Chapter 6

Conclusions.

This book provided an ethnographic account of how a group of people seeking asylum and allies attempted to re-define and re-imagine trajectories of refugeehood, displacement and forced migration through making-music and leisure in early 21st century Britain. What inspired it was the presence of a precarious, informal but “actually-existing” assemblage of musicians (with our without refugee background, experienced and beginners, committed and casual), grassroots asylum support movements, and musical instruments that from the autumn of 2016 until the late spring of 2018 co-created a social space to play, learn and share music in Bristol. A space that was missing in the city at that time, but whose relevance was felt by those, people seeking asylum and allies, who weekly made it happen with what was available to them (in terms of time, spaces, resources, instruments). The existence of this quite literal “heterogeneous collective” (Hughes and Forman, 2017) interrogated the well-worn binary scripts that confine people seeking asylum to the bi-dimensional roles of burdens or threats, victims, or tricksters, traumatised or resilient, deserving or undeserving, “welfare scroungers” or super-achievers. Moreover, the presence of this leisure space (and its sounds) posed, at least to me, a simple but compelling question. How the domains of music-making and leisure can constitute entry points that contribute to address “what goes unnoticed” (Salih, 2017, 743) in existing ways of thinking about forced migration, refugeehood and displacement?

This question, together with the practices and affective registers that (e)merged from the group enabled me to look at asylum “slantwise” (Ahmed, 2006), that is, through a situated perspective that facilitated an interrogation of normative lenses and binaries used to understand forced migration, asylum, and their relationship with leisure. From such a perspective, and throughout everyday geographies of displacements and precariousness, this work addressed how music and leisure constituted domains for the men and women in the group to negotiate shared but differently lived forms of exile, marginality, and suspension in a city of sanctuary and dispersal, of welcome and violence: Asylum Bristol. This book thus contributes to an emerging body of work that critically engages with leisure beyond a mere tool to achieve pre-defined, policy-driven outcomes of migration and integration policies (see Mata-Codesal, Peperkamp and Tiesler, 2015; Lewis, 2015; De Martini Ugolotti and Caudwell, 2022). The focus developed here examines instead how leisure constituted a domain of practice through which people seeking sanctuary and allies engaged with to navigate and negotiate an asylum system predicated on dislocation, dispersion, and isolation and the pro-active mobilisation of cruelty as a means of deterrence. As I will discuss below, the perspectives advanced here can also contribute to wider discussions and conceptualisations of leisure in contexts of intersecting inequalities.

In addressing the practices and registers that animated the group, musicking and leisure constituted domains where the entanglements of personal trajectories and wider political histories transpired *as and though* bodily registers and affective intensities. I thus engaged with the domain of the affective in this book not interested much in debating the ontological claims and status of affect, emotions, and so on, but rather to explore how 'forms of power work through affective life' (Anderson 2016, 8). That is, I wanted to explore the "forces of encounter" (Seigworth and Greggs, 2010, 2) that emerged between and amid people, places, things, sounds that were shaped but not determined by the contemporary necro-politics of asylum. I worked with affect "as a signal and not a truth", as an "intense feeling pointing to situations that need addressing" (Berlant and Manning, 2018, 3) to address the entanglements of affective domains, power and the everyday amid lives lived in the British asylum system. Through this lens, I engaged with affect as an object-target of power apparatuses, and as a bodily capacity emergent from encounters with people, sounds and things that can exceed the imposition of State authority and humanitarian discourses 'onto' or 'into' the objects, environments and encounters that shaped lives lived in the asylum system (see also Darling, 2014; De Martini Ugolotti, 2022). Following this perspective, my effort in this book was to articulate necropolitical processes and affective domains not just to explain injustice and oppression *better*, but to explore complexities and ambivalence of politics and everyday lives, of asylum apparatuses and the affective registers that pervade them. An effort, to put it with

Johnny Darling (2014), to engage with and enable 'a politics that is attentive to more than simply the discursive channels through which abjection works' (496).

