

THE *MISKIN* AND THE BIG-MAN: SURVIVING AS A REFUGEE IN MALTA

MARCIA YOUNG

Malta passed the Refugees Act in July 2000. Refugees and aid agencies alike had long awaited this law in the hope that it would enable refugees in this country to take more responsibility for their own lives. This paper will make an ethnographic investigation of the situation prevailing in Malta prior to the enactment of this law, discussing some of the issues it was meant to address. We will examine the categories and assumptions of the institutional framework that lay behind the distribution of charity to refugees. The paper will outline the paths and strategies that made particular resources available to refugees. Without legal structures to guarantee refugees their livelihood, they were pushed into relations more akin to traditional networks of patronage. The Government's decision to permit refugees access to particular resources, such as work, has important implications for the ability of refugees to engage with Maltese society as complete social beings.

Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realisation, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organisation and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Article 22, Universal Declaration of Human Rights

1. Introduction

In international law 'Refugee' refers exclusively to 'a status accorded to an individual who has crossed an international border and been granted the right to asylum on the grounds of persecution and the loss of protection of his or her state' (Harrell-Bond & Voutira 1996a: 1076). It is the nation-state that is the presumed

guarantor of their citizens' rights. Refugees are a product of the failure of this assumption. Certain groups of people do not have the protection of their own state. UNHCR figures for the end of 1999 estimated 11,675,660 people as refugees around the world.¹ Just as worrying is the fact that in the present day asylum seekers are finding it increasingly difficult to find protection elsewhere. Lanphier describes the beginning of the new millennium as marked by large numbers of people on the move with no place to go (1997: 118).

Malta's location in the Mediterranean makes it physically an ideal stepping stone between parts of the Southern and Eastern coasts of the Mediterranean and the coasts of Italy, to the North. A significant proportion of asylum seekers in Malta arrive through illegal channels to our islands. Others outstay their visas. UNHCR figures for the end of 1999 showed the number of refugees in Malta to be 270.² The Government of Malta admits all refugee applications, however, it does not permit resettlement in Malta. Despite this criterion, refugees' sojourn in Malta often stretches to several years before they are resettled.

Till July, 2000, there was no Refugee Law in Malta. Before the implementation of this law, refugees were permitted free education and medicine, refugees were not permitted to work. As a result they had to rely on aid from humanitarian agencies. Often this aid took the shape of helping the refugees to find work so that they could become self-sufficient. This paper will look at the reasons why this policy failed. Rather than becoming self-sufficient, refugees became increasingly dependent on what they could attain from the main aid agency on the island, the Emigrants' Commission. It has been shown in studies of other refugee and aid worker relationships, especially within camps, that 'the one fundamental problem: the reason why it is so difficult to assist refugees, is that they are not recognized as having any responsibility for their affairs at the beginning – and this affects the whole subsequent programme...' (Appe 1984, cited in Harrell-Bond 1986: 300). Categorising persons as refugees involves aid workers establishing what they should do

¹ Source: <http://www.unhcr.ch/pubs/rm101/10101.htm>

² Source: <http://www.unhcr.ch/refworld/refbib/refstat>

for them (Zetter 1991). Below, we will consider how refugees in Malta could rarely get by without some form of help from aid agencies. By observing how aid was distributed, we can deduce the 'networks of power' (Harrell-Bond and Voutira 1996b: 211) by which aid workers could make decisions over the refugees' lives.

It is important not to erase the refugees as actors in this process. Refugees became aware on what basis aid would be distributed to them. Thereby, they could develop strategies so as to fit the expectations of aid agencies so that they would be given provisions. It is central to developing theory on refugee behaviour that the 'refugees are present but are neither glorified nor explained away' (Harrell-Bond and Voutira: 1996b: 209). The conclusions that will be drawn here will be based on observations drawn from anthropological fieldwork carried out by the present writer between January and May 1999, amongst male refugees hosted in a Home in Malta.

The objective of this critique is to establish the scenario that the new Refugee Law is being introduced to. By recognising and addressing the weaknesses of the previous system, the Refugee Law may be implemented in a more effective way, thus granting refugees their rights as individuals.

