

УДК 392(=163.41)
341.485(=163.41)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5937/bastina33-46775>

Originalni naučni rad

Nevena S. PETKOVIĆ*

Institute for Serbian Culture Priština – Leposavić

ANTHROPOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE QUESTION OF DOMICIDE**

Abstract: Domicide, a term that recently emerged in the field of geography, has been further revised in contemporary studies to include various processes concerning housing issues of life-endangering situations. These elaborations questioned the basis of the concept that aimed to explain the planned physical destruction of homes by revising its compositional components and its typology. This article provides an overview of some of the most relevant studies in the given domain by assessing the applicability of the term in anthropological research. It starts from the premise that the trope of the victimhood prevents its usage in anthropology, while simultaneously mapping multidisciplinary approaches that widen the span of domicile in accordance with an anthropological framework. Offered explanations are briefly complemented with observations acquired during fieldwork on internally displaced persons from Kosovo and Metohija.

Key words: domicile, cumulative domicile, home, internally displaced persons, cultural trauma, resistance.

The term discussed in this paper was primarily coined in the field of geography, being originally intended as a signifier of planned and systematic destruction of marginalized groups' homes, mostly related to internally displaced persons affected by conflict. John Douglas Porteous and Sandra Eileen Smith formulated *domicide* to denote physical loss of homes and emotional consequences of such loss. They organized its typology to differentiate between *everyday domicile* and *extreme domicile*, the first being related to cases of war, conflict, large scale relocations and colonialism, and the latter to consequences of urbanization (2001: 64–150). Furthermore, victims and proponents of domicile were considered as basic components of the term.

However, both original typology and components were questioned in the later reconceptualizations of the term that were most comprehensively given by Mell Nowicki (2014; 2017; 2023), who changed the focus from physical loss to *socio-symbolic domicile*, which is connected to the ideal of good citizens and the treatment of those who do not qualify as such (2023). Thus, *domicide* was associated with broader

* Junior Research Assistant, nevena5co9@gmail.com

** The paper was created as part of the scientific research work of the Scientific Research Organization under the Agreement concluded with the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation of the RS number: 451-03-47/2023-01/ 200020 from 03.02.2023.

concepts, such as *slow violence* (Nixon 2013), primarily related to postponed effects of environmental degradation, and the “home *unmaking*”, which was coined to account for losses and obstacles inherent in all processes of homemaking practices (Baxter–Brickell 2014: 135, 141). The term *domicide*, as Mell Nowicki recognized, was first introduced in theoretical discussion on the concept of home through Alison Blunt and Robyn Dowling’s work (Nowicki 2014: 786, 787). It is exactly through this prism of home studies that the meaning of the term *domicide* and its typology are questioned, as well as its possible usage in the domain of anthropology. Therefore, this paper starts with the concept of *multi-sided ethnography* as one of the basic methodological lenses for understanding homemaking practices and *domicide* as a factor that shapes them (Marcus 1995).

Anthropological observation of the processual character of *culture* initiated the formulation of *multi-sited ethnography*, focused on human interactions in a globalized framework, which removed some of the existing spatial limitations in research design (Marcus 1995: 96; Van Duijn 2020: 284; McAdam-Otto–Nimführ 2021: 46). In the same vein analyses of singular cultures as isolated units and researches bounded by state territories were criticized as an outcome of *methodological nationalism*, present in the field of humanities regardless of its incompatibilities with aforementioned findings (Wimmer–Schiller 2003). Described methodological limitations, in accordance with the broader conclusions of Andreas Wimmer and Nina Glick Schiller, came to “equate society with the nation-state” and therefore, in some cases, even contributed to the ideologization of research results (2003: 576). Due to restraints of this type, the *multi-sited* approach was formulated to combat the idea of isolated societies and cultures (McAdam-Otto–Nimführ 2021: 46; Faist 2012: 56). This methodological development, that was certainly not defined as a precondition for all types of transnational studies (Faist 2012), or as involving literal crossing of state borders by researchers in order to conduct *multi-sited* research (McAdam-Otto–Nimführ 2021: 45–47, 51–53), is recognized by Sarah Pink as one of the important pillars of the anthropological studies of home (2004: 11).

However, Joanna Cook, James Laidlaw and Jonathan Mari, as well as other authors (e.g., McAdam-Otto–Nimführ 2021: 43), pointed out that distinctly bordered cultural forms were never a groundwork of anthropological methodological apparatus, but rather that a *multi-sited ethnography* and its later progression brought innovations in prioritizing research questions to spatial units (Cook–Laidlaw et al. 2009: 58, 63, 65, 68). This advancement established the basis for analysing globally related phenomena that span various places, such as migrations in general (e.g., Petridou 2001; Yi-Neumann 2022). Therefore, allowing more nuanced descriptions of the expansion of home-centred activities throughout spatial continuums. Accordingly, this approach further confirmed Sara Ahmed’s argument that home itself should be perceived through the lens of interaction and movement (1999: 340).

In line with this conclusion, home became conceptualized by geographers Alison Blunt and Robyn Dowling as “multi-scalar”, therefore ranging from smaller units to larger surroundings (Blunt–Dowling 2006: 22; Chambers 2020: 5–6), and “pluri-local” in a sense of consisting of many places simultaneously, as depicted in Susan Lucas and Bandana Purkayastha (2007) analyses of transnational practices of Canadian migrants

in the United States. Furthermore, Pauli Tapani Karjalainen defined the home as an important component of the identification process and David Morley also recognized its “heavily value-laden” basis (Karjalainen 1993: 71; Morley 2000: 16). Gradually, studies of home came to include daily activities, practices and objects implicated in homemaking, as well as social and political restraints structuring them.

Contrary to Richard Baxter and Katherine Brickell’s argument that processes involving disruption of dwelling capacities, denoted by the term “home *unmaking*”, were underresearched (2014: 134), anthropological methods were attentive both to impediments that affected inhabitants and to their resistance. Such disruptive aspects are extensively analysed in current studies, but their formulation has long been present in the discipline. Relatedly, Annika Lems devoted her research to “*emplacement*” practices by focusing on “how people actually shape and reshape places, particularly in the face of displacement, and how they negotiate their position in relation to the wider world” (2018: 2, 9, 22),¹ basing her methodology on Heideggerian theory, as also do many authors writing about place and home (e.g., eds. Seamon–Mugerauer 1985). Earlier even Mary Douglas recognized the internal “tyrannies” of home in the construction of its daily rhythms (1991: 303–5). Other researchers, who focused on family and value systems, were continually discussing larger social problems, such as the withdraw of individuals from participation in social spheres due to home related ideology, or the effect of authoritarian regimes on personality formation (e.g., Golubović 2007: 322).