The affective and embodied registers I attuned to during the research thus addressed the affective, social, and material domains through which "women and men become subjects and live their lives as a story within a history" (see Salih, 2017, p. 743). Such process entailed also addressing the productive entanglements of sounds, gestures, feelings, things, (hi)stories, places and movements that *mediated such attempts*. In this sense my engagement with the domains of affect denotes an attention to "the sensual registering of encounters between different bodies and objects" (Militz et al., 2019, p. 2; see also Ahmed, 2004). An attention to "intensities of feeling" (Müller, 2015, 411) —joy, suffering, hope, despair, and those that don't quite have a name or require one of their own— that work in and through the body and bodily experience but also exceed the subject, encompassing human and non-human elements as they co-produce practices and environments. Differently from other explorations of the affective politics of asylum, I have studied affect not in the court-rooms, or other institutional spaces (Meier, 2020; Griffith, 2023), nor through the "things" that materialise the politics of asylum (e.g., the Home Office letters discussed by Navaro-Yashin, 2012 and Darling, 2014). Instead, I have attended to affect in the interstices that emerge beside state and humanitarian responses to asylum. In one of many small-scale experiments that traverse the boundaries between humanitarianism, voluntarism, activism and that in many ways outrun the pedagogies in which we have been trained to understand what emerges and survives "against all odds and against the grain under extreme political pressures" (Navaro, 2017, 213). In doing this, I have built on and hopefully contributed to and expanded a body of literature that have engaged with the multifaceted registers of music and sound as entangled with power and history, and as in themselves lenses to understand social and political life in contexts of multiple and protracted displacements (Van Aken, 2006; Lewis, 2010, 2015; Western, 2020; Pistrick, 2020; Wilcock, 2023). It is in this merging of the forces, energies, and affective potentialities of people with sounds, things, and material environments that I located the core analytical perspective of this book, the idea of music *as a site of intensity and articulation.* With this idea, I conceptualise music (and leisure more widely) as lived, embodied, and felt domains where the 'gradual wounding' (Mayblin, 2020) produced by (necro-)political formations of power can be both made manifest and negotiated[51]. The notion of music (and leisure) as sites of intensity and articulation thus bridges a divide between naming violence and attending to the mundane practices, spaces, and registers through which liveable lives and worlds to dwell in are carved even within contexts in which life is debilitated, hurt, diminished. This analytical perspective does not minimise or side-lines the violence and harm of political practices and narratives that compel people to live in a state of suspension and injury nor "seeks consolation in naming violence" (McKittrick, 2016, 5). Rather, it directs the attention to the domains where liveable lives are tentatively shaped "against all odds" (Navaro, 2017; Dokumaci, 2023) to see what can be learned from the mundane sites where forced migrants and their allies can attempt to think, live, and feel beyond the human hierarchies, categories, and (necro)politics of asylum (see also De Martini Ugolotti and Webster, 2023). This analytical framework informs the discussion that the book threads across its chapters, articulating the bodily, affective, and collective intensities of music, the experiences and negotiations of lives lived in the British asylum system, and the group participants' attempts to make home in a city of sanctuary and dispersal, of welcome and violence. Through the notion of *affective vernaculars of diasporic belonging* in chapter 3, I have addressed how entanglements of people things (e.g., musical instruments), and sounds mediated affective registers that temporarily but productively interrupted suffocating feelings of isolation, uncertainty, and the ordinary materialisation of 'hierarchies of human worth' (Mayblin 2017) among the group participants. In this way, the concept highlights the mundane registers and modalities (affective vernaculars) that enabled specific forms "socialities of solidarity" (Rozakou, 2016, 187) *and* the kind of convivial connections beyond ethnic, national, gendered, and religious lines that emerged within and across various forms of displacement (diasporic belonging), including state responses to asylum. In chapter 4, I have examined how music-making blurred the spatial domains of the private and the public in shaping relationships with and in place with(in) everyday and carceral geographies of asylum. By addressing the *secret publicness of* the music *space*, I underlined the tensions within established (psycho-social) reading of music and leisure as a "private" space of individualised healing and/or well-being, and as "public" opportunities to showcase refugees' efforts to integrate (see also Kataria and De Martini Ugolotti, 2022; Giudici and Boccagni, 2022) or tools of political action (Bagelman, 2019; Wilcock, 2023). Building on these points, I argued that the notion of secretly public spaces can contribute to debates on the urban politics of asylum by complicating established assumptions around the public/private divide

---

[51] I started to explore in previous works See De Martini Ugolotti, 2022; De Martini Ugolotti and Webster, 2023. In the former I have discussed music as a site of articulation and in the latter leisure as a site of intensity,

---

building on these discussions to combine these perspectives in this work.

within urban struggles for the right to refuge (and to the city). In chapter 5, I examined how immobility, temporariness and waiting were differently lived and tentatively redefined by the men and women in the music group amid state-enforced procedures employing time as a necropolitical tool of deterrence (Mayblin, 2020; Mountz, 2020). I then put to dialogue an approach to leisure inspired by Dokumaci's (2023) theorisation of ordinary "acts and arts of survival in a shrinking world" (7) with conceptualisations of leisure as "an art of living" (Blackshaw, 2017, 2018). Through such a dialogue, I discuss leisure as site of intensity and articulation as a perspective that can illuminate (learning from crip, post- and de-colonial standpoints) key omissions in contemporary leisure theories while probing new ways to engage with the temporary, unnoticed, yet existing possibilities of "world-making" amid lives lived in a state of injury (Mbembe, 2003). I put to work these conceptualisations to advance a critical vocabulary that can give a name to the practices, encounters, spaces, and possibilities that emerged (if temporarily) in the music group I engaged with, as both a contribution to scholarly debates across, leisure, forced migration and for the practices of activists, practitioners, and community organizers. While these concepts can be extended to other leisure domains and social contexts (see De Martini Ugolotti and Webster, 2023), their conceptualisation emerged nevertheless from the possibility to "think through theory ethnographically" (Khan, 2020, 83) through musicking with the group. Put it differently, they emerged from an engagement in and with musicking not as an object of study but as a form of relationality: a modality of ethnographic encounter through which I could engage with "what goes unnoticed" (Salih, 2017, 743) in existing ways of thinking about forced migration, refugeehood and displacement.