2. The situation in Malta before the Refugee Law, July 2000

Malta signed the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees in 1971. Malta limited its official commitments to refugees coming from Europe. However, Malta has not abided by its self-imposed criteria and has given asylum to any eligible applicant from any nation. It also made a number of reservations 'in the light of Malta's own special problems and its peculiar circumstances and characteristics' (Buttigieg 1997; 67) which mainly referred to Malta's size, its high population density, and its 'very limited resources' (Buttigieg 1997; 77). The two reservations made in 1971 were that:

- (i) Refugees were not allowed to settle permanently. Therefore, Malta could only serve as a transit point to a third country of resettlement.
- (ii) Refugees were not permitted to work in Malta.

Malta offered refugees free medical attention and free education, including university education. Other than these, refugees were

entitled to no other social benefits. Finally, refugees in Malta could not be issued with a refugees' passport to enable them to travel.

Although not allowed to remain in Malta, many refugees' sojourn in Malta stretches to several years. Not being given a legal right to work under the previous system, refugees were placed under the responsibility of the Emigrants' Commission.

The Emigrants' Commission was originally set up to help Maltese emigrants abroad. The Maltese Government referred sporadic cases of asylum seekers arriving in Malta from Europe in the seventies and eighties to the Emigrants' Commission. During that time, a rapport developed between the Commission and the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) until, in 1987, the Emigrants' Commission became an Operational Partner for the UNHCR, via UNHCR's Branch Office in Rome (Buttigieg 1997; 67). Between 1992 and 1998, the Commission dealt with over 2,000 refugees, of which 1,500 were resettled, mainly in Australia and Canada. Malta has a relatively high success rate of resettlement for its refugees. This is mainly thanks to *Monsignor Bugeja*, the Director of the Emigrants' Commission. Mgr Bugeja has drawn on contacts from over forty years experience of dealing with authorities abroad in caring for the well being of Maltese emigrants.³

Without any legislation catering for refugees' subsistence in Malta, Mgr Bugeja decided to commit himself and the organisation he heads to ensuring that refugees got by on the island. From the Commission's Offices refugees with no means to support themselves received funds and goods. Families and individuals were provided with free accommodation, or paid a nominal rent. In 1995, the Emigrants' Commission was providing shelter to 185 persons in church homes and private accommodation (Calleja 1995). UNHCR funds to mandate refugees were distributed through the Commission too, beginning at LM90⁴/month for the first six months, then reduced to half the sum, and for the following year to a quarter of the original sum, until stopped completely. After this,

³ Until the 1960s large numbers of Maltese migrated in order to find work many of whom went to Australia and Canada.

⁴ LM1 is equivalent to \$2.50.

refugees with no other source of income received LM1/day from the Commission as well as accommodation.

Although not permitted to work, the refugees were encouraged to become self-sufficient by the Emigrants' Commission. Employers would get in touch with Mgr Bugeja offering work to the refugees. Much of the employment came from construction and agriculture, where employers were seeking cheap manual labour. Refugees were not protected by the Social Services Act in case of injury, they received no sick pay, they were not paid during shut down or on weekends, and were not entitled to bonuses and other allowances (Calleja 1995). This situation put refugees in a very vulnerable position. Most of the refugees I met had experienced not getting paid for their work by one employer or other. In all cases where this happened, the refugee had found the work on his own, not through the Commission. Refugees could go to Mgr Bugeja in such cases, and occasionally he would be able to sort something out with the employer.

Even work could not grant refugees total independence. Without a Law to protect them they were liable to exploitation and abuse, and their only source of support in such cases was the Emigrants' Commission. All major decisions in the refugees' lives seized to be in their hands. Work, their whereabouts, and ultimately whether and where and when they would be resettled, became subject for others to decide.

The following case study of one of the Homes provided by the Emigrants' Commission will illustrate how decisions were taken for the refugees, and how refugees' needs became institutionalised. Following Mauss (1990), we examine the relationships tied to the procedures by which refugees received charity and the systems of control made applicable through the manner in which charity was distributed.

