

The Intersection of Peace and Conflict Research and Forced Migration and Refugee Studies

Online workshop, 27 April 2020

INTRODUCTION

The first FFVT expert workshop aimed to clarify how the intersection between Peace and Conflict Research and Forced Migration and Refugee Studies can be conceptualised from the perspective of a wide range of academic disciplines working in this overlapping field. Discussions at the workshop focused on the following questions:

- How do peace and conflict researchers approach the subject of forced migration and refugees conceptually?
- How does research on forced migration and refugees take into account conflict (dynamics) and peace processes?
- How does the interdisciplinary nature of both research fields affect conceptualisation and theory building?

The workshop was organised in an interactive format to allow for intensive discussions based on statements submitted by the participants to identify concepts that link the interdisciplinary fields of peace and conflict research and forced migration and refugee studies. In a first step, three groups with rotating participants discussed clusters of four statements each. During the subsequent plenary discussion, the participants shared further thoughts and identified research needs that could form the basis for future joint research programmes.

This report summarises the twelve statements provided by workshop participants, the group discussions and the outlook that emerged from the plenary discussion. A separate section presents the research needs identified. The appendix contains the full text of the statements and research gaps identified, including references.

CONCEPTUAL OVERLAPS BETWEEN PEACE AND CONFLICT STUDIES AND FORCED MIGRATION AND REFUGEE STUDIES: RESULTS OF WORKSHOP DISCUSSIONS

This section highlights the main points of the three sets of statements and summarises the discussions in each group. Suggestions for adapting or improving existing concepts are mentioned here and are taken up again in the following section, which presents the research needs identified by workshop participants.

Group 1 discussed ‘**Forced migration in space and time, immobility, continuum of violence**’. Statements called attention to concepts that capture the spatial and temporal frameworks of forced migration as well as the barriers that forced migrants experience when fleeing (immobility) and settling. **Violence**—in a wide range of dimensions and as a continuum—emerged as a key concept that shapes displacement, place-making and emplacement and the social relations of which refugees are a part.

In his statement, one participant criticised the fact that too narrow a perspective in Peace and Conflict Studies obscures the multi- and translocal dimensions of displacement, while Forced Migration and Refugee Studies obscure the contexts and practices of violence in which refugees' mobilities are embedded. He, therefore, proposed to conceptually link mobility and immobility to the context of violence. He also called for concepts that relate the multiple interactions between people's mobility across different distances, borders and time frames to the context of violence and pointed out that the new mobilities paradigm (Sheller & Urry) links the social practice of mobility—as well as its opposite, immobility—with other forms of mobility rooted in economic, political, social, cultural and material structures. However, the borders, barriers and selective filters that structure (im)mobility had not yet been systematically incorporated into conceptual discussions of violent conflict and organised violence. An attempt in this direction could be to identify dimensions of violence during displacement (Bank et al.), which include the means of forced mobilisation, displacement-induced mobility as a violent process, and movement into new constellations of violence during (temporary) settlement and return.

Another participant also took a spatial and temporal perspective on displacement in their statement and examined *how displacement influences socio-political relations during (temporary) 'place-making'*. Like the last participant, this participant referred to displacement as an attempt to move out of violence, as a movement embedded in violence (securitisation), and as a path towards violence (stigmatisation) (Bank et al.). The participant emphasised that this concept brings to the fore the social relations that structure the living conditions during protracted displacement. This refers to the social relations in the places from which people flee or where they remain trapped due to violent contexts as well as the potential conflicts created by migration corridors, transit 'camps' etc., and the social relations at 'new' places. This approach also pays attention to the spatial technologies governments and political or humanitarian actors use to manage and control movement through borders, camps, reception centres and humanitarian aid. It also allows for the analysis of resistance by and against displaced people. How displacement itself generates potentially conflictive socio-spatial relations and thus shapes subjectivities of displacement (refugeehood) that tend to shape generations should also become part of the concept.