Working the Hyphen of a Militant Investigation: Music as Ethnographic Relationality

The writing of this book intended from the start to bring the reader close to the practices and experiences of a group of people seeking asylum in Bristol through their engagement with musicking and leisure. What informed such endeavour was an approach to research that engaged with ethnography as a situated "art of listening, learning and telling and showing" (Back and Sinha, 2018, 172); an art that can "illuminate the unknown while interrogating the obvious" (Fassin, 2013, 642). Such an approach carries a clear intent to reach readers beyond academic circles, as, according to Didier Fassin (2013) the public value of ethnography lies in addressing the "black holes" of social reality that are ignored or misconstrued by hegemonic representations as means to dialogue with and transform the view of policy-makers, community-members, practitioners, and academics. At the same time, the ethnography as a method originated with anthropology's colonial premises and has been the subject of crucial critiques concerning the forms and hierarchies of power and representation that it can reproduce (see Clifford and Marcus, 1986; Tuhiwai-Smith, 2012 to name a few). Tuhiwai-Smith (2012, 9) argued for a radical transformation of research processes based on the extraction of knowledge ownership from the researched by (ethnographic) researchers and their replacement with forms of research that unsettled the exploitative premises of Euro-centric form of knowledge-making. Attending to how such kind of ethnographic research might look like, George Marcus (2010) called for the replacement of "The cliched participant observation of traditional ethnography for the archive […] by an aesthetic of collaborative knowledge projects of uncertain closure" (275). A proposition that authors have increasingly actualised by co-creating aesthetic collaborations with research interlocutors (see Western, 2020; Wilcock, 2023). To put it concisely with Back and Sinha (2018, 171), these critiques illuminated how every kind of research perspective is profoundly political and thus requires a clear reflection on how the knowledge that is presented has been produced. Such position requires an ethical commitment to research that makes it accountable not only to university ethical standards but also "to the people being portrayed and the relationships out of which […] words and insights have been assembled" (Back and Sinha, 2018, 172).

Attending to such questions while addressing how liveable lives have been tentatively reshaped amid intersecting forms of (slow) violence shaped a research approach that resonated with what Casas-Cortes et al., (2015) defined as "militant investigation" and what Fine described as "working the hyphens" (1994). On one hand my engagement with the group as a researcher endeavoured to acknowledge and explicitly address the power asymmetries that make (forced) migrants into subjects of knowledge production (Casas-Cortes et al., 2015). In fact, this was a necessity that the group participants ironically but explicitly, kindly but firmly pointed to me on several occasions, by making clear that they would not become "my guinea pigs" (Yanet), by asking in some cases not to have their voices recorded or by defining their conditions for images of the group to be taken. Through these acts, the men and women in the group clearly declared their refusal to be fixed as objects of research (but also management, care, advocacy) while opening for a possibility of a dialogue on how to represent the group in ways that could be relevant and respectful for them, the result of which is in this work.

Relatedly, in "working the hyphen" (Fine, 1994) I 'thought through' my body and its affective registers not as sources of knowledge *per se* on what the group meant, felt, and did.

Rather, I engaged with my body and its affective registers as *points of contact* with what took place (or not) in encounters where the boundaries between conducting research and co-creating shared spaces of sociality and solidarity became blurred. Music in this research process became not much a practice that I was studying, for example to assess its political relevance or towards the production of specific creative outputs (see Marcus, 2010; Hughes and Forman, 2017; Western, 2020; Wilcock, 2023). Differently from the above, musicking constituted the space and form of an *ethnographic relationality,* something I *did* and *felt* with the group participants and that required and enabled me to work on how differences, commonalities, and the space between them emerged and were negotiated in the research process. Such process did not contrast or went against the idea of using expressive domains as sites of creative or aesthetic collaboration with research interlocutors, rather signalled *another way* of engaging with music and other expressive practices in social research. Such a way of conducting research arguably turned around the meaning of *participatory research,* as music was not intended as a creative collaboration aiming to engage with the participants' viewpoints through participatory means and/or to be used for public engagement and/or advocacy efforts (see Lashua, 2006; Lashua and Fox, 2007; Hughes and Foreman, 2017; Wilcock, 2023). It was instead *an existing social and expressive activity that I was allowed to participate and contribute to*. The positionality that I occupied in the group made for the research to be less about devising a set of participatory methods to engage with the participants' viewpoints, and more a bricolage of practices of relationality that started with musicking and extended to attending social events, home visits, doing errands, cooking and/or sharing food together, much akin to what Gaudet (2018) termed "the visiting way". It is not lost on me here, that Gaudet's methodological perspective is imbued in Indigenous Knowledges[52] that grounded the author's research in continuity with specific cosmologies and ontologies, while such positionality did not inform my focus on developing relationalities as forms of knowledge-making here (nor claims to do so). That said, I find generative for researchers working across different historical and political formations of colonial violence and displacement to explore affinities and differences in conducting research based on building relationalities with research interlocutors (human and not-human) instead of just *generating* data. This is something that working on this book enabled me to reflect more on, and I contend can open important avenues for dialogues, and transformative approaches not just across disciplines but contexts, issues and ways of being in the world.