3. Case-study: St James' Home⁵

I carried out research at St James' Home between January-May 1999. St James' Home hosted only male refugees, mostly under

⁵ All names used in this text are fictitious so as to protect the identities of the people concerned.

thirty years old. There were normally around 25 refugees there at a time. All refugees had to have written permission from Mgr Bugeja to live at the Home. St James' is an old building and most of the refugees shared rooms because of the lack of space. It was expected to be a temporary refuge, until the refugee could get a job and rent his own accommodation. However, as can be seen from Appendix 1, a good number of refugees who arrived there remained for over a year. Most of those who left while I was carrying out my research did so because they were resettled in, or escaped to, another country. Only two managed to pull together enough resources to be able to afford to pay rent for their own flat. Refugees at St James' were mainly in and out of different labour jobs so money was always sparse. At least 2 refugees had not worked in the previous 3 months. For basic necessities they came to rely on what they received from the Home and from the Emigrants' Commission.

Sister Rose, a small lady in her seventies, was responsible for the Home. Sr Rose came from the convent next door several times a day in order to cook for the refugees and distribute various foodstuffs to them. There was a small kitchen at the front of the residence where a number of refugees gathered at different times of the day to ask the Sister for food or money or to wait for her to feed them. The refugees would also ask her if anyone had phoned to offer work. There was no phone at the residence, so it was through Sr Rose that employers got to the refugees. Often Mgr Bugeja gave employers her phone number at the convent in order to employ refugees.

Sr Rose relied solely on the money, food and clothes donated to the home. She often did not have enough food to go around in terms of tins of tuna, packets of rice and tins of milk, so she cooked at least one meal a day to ensure the refugees who did not cook got one proper meal. Sugar and clothes detergent were divided into small jars and distributed all around. When not in the kitchen, she always kept it locked. Otherwise, the refugees would "take all the food I have stocked. Oh how much they eat! They always want rice and milk, but I have to make sure that I give to everyone!" Thus she had difficulty making ends meet. She often exclaimed how her heart goes out to every one of the refugees at the Home, but she often got angry at them for not taking some responsibility for themselves, and not giving her a hand in taking care of the Home.

Furthermore, she could not trust the refugees to make good use of the goods she gave them. For example, occasionally food was thrown away because one of the refugees had cooked more than he needed. Sr Rose kept a tight hold over the small amounts of money she received in the form of donations. She insisted donors give the money to her, to ensure that all the money reached all those who were in need. Otherwise, she said, the refugees would spend all the money on *kapricci* (trivial luxuries), such as cigarettes and alcohol. It was up to her to ensure that the money would go where it was needed most.

4. How refugees became objects of charity

The charity that went to the refugees at St James' was channelled through the Emigrants' Commission or Sr Rose, who could then see that the charity went to meet the refugees' needs. There were specific purposes that charity was supposed to go towards, such as food, clothing and shelter; while it was clear what charity was not supposed to go towards, such as items classified as *kapricci*. Refugees' needs were specified by those who were distributing the charity, not the refugees themselves.

Carrying out policy agendas involves defining the categories one is dealing with so as to meet specific objectives (Zetter 1991). As soon as individuals come under care and are labelled refugees, specific sets of assumptions are built around them. Labelling is a process 'by which policy agendas are established and more particularly the way in which people, conceived as objects of policy are defined in convenient images' (Wood 1985, cited in Zetter 1991, 44). In Malta, the aid agencies saw themselves as reacting to a refugee situation where refugees were not permitted to work, and when they did, work did not offer them any long-term financial security. Thus the institutional objective was to provide aid in the form of charity. In the process, the refugee was constructed and presented to the public as *miskin* (this Maltese adjective is broadly translatable as 'poor and pitiable').

Mauss remarked that 'charity is wounding for him who accepted it' (Mauss 1990: 65). This is because charity goes against the spirit of the gift, since it does nothing to create or solidify human relationships. Gifts are not just about receiving, but also about reciprocating, in the process signifying the relationship between the

persons involved whether between parent and child, husband and wife or between friends. No such relationship could be created between the anonymous donors and the refugees. Refugees dealt mainly with the aid agencies. According to some refugees, even wages from work carried out by the refugees would occasionally be transmitted through the Commission. This procedure protected refugees from not getting paid, but also protected employers from the authorities for employing illegal workers. This process, however, also denied refugees an identity separate from that of refugee, as the transaction between employer and refugee contained a different set of rights and obligations to that of normal work.