However, Mel Nowicki argues that one of the most important foundations for understanding political dimensions influencing home, apart from feminist critique, has been formulated in the field of geography through the concept of *domicide* (2014: 788). This term was originally defined by John Douglas Porteous and Sandra Eileen Smith as “planned” destruction of homes involving justification of such intervention, which is based on the scheme of “victims” and “proponents” and ranges from urbanization to war and colonial strategies (2001: 11).² Nowicki recognized that this conceptual framework was particularly influenced by the anthropology of material culture that analyzed the meaning of personal objects (2014: 786). Nevertheless, through her own alteration of the concept, she pointed out its restrained usage in geography, which is in contrast with its importance for understanding the outer political dimensions of home (Nowicki 2017: 786).

Therefore, by following Nowicki’s remarks (2014; 2017; 2023), this paper aims to question the possibility of future usage of the term in the domain of anthropology through theoretical links of existing researches on the topic of *domicide*. This hypothesis of applicability is based on the fact that current studies on *domicide* are continually improved by anthropological methods. Ethnography was considered as an important methodological asset in Christopher Harker’s (2009) research on Palestinian homes in Birzeit. Furthermore, Qin Shao’s (2013) historical study on economic reform in China included the gathering of life stories and conduction of interviews to

1 Italics quoted from the original source.

2 Authors never directly pointed to the *victim – proponent* scheme itself, but they did elaborate on the position of *victims* and the power status of *proponents*. Therefore, in the text itself, these notions will be treated as schema ingrained in the conception of *domicide*.

gain insights into *emic* perspectives of population affected by relocations and home loss, thus resembling anthropological approach.

Once implying planned devastation of the mostly physical structure of a home, which was taken for granted as a comfort zone prior to destruction (Porteous–Smith 2001), *domicide* gradually came to be viewed as a process involving physical segregation based on discursive shaping followed by resistance. These developments in the meaning of *domicide* followed John Douglas Porteous and Sandra Eileen Smith’s original formulation and started from baselines that the authors had already discussed but had not developed. Most of them resemble or are already cited in Nowicki’s main four criticisms of *domicide* regarding: misunderstanding of the concept of home and an over exaggeration of the importance of physical structure, as well as a lack of concern for gender relations in shaping the home and for the reactions of the inhabitants affected by potential losses (2014: 786). Further comparisons give insights into the reformulation of the typology of *domicide*, which was at first a differentiation between *extreme* destruction in times of war, conflict and large-scale relocations, on one side, and *everyday* disruptions, such as urbanization, on the other side (Porteous–Smith 2001). Following these observations, this paper starts from *domicide*’s central components of “victims” and “proponents”, continuing with elaboration of its typology. Theoretical explanations are complemented with brief accounts from insights on research of internally displaced Serbs from Kosovo and Metohija, who forcedly migrated due to the NATO aggression in 1999 and the March pogrom in 2004.³

Mentioned research (2020–2022) was based on a *generational approach* and the collection of oral histories and personal stories centred around displacement, based on semi-structured interviews in accordance with the age of the interlocutors.⁴ Approximate age groups of participants were formed for the purposes of comparison of their value systems, with slight overlapping of their lower age limits. The oldest age group included participants born between 1945 and 1969, the second those born between 1970 and 1985, both counting thirty-eight participants. The youngest group included 20 interlocutors born between 1986 and 2004, and its questions were based on a method of collecting personal stories taking into consideration the lack of direct memory of displacement (Antonijević 2009). Some of the interlocutors from preliminary interviews and secondary participants were not included in those numbers. Both individual

3 For the purpose of this paper, the case of NATO’s bombing of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia can only be briefly described. Following Aleksandar Pavlović’s anthropological account of this period, it should be noted that the bombing lasted from 24th of March until 10th of June in the year 1999. It was stopped due to the signing of the Kumanovo agreement and followed by United Nations Resolution 1244, which recognized the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Павловић 2021: 19). The March pogrom of 2004 was one of the most important happenings after the bombing. It lasted from 17th till 18th March, and in this wave of violence many Serbs were displaced, while Serbian orthodox heritage endured great damage. Both Serbs and Kosovo Albanians had human losses (Павловић 2021: 22).

4 Monica Palmberger used *generational approach* for the purposes of analysing memory formation among members of different age groups in Bosnia and Herzegovina after the *Dayton agreement*. She examined differences in age views through the concept of “generational positioning” (Palmberger 2016).

and group interviews were conducted, while the second method was applied in cases of interviewing family members who lived together. The preliminary phase of interviews was implemented online, while the majority were conducted in person in different locations, in Belgrade, Niš, to a lesser extent in Novi Sad, and in the territory of Kosovo and Metohija, mostly in Gračanica and the northern part of Kosovska Mitrovica.

QUESTIONING BASIC COMPONENTS OF DOMICIDE

Apart from being labelled as an entry into the political domain of home, the theory of *domicide* has also been critiqued by Mel Nowicki for misconceptions regarding the relevance of “micro-politics” and gender roles inscribed in them (2014: 787, 788, 793). This shortcoming can also be understood as an outcome of a narrow conception built up by unquestioned private-public dichotomy (Nowicki 2014: 787), whose well-known assessment was inspired by feminism (Baxter–Brickell 2014: 136; Nowicki 2014: 787). Other important criticisms questioned *domicide*’s inherent notion of victimhood. From this aspect, authors negatively judged the overemphasis given to home loss (Harker 2009) and the terms by which victims are classified (Zhang 2018), while some defined the concept as inflexible for analysis of social interactions (Nowicki 2014). Most of them were interested in including a broader range of experiences, and the ideologies structuring them, under the umbrella of the term. They also tended to eschew victimization that echoes Richard Baxter and Katherine Brickell’s observation regarding the “apocalyptic tone” of the concept (2014: 134).

Another problem in this regard is the numerical scope of victims, which is usually represented through the UNHCR statistics of forcibly displaced people (Porteous–Smith 2001: 16; Atkinson 2012: 416). Due to the primary authors’ determination to take into account only the literal loss of physical homes, and therefore mostly focus on the internally displaced persons (IDP), these numbers were seen as an approximate description. Such a frame would now include the current UNHCR’s statistics that reached more than “100 million” forcibly displaced persons at the beginning of 2022,⁵ aside from which new theoretical formulations contribute to greater difficulties in measuring the scope of the *domicide*. In cases where the population is continually exposed to domicidal effects, numerical representation is not reliable. Such cases are best encompassed by the term *accumulated homelessness*, formulated by Milena Belloni and Aurora Massa to describe systematic obstacles in homemaking practices of Eritrean refugees in Europe through the lens of personal life histories of displacement (2020). Giving more complete explanations of the protracted displacement and its understanding beyond policy making, they elaborate on cases of forced migrations “characterized by the repeated loss of home” and on durability of “subjective experience of displacement” (Belloni–Massa 2020: 4).

