

# **Tagungsbericht zum 49. Jahreskolloquium der AFK**

## **“Peace and Conflict Studies from the Margins to the Center. Rethinking Europe in an Unequal World”**

in Kooperation mit der Evangelischen Akademie Villigst  
und der European Peace Research Association (EuPRA)

### **1. Leitfragen und Ergebnisse des AFK-Kolloquiums 2017**

Vor dem Hintergrund jüngster politischer und gesellschaftlicher Entwicklungen in Europa, wie etwa der Versicherheitlichung von Grenzen und der Zunahme rassistischer und rechtspopulistischer Bewegungen gerade auch gegen Geflüchtete, beschäftigte sich das diesjährige Kolloquium mit der Herausforderung, die gegenwärtige Friedens- und Konfliktforschung von den Rändern her neu zu denken. Hierbei sollten Alternativen zu ‚klassischen‘ wissenschaftlichen Ansätzen diskutiert und bestehende Forschungspraktiken und -perspektiven hinterfragt werden, um Europas Rolle in einer Welt globaler Ungleichheiten und Machtasymmetrien kritisch zu reflektieren. Zusätzlich war das diesjährige AFK-Kolloquium in Schwerte die erste gemeinsame Tagung mit der European Peace Research Association (EuPRA), wodurch die internationale Vernetzung von Friedens- und Konfliktforschenden gefördert wurde und ein besonders diverses Spektrum an Themen und Perspektiven vorgetragen und diskutiert werden konnte.

#### **1.1. Zielgruppen und Zielgruppenresonanz**

Die Zielgruppen der Tagung waren deutsche und internationale Friedens- und Konfliktforscher\*innen (insgesamt nahmen 117 Forschende teil). Neben den traditionell vertretenen Teilnehmenden aus dem deutschsprachigen Raum konnten durch die Tagungssprache Englisch und die Kooperation mit dem europäischen Dachverband EuPRA zahlreiche Beiträge aus dem europäischen Ausland, aber auch darüber hinaus von anderen Kontinenten gewonnen werden. So kamen die Referierenden nicht nur von Forschungseinrichtungen aus Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz, sondern auch aus Brasilien, Frankreich, Finnland, Großbritannien, Irland, Italien, Kasachstan, Nepal, den Niederlanden, Mexiko, Uganda, Kirgisistan, Nord-Zypern, Norwegen, Portugal, Südafrika, Schweden, der Türkei und dem Jemen.

Mit der Verleihung des Christiane-Rajewsky-Preises und einem Workshop des Arbeitskreises Junge AFK wurden zudem auch in diesem Jahr wieder zahlreiche Nachwuchswissenschaftler\*innen angesprochen. Diese fühlten sich offenbar auch von der thematischen Ausrichtung des Kolloquiums angezogen, die zu innovativen Ansätzen ermutigte.

#### **1.2. Zusammenfassungen der Einzelbeiträge**

In insgesamt 22 Panels, einer Keynote und einer Podiumsdiskussion diskutierten die Teilnehmenden aus unterschiedlichen Perspektiven aktuelle Entwicklungen und Konflikte v.a.

der europäischen Politik und hinterfragten die eigene Position und Forschungspraktiken vor dem Hintergrund der Frage nach Zentren und Rändern der Macht.<sup>1</sup>

### ***Welcome Note and Opening***

Uwe Trittman (Evangelische Akademie Villigst) opened the conference by referring to a general state of uncertainty regarding the struggle for power between former superpowers. Moreover, he stressed that the difficult working conditions for academics in different parts of the world underline the importance of this conference and its thematic focus.

Dr. İtir Toksöz (President of EuPRA; Doğu University, Turkey) emphasized that there are many layers to be analyzed and uncovered when discussing about centers and margins. This debate has to be an interdisciplinary one, resulting in a very complex puzzle.

Prof. Dr. Bettina Engels (2<sup>nd</sup> Chairwoman of AFK; Freie Universität Berlin, Germany) pointed out that this conference was a première in two aspects: First, it was the first conference organized in cooperation with EuPRA; second, participants could leave comments and discuss about panels and contributions on a conference blog.

### ***Plenary I: Keynote by Dr. Meera Sabaratnam (SOAS, University of London, UK), "Decolonizing Peace and Conflict Studies"***

In her keynote "Decolonizing Peace and Conflict Studies", Dr. Meera Sabaratnam stressed the necessity of decolonizing Peace and Conflict Studies and underlying social theory. Even though Peace and Conflict Studies are an important resource for the thought and practice of 'decolonizing' our modes of study, the research field itself and social theory in general are influenced by colonial and Eurocentric thought. Therefore, she argued that on the one hand, academics in Peace and Conflict Studies have to reflect upon their assumptions as well as narratives regarding the environment of conflicts and the underlying norms. On the other hand, this also applies to research methodologies and methods. Regarding these, she called for more participatory, dialogic and accountable research practices. This includes a direct discourse with the people in the area the research is taking place, taking into account their perspectives and aiming for a plurality of perspectives. The following discussion focused on the question of how exactly researchers can decolonize their thoughts and work in their daily research practice. In particular, the importance of critical self-reflection was stressed. Among other practical recommendations, Dr. Sabaratnam suggested that traditional concepts, such as 'warlords', should be scrutinized and research results should be made available to the people who are, unfortunately, often considered mere research subjects.