The image of the refugee as *miskin* was prevalent in the national media as well as within the institutional framework which catered for refugees in Malta. There have been several occasions in recent years where Malta has had to cope with a boatload of destitute migrants arriving at its shores. Many of these ask for asylum, although it is often the case that most of them will not have come from a refugee-producing country therefore their claim for refugee status is invalidated. Not all refugees, however, arrive at Malta's shores destitute and in such severe need of emergency assistance.

Refugees come from a variety of backgrounds. At the Home, I came across former mechanics, university students, a cook, a theatre director, electricians and even one who claimed to have had experience in providing aid in refugee camps in his own country. Some had arrived with money and had managed to work illegally for some time with no help from the Emigrants' Commission. However, either because of not getting paid, losing their jobs or similar circumstances, as soon as they hit on hard times they would need help from the Commission.

The category of the poor refugee is not a fixed identity but is a process whereby a person comes to fit that label (see Zetter 1991; Harrell-Bond 1986; Harrell-Bond and Voutira 1996b). Refugees may have arrived in Malta with their own resources, or else as capable young persons, yet in the course of their stay they became the *miskin* who needed the help of Maltese generosity to get by while on the island. Furthermore, the aid provided to refugees could offer no alternative identity to refugees other than that of *miskin*.

5. Refugees behaving badly?

We have explained how by accepting charity one takes on other persons' assumptions of oneself, in this case, that of a poor refugee. However, was this an identity a refugee assumed uncritically? Looking at the aid agencies' assumptions in giving charity is only one side of the equation. In order to answer this question we need to see how refugees put charity, and their other sources of income, to use. This way we can recognise refugees as actors in their life histories.

It was observed that the refugees were often scolded by Sr Rose for spending what income they had, including money from charitable sources, on *kapricci*. Such spending drew disapproval, as it denied the whole ethos of charity where persons who are better off give to the needy. By going out, drinking and socialising, the refugees attempted to keep apace with Maltese people, thus hazarding the boundary between the needy and the average person. Sr Rose would occasionally exclaim, "they are still young", in excuse for their behaviour, which after all was normal to their age group, except for the fact that they were refugees.

The refugees at the Home rarely looked after the little funds they had. At best they would save for a specific object such as a second-hand car or something as simple as a new pair of shoes. Being able to purchase something themselves rather than relying solely on what was given gave the refugees a sense of independence, and they displayed pride in such objects. Charity and work were therefore maximised by successfully converting them into objects which granted the refugees the *appearance* of normal persons. Harrell-Bond and Voutira note that in camps in Africa, from the refugees' standpoint, 'they have legitimate claims as regards the promotion of their interests, which include becoming sufficiently independent so as not to need the camp' (1996b: 216). We have seen that the refugees who came to the Home rarely managed to become totally independent, but they could buy goods to at least appear independent. However, drawing further on Harrell-Bond and Voutira's observations, 'such realisations are seldom articulated because they would threaten the fragile (paternalistic) relationship on which the refugees are forced to depend' (1996: 216b). The refugees at the Home would draw on images of the refugee as *misikin* in order to attract more charity, but they felt little

responsibility towards Mgr Bugeja or Sr Rose on how they put it to use.

6. Resource networks

In the foregoing discussion, it has been observed how survival as a refugee in Malta depended on two networks for the provision of resources. On the one hand, their status as refugees created expectations of certain guarantees and civil rights from the international community, while on the other, their day-to-day existence depended heavily on the charity that reached them through the Church and their identity as *miskin*.

Appadurai (1986) has demonstrated the value of examining the different pathways that resources may follow in order to understand the social relations that are at work. Here it is argued that much of the refugees' frustration may be traced to the ambiguities that arise from the different values and strategies that are at work in these two networks, which shall be examined more closely in turn.