---

[52] More specifically, Gaudet (2018) located their methodological approach in Omushkego people's worldview of living and being well and developed it with the support of Métis Elders, Métis and Cree scholars, and family (48).

In a way, a commitment to working the hyphen of a militant investigation dialogued with recent, constructive critiques in and beyond leisure studies that interrogated a romantic view of participatory approaches as an inherently empowering experience for those involved[53]. Specifically, the focus on making time to be and make things with the group instead of focusing on enacting specific methodologies resonated with Rosen's (2023) argument that a reliance on linear and predictable understandings of time and knowledge-production risks obscuring the same exclusions that participatory methodologies aim to challenge. Relatedly, the emergent and relational nature of this work, based on playing, cooking, eating, walking with the group participants, interrogated a tendency to follow specific guidelines for doing participatory research "which risks being celebratory of its own methods alone" (Ozkul, 2020, 232). Mindful of the promises and tensions of ethnographic *and* participatory research approaches, my engagement with musicking as, at the same time, a site of relationality, translation, and incommensurability (see also Back, 2016) materialised in a commitment to an ethnographic perspective that could talk *nearby* the group, instead of talking *about* it. That is, and ethnographic perspective that strove to establish a narrative that could come "very close to a subject without, however, seizing or claiming it" (Chen and Minh-ha, 1992, n.p.). In doing this, in this book I employed ethnographic fragments and vignettes to shed light on the complexity, ambivalence and productivity of the relationalities that composed the group. The use of ethnographic fragments in this book thus attempted to convey how everyday practices, affects and ordinary struggles live not always coherently, but can transport those who engage with them into worlds that articulate affective entanglements of pain, joy, and (im)possibility, with wider political histories and processes (see Khan, 2020). The ethnographic fragments and vignettes that inform the discussion of this book have thus emerged from "mundane" encounters that stood in place and time, in the music group, on a bench, during breaks between or after playing, over half-days spent walking, and doing errands. Despite their apparent ordinariness, these fragments were relationally emerging, personally moving and methodologically provocative, providing "perspicacious presentations, juxtapositions, analogies, poetic images, epiphanies and anecdotes" (Jackson, 2009, xiv, in Khan, 2020, 160) that complicated the narrative enclosures that flatten people seeking asylum into essentialising binaries. Furthermore, these ethnographic moments and fragments highlighted how ethnographic work "asks for all scopes of the imagination to be kept on board" (Navaro-Yashin, 2009, 15) and against the grain of paradigm-setting. In one moment, listening to and with the group meant being present to attempts to put to work past and present, here and there and to shape how a liveable life could feel here and now among the group participants. In another, words and/or embodied intensities registered how sounds, instruments, melodies *said, did and made* things and mediated relationships with places, people, power, and time. The ethnographic relationalities and the collaborations with the heterogeneous collective that shaped the group thus constituted ways to "listen with displacement" (Western, 2020) and offered novel entry points that complicated public and academic perspectives on forced migration. That is, they critically interrogated and showed what is beyond the "ontologies of suffering" (Khan, 2020, 49) that populate well-worn humanitarian and academic narratives, the ethno-populist portrayals of refugees as inherent threats to the nation, and perspectives that contain refugees' practices within individualising discourses of empowerment and resilience. Most importantly, these ethnographic relationalities, of doing things and making time together extended beyond the research process and into the writing of this work. To this end, I considered fundamental to invite the group participants to read *and review* the manuscript of this book to see if they wanted to comment, provide feedback, check accuracy of events and basically recognise their experience of the group (or some parts of it) in what they read. This was in fact fundamental to me as this work needed to make sense first for those who made the group happen in the first place. Working through this "horizontal" process of *peer*-review ensured to me that, while not claiming to provide a complete account of experiences of forced migrants in Bristol, or of the group itself, this book can articulate arguments and analyses that contribute to wider analyses at the intersection of leisure, urban and (forced) migration studies. In fact, as I will discuss in the last concluding considerations, the situatedness of this work and its historical and geographical specificity are an invitation to dialogue with and compare what is described and conceptualised (from) here in other leisure domains, and socio-political, historical and planetary contexts.

---

[53] For important critical discussions on participatory research and PAR in leisure and sport studies, see Venturini-Trindade, (2021), Luguetti, Syngehebuye and Spaaij (2022a; 2022b), Enderle-Mohammadi and Mashreghi (2022), Smith, Mansfield, and Wainwright (2022, 2023),.

Final Considerations: Leisure and Forced Migration Perspectives in Times of Planetary Upheaval

The music group at the centre of this work stopped taking place in May 2018, when community venue that hosted the group, Hamilton House, came under eviction to be transformed in residential apartments, an event that speaks to ongoing dynamic of unequal urban change in Bristol that would deserve another book to be discussed in depth. Yet, despite losing the place where it gathered for almost two years, the group did not disappear. It re-emerged instead, and not just as a music group but across several other grassroots experiments of sociality, leisure and expression[54] co-organised with community groups across Bristol and elsewhere.