From the example of the case of the Serbs in Kosovo and Metohija, it can be seen how the *March pogrom* as a violent wave in the year of 2004 affected all Serbs living in the province, some of whom were already displaced. An earlier detected problem was

5 Information is accessible on the site of the organization.

that of making an integrated base of registered persons, since even numbers of those displaced in 1999 were not the same in official records of the Serbian government and other international bodies (Павловић 2021: 89).⁶ One of the interlocutors stated that he was never registered as an IDP after the *March pogrom*, despite losing his home, due to having been received and taken care of by his extended family. Additionally, during March happenings those displaced elsewhere in Serbia lost their parental homes. For example, this was the case of another interlocutor who had recently gained the right to return to the province after having previously been displaced into central Serbia, while her parents stayed in Kosovo and Metohija and endured *domicidal* actions in 2004. She described such circumstances in the following statement:

“It’s hard for me, even today, even though I work here [in the province]. My house was set on fire. I have not told you that. [...] My parents continued to live here [in the province, after 1999]. In [name of the place], on the seventeenth of March at half past seven, the first bomb was thrown, at night. For twenty-two hours, my parents were the target of an attack. Eighty-six Molotov cocktails were thrown at the house. The police report said so. Fortunately, they had enough water, since water often disappeared during that period, here in [name of the place], they had large supplies of water. They filled all the possible vessels they had, they filled them with water, in order to have as a supply, not in order to put out the fire” (16.03.2022.).

The approximate number of displaced Serbs and non-Albanians in the March pogrom reached 4.000, while 420 houses, institutions and other objects were counted as targets of destruction (Ђокић 2015: 450–51). The devastation of the orthodox Serbian material heritage affected the whole population, since such historic monuments play an important role in preserving a perception of continuity. Bojan Ђокић pointed out that thirty-five monuments and churches were destroyed in these attacks (Ђокић 2015: 451). Therefore, it is obvious that even clearly historically and geographically bounded cases of *domicide* require a combination of qualitative and quantitative assessment.

Furthermore, as stated by Rowland Atkinson, the primary definition of *victim-proponent* is clearly inadequate when approached from the aspect of describing the “intentionality” of destructive actions (2012: 417–18). For example, John Douglas Porteous and Sandra Eileen Smith’s representation of the perpetrators in the case of the fall of Yugoslavia puts primary blame on the Serbian intellectuals for authoring the so-called *Memorandum* of the Serbian Academy of Sciences published with the aim of describing the degradation of the Republic of Serbia through the federal arrangements. Broader aspects of conflict are left out from such an explanation.⁷ Named authors also mention the case of Kosovo and Metohija, but only to account for the displacement of the Albanian

6 Most of the given estimates regarding the aftermath of the NATO intervention range around 200.000 of internally displaced Serbs and non-Albanians.

7 The overemphasis given to the above-mentioned document is neatly shown by Vladimir Ribić (2007), who analysed criticisms of the *Memorandum* that was drafted by members of the Serbian Academy of Sciences in 1986. Ribić described how confederalisation affected the economic stagnation of Serbia and degraded the governmental capacity of the Republic. On the other hand, as it is seen through his polemic, different opinions are also persistent (Ribić 2007).

population during NATO bombing caused by fear and the violence of Serbian police and the Yugoslav Army (Porteous–Smith 2001: 96). It could be argued that due to such references to the fall of Yugoslavia in various texts, the term *domicide* itself, according to Atkinson (2012), became related to Balkan conflicts.⁸ Gearoid O’ Tuathail and Carl Dahlman’s study of *domicide* in Bosnia and Herzegovina (O’Tuathail–Dahlman 2006), that was later cited by many authors, can also be interpreted as a basis for this constata-tion (Harker 2009; Nowicki 2014: 189–90; 2017, 126). Moreover, frequent mentions of the situation regarding Bosnia and Hercegovina remained present even in the latest studies (Basso–Ciaschi et al. 2020: 3; Azzouz 2023: 7, 83, 130).

It can also be noted that it is exactly this victimization scheme that required idealization of home in the primary analytical frame. An emotional basis was used to illustrate human rights violation where home became personified through the phrase “murder of the home” (Porteous–Smith 2001: 3). In this way, the term became more applicable for advocating the rights of vulnerable groups than for contextual explanations of their position. This is best exemplified by the authors statement that: “If home means security, it is all the more devastating when home is invaded or destroyed” (Porteous–Smith 2001: 54). Additionally, the observed victimization is strongly built around the etymological root of the word *domicide*, whose meaning is defined through comparison with concepts of: *genocide*, *ecocide* and *terricide* (Porteous–Smith 2001: 12, 14, 15, 20, 65, 69). While it was considered as a minor issue compared to such phenomena, both *genocide* and *ecocide* were defined as its broader operational frameworks (Porteous–Smith 2001: 15, 20). Additionally, *memoricide* was described as a process implicated by it on the level of heritage devastation (Porteous–Smith 2001: ix, 4, 14, 65, 79, 97, 190, 197, 198, 223).

In order to avoid the above-mentioned shortcomings, some theoretical advancements were followed by reference to the concept of “home *unmaking*” as one that is not exclusively tied to the negative consequences of hardships in the housing sector (Baxter–Brickell 2014: 135, 141). Therefore, through such connotation home dispossession and its overcoming was interpreted as involving both negative and positive experiences (Nowicki 2014: 785–89; Basso–Ciaschi et al. 2020: 2). Regarding the described problems, it is clear that the primary framework of the word *domicide* prevented its application in the domain of anthropology, since it lacked explanatory force. Conversely, the span of *domicide*’s application has changed due to newly added layers of meaning.

THE TYPOLOGY OF DOMICIDE

Another contribution to the theoretical frame included accentuation of *domicide*’s processual character and new classifications that it provided. The original typology differentiated between “deliberate” actions of *extreme* and *everyday domicile*, the first usually being related to wartime happenings, large scale relocations and colonial

8 This statement by Roland Atkinson is given in his abstract of the chapter on *domicide* published in the *International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home*. Cited abstract is accessible online, but not in the *Encyclopedia* itself.

ideology, and the second mostly to urbanization plans (Porteous–Smith 2001: 64–150). Through questioning the formulation of “intention” itself, Rowland Atkinson recognized the need for revising existing typology (2012: 417). Likewise, some authors tend to name new subcategories, to reconceptualise existing ones, or to provide the material for their reformulation. Thus, Mel Nowicki developed the notion of *socio-symbolic domicile* (2023), which refers to the deepening of the marginalization of deprived citizens who live on economic margins through housing policies. Additionally, the notion of *cumulative domicile* was formulated to account for the processual nature of domicidal action (Basso–Ciaschi et al. 2020), and the term “post-domicide condition” was introduced to cover broader effects of home dispossessions (Ó Tuathail–Dahlman 2006: 257).