In the same vein, another participant pointed out the concept of *'emplacement'* as linking processes of everyday coping with displacement, war and intervention. The concept encompasses the circumstances that drive people away from places of violent conflict, famine, poverty or political arbitrariness as well as the processes of building new relationships and frameworks in a new place. The concepts of 'displacement' and 'emplacement' thus shed light on the changes in what is trusted and familiar to all parties involved, including the receiving societies. The relationality of a wide range of actors is at the heart of this concept, which explains an observable process of how people establish and react to new relationships, practices, rules and regulations as well as new conflicts. The statement linked this to the debate sparked by the 'new wars' paradigm, which criticised the biopolitics inherent in humanitarian interventions and perceived the resulting new forms of citizenship and governance as a form of 'benevolent dictatorship' or a post-colonial form of 'experimenting' in situations of devastating need. Recent scholarship has broadened the one-sided focus in this strand of research to include the interactive exchanges and mutual adaptations of institutions that provide aid, the population groups they target, and the military actors.

The fourth statement introduced the concept of *conflict-induced displacement* as a core concept at the intersection between Forced Migration and Refugee Studies and Peace and Conflict Research. The concept explains how conflict-related violence can contribute to refugee movements and protracted refugee situations. Violence and fear of violence are risks for people in conflict settings and while they settle (temporarily) in camps or other locations. Another strand of research focuses

on the choices actively made in search of greater stability, security and livelihoods elsewhere. This includes refugees who continue to search for a better future while facing multiple uncertainties in exile (concept of 'dia-placement' and 'agency-in-waiting'). The continuum of gender-based violence as an approach that links violence during conflict, while people are fleeing and during displacement has not yet been sufficiently linked to feminist work in Peace and Conflict Studies. With regard to approaches that focus on the continuity of violence and address the spread of violence as a result of forced migration, the participant warned that portraying refugees as sources of insecurity could invite political actors to (mis)use these studies to further securitise forced migration and refugees.

The discussion in Group 1 revealed that Forced Migration and Refugee Studies and Peace and Conflict Research have begun to move beyond linear or causal concepts of forced migration and violent conflict. Place-based, spatial and temporal perspectives cut across both research fields. Concepts have increasingly incorporated a 'spatial turn', a 'local turn' and a 'temporal turn' and considered social transformations through displacement. Participants argued that the 'mobility paradigm', which is concerned with the rhythms and temporalities of movement, still needs to integrate violence into its conceptual framework. The continuum of violence was suggested as a heuristic device for making and exploring these connections. Participants also considered it important to link theories of the organisation of space with ways of managing conflict. Conceptualising the movement of refugees requires a particular focus that links mobility and immobility with the notion of (organised) violence.

Participants agreed that theory needs to take into account the interconnectedness of displacement, emplacement, mobility and immobility. Concepts need to explain the differential access to mobility and the exclusion from mobility, that is, immobilisation in relation to violence, covering enforced immobility and immobilisation in contexts of ongoing violence. Moreover, such a concept needs to capture both, (im)mobility embedded in violence and violence embedded in (im) mobilities. A normative concept of 'mobility justice' may be desirable here. There was consent that conceptual approaches need to acknowledge the normality of immobility and mobility and place them in a historical context.

'**Locality**' was seen as a relevant concept in Forced Migration and Refugee Studies insofar as the 'local' is conceptualised with its transnational links. This is often referred to as 'translocality' to capture the interconnectedness of localities and the processes that take place within a locality and between different localities. Closely related is the transformation of constellations of actors through displacement, emplacement and intervention. '**Relationality**' appears to be a key concept to capture the agency of refugees, their everyday practices and the changing constellations of actors through displacement and during emplacement. This may be adequately conceptualised as figurational change.