### ***Plenary II: 'Liberal Peace'? Civil Wars and Hybrid Peace in a Post-Colonial Era of Global Transition***

In her speech, Dr. Martina Fischer (Bread for the World/Berghof Foundation, Germany) passed the conference in review and linked her reflections upon it to her personal experiences with decolonizing attempts both in research and practical work. Against this background she drew conclusions for future Peace and Conflict Research, pleading for thoroughly considering power relations, for taking cultural aspects into account and continuously including a gender perspective.

Prof. Dr. Akbota Zholdasbekova (Scientific-Political adviser to Government/G-Global/Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan) continued to stress Kazakhstan's mediation initiatives in global

---

<sup>1</sup> Entsprechend der Tagungssprache erfolgt der folgende Teil auf Englisch (s.a. Förderantrag).

policies. Moreover, she introduced a number of Kazakh peace building initiatives, one of which was launching the platform 'G Global' which intends to find solutions in answer to the global financial crisis by providing international economy experts a public space for constructive debate.

Tawakkol Karman (Nobel Peace Laureate 2011, Yemen) reminded the audience of the values of humanity, the billions of lives lost through wars and the impact of discrimination and racism all over the world. In her lecture she mainly focused on the Arab Spring, its intentions and future: Karman pointed out that the people in the Middle East are inspired by the dream for a better future that includes democracy. She stressed that the most relevant goals of the Arab Spring are freedom, dignity and democracy for all people in the Eastern world. According to her, "nothing is more valued than freedom, freedom is democracy and power".

### ***Panel 1: Ethnic Divided Societies***

Drawing on a system-theoretical perspective, Mitja Sienknecht (Viadrina University of Frankfurt/Oder, Germany) discussed how non-state actors representing politically excluded (ethnic) minority groups enter into communication with international organizations (IOs) as can be observed in the EU in the Kurdish conflict in Turkey. She pointed out that the non-state conflict parties' aim is to include the IOs into the conflict system to their advantage and to take a special responsibility in this conflict. This, Sienknecht argued, results in a de-bordering of conflicts which should be taken into account in Peace and Conflict Research practice.

In the following contribution "Power-Sharing Coalitions and Ethnic Civil War", Dr. Nils-Christian Bormann (University of Exeter, UK) examined the connection between large coalitions and the risk of civil war in ethnically divided societies. In his research he found that especially in ethnically divided societies, actors would choose a large coalition rather than a minimum-winning one in order to avoid the risk of instability due to possible fragmentation of ethnic groups. Accordingly, when group coherence increases, coalition sizes decrease. He concluded that large coalitions are not formed because of good will but because political actors are trying to avoid the repercussions of forming a minimum-winning coalition and excluding groups.

Next, Dr. Sebastian Schutte (University of Konstanz, Germany) gave a talk about "Politics or Prejudice: Explaining Individual-level Hostilities in India's Hindu-Muslim Conflict". Schutte's interest especially lies with the question why individuals show hostilities towards others in identity-based conflicts. Drawing from his empiric data from an online-survey he conducted with Hindus and Muslims in India, he found out that the more contact the interviewees had with the out-group the lower the support of statements suggesting animosities towards this group was.

### ***Panel 2: Everyday Communal Peace and/or Everyday Hybrid Peace in the Fergana Valley***

In her contribution on "Hybrid Peacebuilding and Local Peace in the Fergana Valley", Dr. Anna Kreikemeyer (Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy, University of Hamburg, Germany) focused both on the conceptualization of the 'local' as well as on developing an understanding of 'everyday hybrid peace'. She advised against talking too early about the latter, emphasized the still existing gap between hybrid and communal structures, and underlined the different degrees of hybridization. Against this background, Kreikemeyer demanded an interdisciplinary approach and a strategy that includes reflexivity, subsidiarity and dialogue in advance.

Aksana Ismailbekova (Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle, Germany) presented

her work on “Informal Women Leaders, Mediation, and Peacebuilding in Southern Kyrgyzstan”. Deriving authority from factors like family position, age, experience, sensitivity, education and others, informal women leaders strengthen the role of men by empowering them concerning communicative, strategic and negotiating skills, while at the same time preserving the image of men as the embodiment of peacebuilders.

Asel Myrzabekova (Bonn International Center for Conversion, BICC, Germany) presented her case study of civil activism and mixed couples in “Everday Practices of Security-making in Central Asia”. Her research was conducted in Bishkek and Osh among mono-ethnic and mixed couples on the basis on semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions. In conclusion, Myrzabekova pointed out that the most significant coping strategies of mixed couples include religious ones (conversion to the partner’s religion) and also avoidance as well as acceptance or acquiescence combined with obeying the rules and accepting the norms of a community.

### ***Panel 3: Forced Migration and Inequality – Part One: The Production and Process of (Forced) Migration***

In her contribution with the title “Exodus Eritrea”, Dr. Christine Smith-Simonsen (University of Tromsø, Norway) discussed several reasons for Eritreans to migrate to other countries. Her leading question was: “Why are they leaving if there is no war?” She identified important factors such as limitations to freedom caused by the lack of a private press or freedom of speech. Also, no international NGOs have been allowed since 2001 and most importantly, Eritrea became a post-independent state with only one legal party. Finally, she concluded, Eritreans strive for a better life elsewhere since “there is no war [in Eritrea], but there is no peace either”.