In a liberal democracy, there are civil agencies that distribute civil justice equally among its members. We have already noted how, by definition, a refugee is a person whose civil rights are not being protected by the country of origin. In fact, the refugee's only hope of protection by a civil society depends on being a formally recognized refugee. In Malta, the rights that this entailed were that they would be resettled by the UNHCR, and until resettlement would be able to remain in Malta. The UNHCR provided some financial assistance for a limited period. Meanwhile, refugees were denied the right to work to sustain their livelihoods.

The denial of this right pushed them into a different network from that of the formal procedures which accompany civil rights. They found themselves depending on this alternative network in order to get access to clandestine employment and charity. As noted above, the Emigrants Commission tried to ease their plight by facilitating contact with potential employers. When unable to find clandestine work, they relied on the providence of the Emigrants' Commission in the form of charity. The channels to gaining access to resources for their livelihood were therefore not through legal structures but rather took the form of traditional networks of patronage.

In this scenario, the only person of any authority that the refugees had access to was Mgr Bugeja. In their eyes, he was the

figure that could distribute work or charity to them. So many resources were dependent on him, that it was felt among refugees that one had to ingratiate oneself with him in order to access any sort of resources. Any friction with Mgr Bugeja was blown-up into a personal vengeance from the Monsignor in their minds. Several refugees accused Mgr Bugeja of withholding funds which they received from the UNHCR. They could not understand why the UNHCR stopped funds after a certain amount of time. They often spoke as if all power over their lives was in the Monsignor's hands, even arguing that the ultimate question of their resettlement depended on him.

Against this background, it is particularly significant that one Sudanese refugee described the Monsignor as the "big man" for refugees on the island. This observation succinctly summarised the way that Monsignor was perceived by the refugees at St. James'. The role of the "big man" in many traditional agricultural societies is to further the interests of members of his own group, through skilful negotiation with leaders of other groups (Sahlins 1963). The network which refugees depended found themselves engaging with for their survival was very similar, in that they were often totally dependent on the contacts, skill and experience of the Monsignor to further their interests.

However, having invested all one's hopes in the Monsignor, any failure on his part to achieve anything for anyone of the refugees was taken as a failure in his role as one's provider. Having become the principal provider for refugees on the island, the Monsignor was in the thankless position of also having to bear responsibility for their grievances.

In this section, we have considered two networks through which refugees had access to resources. We have seen how the formal structures of UNHCR recognition and the state failed to guarantee the livelihood and daily bread of the refugee. As a result, refugees came to depend for their survival on a very different network of patronage, which was inseparable from their identity as objects of charity. This ambiguity resulted in their constant frustration. Their expectations as formally recognized refugees with a right to participation in a civil society were met instead by charity and segregation.

The refugees regarded the right to work or resettlement as the only avenue to re-claiming control over their lives. Recognising this

we may better appreciate the wider implication of the new Law on refugees' lives on the island. What remains to be explored is the earlier reluctance to grant refugees the right to work.

7. Admitting refugees into civil society: What cost?

At the time of my research in 1999, the Emigrants' Commission was spending between LM3,000 and LM4,000 every month on refugees, much of which was derived from charity (Young 1999: 17). The situation at St James' Home was not unique. No matter how much refugees received through charity and work few were able to achieve financial independence.

This system gave aid on the presumption that the refugee would need to come back for more sooner or later, rather than establishing the refugee as a fully functioning individual in society. One key to understanding this is by looking at what was given to the refugee, and what was not. The type of goods that were given to the refugees were often durable items like food and clothes; or money that was expected to be spent on these items. They were not expected to go beyond the refugees, who used them up then returned for more.

Charity is derived from donors' surpluses. It gives the giver a good feeling, but does not necessarily improve the quality of life of the recipient. The alternative to charity would have been granting refugees work. Yet work is a resource which the authorities were wary of sharing with refugees, even if it could make them more responsible for themselves, rather than a drain on charity. Here we may draw on Weiner's work showing that 'reciprocity as a principle of exchange is not only "giving while receiving" but a series of disguised strategies of power relations that she describes as "keeping while giving"' (Weiner 1992, cited in Harrell-Bond et al 1996: 211). In the case of Malta's policy with refugees, it was a matter of keeping Malta's resources for Maltese while giving from a surplus which could be absorbed by the refugees without actually sharing in the resources that really are considered to matter, such as a 'good' job.