The discussion then focused on **military, humanitarian and development interventions**, as well as '**politics of mobility**' such as migration governance. The resulting regimes and the different interventions involve norms and standards that are geared towards changing constellations of actors. Participants stressed that concepts should not be static or take only one perspective in explaining these interventions. Instead, concepts should take into account the dynamics that emerge from actors' responses, how forced migrants navigate and position themselves in changing circumstances, and how this in turn re-shapes interventions and governance approaches. This would make it possible to explain how governance and other interventions evoke processes of inclusion and exclusion. Incorporating concepts and findings from gender studies will enrich such studies. Examining the 'journey' and the power of narratives was seen as another important dimension

to include in approaches that aim to shed light on how ‘affected people’ think about and respond to these interventions. Participants also pointed to the relevance of political economy concepts in taking a critical stance towards interventions and governance. The ‘frontiers of capital’ seem to be a dimension that concepts explaining the dynamics of intervention should include.

For empirical research, the participants suggested the triangulation of sedentary and mobile methods and the use of new technologies. Relational approaches (incorporating both actor and structural perspectives, such as a figurational approach) were considered most appropriate for empirically studying forced migration in contexts of violence. The challenge for researchers is that it is difficult to collect data on displacement and immobilisation during conflict, and there is a risk that the main data available will be the interviewees’ narratives, as further triangulation is unlikely.

Group 2 discussed ‘**Concepts of violence related to forced migration, mobilisation, figurational approach**’. Statements here focussed on *concepts of violence*—including the potentiality of violence and violence as a continuum—and *mobilisation* as key concepts at the nexus of Peace and Conflict Research and Forced Migration and Refugee Studies.

In their first statement, a participant argued that analyses of the *intersection between violent conflict and forced migration* are indispensable for understanding the formations and dynamics of refugee movements. The militant pursuit of certain geopolitical, socio-economic or cultural goals, but also different stages of armed conflict, lead to different formations of displacement. Techniques of organised violence (such as ethnic cleansing or scorched earth) are used to create new facts such as altered property and access rights, which are then consolidated in the course of protracted armed conflict. These changes can impede the return of displaced people and thus contribute to protracted displacement. Aid agency interventions, diaspora activities, the recruitment of combatants in refugee camps, but also political, gender or ethnic violence within refugee communities and violent conflicts with the host communities change the dynamics of armed conflict and displacement and can perpetuate the conflict. Economic and social costs, socio-psychological and cultural-political changes also shape the context of forced migration over time and create opportunities for or obstacles to return. These findings from Peace and Conflict Research deserve more attention in Forced Migration and Refugee Studies.

In contrast, the second statement considered *forced migration as part of human migration* in general, as migration is almost always the result of a complex mix of motivations, of which displacement due to war is only one. Like the first statement, it sees violent conflict and human migration as interrelated and potentially mutually reinforcing. The participant argued that approaches to the study of the evolution of migration systems and research approaches to the study of political and armed conflict can be more closely linked through the concept of mobilisation. Mobilisation in the sense of sustained collective initiatives formed to bring about or prevent social or political change from outside formal political institutions while interacting closely with them, includes collective and political dimensions. This concept needs to be related more systematically to the context of migration and to include conceptually the flipside of mobilisation, that is, the prevention or refusal of migration (immobility). This bridging concept can inform research on the choice of migration strategies, disputes over migration, or the impact of actors in exile on conflict resolution.

A statement by another participant challenged the commonly accepted causality of armed conflict triggering forced migration as the main explanation for refugee movements. This participant shifted attention to the *potential of violent conflict as a driver of refugee movements*. From the perspective of population groups that have already been displaced by violent conflict, it will be

rational to seek refuge at an early stage when renewed violence seems likely. The anticipation of armed conflict can thus cause large groups of people to flee, even if no significant increase in violence can be measured. However, studying how decisions are made based on anticipated futures is methodologically challenging.