Janvier Nzigo (International Organization for Migration, Norway) presented his work on “The Circle of Forced Migration, Refuge and Possible Repatriation” by asking the plenum: “Do we really know what we are talking about if we talk about migration? And what does forced migration actually mean?” Nzigo demonstrated two models of forced migration, namely, first, the model of kinetics, and second the circle of flight, (re-)settlement and potential repatriation, both focusing on the situation of individuals and their possible outcomes in terms of social and economic status.

### ***Panel 4: Intervention and Activism***

Prof. Dr. Margit Bussmann (University of Greifswald, Germany) aimed at exploring whether in the case of France, a ‘rally-around-the-flag’ effect can be proven as a result of foreign military interventions. In particular, she was asking whether France, as one of the militarily most active European powers, uses this as a diversion from domestic problems. Touching upon main aspects of diversionary theory and, in particular, how presidential approval ratings react to military action, Bussmann addressed two key questions: First, whether the presidential popularity increases in case of military action and second, if the president is more likely to intervene when ratings are low. The results from the time-series analysis covering a time span from 1978 to 2005 showed no systematic relationship between French military action and presidential ratings or evidence for diversionary behavior.

In his contribution, Dr. Johannes Vüllers (University of Konstanz, Germany) presented his research on the effectiveness of religious peace activism on inter-religious violence. According to him, religious peace activities have a preventive as well as a conflict-dampening effect as the promotion of peace norms makes it more difficult to exploit religious norms in order to legitimize violence. Vüllers was able to draw two main conclusions from his research: First, he found out that if there is religious peace activism in inter-religious clashes the number of deaths

decreases. Second, he pointed out that campaigns, in order to have the most substantive effect, are led by inter-religious coalitions rather than one singular religious group.

Dr. Sabine Otto's (Uppsala University, Sweden) contribution, titled "UN Peacekeeping and Civilian Protection: The Role of Pro-Government Militia", explored the effect of the latter on the success of UN peacekeeping missions in protecting civilians against violence. While scholars mainly focus on the question why some peacekeeping missions are more successful than others, she asked which impact pro-government militias might have on the reduction of violence against civilians. In her model, the government therefore is not a unitary actor anymore. She concluded that pro-government militias indeed seem to hinder the success of UN peacekeeping missions in protecting civilians against violence because of two main reasons: First, by employing militias, governments find themselves in a situation in which their peacekeeping-efforts lack in credibility which is why rebel groups are less likely to commit to the peace process. Moreover, a successful UN peacekeeping mission would render the militias useless. Therefore, militias have an intrinsic motivation to spoil the peace process by targeting civilians.

### ***Panel 5: Humanitarianism, 'Emergency Imaginary' and Alternative Imaginations of Inter- and Transnational Solidarity***

In his presentation, Prof. Dr. Dennis Dijkzeul (Ruhr-University Bochum, Germany) dealt with the missing definition of 'humanitarian crisis' in international law. What is defined as a crisis depends on political and economic power. From Dijkzeul's point of view, the framing as such can be a mixed blessing, since often the term is part of an instrumentalization of the positive image of 'humanitarianism'. He criticized that, whereas the causes of most crises are political, the focus often lies with the morbidity and medical needs of the population, leaving out the political roots of the conflict and the agency of local actors.

As part of a decolonizing attempt, Dr. Cordula Dittmer and Daniel Lorenz (Freie Universität Berlin, Germany) tried to apply the concept of the 'emergency imaginary', which is more often applied to the Global South, to the so-called refugee crisis in 2015/2016 in Germany. At that time, disaster management units were active without an official disaster declaration. As an outcome of their case study Dittmer and Lorenz hypothesized, that the so-called refugee crisis was not officially declared a humanitarian emergency since that would undermine the notion of the 'strong state'. The presenters concluded that disaster declarations are political acts and that disaster notions were used strategically in Germany. Thus, the concept of the 'emergency imaginary' may not be universally applicable.

Dr. Sophia Hoffmann's (University of Bremen, Germany) and Kai Koddenbrock's (Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies, Cologne, Germany) contribution was titled "'There is no Alternative': The Rise of Humanitarian Aid in International Politics". According to their research, the increase in aid is not due to increasing need, but to three other dynamics: First, they argued that NGOs themselves maintain the sector, answering humanitarian needs which are not formally defined and therefore constantly extending. Second, working in the humanitarian aid sector is still a gratifying, attractive option for many people in Western societies. Third, humanitarian aid has gained the label of being politically neutral, and therefore aid-receiving governments integrate the financial means in their domestic politics without being criticized for enabling interventions. Hoffmann and Koddenbrock warned that humanitarian aid might even deepen poverty as it seems to be applied as a solution rather than a short-term needed reaction. Instead of rising humanitarian aid, German arms exports and EU partnership agreements should be questioned.

***Panel 6: Forced Migration and Inequality – Part Two: Migration, Fears and Threat Perceptions***

Dr. Vidar Vambheim (University of Tromsø, Norway) presented his work “State-Centered vs. Human-Centered Perspectives on Migration”, drawing on a perspective of external borders and internal orders. He discussed possible costs for both incoming migrants as well as the receiving society and pointed out that education on two aspects is needed in order to reduce these costs: First, knowing and understanding one another’s culture; and second, understanding where the cultures have their own borders. He concluded his presentation by claiming that the main focus of integration should lay in education, which has been underestimated by many countries.