This process is also evident in the type of work refugees carried out. It was shown above that the type of jobs that normally went to refugees were low-paid, labour-intensive jobs. This time surplus was not in the form of charity but in the form of work most citizens were unwilling to do. Refugees were given work because they were a source of cheap labour.

Finally, we need to question whether the refugees were welcome by the authorities to integrate among the Maltese during their sojourn here. It has been noted that 'there has risen since the seventies a rhetoric of inclusion and exclusion that emphasises the distinctiveness of cultural identity, traditions, and heritage among groups and assumes the closure of culture by territory' (Soysal 1993, cited in Stolke 1995: 2). Thus insiders should stay in, while outsiders stay out. The Government policy among refugees in Malta at the time ensured that even if refugees were in the country, they still could not partake in Maltese society as full social beings. This is the crucial issue that the implementation of the new law will have to address.

8. The Refugees Act, 2000

The Refugees Act was enacted on the 25th July, 2000. The Act regulated procedures for the granting of refugee status, establishing a Refugee Commissioner and a Refugee Appeals Board. It is significant that refugees' rights are clearly stated, in terms of section 11 (1) of the Act:

- a) to remain in Malta, and to be granted personal documents, including a residence permit; and if in custody in virtue only of a deportation or removal order, to be immediately released;
- b) unless he is in custody awaiting judicial proceedings for the commission of a criminal offence, or is serving a term of imprisonment, to be given a Convention Travel Document entitling him to leave and return to Malta without the need of any visa;
- c) to have access to state education and training in Malta and to receive state medical care and services.

Section 11(1) (b) is the most significant addition to refugees' rights in Malta. Rights are at the basis of being able to participate in society as a full social being. It is significant therefore that work is not included as a right of refugees in Malta. Instead, it is left to the discretion of the Minister, in terms of section 19 (1), to make provisions for:

- d) extending, with the concurrence of the Minister responsible for social security, any of the provisions of the Social Security Act to person falling under this Act

- e) regulating, with the concurrence of the Minister responsible for labour, the granting of work permits to recognised refugees

The Government, it would seem, does not want refugees to forget that they are Malta's guests, and that Malta should not become their permanent home.

Since September 2000, an increasing number of refugees have received their work permits. This offers the possibility that refugees may integrate into Maltese society and exercise the right to self-dignity,⁶ which derives from the freedom to make one's own decisions over one's life. It is still too early for us to assess the impact of this Law over the refugees' lives. But in light of what has been discussed above, we may question whether the Law alone will be enough.

We have seen how a culture of dependency was integrated into the refugees' lives on the island. This was heavily due to the absence of any Law protecting their rights at the workplace. However, there were other important factors too. Only certain jobs were often open to most refugees, such as in construction. The main reason they were employed was because they were cheap to hire. This will predictably remain the main reason refugees get employed in such industries even with the Law in effect, although the refugee will now be entitled (at the discretion of the Minister) to protection and benefits other workers receive. Whether other jobs become open to refugees will depend much more on the culture of the country: will refugees be considered appropriate applicants for office jobs, for example?

Even with the permit to work, we cannot assume that refugees will be able to manage on their own all the time. Aid agencies need to be flexible enough to meet the different needs of different refugees (see Harrell-Bond 1986; Harrell-Bond and Voutira 1996) so as to enable refugees to have responsibility over their own lives. This requires a change in the culture of giving aid to refugees in Malta. Need should not be dictated or else we will remain with a system where refugees receive nothing until they become poor

⁶ See the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 22.

refugees in need of food and shelter, or else where they learn how to live up to the preconceptions of need by which they can access aid. Refugees often need a helping hand not a handout.

9. Conclusion

A major source of refugees' frustration on the Island has been their inability to fulfil their potential, whether at a professional or social level. The two are interconnected. Failure to advance at a professional and economic level contributed to preventing the refugees from integrating socially. Ability to participate in social life was often at a superficial level, depending on one's success of accessing funds through work or charity.

The new Refugee Law needs to challenge preconceptions held about refugees in Malta. Being denied any control over their lives meant refugees in practice became dependent on the agencies which attempted to instil a sense of independence in them. The new Law could be a start to enabling refugees to re-acquire responsibility for themselves. Perhaps refugees, in turn, will return more than gratitude to Malta, but contribute to Malta's economic, social and cultural life.