It would be tempting here to evoke the well-known Deleuzian image of the rhizome to describe the music group as a practice that cannot be controlled, curbed, or located, and in fact dispersed across Bristol taking different (leisurely) forms. Yet, while it could account for some of the non-linear and unexpected productivity of the music group, the image of the rhizome would not fully explain how several heterogeneous leisure collectives kept (re)assembling in Bristol and elsewhere after the music group ceased to meet. In fact, the composition of this and other grassroots leisure groups in other contexts (see Hughes and Forman, 2017; McGee and Pelham, 2018; Schmidt and Palutan, 2022; Webster, 2022) emerged from and required to be studied in historical contingencies and political specificities: those that compelled people to leave their country in search for sanctuary, those of the "hostile environment" regime of migration management, and those that made Bristol as a city of progressive cultural and grassroots politics and stark inequalities to name but a few. Building on the discussion of this book, I contend that the (re-)appearance of multiple small-scale experiments in leisure, sociality, and solidarity with forced migrants in Bristol and elsewhere was not the manifestation of the limitless potentialities of leisure as a domain of freedom and self-actualisation in the 21st century (see Blackshaw, 2017). Rather, it makes evident how the conditions that informed the needs and capacities that these groups address continued to exist and are worsening — not just in Britain— as the "landscapes of asylum and refuge are changing globally and dramatically so along the edges of the Global North" (Mountz, 2020, 5). This is where, despite its situatedness and limitations this book offers productive entry points that are relevant in other geographical and political domains as well as scholarly debates across and beyond leisure and forced migration studies. In making this point, I agree with Lopez and Sene-Harper (2023) on the necessity to bridge critical understandings across disciplines among planetary events that illuminate with devastating clarity the connectedness of the world(s) we live in. This is why I contend that the dialogue advanced in this book can inform critical leisure perspective on (forced) migration in a historical conjuncture in which the latter does not just constitute a key domain for any adequate theorization of power and politics (De Genova and Tazzioli, 2022, 783), but is also entangled with wider planetary processes (e.g., climate upheaval, socio-economic and political tensions, historically entrenched inequalities, ongoing extractive processes of land and peoples' dispossession). This book highlighted how critical leisure perspectives can inform forced migration research (and related praxis), a field of scholarship that has so far rarely paid attention to leisure as a meaningful entry point to address the everyday lives, practices and negotiations of people seeking asylum. As shown in this work, engaging with leisure as a site of intensity and articulation can make visible the harms and negotiations associated with displacement, the bio- and necro-political management of refugee populations, and the contingent but productive spaces and practices of migration solidarity (McGee and Pelham, 2018; Webster and Abunaama, 2022; Webster, 2022; Schmidt and Palutan, 2022). Moreover, it can contribute to advance a "migrant perspective" (Casas-Cortes et al., 2015; Achiume, 2019) on both leisure and forced migration that can de-centre the Global North as the gatekeeper of the terms of reference for the transformative politics required at this planetary conjuncture. Beyond the field of forced migration studies, such a perspective dialogues with ongoing critical debates in leisure studies on the scope, relevance and aims of leisure perspectives within the present, unfolding global scenario. I am thinking here specifically of the critical analyses that examined the relationship between leisure, "racecraft" and white supremacy (Mowatt, 2018; 2022), illuminated the erasure of "subaltern" knowledges and ways of knowing from leisure theorising and teaching (Fox, 2006; Ratna, 2018; Fox and McDermott, 2019; Mashreghi, 2022; Henhawk, Yuen and Barrick, 2023), and problematised Western-centric, notions of leisure, well-being and human agency through various theoretical perspectives (Kumm, Berbary and Grimwood, 2019; Evers, 2019; Newman et al., 2020). In relation to the latter, this book's trans-paradigmatic engagement with theories of affect (Navaro, 2009, p. 17) contributes to more-than-human approaches to leisure, including by considering some of their ambivalences and tensions (see also De Martini Ugolotti, 2021). In grappling with how affects register the encounters between bodies, things and environments marked by past and present forms of political violence, this work examined leisure beyond calls to register the agency-of-things or de-centring of the euro-centric Cartesian subject. Rather, the engagement with the more-than-human entanglements that shaped the group moved instead towards possibilities for a "re-enchantment with the human" (Goodley et al., 2020). A possibility that engages with and involves leisure domains in the "ongoing work of salvaging imperilled humanity from the mounting wreckage" (Gilroy, 2018, 20) at the edges of contemporary citadels of overdevelopment[55].

---

[54] These ranged from theatre to painting groups and a lullaby-exchange meet-up made by and for mothers in Bristol and lead, among others by Taban.

This book contributes to direct the attention to how a "re-enchantment with the human" can learn from those who have historically struggled to reclaim their "ways of being human in the world" (De Martino, 1977, 396) including because considered infrahuman commodities, objects-among-other-objects (Fanon, 1952; Levi, 1959), not-(quite)-humans (Denowski and Viveiros de Castro, 2017; Goodley et al., 2020). Following Navaro (2017), I contend that such an engagement with affect and the more-than-human needs to learn and dialogue with but does not necessarily imply "the ontological project of finding the truth in the radically-alter existence of non-Western societies[56]" (211). Instead, it is about engaging through affect and leisure with "that which was previously uncaptured in scholarly framings, as well as that which survives against all odds and against the grain under extreme political pressures" (Navaro, 2017, 213).