Prof. Dr. Gunhild Hoogensen Gjørsv (University of Tromsø, Norway) presented her paper “Emotional Politics and Migration”, by introducing the question: “How do we understand civilian society?” One of the key terms raised was hybrid warfare. Hoogensen Gjørsv claimed that many people thought of warfare and especially hybrid warfare as war. The ‘cure’ for such thought could be non-military approaches. Moreover, she introduced the seven baselines of resilience using examples from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

During her presentation titled “The Perception of Migration and Migrants as a Threat – Fears and Manipulation of Fears among Populations in Europe”, Dr. İtir Toksöz (Doğuş University, Turkey) discussed how and why migrants instead of states came to be perceived as the newest threat to states and communities in the European context and whether this threat perception was grounded in reality or was constructed. She furthermore explored the connections between the concepts of migrants, culture and threat. Finally, she used photographs to show how migration is constructed as a threat in different societies.

***Panel 7: Forced Migration and Inequality – Part Three: Governance and Control of Migration***

Dr. Peter Stuart Robinson (University of Tromsø, Norway) introduced his paper “The Proprietary Constitution of Space: Towards a Political Economy of Mobility Management”, taking an alternative perspective to the state-centered order of space, which is often rooted in security concerns. He focused on the processes of industrialization and urbanization to reveal social mechanisms of space production to introduce a new ordering of space. Robinson concluded his presentation with the statement that economic constructions have to be unraveled to ensure economic mobility for everyone.

Dr. Martina Fischer (Bread for the World/Berghof Foundation, Germany) presented her work “From the Margins to the Center – And Then Erecting Walls Again? A Critique of the European Union’s Foreign-, Security and Refugee Policies”. She gave, first, an outline of current trends in EU policies and, second, elaborated on certain challenges of Peace Research. She claimed that the EU Instrument contribution to Stability and Peace (IcSP) can be considered a door opener for strategies of funding military trainings and equipment for partner countries. Fischer explained that one of the challenges of Peace Research is the lack of transparency regarding civilian and military funding. She called for more research on EU policies on migration and economic development.

Dr. Daniela Irrera presented her and Prof. Dr. Fulvio Attinà’s work (University of Catania, Italy), discussing the new ‘normal’ role of NGOs in Search and Rescue (SAR) missions. She pointed to a growing interplay between a service-oriented role of NGOs and a political necessity to be more active. Moreover, she claimed that NGOs are increasingly influenced by the security paradigm

and by the need to protect and emphasize the human dimension against a dominant discursive position, according to which migrants are perceived to be an economic and social threat.

### ***Panel 8: Theorize Radicalization and Inequality***

This panel addressed the problem that the term radicalization is increasingly used in political discourse, while it remains under-theorized. Timothy Williams' (University of Marburg, Germany) contribution, titled "Conceptually Modeling Radicalisation in Genocide", focused on the question of why people take part in genocidal violence. Williams problematized that in research literature, radicalization is primarily believed to move from attitude to behavior and to be mostly directed against a state or social order. However, Williams argued, radicalization can be both behavioral and attitudinal; but if it is behavioral first (e.g. by being a member of the perpetrating organization), it will be attitudinal as well, although to a lesser degree in order to avoid cognitive dissonance.

Dr. Andreas Önnersfors (University of Gothenburg, Sweden) and Dr. Kristian Steiner (Malmö University, Sweden) concentrated on the question of how radicalization has been framed in Swedish parliamentary debates as well as media sources between 2010 and 2016. They found that in 2014 and 2015 media references to radicalization and the use of alarmistic language increased. They stressed that one main subject of the debate was the threat of radicalization by digital media that the young generation was exposed to.

Maik Fielitz presented his and Philip Wallmeiers' (Goethe-University of Frankfurt/Main, Germany) work on "Breaking (with) the System. Withdrawal as Radicalization" by offering withdrawal as an alternative facet of radicalization. Withdrawal is here understood as a mute gesture of the complete refusal of a system, community, and common identity. In this view, withdrawing persons are not misguided, apolitical dreamers but mutely communicate a radical form of critique. Fielitz and Wallmeier thus called for including this facet of radicalization into the research agenda, adding to the more common focus on violence.

### ***Panel 9: Transitional Justice and Participation***

Joana Amaral (University of Kent, UK/University of Marburg, Germany) presented the findings of her research on the Annan Plan Referendum (Cyprus) and the Good Friday Referendum (Northern Ireland). Her research was led by the question of which factors enhance the chance of success for peace settlement referendums following peace negotiations that involved mediation. Her findings show that politically inclusive negotiations, involving civil society actors and the public, contribute to a stronger pro-peace settlement campaign leading up to the referendum and thus a more likely success.

Ulrike Lühe's (Swisspeace/University of Basel, Switzerland) contribution was based on her comparison of the AU's and the EU's policy discourses on transitional justice, assuming that policy discourses influence the understanding, scope and institutionalization of the transitional justice concept. According to her, there is one major difference: Whereas the EU uses a top-down approach to transitional justice to legitimize interventions while blaming the respective countries for a lack of political will or capacity, the AU remains critical of this approach and focuses on individuals and witnesses.

The third panelist, Rajib Timalina (Tribhuvan University, Nepal), discussed the role of the consensus principle for stability, sustainable peace and democracy in Nepal since the Peace Accord of 2006. He pointed out that even though it contributed to an easier resource

distribution, contained open violence and involved different political parties, it hindered democratic initiatives and actions, especially on the local level.