APPENDIX 1

Refugees at St James' Home Jan – May 1999

	Origin of refugees at the Home as at 15/1/99	Whereabouts as at 10/5/99	Time spent at St. James' Home as at 10/5/99
1	Algeria	St James' Home	3 years
2	Algeria	St James' Home	2 years
3	Algeria	St James' Home	1 year
4	Algeria	St James' Home	Unknown
5	Algeria	Moved out. Returned to the Home within a month	1 year
6	Algeria	Moved out. Returned to the Home within a month ⁷	10 months
7	Iraq	St James' Home	14 months
8	Iraq	St James' Home	9 months
9	Iraq	St James' Home	1 year
10	Iraq	St James' Home	Unknown
11	Iraq	St James' Home	Unknown
12	Iraq	Moved to own apartment in February	Unknown
13	Iraq	Moved to own apartment in February ⁸	Unknown
14	Iraq	Moved in with Maltese lady friend in March	18 months
15	Iraq	Escaped ⁹ in February	Unknown
16	Iraq	Escaped in May	6 months
17	Lebanon	St James' Home	2 years
18	Palestinian (from Iraq)	St James' Home	10 months

⁷ 5 & 6 moved out and rented a flat together. They returned after having difficulty paying the rent.

⁸ 12 & 13 moved out together. I never met either of them.

⁹ That is, clandestinely by boat to Sicily.

	Origin	Whereabouts	Time spent at the Home
19	Palestinian	St James' Home	2 years
20	Guinea	St James' Home	9 months
21	Somalia	Resettled in USA ¹⁰ in March	2 years
22	Somalia	St James' Home	4 years
23	Sudan	St James' Home	Unknown
24	Sudan	St James' Home	Unknown
25	Sudan	Moved in with Sudanese friend in April	6 months
26	Sudan	Resettled in USA in March	2 months
27	Sudan	Resettled in USA in March	3 years
28	Sudan	Resettled in USA	2 years
29	Senegal	Escaped	Unknown
30	Angola	Moved out and married	7 months

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to Dr Katrin Camilleri for sharing many insights on this subject, and to Dr David Zammit and Reuben Grima for making many useful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

Bibliography

- Appadurai, A. 1986. "Introduction: Commodities and the politics of value" in Appadurai, A. (ed.) *The Social Life of Things*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buttigieg, C. 1997. "Refugee Rights. A Small Nation's Perspective" in *Mediterranean Social Sciences Review*, 2(1): 67-78.
- Calleja, P. 1995. *The Refuge Situation in Malta*. Unpublished paper.
- Harrell-Bond, B.E. 1986. *Imposing Aid: Emergency Assistance to Refugees*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harrell-Bond, B.E. & Voutira, E. 1996a. 'Refugees' in Levinson, D. & Ember, M. (eds). *Encyclopaedia of Cultural Anthropology*, Vol 3. Henry Holt & Co. New York (1076-1079).

¹⁰ Those marked 'Resettled in USA' were accepted to immigrate there during the INS interviews held between the 15th and the 17th of December 1998.

- 1996b. 'In Search of the Locus of Trust. The Social world of the refugee Camp' in Daniel, E.V. & Knudsen, J.C. Mistrusting Refugees. University of California Press (208-223).
- Lanphier, M. 1997. 'Scapegoats Born of the demise of the Nation-State: The Dilemma of Asylum Seekers' in Mediterranean Social Sciences Review, 2(1):119-132
- Mauss, M. 1990. The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies. trans. Halls, W.D. Routledge.
- Sahlins, M. 1963. "Poor man, big man, rich man, chief: Political types in Melanesia and Polynesia" in Comparative Studies in Society and History, 5:285-303.
- Young, M. 1999. Refugees in Malta. An unpublished thesis for the fulfilment of a BA(Hons) course in Anthropology, University of Malta.
- Zetter, R. 1991. "Labelling Refugees: Forming and Transforming a Bureaucratic Identity" in Journal of Refugee Studies 4(1): 39-62.