As Paul Gilroy (2018) argued, the salvaging and refiguring of the human, "both before and after the 20th century's noisy death of Man, necessitates the adoption of unorthodox interpretative angles" (12). In advancing one of such unorthodox angles, the analytical sensibility that informed this work has been oriented towards foregrounding (forced) migrants' desires, feelings, and practices, how they are entangled with the material operations of (necro)power, and how they complicate, exceed, and elude many framings of state and humanitarian responses to asylum. Such a perspective, challenges leisure scholars to address how we can understand, theorise, and teach leisure not just from the standpoint of the lives lived in asylum systems, but more widely from the borderlands, thresholds and crossings that map this historical and planetary conjuncture. Including such perspectives as significant, binding standpoints from where to address leisure in the contemporary present can contribute to understand what leisure can tell us when studied across the thresholds and crossings between marginality, precariousness, and desires to shape worlds to live and dwell in. Where acts of recreation and acts of survival blur and overlap with each other, reconfigure received pedagogies of the political, and give us the measure of why and how leisure constitutes a site from where to address injustice and sustain social and planetary life in the present conjuncture.

---

[55] The expression is taken from Gilroy's Tanner Lectures (2014)

[56] In this sense, I agree with Kumm, Berbary and Grimmond's (2019) argument that "Indigenous scholars and Indigenous knowledges provide an example from which to learn, not to appropriate" (344).

References

Achiume, E. T. (2019). Migration as decolonisation. *Stanford Law Review*, 71(6), 1509–1574.

Ahmed, S. (2004). *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Edinburgh University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2006). *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others*. Duke University Press.

Anderson, B. (2016). *Encountering Affect: Capacities, Apparatuses, Conditions*. Routledge.

Back, L. (2016). Moving Sounds, Controlled Borders: Asylum and the Politics of Culture. *YOUNG*, 24(3), 185-203.

Back, L. & Sinha, S. with Bryan, C., Baraku, V. & Yembi, M. (2018). *Migrant City*. Routledge.

Bagelman J. (2019). Sanctuary artivism: expanding geopolitical imaginations. In, J. Darling & H. Bauder (Eds.), Sanctuary Cities and Urban Struggles (pp. 131-164). University of Manchester Press.

Berlant, L., & Manning, N., (2018). “Intensity is a signal, not a truth”: an interview with Lauren Berlant. *Revue française d’études américaines*, 15(2), 1-9.

Blackshaw, T. (2017). *Re-Imagining Leisure Studies*. Routledge.

Blackshaw, T. (2018). The Two Rival Concepts of Devotional Leisure: Towards an Understanding of Twenty-First Century Human Creativity and the Possibility of Freedom. *International Journal of the Sociology of Leisure*, 1, 75–97.

Casas-Cortes, M., Cobarrubias, S., De Genova, N., Garelli, G., Grappi, G., Heller, C., Hess, S., Kasparek, B., Mezzadra, S., Neilson, B., Peano, I., Pezzani, L., Pickles, J., Rahola, F., Riedner, L., Scheel, S., & Tazzioli, M., (2015) New Keywords: Migration and Borders. *Cultural Studies*, 29(1), 55-87.

Chen, N. N. & Minh-ha, T. (1992). Speaking Nearby: A Conversation With Trinh T. Minh-ha. *Visual Anthropology Review*, 8(1), 82–91.

Clifford, J. & Marcus, G. (1986). *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. University of California Press.

Darling, J. (2014). Another letter from the home office: Reading the material politics of asylum. *Environment and Planning D, Society & Space*, 32(3), 484–500.

De Genova, N. & Tazzioli, M. (2022). Minor Keywords of Political Theory: Migration as a Critical Standpoint. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 40(4), 781-875.

De Martino, E. (1977). *La fine del mondo. Contributo all'analisi delle apocalissi culturali* [The end of the world. A contribution to the analysis of cultural apocalypses]. Einaudi.

De Martini Ugolotti, N. (2021). The productive turbulence and unre-solved questions of ‘new’ materialist approaches to sport, leisure and physical culture. *Leisure Studies*, 40(3), 438-440.

De Martini Ugolotti, N. (2022). Music-making and forced migrants’ affective practices of diasporic belonging. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 48(1), 92–109.

De Martini Ugolotti, N., & Caudwell, J. (eds). (2022). *Leisure and Forced Migration: Lives Lived in Asylum Systems*. Routledge.

De Martini Ugolotti, N., & Webster, C. (2023). Sites of intensity: Leisure and emotions amid the necropolitics of asylum. *Leisure Studies*, 1–15.

Denowsky, D. & Viveiros de Castro, E. (2017). *The Ends of the World*. Polity Press

Dokumaci, A., (2023). *Activist Affordances: How Disabled People Improvise More Habitable Worlds*. Duke University Press.

Enderle-Mohammadi, S. & Mashreghi, S. (2022). ‘Methodological challenges and opportunities in working within a participatory paradigm in the context of sport, forced migration and settlement: an insider perspective’. *Sport in Society*, 25(3), 469-484.