Thus, architect Ammar Azzouz wrote about Syria as an “in-between” phenomenon on the edge of classified cases (Azzouz 2023). His description neatly fits in into the formulation of *cumulative domicile* (CD) given by Andrew Basso, Patrick Ciaschi and Bree Akesson (2020). This category was developed through analysis of relocations of an indigenous people the Sayisi Dene by the Canadian government. These relocations were not in line with indigenous social organization, economy and way of life in general, and even though the later return of the Sayisi Dene to their habitual location was followed by compensation and an apology, the destruction of their community through previous exposure to continual colonial politics is still considered as invasive (Basso–Ciaschi et al. 2020: 12). *Cumulative domicile* was, therefore, formulated in opposition to the notion of an “event”, and denoted the processual implementation of segregational policies on the spatial and social plane. Additionally, it was defined as involving “direct” or “indirect violence”, the former being staged through literal destruction of dwellings or various physical attacks, and the latter as based on restrictions and discrimination (Basso–Ciaschi et al. 2020: 1–3).

Occasionally Rob Nixon’s concept of *slow violence* was also applied in explaining *domicide* (Basso–Ciaschi et al. 2020: 5; Azzouz 2023: 29). This association further accentuated the unfolding character of the analysed phenomena, widening the scope of research subjects that can be perceived as related. Therefore, emphasis is given to issues of escalating social inequalities in the housing sector, even though the concept of *slow violence* was previously concerned with long term environmental degradation. Given that *slow violence* itself indicates the significance of the tempo of social transformations and strives to configure a frame for “*apprehension*” of the “forms of violence that are imperceptible” due to their delayed outcomes, connection with it broadens *domicide’s* capacity to track social dynamics and policies implicated in the regulation of housing problems (Nixon 2013: 10, 14, 17).⁹

It is exactly through persistent “indirect violence” that *cumulative domicile* structures everyday activities in conflict driven societies, further confirming Christopher Harker’s observation on how the “intimate” becomes highly political (Harker 2009: 329). Many constraints of this sort have long been present in areas in Kosovo and Metohija populated by Serbs and are met by organized and individual counteractions.

9 Italics quoted from the original source.

However, recent events in the northern part of the province have led to an atmosphere of great disappointment among Serbs towards their government.¹⁰ An important part of this type of political ordering is the normalization of conflict tensions. Accordingly, such occurrences in the context of everyday life in the province are described as situations to which its inhabitants have become accustomed and are commonly expressed through the verb “oguglati” whose meaning denotes the negative state of becoming indifferent to something.

Mel Nowicki concluded that contemporary studies brought insights into organized resistance in life-endangering situations where extreme devastation of dwelling conditions is contested through home centered activities (2014: 786–87). The strength of such an approach lies in understanding how the gaps caused by destruction are met through resilience and the attribution of meaning to the suffering and loss (Azzouz 2023: 22, 27). In this domain, Ammar Azzouz specifically reflects on the role of art in expressing and formulating cultural memory (2023: 84–85, 86–95, 134). Such cases indicate how *domicide* is never complete and conclusions arising from research into them are in line with anthropological observations by Samanani Farhan and Johannes Lenhard that the home can be central to the organization of activities even in the case of its physical loss (2019: 13). However, this is not to say that psychological disturbances due to domestic or any other type of violence cannot seriously impede this process, as shown by Catherine Robinson (2005).

Through commonalities of *everyday* and *extreme domicide* Azzouz built up a possible category of *domicide* in motion, showing how transformation of everyday life, particularly in Syria, is neglected due to the greater focus on physical destruction (Azzouz 2023: 11,80). Harker drew a similar conclusion in his description regarding the effect of the extensive focus on destruction in context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and its insensitivity to the everyday life and resistance of Palestinian families (Harker 2009; Nowicki 2014: 786, 799, 792). This methodological shortcoming did not appear in the domain of studies on internally displaced persons from Kosovo and Metohija, that fully covered the questions indicated as important by Harker, such as the role of the intangible cultural heritage in displacement and everyday life in post-war conditions. Sanja Zlatanović researched all these aspects in the southeast region of the Kosovo basin (Златановић 2018; Zlatanović 2012).¹¹ The event of the March pogrom, however, was analysed from the point of view of material heritage destruction due to the systematic devastation of Serbian orthodox properties (ed. Jokić 2004; Ђокић 2015; Антонијевић 2014).

It is exactly through such observations of the transformations affecting everyday rhythms and interaction that the framework of *domicide*, as presented by Ammar

10 Here it is referred to as the disappointment of Serbs in the northern part of the province due to the election boycott in the year of 2023 and the taking over of Serbian municipal institutions by the self-proclaimed government of Kosovo. Detailed explication of everyday life of Serbs in the northern part of Kosovska Mitrovica, prior to this period, is given by Aleksandar Pavlović (Павловић 2021).

11 Position of the IDP's from Kosovo and Metohija was also researched in other disciplines, such as geography (Медојевић 2010), history (Секулић 2003), sociology and psychology (Минић–Станковић et al. 2021).

Azzouz, becomes people centred and more anthropologically tuned (Azzouz 2023: 22). His conclusions demonstrate how the “trauma of domicide” can be considered as a specific type of *cultural trauma*, or its synonym – “collective trauma” mentioned by the author (Azzouz 2023: 96, 136). Even if comprehensive theoretical references to these terms are missing, thereby showing analytical weakness, his constant contemplation of destruction and changes on the social and cultural plane is omnipresent (Azzouz 2023: 11, 12, 17, 25, 68, 95, 96, 127, 136). Mentioned deficiencies lie in the somewhat biological conceptualization of *trauma*, transferred from the original conception of *domicide*, which implies occurrence of *trauma* as a direct consequence of a disruptive event. Jeffrey Alexander named this branch of understanding as the “Enlightenment version of lay trauma theory”, contrary to which he defines *cultural trauma* as a social construct induced by the perception of threatened security by a particular group influencing its direction of identification (Alexander 2004: 3). Despite the different characteristics of trauma, phenomena included by *domicide* and *cultural trauma* significantly overlap. *Cultural trauma* can also be defined by reference to genocide and seen as a concept based on victimization and its overcoming (Alexander 2004: 25–26; Smelser 2004: 36). Additionally, it requires individuals having intellectual and social resources enough to delineate the occurring social changes as threatening (Smelser 2004: 38). Moreover, Alexander notes that the actual event itself is not a precondition for *cultural trauma*, which is primarily related to the domain of representation and imagination (Alexander 2004: 8). Nonetheless, the advanced *cultural trauma* framework can also at some points impose a holistic vision of culture. For example, Nail Smelser presumes that traumatic social rupture affects “culture as a whole” or its “essential ingredients” (Smelser 2004: 38).

