

tualize power and domination in the scope of its biopolitical nature and economy as a governmental practice (ibid. 2002: 61).

In this tradition Dorothy Smith gives a characteristic account of bureaucracy from the realm of humanitarian governance and the refugee regime:

„For bureaucracy is par excellence that mode of governing that separates the performance of ruling from particular individuals, and makes organizations independent of particular persons and local [...]. Today, large-scale organization inscribes its processes into documentary modes as a continuous feature of its functioning [...]. This [produces] a form of social consciousness that is the property of organizations rather than of the meeting of individuals in local historical settings“ (Dorothy Smith, quoted in Hyndman 2000: 74).

The gap that bureaucracy hence creates between the administration and the administered is something that becomes particularly visible in the microcosmos of refugee camps and settlements, as a very defined population is administered in a just as well defined manner. The following section intends to illustrate this further.

ADMINISTERED MICROCOSMOS – THE REFUGEE CAMP AS A TECHNOLOGY OF CARE AND CONTROL

“The observer, or observing colonizer, commands a knowledge of groups such as institutional inmates, welfare recipients, and the colonized, that is intimately linked with a classification and diagnosis of the inferiority or inadequacy of the latter, that establishes the need for management” (Thomas 1994: 41).

As suggested above, humanitarian aid and specifically the context of refugee camps and settlements provides an insight as to how administration is connected to power and domination. The defined setting of who is to be administered and who administers allows a more profound study, as it reduces the complex construct of societies along with their genesis therefore clearing the „wood of bureaucracy“ from the trees, as Graeber (2015: 140) had