Evers, W. C. (2019). Polluted leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, 41(5), 423–440.

Fanon, F. (2008/1952). *Black Skin, White Masks*. Grove Press.

Fassin, D. (2013). Why Ethnography Matters: On Ethnography and its Publics. *Cultural Anthropology*, 28(4), 621-646.

Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphen: reinventing self and other in qualitative research. In, N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln, (Eds.) Handbook of qualitative research (1st ed. pp. 70-82). Sage Publications Ltd.

Fox, K., (2006). Leisure and Indigenous Peoples. *Leisure Studies*, 25(4), 403-409.

Fox, K., & McDermott, L. (2019). The Kumulipo, Native Hawaiians, and well-being: How the past speaks to the present and lays the foundation for the future. *Leisure Studies*, 39(1), 96–110.

Gaudet, J.C. (2018). Keeoukaywin: The visiting way—fostering an Indigenous research methodology. *Aboriginal Policy Studies*, 7(2), 47—64.

Gilroy, P. (2014). The Tanner Lectures on Human Values, Yale University, February 21st 2014. Retrieved January 2, 2024, from https://tannerlectures.utah.edu/_resources/documents/a-to-z/g/Gilroy%20manuscript%20PDF.pdf

Gilroy, P. (2018). “Where every breeze speaks of courage and liberty”: Offshore Humanism and Marine Xenology, or, Racism and the Problem of Critique at Sea Level. *Antipode*, 50(1), 3-22.

Giudici, D. & Boccagni, P. (2022). Exposing the private, engaging in the public. Asylum seekers, intimate publics and normative performances of public participation. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 40(6), 1122-1140.

Goodley, D., Lawthon, R., Liddiard, K., & Runswick-Cole, K. (2020). The Desire for New Humanism. *Journal of Disability Studies in Education*, 1(1-2), 125-144.

Griffiths, M. (2023). The emotional governance of immigration controls. *Identities*, https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2023.2257957

Henhawk, D., Yuen, F. & Barrick, S. (2023). Engaging struggle: the deconstruction of the academy in leisure studies. *Leisure/Loisir*, 47(1), 1-6.

Hughes, S. M., & Forman, P. (2017). A Material Politics of Citizenship: The Potential of Circulating Materials from UK Immigration Removal Centres. *Citizenship Studies*, 21(6), 675–692.

Kataria, M., & De Martini Ugolotti, N. (2022). Running for inclusion: responsibility, (un)deservingness and the spectacle of integration in a sport for- refugees intervention in Geneva, Switzerland. *Sport in Society*, 25(3), 602-618.

Khan, N. (2020). *Arc of the Journeyman: Afghan Migrants in England*. University of Minnesota Press.

Kumm, B., Berbary, L. & Grimwood, B. S. R. (2019). For Those to Come: An Introduction to Why Posthumanism Matters. *Leisure Sciences*, 41(5), 341-347,

Lashua, B. D. (2006). “Just Another Native?” Soundscapes, Chorasters, and Borderlands in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 6(3), 391-410.

Lashua, B. D., & Fox, K. (2007). Defining the Groove: From Remix to Research in The Beat of Boyle Street. *Leisure Sciences*, 29(2), 143-158.

Levi, P. (1959). *Se Questo é un Uomo* [If This Is a Man]. Einaudi.

Lewis, H. (2010). Community moments: integration and transnationalism at ‘refugee’ parties and events. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 23(4), 571–588.

Lewis, H. (2015). Music, Dancing and Clothing as Belonging and Freedom among People Seeking Asylum in the UK. *Leisure Studies*, 34(1), 42-58.

Lopez, K. J., & Sène-Harper, A. (2023). Leisure research amid socio-political unrest: A reflection on struggle in turbulent times. *Leisure/Loisir*, 47(1), 7-26.

Luguetti, C., L. Singehebhuye & Spaaij, R. (2022a). A collaborative self-study of ethical issues in participatory action research with refugee-background young people in grassroots football. *Sport in Society*, 25(3), 453-468.

Luguetti, N. Jice, L. Singehebhuye, K. Singehebhuye, A. Mathieu, & Spaaij, R. (2022b). 'I know how researchers are […] taking more from you than they give you': tensions and possibilities of youth participatory action research in sport for development'. *Sport, Education and Society*, https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2022.2084374

Marcus, G. (2010). Contemporary Fieldwork Aesthetics in Art and Anthropology: Experiments in Collaboration and Intervention. *Visual Anthropology*, 23(4), 263–277.

Mashreghi, S. with Hassan, Yasmin & Mohammad Ali (2022). Decolonial Stories of Forced Migrants in Physical Activity and Sport: 'We the Afghan Kids'. In, N. De Martini Ugolotti & J. Caudwell (Eds.), Leisure and Forced Migration: Lives Lived in Asylum Systems (pp. 157–175). Routledge.

Mata-Codesal, D., Peperkamp, E. & Tiesler, N. C. (2015). Migration, migrants and leisure: meaningful leisure? *Leisure Studies*, 34(1), 1-4.