On the other hand, if *domicide* were to be defined as a branch of *cultural trauma*, it could be suggested that some of the observed theoretical shortcomings could be altered. Looking at Gearoid O’ Tuathail and Carl Dahlman’s definition of *domicide*, which associates its effects with “social spatial context” in contrast to genocide, which is characterized as identity directed annihilation, it can be seen how a reconstituted frame of *domicide* might contribute to redefining certain aspects of *cultural trauma* (Ó Tuathail–Dahlman 2006: 246). Other arguments also point in this direction. In comparison with most authors who developed the term’s scope through case studies of conflict driven societies, Emil Pull and Ase Richard (Åse Richard) in their research on cost increases for tenants due to renovations in Sweden’s city, Uppsala, demonstrate how the *domicidal* ideology alters the sense of belonging of inhabitants who do not relocate. Upgrading the original concept, these authors singled out “spatial dispossessions” observable on the physical level, and “temporal dispossessions” involving future prospects of the affected population (Pull–Richard 2021: 3). These “temporal dispossessions” of various kinds can also be seen as the structural basis implicated in the formulation of the term *cultural trauma*.

Research on internally displaced persons from Kosovo and Metohija affirms that such “temporal dispossessions” tend to be durable and generationally shared. While younger interlocutors experience them through frequent changes of place of residence due to forced migration and economic issues, or through separation from

parents who continue to work in temporarily relocated institutions in the province even after changing the place of residence and moving the family to other parts of Serbia, older populations, having direct experience of displacement, still cannot define where they belong.¹² Numerical representation of internally displaced interlocutors still living on Kosovo and Metohija, working there, or being involved with organizing humanitarian actions in this region further confirms this statement, despite the fact that the sample taken cannot be treated as representative. In the first group of thirty-eight participants, born between 1945 and 1969, ten of them still live in the province, out of whom three were primarily displaced elsewhere in Serbia and later returned; five work in the territory while their families are based in other parts of Serbia; four are involved in organizing humanitarian actions and projects in the province, out of whom one worked in the province prior to retirement while being apart from her family. Additionally, one more interlocutor worked in the area prior to retirement. In the second group of participants of a same scope, born between 1970 and 1985, fifteen participants live in the territory, ten of whom were primarily displaced elsewhere. Three work in the province while their families have permanent residences elsewhere. It should be noted that three other participants from this group did not have a first-hand experience of displacement and conflict by which their parents were affected, one of whom is professionally dedicated to the region. Out of the last group of interlocutors who had vague or indirect memory of displacement, two still live on the territory, two are connected to it due to their work, one is University related and another through relocation of a parent. All other interlocutors are based elsewhere in Serbia. Therefore, those numbers indicate that “temporal dispossessions” are challenged on a daily basis by different generations through continuation of work and life in the territory. The permanence of these dispossessions, to some extent, also questions the primarily formulated statement that the aftermath of *extreme domicile*, contrary to the outcome of *everyday domicile*, can lead to renewal, because in practice such renewal rarely occurs (Porteous–Smith 2001: 105). Such a state of affairs is best exemplified by the term “post-domicide condition”, as referred to by Gearoid O’ Tuathail and Carl Dahlman in their analysis of the return of the forcedly displaced population from Bosnia and Herzegovina after the Dayton agreement, which followed the lines of ethnic homogenization (2006: 257).

The further question of *domicide*’s scope that can also be associated with a compositional *victim-proponent* scheme concerns the management of natural disasters. This, as already noted, was discussed both in Nowicki’s and Atkinson’s overview, and was mentioned by other authors who considered it as an important future issue (Basso–Ciaschi et al. 2020: 12). The question lies not in identifying the affected population and its organizational capacities, but rather in crisis management. Consequently, a natural disaster itself is not viewed as the primary difficulty, but it is the following response that can be defined as problematic. Thus, Andrew Gorman-Murray, Scott McKinnon and Dale Dominey Howes treated the aftermath of natural disasters as “socially

12 After the NATO bombing of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1999, due to enforced demographic changes, Serbian public institutions in the province were temporarily relocated in areas populated by Serbs.

constructed” phenomena (2014: 239, 240, 243). Their expansion of the term *domicide* is remarkable, not only because it aims to question the heteronormative basis of the original concept of *domicide*, but also because it includes the management of natural disasters (2014: 240). Even though effects of natural disasters were considered earlier, they were not fully integrated in the original scope of *domicide*. Nonetheless, Atkinson argued that cases of *domicide* caused by such events should be treated separately from primarily identified ones (Atkinson 2012: 417).

Aside from the described variances in the character of *domicidal* actions, understanding of *domicidal* effects in disaster management gives further insight into the processual basis of the term once more differentiating it from the notion of a “single event”, as Andrew Basso, Patrick Ciaschi and Bree Akesson argued (2020: 9, 12, 14). In this sense, the same procedural basis, found in cumulative *domicide*, can be identified in each type of *domicide* viewed as continuation of certain ideological force. Since *cumulative domicile* involves the process of deepening marginalization that many authors define as inherent to the concept of *domicide*, it also further illustrates the practices of *othering*, which are evoked in justifying destructive forces (Porteous–Smith 2001: 190, 191). Such advocacy for destructive actions and the figure of the Other, apart from being recognized in the original monograph, have not been further developed by primary authors to describe broader political implications of the discourses of *othering* that are now widely used in the criticism of colonialism (Thomas-Olalde–Velho 2011). Consequently, by following this line of argument, some of the researchers in the field of *domicide* approach it as a frame for analysing discursive constructions implicated in housing policies. Given that, as Bernhard Leistle concluded, “otherness is a key notion of anthropology”, existing groundwork can be reviewed as suitable for research in this discipline (2013: 300).

THE DISCURSIVE CHARRACTER OF DOMICIDE

The figure of the *Other* was ingrained in the concept of *domicide* in such a way as to allow analysis of the established ideological grounds for destructive interventions. In the case of NATO’s bombing of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, for instance, such rhetoric of rationalizing *humanitarian intervention* was heavily criticized. Thereby, Robert M. Hayden concluded that by emphasis on human rights protection, NATO aggression concealed war crimes against civilians that it produced (Hayden 2003: 175–80). Due to their prevalence, as exemplified above, such pretexts for actions of *domicide* were later considered as a central problem in the analysis of media reports and housing policy. Accordingly, the recognized “socio-legal” scope of *domicide* was most comprehensively investigated through consideration of narratives of *othering* (Atkinson 2012: 418).

From this theoretical angle, Christina Dando researched the discourses on the Great Plains in the United States that contributed to the turistification of that region and consequently to a reduction in farmers’ subsidies further causing depopulation of the area. She named such commercially inspired spatial changes as “creative destruction” (2009: 109–11). This type of *domicide* is also noted by Qin Shao who described how narrative on the preservation of cultural sites can become a means of economic

profiteering through replacement of conservation with replicas (2013: Historic preservation).¹³ Furthermore, her study on the reform era in China, indicated that the media contributes to presenting petitioners seeking retribution for destruction of their homes as a population with severe psychological problems, using existing stigma around such problems to further downplay their position (2013: *Going Mental*).