***Panel 10: Forced Displacement and Statelessness – More Alternatives to Mainstream***

In her contribution, Dr. Viktorija Ratković (University of Klagenfurt, Austria) critically assessed the conceptualization of ‘migration’ in mainstream migration research as well as in Peace research. Whereas approaches in migration research are, according to her, often reductionist and little differentiated, Peace Research tends to consider migration almost exclusively in the context of conflict. As an alternative, Ratković combined critical Peace and Conflict Studies and migration research by proposing a “peace logical migration research”.

In his comparative study, Anthony Ssembatya (Leipzig University, Germany) broached the issue of citizenship and statelessness with special reference to Uganda and Kenya, continuously applying a gender perspective. He underlined the disproportionate percentage of women among stateless persons, introduced the many causes of statelessness as well as its manifold severe implications. In conclusion, he showed that in the international context, despite reforms in several countries, reforming gender nationality law remains an urgent task in order to effectively address statelessness and open up full citizenship.

In her contribution, Dr. Sybille Reinke de Buitrago (University of Hamburg, Germany), used a Pecha Kucha presentation, showing pictures (e.g. of art or nature photography). In the context of the current migration movements in Germany, Reinke de Buitrago elaborated on Western hegemonic discourses and practices of marginalization, intolerance and exclusion towards non-Western cultures and ideas. Against this background, she presented selected non-Western ideas of peace and pleaded for taking them into consideration in order to conduct future research in a more critical, reflected and inclusive way.

***Panel 11: From Hot War to Negative, Positive or Hybrid Peace? Inclusive Peacemaking and Comprehensive Post-conflict Tasking – Part One***

In this panel, Dr. Hendrik Bullens (Eurasian National University Kazakhstan) outlined practical-political pilot projects (2PIR) as alternatives in post-conflict management focusing on the “Integration and Re-Integration of Forcibly Displaced Persons and Ex-Combatants”. Based on the perspective that current political strategies regarding refugees and migration are misled, the 2PIR projects focus on a variety of areas such as jobs/housing, schooling/education, joint fisher ventures between Greece, Turkey and the EU, and integration of displaced persons in post-conflict countries. He stressed that these projects will be conducted in an international cooperation of scholars from different institutes.

In their talk, Dr. Enika Abazi (PRIP/University of Lille, France) and Prof. Dr. Albert Doja (University of Lille, France) problematized the dominant narratives of the Balkan wars and how they engage public representation of Balkan populations. They analyzed how international representations (as a socio-anthropological concept) of Eastern Europe were constructed in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and atrocities of the war continue to dominate the narratives in the region and revive the stereotypes of national hatred and lacking civilization, among others. By exploring the discursive legacies of the Balkan wars, they stressed the importance of international representations in the context of ideological and political interests, pointing out that these constructions are representations of power in international relations.

Dr. Susan Hoppert-Flämig (University of Bradford, UK) called for a more holistic approach to issues of insecurity in societies in the Global South, stressing that the conceptual division

between political and social violence has led to lacking attention from scholars and politicians for the latter. She presented her research on security policy making in El Salvador, shifting the attention from the established focus on institutional aspects to the analysis of security policy processes. Here Hoppert-Flämig introduced the concept of ad-hoc decisions as characteristic for security policy processes in states lacking a legitimate monopoly on violence and explained that these short-term policy decisions hinder the process of implementation for security reforms as they are easily replaced or reversed.

Aline Mugisho (University of Erfurt, Germany) presented a qualitative case study of social resilience of Congolese women in the Great Lakes region and the strategies they employ for self-protection. Focusing on local protection strategies, Mugisho used a myriad of methods, founding her research on distancing herself from victimizing approaches and those in which women are merely passive participants. Her research showed that for the women, especially communities and families but also governments and NGOs are important for implementing sustainable protection strategies.

### ***Panel 12: Regional Case Studies of In-/Exclusion of Ethnic and Other Minorities and Peace Education***

Vadim Romashov (University of Tampere, Finland) presented his work on “Community Narratives and Conflict Avoidance: The Case of Armenian-Azerbaijani Rural Population in Georgia” with a focus on the question of how the Armenian and Azerbaijani people, in this conflict crisis, can live in peace. The presentation focused on ethnically mixed borderland communities confronted with competing national narratives that spread from the surrounding states. He showed that joint constructions of narratives about the shared space – past and present – with continuous reference to the collective memory help to relieve ‘national’ boundaries between Armenians and Azerbaijanis and effectively suppress ‘inter-national’ tensions.

Yoko Tanabe (University College London, UK/University of Tromsø, Norway) presented her work on “The History, Policy and Legacy of Indigenous Education in Norway and Japan, 1850-2016”. She focused on the analysis of Japan’s indigenous education policies and the school experiences of the Ainu during the Meiji period as well as on the examination of the recent development of government policy for the indigenous Ainu people in Japan. The significance of her research lies in shedding light on the historical emergence of indigenous schooling and the long-term impacts of the education policy on the Ainu and Sámi societies, culture and languages. Through this, Tanabe has pointed out a few key issues, one of which was that special measures will be implemented only if the majority population considered them ‘rational’ and not in conflict with public interests.

