-technological conglomerates”.51 Her voice is backed up by Joachim Fischer, who wrote “in their architectural styles, the buildings evoke or block the ways of people’s lives.”52 The space of a non-home is indeed a significant one and an active player. However, at least some of its influences and messages which are conveyed are contradicted or neglected and sometimes actively opposed. For the inhabitants of migration dwellings are able to read the space of the rented dwelling, however in some parts they tend to ignore, reformulate or destroy the readout. We are facing here the aforementioned duality: the discourse of home very well known to the inhabitants and even strongly inscribed into their imagination on home and homeness, additionally reinforced by the activity of the sole corporeality of the dwelling is superimposed by the sphere of meanings coming from (some) definition of current dwelling or to put it more generally – in the life-affecting situation. This definition is not given but at least partially inflicted. In any case we can see the emphasis on the fluctuation between the prompt discourse of the homeness and the created

on-the-go and processed definition of the current situation, which is built from the components of different provenance. Migrants’ dwelling is a cause and at the same time an effect of the movement of invalidating the idea or discourse of the home. An effect, because migration dwelling is a product of social changes which undermine the idea of home. A cause, because it becomes a reference point which by constant, thoughtful relevance to this idea brings it to the movement of frustration. Such a dwelling makes use of the idea of home in the creation of itself, albeit there are no model so mythical “it is the way you live in the migrants’ dwelling”, it is a product of non-placement and at the same time a practice of the reconstruction from the available logics and discourses, e.g. gregariousness or economization. We must remember though the sole dwelling, the physical and material being is not only a scenery or even a scenery sending encoded message but together with the inhabitants it becomes a component of this aforementioned “socio-technological conglomerate”. What is the meaning of this? Well, the space of the non-home is defined and redefined on-the-go, depending on the more or less permanent meanings inscribed in it by its current inhabitants.

Subsequent inhabitants install\textsuperscript{53} themselves in the feeling of temporality and transitiveness. Their bodies accommodate to the new living space, and at the same time they practice in weaning. In the subsequent cycles of installation and de-installation they acquire the proficiency in migration competences. Moreover, conceiving this characteristics from the side of non-home one should note that this flat was occupied by many inhabitants in different line-ups and set-ups, leaving in its substance and the equipment its habitual beauty. So the flat itself and its furniture preserves the traces of habitual utilization by the owner and by the subsequent tenants, traces that do not bear any corporal nor emotional meanings but only some – difficult to be precisely verbalized – corporal equivalent of noise or chaos. With this respect, the flat assimilates to the transit space which preserves or accumulates within so many various, personal traces that it turns to the completely non-identifying, “smooth and barren”, no man’s space. Exactly transitive.

Conclusions

As it was noticed by Daniel Miller, „in moving in and maintaining a home we have constantly contend with the pre-given decorative and other ordering schemes of the house”\(^{54}\) – the setup of rooms (one-room flat forces to its multi-functionality; multi-room flat forces to division of functions – e.g. bedroom, working room) or the orientation of windows to the geographic directions (obfuscated, northward rooms have to be additionally lighted). Hence Miller concludes that “although we may seek to overthrow these [implied household conditions – ML, MJ], more often we develop a kind of negotiated compromise between that which is expressed by the house and that which seek to express through the medium of the house.”\(^ {55}\) Although Miller is after something more significant than the mere freedom of individual expression: by writing *house* he indicates the agency of the material objects, which dimension is usually overlooked in the anthropologic analyses of the material culture and in the broader sense, in social sciences. It was the dimension which Bruno Latour asked for in his essay *Where are the missing masses?*\(^ {56}\) Latour in his ANT (*actor-network-theory*) acknowledges the equivalent role to humans and non-humans in influencing the course of actions. In his recognition, the objects stop to be passive containers of meaning and become active performers, such as an automatic hinge described by Latour. The hinge automatically closes the door simplifying life of many people, who, if the hinge wasn’t there, would have to close the door themselves. So, the automatic device, as Latour reasons, saves time and money, since it performs the job of closing the door for people. Following this path, authors such as Elizabeth Shove and Dale Southerton\(^ {57}\) describe the subjective agency of the fridge-freezer, and Emma Roe\(^ {58}\) – the processed carrot in household nutritional-freezer practices. Russell Hitchings very picturesquely describes the operation of the freezer which has its needs regarding the setup


\(^{55}\) Ibid., p. 11.


and continuous supplies of energy, it demands to be used and prefers some varieties of food above some others.\footnote{Russell HITCHINGS, “At Home with Someone Non-human.” \textit{Home Cultures}, vol. 1, 2004, no. 2, p. 180 (169–186).}

Here is where we capture precisely relationships between space and knowledge in a non-home. Cleary objects and house’s construction influence dwelling practices but also knowledge - meanings inscribed in the certain part of a place, in the furniture, in the figure of owner as well as meanings connected with the current life situation and the ideal of dwelling, transgressing the material condition of a flat. In our comprehension, a non-home is a notion introducing both the discursive and material dimension into the analysis of habitation.

A non-home is an epistemological proposition not an empirical concept highlighting mutual relationship between space that produces and restricts narratives on it and knowledge (narratives) that constitute spaces. Implementing the concept of a non-home to empirical scrutiny one is to remember that dwelling is vague, automatic, habitual, embodied and non-discursive and, hence, non-home is neither a straightforward nor more sophisticated antithesis of home. It is rather a point of departure.