Similarly, Nowicki also elaborates how social policies involving cutbacks in benefits for the low-income population and the criminalization of squatting in residential building in London are related to the idea of homeownership and the stigmatization of those who do not conform to these standards, instead of contributing to the solution of housing problems (2017: 122, 129, 126, 136–39; 2023). By singling out the case of London as a city of vast disparity, Nowicki exemplifies how the regulations concerning “the removal of the spare room subsidy”, which caused tenants to partially lose economic support in cases where they have extra rooms, were not consistent with the fact that the council housing sector lacked smaller accommodation units to which the tenants could relocate (2017: 122, 129). In her terms these policies, functioning primarily as ideological tools, presented low-income residents as “welfare-dependent/undeserving” citizens and squatters as “deviants” consequently maximising social inequalities (Nowicki 2017: 127, 138, 140).

Among analyses on how citizenship affects the regulation of housing and accommodation policies, Travis Van Isacker’s inquiry on alternative shelters for migrants in France stands out as theoretically sound. Verbalizing *domicide* as the “technology of citizenship and migration” leading to a “denial of homebuilding capacities” Van Isacker is displaying how illegal migration from Calais to the UK is regulated both by the French state and the country of desired destination (2019: 7). In such a framework *domicide* is conceptualized in its broadest sense as the term covering the spatial plane of segregationist ideology. However, the entire corpus of studies did not provide an all-encompassing definition of *domicide*, which was rather adjusted in line with the subject of research. One of the rare basic premises that was not questioned relates to its global presence and expansion (Porteous–Smith 2001: 10).

Despite the undefined meaning range of the term that was caused by reconceptualizations of *domicide* given by some of the mentioned authors, outlined theoretical reframings can be considered as essential for the possibility of applying the concept of *domicide* in anthropological fieldwork. Compared to “home unmaking” (Baxter–Brickell 2014), *domicide* is not inherent in all homemaking practices, and should denote negative changes brought about enforced ideology and actions. Analysis of such consequences should enable understanding of home destruction and discriminatory housing politics by escaping generalisations and identity categorisation of the affected population. This objective can be reached through focusing on the spatial and social plane, as proposed by Gearoid O’ Tuathail and Carl Dahlman, and therefore should include research on personal reaction to *domicide*. Such an approach could be in line with Nigel Rapport’s aims of focusing on individuality as a starting point for anthropological understanding and explanation (e.g., Amit–Rapport 2002).

13 Due to the unpagged version of the book chapter names are written instead of page numbers.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Developed through studies that include questions ranging from conflict, war, colonial ideology, economic and urban transformations, to natural disasters, *domicide* became a widely open term able to account for the dynamic social character of home issues. Its compositional notions of victims and proponents have been challenged accordingly; leading to the conclusion that numerical description of *domicide's* global scope can only partially be presented. The primary definitions of *domicide* were based on physical losses, and were later developed to include the influence of ideological forces on everyday life and spatial arrangements. First outlines regarding its evolution were represented in Mel Nowicki and Rowland Atkinson's overviews of the topic whereby connection to anthropological theory and method was made evident (Nowicki 2014; Atkinson 2012). Most notably it is Harker who used an ethnographic approach in his studies on everyday life of Palestinian families living in the conflict zone (Harker 2009). Therefore, by making connections between politics and daily homemaking practices, the groundwork of *domicide* became applicable in the realm of anthropology. Additionally, it was adjusted to anthropological usage by restructuring its framework to include links between the global and local planes (Harker 2009; Azzouz 2023). Analyses of global discourses on the destruction of certain localities and local resistance to it, also stand in line with Ruediger Korff's conclusion regarding the need to develop a research approach that spans "from the local to the global" and allows analysis on "how local contents are globalized" and how certain groups become marginalized (Korff 2003: 2).

Quoted theoretical developments require a change of research objectives from identifying proponents and victims of *domicide* to analysing discourse formation. Unlike the concept of "home *unmaking*", which covers the continuum of positive and negative experiences related to dwelling circumstances (Baxter-Brickell 2014), *domicide* also requires observation of the process of *othering* that necessarily bears negative consequences. If its frame stays coherent with the existing conception of home as value based (Morley 2000: 16), it can also keep some of the primary premises, such as John Douglas Porteous and Sandra Eileen Smith recognition that *domicide* would not exist in cases where economic compensation is sufficient for relocation (Porteous-Smith 2001: 107). Furthermore, if Mary Douglas' perception of home as "gift economy" is adopted, (Douglas 1991: 302), *domicide* needs to include research into political influence on home-making practices, such as in the case of Harker's study on Palestinian families (2009).

Apart from analysis of its compositional notions, most important re-examinations were given through studies of *domicide's* typology. Therefore, terms such as *socio-symbolic domicile*, *cumulative domicile*, "post-domicide condition" (Basso-Ciaschi et al. 2020; Tuathail-Dahlman 2006: 257; Nowicki 2023), and named connections with concepts of "home *unmaking*" and "slow violence" emphasize that *domicide* is an evolving concept (Baxter-Brickell 2014; Nixon 2013). Furthermore, suggested association of *domicide* with *cultural trauma*, implicitly present in Ammar Azzouz (2023) description of the case of Syria, as well as the inclusion of the management of natural disasters in its thematic scope, directed attention to ideological forces and their interpretation as primary reference points in research.

In the case of the Serbian population from Kosovo and Metohija, which has been taken as an example, *domicidal* issues have been identified as indirectly researched in different disciplines. That which theories on *domicide* can contribute to existing studies is a multidisciplinary basis for analysing the formation of cultural memory. On the other hand, research in this domain can give insights into the unfolding character of *domicide* and into far-reaching implications of existing conflict that are generationally transferred. The typical classification of *everyday* and *extreme domicide*, therefore, needs to be redefined in such a way to include bordering cases, as described by Amar Azzouz (2023: 18). This further development of typology could contribute to finding common features among domicidal actions and their implications that could create a clearer definition of the term itself. From the anthropological standpoint it is important that the term stays focused on the perspective of the affected population, and its meaning can be accepted as oscillating between physical loss of destroyed homes and housing politics that affect a vulnerable population. In that line it can be beneficial to think about differentiating between domicidal policies that are based on ideological grounds and cases of invasive *domicide*, that can involve all types of direct violence and unregulated home dispossessions, and therefore reformulate the original typology.

SOURCES

UNHCR: UNHCR. "More than 100 million people are forcibly displaced" < <https://www.unhcr.org/refugee-statistics/insights/explainers/100-million-forcibly-displaced.html#:~:text=As%20a%20result%20of%20these,the%20first%20time%20on%20record>>. [31. 08. 2023.].