Mayblin, L. (2017). *Asylum after empire: Colonial legacies in the politics of asylum seeking.* Rowman and Littlefield International

Mayblin, L. (2020). *Asylum and impoverishment: Social policy as slow-violence*. Routledge.

Mbembe, A. (2003). Necropolitics. *Public Culture*, 15(1), 11–40.

McGee, D., & Pelham, J. (2018). Politics at Play: locating Human Rights, Refugees and Grassroots Humanitarianism in the Calais Jungle. *Leisure Studies*, 37(1), 22-35.

McKittrick, K. (2016). Diachronic loops/deadweight tonnage/bad made measure. *Cultural Geographies*, 23, 3–18.

Meier, I. (2020). Affective border violence: Mapping everyday asylum precarities across different spaces and temporalities. *Emotion, Space and Society*, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2020.100702

Militz, E., Faria, C. & Schurr, C. (2019). Affectual intensities: Writing with resonance as feminist methodology. *Area*, 52(2), 429–436.

Mountz, A. (2020). *The death of asylum: Hidden geographies of the enforcement archipelago*. University of Minnesota Press.

Mowatt, R., (2018) A People's History of Leisure Studies: Leisure, the Tool of Racecraft. *Leisure Sciences*, 40(7), 663-674.

Mowatt, R., (2022) Revised notes from a leisure son: expanding an understanding of White supremacy in leisure. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 25(2), 291-298.

Müller, M. (2015). More than representational political geographies. In J. Agnew, V. Mamadouh, A. J. Secor, & J. Sharp (Eds.) The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Political Geography (pp. 410-423). Wiley Blackwell.

Navaro, Y. (2009). Affective Spaces, Melancholic Objects: Ruination and the Production of Anthropological Knowledge. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 15(1), 1–18.

Navaro, Y. (2012). *The Make-Believe Space: Affective Geography in a Postwar Polity*. Duke University Press.

Navaro, Y. (2017). Diversifying Affect. *Cultural Anthropology*, 32(2), 209-214.

Newman, J., Thorpe, H., & Andrews, D. (2020). *Sport, Physical Culture and the Moving Body: Materialisms, Technologies, Ecologies*. Rutgers University Press.

Ozkul, D. (2020). Participatory Research: Still a One-Sided Research Agenda? *Migration Letters*, 17(2), 229–237.

Ratna, A. (2018). Not just merely different: Travelling Theories, post-feminism and the racialized politics of women of colour. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 35(3), 197-206.

Rosen, R. (2023). Participatory research in and against time. *Qualitative Research*, 23(3), 597-613.

Rozakou, K. (2016). Socialities of Solidarity: Revisiting the Gift Taboo in Times of Crisis. *Social Anthropology*, 24(2), 185-199.

Salih, R. (2017). Bodies that walk, bodies that talk, bodies that love. Palestinian women refugees, affectivity and the politics of the ordinary. *Antipode*, 49(3), 742-760.

Schmidt, D., & Palutan, G. (2022). Thick leisure: Waiting time in a migratory context. In N. De Martini Ugolotti & J. Caudwell (Eds.), Leisure and forced migration: Lives lived in asylum systems (pp. 52–66). Routledge.

Seigworth, G. J. & Gregg, M. (2010). An Inventory of Shimmers. In, G. J. Seigworth & M. Gregg (Eds.) The Affect Theory Reader (pp. 1-28). Duke University Press.

Smith, R., L. Mansfield and E. Wainwright (2022), 'Should I really be here?': Problems of trust and ethics in PAR with young people from refugee backgrounds in sport and leisure', *Sport in Society*, 25(3), 434-452.

Smith R., L. Mansfield & Wainwright, E. (2023). 'Do know harm': Examining the intersecting capabilities of young people from refugee backgrounds through community sport and leisure programmes', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, https://doi.org/10.1177/10126902221150123

Tuhiwai-Smith, L. (2012). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous People*. Zed Books.

Van Aken, M. (2006). Dancing Belonging: Contesting Dakbeh in the Jordan Valley, Jordan. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 32(2), 203–222.

Venturini-Trindade, N. (2021). Leisure Provision for LGBTIQ + Refugees: Opportunities and

Constraints on Building Solidarity and Citizenship across Differences in Brazil. In, N. De Martini Ugolotti & J. Caudwell (Eds.), Leisure and forced migration: Lives lived in asylum systems (pp. 85-104). Routledge.

Webster, C. (2022). The (in)significance of footballing pleasures in the lives of forced migrant men. *Sport in Society*, 25(3), 523–536.

Webster, C., & Abunaama, K. (2022). Informal football spaces and the negotiation of temporal politics in the lives of forced migrants. In, N. De Martini Ugolotti & J. Caudwell (Eds.), Leisure and Forced Migration: Lives Lived in Asylum Systems (pp. 21–34). Routledge.

Western, T. (2020). Listening with Displacement: Sound, Citizenship, and Disruptive Representations of Migration. *Migration and Society*, 3(1), 294-309.

Wilcock, C. A. (2023). In the groove and in the moment: epistemology and ethics in ethnography with Sudanese musician revolutionaries. *Qualitative Research*, 23(3), 746-763.