### ***Panel 13: Feminist Interventionism, Postcolonial Critique and Non-Western Feminist Approach***

Esther Philips (University Frankfurt, Germany) and Mira Hellmich (Marburg University, Germany) aimed at “Redefining Transnational Justice from a Black Feminist and Feminism of Color Perspective”. In a first step, they demonstrated how colonialism is still present also in transnational justice discourses and practices. Moreover, even when a gender perspective is applied, the diversity and complexity of the living conditions of women in the Global South are often neglected. With the aim of understanding ‘justice’ in more holistic terms, Philips and Hellmich called for approaches by Black feminists and feminists of Color to overcome the shortcomings of White Western liberal discourses on transitional justice. Furthermore, they

demanded to reflect the own situatedness of researchers, among them postcolonial feminists, and criticized the ongoing influence of colonial heritage and presence in universities.

Katharina Hameter, Anna-Maria Meyer, Natalie Rodax (Sigmund Freud Private University Vienna, Austria), Gabriela Kielhorn and Isabel Prado (University of Vienna, Austria) presented their study on “Racializing and Anti-Feminist Experiences of Muslim Women”. Against the background of intersectional and postcolonial theoretical approaches and based on a discourse analysis of Austria’s women’s magazines as well as narrative interviews, the researchers analyzed Othering processes in the construction of Muslim women as victims in need of liberation and of Muslim men as patriarchal and having to be tamed. It was shown how women’s magazines on the one hand claim to strive for emancipation, but on the other hand remain stuck in racialized gender stereotypes.

Lennita Oliveira Ruggi (Federal University of Paraná, Brazil) and Rosimeire Barboza Silva (University of Coimbra, Portugal) deserve the credit to bring the long neglected Brazilian writer Carolina Maria de Jesus (1914–1977) to the attention of a broader international public, thus contributing to the establishment of a Black genealogy. As outlined in the title – “Brazilian Jesus. Contemporary reverberations from Carolina Maria’s feminist epistemology” –, the researchers delineated how Maria de Jesus’ reflections on her position at the weak edge of Brazilian inequality, her contribution to transforming worldviews and the demand for recognition offer a powerful standpoint – a standpoint that can positively contribute to feminist interventionism, postcolonial critique and non-Western feminist approaches.

***Panel 14: From Hot War to Negative, Positive or Hybrid Peace? Inclusive Peacemaking and Comprehensive Post-Conflict Tasking – Part Two***

In their contribution, Christian Braun and Sande Späker (Engagement Global gGmbH, Germany) presented their empirical findings from the trainings they provide for the German Armed Forces, which are meant to offer alternative insights on what international development actors do and what their aims are. However, they are facing a myriad of problems: First, due to the referral to the so-called comprehensive approach, which is part of a dominant discourse mainly within government circles, NGOs refuse to cooperate as they consider the approach to be Eurocentric. Second, the trainers tend to simplify and stick to a stereotypical picture, or even adapt a more critical perspective. In return, military actors assume a negative view on development work. Third, there cannot be any long-term effects since there is no follow-up with the same group after the one-day training. Overall, Braun and Späker criticize that rather than changing the structure, they are changed by it, reproducing stereotypes and not helping the margins to move to the center but rather helping the center to gain an even stronger foothold.

Onna Malou van den Broek (Utrecht University, Netherlands) focused on the question of how companies in Germany reacted to the so-called refugee crisis and discussed the legitimacy of their engagement. She pointed out that companies have filled a vacuum left by the state and have acted within their frameworks of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), however without a democratic mandate. Larger companies were more likely to become active, e.g. in providing accommodation or offering a kind of employment to refugees. These actions mostly took place on a local basis. Regarding legitimacy, van den Broek assessed that it could be increased by addressing all of the rights given to refugees by the 1951 Refugee Convention or the needs defined by the UNHCR.

### ***Panel 15: Reflecting 'The West' – Globalization and Gender***

In his lecture, Karim Maiche (University of Tampere, Finland) introduced an understanding of the Mediterranean culture as a single unit, stressing that the divide between 'Europe' and 'North Africa' is artificial. The notion of the West, he argued, is a political notion which influenced the historical narration of 'the West' and 'the rest'. Maiche called for more awareness of Eurocentric thinking when using concepts such as 'sensitivity' and 'peace mediation' and for focusing on how this distorts perceptions of the past and the present.

PD Dr. Andreas Herberg-Rothe (University of Applied Sciences Fulda, Germany) described two simultaneous developments in the world: 'the rise of the rest' and 'the decline of the rest'. The former shows itself in the crisis of neo-liberal globalization as represented by the election of Trump, Brexit, the new rise of China, Russia and India, all leading to the questioning of the supremacy of the European-American liberal model. By the 'decline of the rest' he refers to the globally unequal distribution of income. He pointed to the increased thinking in terms of 'us' and 'them' and that states and non-state agents, consequently, start thinking like tribes trying to construct and expand their vision of 'order'. Neo-liberalism, he claimed, is freedom without equality and the current tribalization of global politics is a counter-reaction to that.

Seyit Ali Avcu (Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Turkey) presented a study of the conflicts that arose from ethnic tensions in the region between Kyrgyz and Uzbeks in southern Kyrgyzstan, primarily in the cities of Osh and Jalalabad, especially focusing on the role of gender and religion in this conflict. One of Avcu's main findings was that women on both sides encouraged men to fight for the cause. However, in Aravan where many marriages are inter-national, conflicts subsided and there was less or no violence. This is why inter-ethnic marriages are encouraged by the government by financial incentives. The role of religion was also found to be significant as there is an ethnic distinction between types of Islam in the region.