LITERATURE

- Ahmed 1999: Sara Ahmed. "Home and Away: Narratives of Migration and Estrangement." *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, II, 3, 329–347.
- Alexander 2004: Jeffrey Alexander. "Toward a Theory of Cultural Trauma." *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*. Collection of papers. Eds. Jeffrey Alexander, Ron Eyerman, Bernard Giesen, Neil J. Smelser, Piotr Sztompka. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1–30.
- Amit–Rapport 2002: Vered Amit–Nigel Rapport. *The Trouble with Community: Anthropological Reflections on Movement, Identity and Collectivity*. London: Pluto Press.
- Antonijević 2009: Dragana Antonijević. „Okviri proučavanja ličnih i porodičnih priča o materijalnom gubitku i porazu“. *Етноантрополошки проблеми*, IV, 1, 13–35.
- Антонијевић 2014: Ненад Антонијевић. „Мартовски погром - албански терор над српским становништвом на Косову и Метохији (17-19. март 2004)“. *Годишњак музеја жрјивава јеноцида*, 6, 211–218.
- Atkinson 2012: Rowland Atkinson. "Domicide." *International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home*. Ed. Susan J. Smith. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 415–418.
- Azzouz 2023: Ammar Azzouz. *Domicide: Architecture, War and the Destruction of Home in Syria*. London: Bloomsbury Visual.
- Basso–Ciaschi et al. 2020: Andrew R. Basso–Patrick Ciaschi–Bree Akesson. "Cumulative domicide: The Sayisi Dene and destruction of home in mid-twentieth century Canada." *Current Sociology*, LXVIII, 5, 651–68.
- Baxter–Brickell 2014: Richard Baxter–Katherine Brickell. "For Home *Un*Making." *Home Cultures*, XI, 2, 133–43.

- Belloni–Massa 2020: Milena Belloni–Aurora Massa. “Accumulated Homelessness: Analysing Protracted Displacement along Eritreans Life Histories.” *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 00, 0: 1–19.
- Blunt–Dowling 2006: Alison Blunt–Robyn M. Dowling. *Home*. London: Routledge.
- Chambers 2020: Deborah Chambers. *Cultural Ideals of Home: The Social Dynamics of Domestic Space. Directions in Cultural History*. Abingdon, Oxon, New York: Routledge.
- Cook–Laidlaw et al. 2009: Joanna Cook–James Laidlaw–Jonathan Mair. “What if There is No Elephant? Towards a Conception of an Un-Sited Field.” Collection of papers. *Multi-Sited Ethnography: Theory, Praxis and Locality in Contemporary Research*. Ed. Mark-Anthony Falzon. London: Ashgate, 47–72.
- Dando 2009: Christina E. Dando. “Deathscapes, Topocide, Domicide: The Plains in Contemporary Print Media.” *Great Plains Quarterly*, XXIX, 2, 95–119.
- Douglas 1991: Mary Douglas. “The Idea of a Home: A Kind of Space.” *Social Research*, LVIII, 1, 287–307.
- Faist 2012: Thomas Faist. “Toward a Transnational Methodology: Methods to Address Methodological Nationalism, Essentialism, and Positionality.” *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales*, XXVIII, 1, 51–70.
- Golubović 2007: Zagorka Golubović. *Ličnost, društvo i kultura*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Gorman-Murray–McKinnon 2014: Andrew Gorman-Murray–Scott McKinnon–Dale Dominey-Howes. “Queer Domicide: LGBT Displacement and Home Loss in Natural Disaster Impact, Response, and Recovery.” *Home Cultures*, XI, 2, 237–261.
- Harker 2009: Christopher Harker. “Spacing Palestine through the home.” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, XXIV, 3, 320–332.
- Hayden 2003: Robert M. Hayden. *Blueprints for a House Divided: The Constitutional Logic of the Yugoslav Conflicts*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Jokić 2004: Branko V. Jokić (ed.). *March Pogrom in Kosovo and Metohija: March 17-19, 2004: with a survey of destroyed and endangered Christian cultural heritage; Мартовски њором на Косову и Метохији: 17-19. март 2004. године: с крајњим њрељедом унишћеној и ујроженој хришћанској културној наслеђа*. Belgrade: Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Serbia; Museum in Prishtina (temporarily displaced).
- Ђокић 2015: Бојан Ђокић. “Страдање Српске православне цркве 1999–2015. године: Духовно-културни геноцид на Косову и Метохији”. *Црквене Сјудује, Ниш*, XII, 445–56.
- Karjalainen 1993: Pauli Tarani Karjalainen. “House, home and the place of dwelling.” *Scandinavian Housing and Planning Research*, X, 2, 65–74.
- Korff 2003: Ruediger Kroff. “Local Enclosures of Globalization. The Power of Locality.” *Dialectical Anthropology*, XXVII, 1, 1–10.
- Leistle 2015: Bernhard Leistle. “Otherness as a paradigm in anthropology.” *Semiotica*, 204, 291–313.
- Lems 2018: Annika Lems. *Being-Here: Placemaking in a World of Movement*. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Lucas–Purkayasth 2007: Susan Lucas–Bandana Purkayastha. “‘Where Is Home?’ Here and there: transnational experiences of home among Canadian migrants in the United States.” *Geo-Journal*, 68, 243–251.
- Marcus 1995: George Marcus. “Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography.” *Annual Review of Anthropology*, XXIV, 95–117.
- McAdam-Otto–Nimführ 2021: Laura McAdam-Otto–Sarah Nimführ. “Being There While Not Being There: Reflections on Multi-Sited Ethnography and Field Access in the Context of Forced Migration.” *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*, 30, 41–61.
- Медојевић 2010: Јово Медојевић. „Процес и механизми повратка интерно расељених лица и избјеглица на Косову и Метохију.“ *Косово и Метохија у цивилизацијским њоковима*. Зборник радова. Ур. Урош Шуваковић. Косовска Митровица: Филозофски факултет Универзитета у Приштини.