The author of the fourth statement also questioned the assumed causalities that either violent conflict causes displacement or displacement generates new conflict. The participant argued that the *concept of violence as a continuum* can explain the dynamics of conflict and displacement during a long-term process of evolving peace. Women often experience life on a continuum of violence during conflict, forced migration and in refugee camps. The concept of agency can explain the choices made by (forced) migrants and the involvement of local actors in peacebuilding, but these discussions have taken place in separate fields of research that still need to be linked. This statement suggests that a conceptual approach focusing on diaspora returnees may have the potential to connect separate fields of research as it seeks to explain the influence of diaspora members and deported (forced) migrants on conflict, peace negotiations and society at large.

Discussion of these statements centred on the *different levels of conceptualisation and theory-building* in Peace and Conflict Research and Forced Migration and Refugee Studies. Discussants agreed that agency is a core concept that connects both fields. On the question of how to systematically distinguish between forced migration, mixed migration and migration, the group participants agreed to avoid a discussion of typologies and instead to identify concrete areas of research at the intersection of Peace and Conflict and Forced Migration and Refugee Studies that are under-researched.

The discussion then focused on *people's agency*. While it is clear that needs drive people's actions, participants warned that there are limitations to a needs-based perspective, such as the influence that local patrimonial networks can have on people's agency. The term 'local' has become a widely used term that needs to be redefined in the light of such power relations.

Concepts of violence include the dimensions of agency, structure and space. Participants did not see spaces as territories but as a social concept of figurations among people that change over time, not as territories. Thus, a 'space' includes members of the diaspora and their involvement in peacebuilding or conflict in their homelands. Participants agreed that the territorialisation of ethnic and national views needs critical analysis, as it is a result of territorial ideologies. The discussion led to the dilemma that the use of the concept of violence can limit analysis to studies of people who experience (or perpetrate) violence during displacement, in transit and in host situations (camps or communities). And yet, the inclusion of mixed migration may risk losing the focus on violence. Another perspective discussed was how violence creates places. Participants agreed that a figurational approach will be helpful in providing the relational perspective needed for such analyses. Violence as a concept has the potential to explain immobility and to connect with the discussion of emplacement, displacement and displacement. 'Conflict' in itself should be addressed analytically and not remain the black box that it usually is.

How the concept of agency relates to violence was another point of discussion. Participants felt that, for one, physical violence suppresses agency, a question requiring research into how violence shapes, changes or erases agency. For the other, violence itself is agency. This perspective can lead to a more nuanced approach to research on violence, as it provides an alternative to the common association of violence with victimhood. However, situations of extreme violence such as ethnic cleansing, leave little agency to the targeted population groups. Mobilisation as a concept can provide a way out of the dilemma of juxtaposing agency and victimisation of forced migrants. The role of narratives should be included in a comprehensive concept of mobilisation.

Hence, the two fields of research were seen to use the concept of agency differently. Forced Migration and Refugee Studies seem to cover a continuum of agency mobilisation, where mobilisation can be limited by physical violence. Peace and Conflict Studies consider a continuum of violence–agency–structure. The group discussion tentatively concluded that Forced Migration and Refugee Studies is more descriptive in its approaches, whereas Peace and Conflict Research was seen as more conceptually driven.

The group agreed that methodologies for studying the conflict setting and people on the move under difficult research conditions require more reflection on intentionality, legitimacy and multiplicity of perspectives as well as on the life-worlds and positionalities of researchers.

The fact that Forced Migration and Refugee Studies often engage with policymakers was another topic. Participants agreed that researchers should deconstruct terminologies in the presence of policymakers and make constructive and informative contributions. These contributions should retain the necessary complexity but be understandable to policymakers.

Group 3 discussed ‘**Co-construction of diaspora and conflict, inclusion and exclusion, hegemonic narratives and monetised patronage**’. Such dimensions of inclusion, exclusion and hegemonies appear in the prominent role of diaspora groups in peace and conflict at the expense of the representation of other groups, in hegemonic narratives that sideline local and historically informed narratives, and in the eclipse of narratives that include experiences of mobility. Exclusion also occurs through global ‘monetised patronage’ that enables local and national power holders to maintain control over marginalised groups.