### ***Panel 16: Peace Studies and (De-)Coloniality***

This panel critically reflected on theories, methodologies, research practices and terminologies in German Peace and Conflict Studies. Based on this reflective onset, the panelists aimed at opening the field to theories and concepts from the Global South. Dr. Claudia Brunner's (University of Klagenfurt, Austria) concept of epistemic violence and its implications for so-called Western Peace and Conflict Studies laid the foundation for the other contributions of the panel. She focused on types of non-physical violence and the different forms of opposition such as misjudgment or defamation this school of epistemological thought encounters in academia.

In her contribution, Mechthild Exo (Berlin, Germany) discussed the paradigm of liberal peace, claiming that even though Western liberalism is criticized as oppressive, colonial and bellicose, it is also relied upon as a source of emancipation. Drawing on Sabaratnam's work, Exo continued to develop alternative theoretical and methodic approaches, such as jineology, which is a feminist paradigm contending the 'masculinity' of the Western scientific establishment and especially prominent in intellectual circles of the Kurdish revolution.

Stefan Pimmer (Buenos Aires, Argentina/Berlin, Germany/Vienna, Austria) focused on analyzing the relation of the production of knowledge, power and space. He argued against a one-sided, deterministic perspective on these aspects and stressed the global opportunities for epistemic disobedience and the need to keep challenging Eurocentric thought patterns.

Sofia Ganter (Goethe-University Frankfurt/Main, Germany) called for a decolonization of terminologies in her contribution "Rethinking Concepts of Peace". Focusing on the term 'peace' she pointed to a vast diversity of 'peace' definitions, calling for increased attention for 'non-

Western' concepts. She argued that the neo-colonial practice of imposing a 'Western' concept of peace, which often defines peace as the absence of war, can be understood as a reproduction of epistemic violence. In conclusion she called for a global comparison of concepts in order to enhance the understanding of the manifoldness of peace(s).

***Panel 17: (In-)Security, (De-) Militarization, Post-Liberal Developments – Part One: Challenges***

In her lecture titled “To Act or not to Act in our Age of Insecurity”, Dr. Róisín Smith (Maynooth University, Ireland) discussed when and how the EU should act in response to global crises. She asserted that the Balkan wars led to a paralysis of the EU, which had started as a peace project and was then forced to establish an approach to crisis management. Currently we are observing an ice-berg effect, Smith stated, since the EU institutions are not focusing on the bigger picture. Therefore she called for a more effective use of existing tools within the EU for crisis management.

Dr. Havva Kök Arslan's (Hacettepe University, Turkey) contribution offered a perspective on how to apply an elicitive approach to the events of the attempted coup in Turkey on 15 July 2016. In accordance with an elicitive approach, she drew from personal experiences and not from a toolbox full of prescribed solutions. Arslan described different perspectives, especially criticizing the support of the coup and the protests by Western partners, which only strengthened the Turkish government's and part of the population's skepticism towards Western countries and the EU.

***Panel 18: Conflict and Peace in Arts, Media and the Public***

In their presentation, Fabian Namberger (University of London, UK) and Gerdis Wischnath (FU Berlin, Germany) showed how poststructuralist and postcolonial theory together with critical cartography and geography help to examine space in Peace and Conflict Studies. The authors cast a critical eye on how different types of maps – choropleth, hot spot and grid cell maps – continue to use knowledge about the 'Others' and by this means ensure the domination of the global West by reproducing colonial geographic violent heritage. They pleaded for understanding maps as activators and not as mere descriptions. One should thus try to avoid the above described traps and consider contextualizing an ongoing task.

Angel Iglesias Ortiz (University of Tampere, Finland) considered the “Visual Representation of Peace in Scenarios of Hegemony and Antagonism” as manifested in posters portraying the United Nations. Ortiz introduced one example of hegemonic representation and one of antagonistic. The first was illustrated by posters from 1946 to 2012 which depicted the United Nations as hegemonic vision with the help of signifiers, building on identity-formation. The second example was based on the analysis of two posters from the 1950ies and 1960ies, showing a logic of equivalence, peace as an empty signifier, and a specific formation of identity as negativity. Thus, the author conveyed how the visual representation and symbolization of peace as part of the hegemonic discourse goes along with fixing a certain meaning to it.

Prof. Dr. Metin Ersoy (together with Raziye Nevzat, both Eastern Mediterranean University, North Cyprus) dealt with “Peace Journalism in Post-Intervention Divided Cyprus”. On the basis of qualitative interviews they examined whether the closed Facebook group “Journalists in Cyprus” was contributing to the escalation of the conflict – as does the majority of journalism –, or if it was a case of ‘peace journalism’ (as defined by Johan Galtung). The researchers concluded that it was peace journalism, as the participants tried to overcome misinterpretations in order to give more accurate and valid information. In addition, personal contacts derived from their

communication. Limitations were seen, among others, in the lack of knowledge of the other side's language as well as in few active members.

***Panel 19: (In-)Security, (De-)Militarization, Post-Liberal Developments – Part Two: To dos***

In his contribution, Dr. Klaus Schlichtmann (Nihon University, Japan) offered views on missed alternative paths to more peaceful developments that could have been taken throughout history. He stressed that in order to move towards a more peaceful world, (1) the EU and Germany have to remember that the EU set out as a project to avoid war which is, according to Schlichtmann, not compatible with the EU army project; and (2) the Global South has to be included in a new global security structure, i.e. by including countries such as India as a permanent UN Security Councilmember.