- Минић–Станковић et al. 2021: Јелена Љ. Минић–Бобан А. Станковић–Миљана Павићевић. *Породице у издељеништву и расејању : 20-ак година касније*. Косовска Митровица: Филозофски факултет Универзитета у Приштини.
- Morley 2000: David Morley. *Home Territories: Media, Mobility and Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Nixon 2013: Rob Nixon. *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nowicki 2014: Mel Nowicki. "Rethinking Domicide: Towards an Expanded Critical Geography of Home." *Geography Compass*, VIII, 11, 785–795.
- Nowicki 2017: Mel Nowicki. "Domicide and the Coalition: Austerity, Citizenship and Moralities of Forced Eviction in Inner London". *Geographies of Forced Eviction: Dispossession, Violence, Resistance*. Collection of papers. Eds. Katherine Brickell, Melissa Fernández Arrigoitia, Alexander Vasudevan. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 121–143.
- Nowicki 2023: Mel Nowicki. *Bringing Home the Housing Crisis: Politics, Precarity and Domicide in Austerity London*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Ó Tuathail–Dahlman 2006: Gearóid Ó Tuathail–Carl Dahlman. "Post-Domicide Bosnia and Herzegovina: Homes, Homelands and One Million Returns." *International Peacekeeping*, XIII, 2, 242–260.
- Palmberger 2016: Monika Palmberger. *How Generations Remember: Conflicting Histories and Shared Memories in Post-War Bosnia and Herzegovina*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Павловић 2021: Александар Павловић. *Свакодневица Срба у северној Косовској Митровици*. Лепосавић: Институт за српску културу Приштина.
- Petridou 2001: Elia Petridou. "The Taste of Home." *Home Possessions*. Collection of papers. Ed. Daniel Miller. Oxford, New York: Berg, 87–104.
- Pink 2004: Sarah Pink. *Home Truths: Gender, Domestic Objects and Everyday Life*. Oxford, New York: Berg.
- Porteous–Smith 2001: John Douglas Porteous–Sandra Eileen Smith. *Domicide: The Global Destruction of Home*. Montreal, Quebec: McGill-Queen's Press - MQUP.
- Pull–Richard 2021: Emil Pull–Åse Richard. 2021. "Domicide: displacement and dispossessions in Uppsala, Sweden." *Social & Cultural Geography*, XXII, 4, 545–64.
- Ribić 2007: Vladimir Ribić. „Srpski nacionalizam na kraju dvadesetog veka.“ Zbornik radova. *Antropologija savremenosti*. Ur. Saša Nedeljković. Beograd: Srpski genealoški centar – Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu, 150–171.
- Robinson 2005: Catherine Robinson. "Grieving home". *Social & Cultural Geography*, VI, 1, 47–60.
- Samanani–Lenhard 2019: Farhan Samanani–Johannes Lenhard. "House and Home." *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. Eds. Felix Stein, Sian Lazar, Matei Candea, Hildegard Diemberger, Joel Robbins, Andrew Sanchez, Rupert Stasch. <https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_3240200/component/file_3240201/content>. [07. 09. 2023.].
- Seamon–Mugerauer 1985: David Seamon–Robert Mugerauer. *Dwelling, Place, and Environment: Towards a Phenomenology of Person and World*. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Секулић 2003: Весна Секулић. „Избегла и расељена лица у колективним центрима на северном Косову“. *Башићина*, 15, 137–50.
- Shao 2013: Qin Shao. *Shanghai Gone: Domicide and Defiance in a Chinese Megacity*. Plymouth: Rowans & Littlefield.
- Smelser 2004: Neil J. Smelser. "Psychological Trauma and Cultural Trauma." *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*. Collection of papers. Eds. Jeffrey Alexander, Ron Eyerma, Bernhard Giesen, Neil J. Smelser, Piotr Sztompka. Berkeley: University of California Press, 31–59.
- Thomas–Olalde–Velho 2011: Oscar Thomas–Olalde–Astride Velho. "Othering and Its Effects - Exploring the Concept." *Writing Postcolonial Histories of Intercultural Education*. Collection of papers. Eds. Heike Niedrig, Christian Ydesen. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 27–50.
- Van Duijn 2020: Sarah Van Duijn. "Everywhere and nowhere at once: The challenges of following in multi-sited ethnography." *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*, IX, 3, 281–294.

- Van Isacker 2019: Travis Van Isacker. "Bordering through domicide: spatializing citizenship in Calais." *Citizenship Studies*, XXIII, 6, 608–26.
- Wimmer–Glick Schiller 2003: Andreas Wimmer–Nina Glick Schiller. "Methodological Nationalism, the Social Sciences, and the Study of Migration: An Essay in Historical Epistemology." *The International Migration Review*, XXXVII, 3, 576–610.
- Yi-Neumann 2022: Friedemann Yi-Neumann. "Foodways." *Moving Things*. Eds. Research Project 'On the Materiality of Forced Migration'. Göttingen: Wallstein, 37–61.
- Zhang 2018: Yunpeng Zhang. "Domicide, social suffering and symbolic violence in contemporary Shanghai, China." *Urban Geography*, XXXIX, 2, 190–213.
- Zlatanović 2012: Sanja Zlatanović. „Svadba, tradicionalni ženski kostim i identitetski diskursi srpske zajednice jugoistočnog Kosova". *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU*, LX, 2, 89–105.
- Златановић 2018: Сања Златановић. *Етничка идентификација на њослерайном подручју: српска заједница југоисточной Косова*. Београд: Етнографски институт САНУ.

Невена С. ПЕТКОВИЋ

АНТРОПОЛОШКИ ПРИСТУП ПИТАЊУ ДОМИЦИДА

РЕЗИМЕ

Рад представља теоријски осврт на истраживања о *домициду*, концепту који је формулисан у склопу географских анализа социјално-политичких препрека у становању и изградњи дома. Изворно значење наведеног термина односило се на планску деструкцију простора обитавања, чија је имплементација заговарана употребом оправдавајуће агенде. Реконфигурацијом основних поставки, појам се приближио антрополошком методолошком апарату. У складу са наведеним, повезивањем новонасталих дефиниција и њихових проширења, тежи се разматрању могућности примене издвојеног концепта у домену антропологије. Представљена теоријска аргументација делимично је употпуњена увидима насталим у оквиру истраживања о интерно расељеним лицима са Косова и Метохије.

Сходно сазнањима о процесуалном карактеру појава обухваћених представљеним истраживањима, промишљају се и измене оригиналне типологије, која укључује *свакодневни* и *екстремни домицид*. Накнадно разрађена категорија *кумулятивног домицида* доводи се у везу са теоријом *културне трауме* и проматра се као њена подврста. Истовремено, спрема резултата досадашњих студија, идеолошки регулисана санација природних катастрофа узима се у обзир као засебан вид *домицида*. Испитивани појам се на тај начин уводи као оквир за дискурзивну анализу опредмећивања социјалне стратификације на спацијалном плану.

Потенцијални допринос увођења термина у област антропологије представљен је кроз могућност усвајања скаларног концепта који препознаје инхерентну повезаност глобалних и локалних феномена, најпре у контексту анализе доминантних наратива о тоталном разарању појединих подручја или локација, и свакодневнице унутар које се њихови ефекти оспоравају. Са друге стране, управо антрополошка истраживања издвојених феномена могу пружити потпунију дескрипцију опсега друштвених реакција на *домицид*.

Кључне речи: домицид, кумулативни домицид, дом, интерно расељена лица, културна траума, отпор.