The author of the first statement pointed to the *link* between Forced Migration and Refugee Studies and Peace and Conflict Research in studies *of the role of refugees and displaced persons in peace processes* (peacemakers vs peacewreckers). One strand of research examines the role of displaced persons as political mobilisers in their places of exile through transnational ties. It highlights the approach of co-construction processes of ‘diaspora’ and conflict, showing that diaspora can be a result of mobilisation rather than its initiator. The visibility of diaspora groups often leads to their inclusion in negotiations, while others—those who stay put during armed conflict and displaced persons—tend to be excluded. This perspective introduces the dimension of inequalities in political influence. The conceptualisation of the policy-driven humanitarian–development–peace (HDP) nexus for conflict management and peacebuilding appears to be an emerging approach at the interface between the two fields of research. The consideration of local contexts where the causes and process dynamics of displacement, return and local (re)integration are relevant is inherent in this emerging concept.

Looking at the impact of forced migration on conflict, the second statement arrived at similar conclusions. It distinguished three strands of literature on the role of the diaspora, which are not, however, interrelated. While one strand discusses diaspora’s contribution to post-conflict development, another strand focuses on diasporas’ political and military involvement in the home country, which may contribute to prolonging violent conflicts. A third strand of literature is concerned with the lack of accountability of ‘long-distance nationalism’ and portrays diaspora involvement in the home country as potentially harmful to peace processes. The statement argues for thorough empirical studies of individual cases to understand the relationship between forced migrants / diaspora and conflict from both sides of the relationship.

Another participant’s statement drew attention to the *role of narratives and discourses of (forced) migration in shaping policy*, the integration of (forced) migrants, social cohesion and conflict.

An examination of the influence of global social media and policy debates, geopolitical dynamics and social, economic, political, cultural and security discourses on narratives of (forced) migration creates a new perspective for Forced Migration and Refugee Studies. The statement identified three dominant biases: an ahistorical bias; a national bias and a geographical / Global North bias. The statement argued that a historically informed perspective would lead to a different conceptualisation of who constitutes the ‘we’ in Europe. Local, regional and transnational perspectives would strengthen narratives that normalise movement across borders as well as narratives that focus on community life, locality and hospitality. Bringing the different narratives—including those of (forced) migrants—into an exchange could be a scholarly endeavour to reduce the current bias in narratives around (forced) migration and mobility.

The fourth statement highlighted the ‘global political marketplace’ as a key concept for a **political economy perspective** on protracted violent conflict, displacement and forced migration. The ‘political entrepreneurs’ interacting in this marketplace include local power holders, national elites, rulers of neighbouring states, regional and international organisations. Donor governments and international humanitarian and development agencies are important actors in the political marketplace as they provide economic incentives (‘monetised patronage’). At the local and national levels, armed groups and governments sustain themselves directly by appropriating humanitarian aid, or indirectly by leaving aid agencies to care for the suffering population and concentrating their resources on the armed struggle. Armed groups are thus able to extract ‘rents’ from international humanitarian funding. Forced migration scholars have been quick to criticise the interplay between armed groups and humanitarian agencies, arguing that it enables those in power to maintain hegemonic positions. This has repeatedly secured them a prominent position in peace negotiations.

The first part of the discussion focused on the **role of diasporas as mobilised groups**. Participants identified a dilemma between the co-construction of diaspora groups and conflict and inclusivity and representation in peace processes. Mobilisation seemed to be the key concept to explain this dilemma. The possibility that politics constructs the link between diaspora groups and conflict needs to be taken into account in research on the political influence and participation in peace processes of (forced) migrants organised in diaspora groups and as returnees. The crucial role of politically mobilised groups in influencing policy from exile raises the question of to whom diaspora groups should be accountable. More research is needed to clarify how lines of accountability can be established in the countries of residence of diaspora groups.

The second part of the discussion focused on the role of **categorisations of migrants and refugees and related narratives**. Both, categorisations and narratives, lead to reactions and actions. Plural and situational self-definitions of persons influence practices, conflict potentials and migration regimes. The labelling of forced migrants and subsequent patterns of ‘deservingness’ can, on the one hand, help refugees gain access to assistance. On the other hand, how labels are established and the exclusiveness created by the inherent measures of deservingness require criticism. ‘Un/doing differences’ was identified as a concept at the nexus of Forced Migration and Refugee Studies and Peace and Conflict Research. The discussion also shed light on the question of how narratives become dominant. Past experiences and memories, as well as anticipations, influence narratives about policies, displacement and the role of hegemonic institutions. Positionality in and access to discourses and a critical mass of discourse participants were seen as crucial for a narrative to become dominant. Participants raised the hegemony of narratives as a caveat for research agendas.

The participants also considered the relationship between **conceptions** (as presented in narratives) **as metaframes and preconceptions**. Forced migration tends to be used as a preconception with the effect of limiting the understanding of migrants as (becoming) important actors in peace processes and conflicts. Focusing on forced migration runs the risk of reducing research to the moment

of displacement. Adopting a perspective that sees migration and forced migration as interlinked can avoid an overly narrow approach. By adopting the concept of mixed migration, UNHCR has recognised the mixed motivations for (forced) migration. However, participants still perceived a tension between this approach and the need to analytically separate groups eligible for assistance

The discussion on the HDP nexus distinguished between the local context, the practice level and the conceptual, academic level. Participants saw it mainly as an attempt to develop a problem-solving approach, questioning its conceptual value. So far, the approach has not been linked to the literature on Forced Migration and Refugee Studies. Aspects of it appear in terms of bi-politics or benevolent dictatorship. Participants considered that peacebuilding itself can cause displacement (e.g. evictions in post-conflict reconstruction processes). Peacebuilding can also be undermined by loyalties to influential people, perpetuating patronage networks. Whose peace? What peace? These are normative questions that the HDP nexus approach must address.

A political economy perspective implies that the local, national and global contexts are equally important. Migration and refugee regimes emerge from and affect all three levels. The political economy lens brings together structural and actor-centred approaches in the concept of interests, which is used to explain, among other things, return and non-return or how peacebuilding can cause displacement. From a political economy perspective, global rent-seeking is one of the causes of displacement in urban settings, as well as displacement in the context of post-conflict reconstruction. Participants felt that Forced Migration and Refugee Studies tend to maintain an actor-centred focus. The relationship between development approaches, reconstruction and social services and forced migration or return and non-return has been under-researched in Forced Migration and Refugee Studies.

CAVEATS

Portraying refugees as sources of insecurity can invite political actors to (mis)use these studies to further securitise forced migration and refugee movements. The hegemony of narratives should not drive research agendas. For example, “the very idea of the ‘root causes’ approach that the European agenda is pursuing denies migration and mobility in its very normality and necessity to escape violence and is thus a normative agenda in itself,” as one participant said.

PLENARY DISCUSSION

The discussion began with a general observation that the field of Peace and Conflict Research rarely includes human mobility and should expand more in this direction, while Forced Migration and Refugee Studies should include reflections on the link between peace and conflict and develop an understanding of migration in conflict situations.

The discussion then focused on the concept of the continuum of violence. It was suggested to link this to social movement studies. The concepts of agency, collective action and contentious politics, as brought forward in social movement studies, can be used to shed light on ‘dark’ social movements and the role of the diaspora. The concept was seen as very suitable for linking Peace and Conflict Research and Forced Migration and Refugee Studies. However, the ‘continuum of violence’ approach focuses on forms of violence and is useful for tracking changes in violence—it does not naturally relate to and explain forced migration.

The political economy perspective on conflicts that generate forced displacement was seen as a useful approach to linking the two fields of research. It was suggested to link it to 'violence as a continuum'. The mobility approach looks at materiality, the infrastructures that direct or disrupt mobility. It captures political economy as a broad framework.

Conflict-induced displacement as a concept with the flipside of immobility can be extended to include anticipated conflict. This points to the voice of refugees, which should be systematically included. 'Dia-placement' is a concept that links space, time and agency (as well as what displacement does to people) and uncertainty.

The (im)mobility perspective needs to be made more specific to relate it to Peace and Conflict Research. It focuses on the place and relations of violence. Conflict should be taken more seriously in this perspective. It will be fruitful to relate (im)mobility not only to people but also to discourses, capital, goods, money (remittances) or weapons. An open question is how to relate this specifically to violence. (Im)mobility can be seen as a bridging agenda if it is related to emplacement and anticipation of violence. Another suggestion was to use the concept of mobilisation instead of (im)mobility as it is more closely related to resources. This has a strong connection to the political economy perspective.

Discourse and narrative analysis were seen as a methodology not specific to Peace and Conflict Research but used in many other fields. The question was raised as to how far researchers can go in deconstructing discourses. How constructive will Forced Migration and Refugee Studies need to be to maintain policy relevance? It will be as important to address the epistemology of Forced Migration and Refugee Studies as it is necessary to position oneself as a researcher and recognise the embeddedness in political discourses. The analysis of discourses and narratives was seen as useful to show how perspectives are constructed. It shows who has the power to enforce the categorisation of people and thus links to the political economy approach. Knowledges and materialities are also part of the hegemonic narrative that materialises in refugee regimes and makes refugees an important topic.

The concept of mixed migration was thought to explain different layers of migration that overlap; however, it usually does not only include forced migration.

The Triple Nexus approach was seen as a governance approach separate from host country- and asylum-oriented studies.

The discussion then turned to the aim of the workshop. It was noted that the workshop had been designed as a forced migration workshop with the ambition to learn about the context of forced migration from the field of Peace and Conflict Research. The question was raised as to whether we are rooting our research well enough in both fields and are really applying common concepts. With this workshop, we are trying to broaden our understanding of forced migration. One participant had said earlier that we feel uncomfortable thinking about people in forced migration as factors that are part of a conflict. So, the question is again: What is it that links migration in conflict settings? How can this become a new and different research agenda?

Elke Grawert

Project info

Forced Migration and Refugee Studies: Networking and Knowledge Transfer

The cooperation project “Forced Migration and Refugee Studies: Networking and Knowledge Transfer” (FFVT) aims to strengthen interdisciplinary forced migration and refugee research in Germany. To this end, the project, which is funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), brings together research on migration, development, conflict and violence, climate change, health, governance and human rights and other topics. In this way, FFVT supports the networking of researchers and institutes working in all relevant research fields dealing with forced migration. To provide young academics with teaching and training opportunities in Forced Migration and Refugee Studies, it plans to establish study and graduate programmes. Furthermore, FFVT promotes the internationalisation of German research activities further and, therefore, offers a global fellowship programme, among other things. The dialogue between academia, practitioners, the media and politicians is another key element of its work. FFVT is to contribute to establishing a sustainable infrastructure for research on Forced Migration and Refugee Studies in Germany to facilitate excellent academic work in this field.

FFVT is jointly run by the Bonn International Centre for Conflict Studies (BICC), the Centre for Human Rights Erlangen- Nuremberg (CHREN, University of Erlangen Nuremberg), the German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS, Bonn) and the Institute for Migration Research and Intercultural Studies (IMIS, University of Osnabrück).

Please note that the content provided is a summary of the points discussed during the event. They do not purport to reflect the opinions or views of FFVT, its members or funders.

Author: Elke Grawert, 2020
 Layout: Heike Webb
 Publication date: 30 August 2022

Contact
 Secretariat „Flucht- und Flüchtlingsforschung:
 Vernetzung und Transfer“
 Seminarstraße 19 a/b, 49074 Osnabrück
 www.ffvt.net contact@ffvt.net

SPONSORED BY THE



Project Partners



Except where otherwise noted, this work is licensed under: cf. creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/