Dr. Unto Vesa (University of Tampere, Finland) focused on the prerequisites for “Security, Arms Control, Disarmament and Confidence Building Measures in the Baltic Sea Region”. Drawing on Karl Deutsch's integration theory and the concept of pluralistic security communities, the panelist showed how after the Cold War a new security community developed in the Baltic Sea region. However, currently we face several negative trends and setbacks such as expanding military expenses due to an increasing threat perception. In order to avoid worst-case scenarios, Vesa pleaded for efforts to restart communication and interaction between actors in order to build lasting confidence and trust and move towards co-operative security.

Lastly, Prof. Dr. Akbota Zholdasbekova (Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan) presented her research findings on changes in China's foreign policy during the last few years as well as the perception of these in other Asian countries. She showed how China seems to be striving towards a more powerful position within the global political system, moving from rather passive measures until the early 2000s towards enhancing its international economic and political competitiveness as well as increasing its involvement in global and regional affairs since then. However, she claimed, the country faces different xenophobic reactions towards this outreach.

***Panel 20: Beyond 'Liberal Peace': Western and non-Western Approaches to Peace Theories and Practices: Epistemologies – Concepts – Tools – Findings***

Marie-Kristin Thimm (The International Institute of Peace Studies and Global Philosophy, Scotland) posed the question what role global philosophical studies can play in the search for peace and the resolution of conflict in today's complex multipolar world. Thimm argued that even though conflicts are inherently individual and differ from each other, there might still be a common tool to enforce peace. Thimm concluded the presentation by referring to the Interfaith Peace Treaty and its provenance as the first attempt to establish a lasting philosophical and interfaith peace agreement between warring ideological, religious and theological blocs.

Dr. Maximilian Lakitsch (University of Graz, Austria) presented his paper “The Hobbesian State of Nature in its Relevance for Peacebuilding” discussing problems in post-conflict peacebuilding. Lakitsch asserted that the problem with most strategies in peacebuilding lies with their roots in liberal theory. However, he showed that Hobbes' concept of the State of Nature can be used as a tool in order to (re-)build an egalitarian society with the help of a bottom-up approach, taking into account the significance of specific group identities for peace and conflict.

***Panel 21: Conflict Intervention Policies and Practices***

Wolfgang Schreiber (University of Hamburg, Germany) concentrated on 'European' interventions and the institutional framework within which European states actually intervene. Looking at military interventions of the EU member states since 1990, he listed minor and major

participations in UN missions, EU missions, NATO or NATO-led missions, ad hoc coalitions, and unilateral or individual missions. The study explored the relations between the EU and UN and the EU and NATO, coming to the conclusion that in the former the organizations are neither supportive nor competitive towards each other and in the latter NATO often assumes a leading role. Schreiber pointed out that the contribution of some Nordic countries to UN missions is decreasing and called for research in this matter.

Oscar Hidalgo-Redondo (University of Tampere, Finland/University of New York, Prague, Czech Republic) presented his work-in-progress on a study on the Basque conflict and the impact of external actors to it. He was especially interested in how these external actors have influenced the conflict in a way that has led to the termination of the armed activity of ETA. Hidalgo-Redondo showed that the latest phase of the conflict (since 2001) has been characterized by mobilization against ETA, which he explained with the 9/11 attacks and the international community's reaction to them.

Firuze Simay Sezgin (Koç University, Turkey) presented a working paper on "Initial Deployments of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations and the Divide". As peacekeeping operations (PKO) are one of the preferred ways of the UN to work towards sustainable peace, Sezgin studied the first three months of PKOs as these are often stated to be critical by the UN but have not been thoroughly researched, yet. Sezgin pointed out patterns in size and speed of PKO deployment and argued that conflicts that result in higher numbers of refugees or are associated with international threats are more likely to be addressed by PKOs in a short-time frame. Moreover, the operations tend to last longer and be larger in size.

### ***Panel 22: Methods from the Margins – De-Colonizing Elements of Methodology in Conflict Research***

Hanna AlTaher (University of Marburg, Germany) and Dr. Alke Jenss (University of Bielefeld, Germany) pointed out that dominant concepts such as 'going to the field' or conducting an 'expert interview' entail asymmetric power relations that have to be revealed and replaced in order to decolonize methods in Conflict Research. Reflecting on their role as researchers, they asked what a multiplicity of perspectives actually means for their research and stressed a variety of conceptual consequences of decolonizing methods that have to be based on the understanding that researchers are not the only actors producing knowledge. More precisely, the panelists and the audience called for participatory research including feedback workshops and sharing the research outcomes with the persons concerned, rather than considering them mere research subjects.

Gianna Schlichte (Goethe-University Frankfurt/Main, Germany) presented her work on "Engaging in Radical Relationality as an Irritating (Im)Possibility". She asked how narratives are translated into legal language and how victims are objectified with this codification. Her work was based on the central assumptions that both scientific and legal discourses (mis)understand knowledge production as a quest of finding the truth and, in turn, defining 'the truth' about 'the victim'.

### **1.3. Gesamtergebnis der Tagung im Hinblick auf die Zielsetzung**

Mit der gemeinsamen AFK-EuPRA-Tagung "Peace and Conflict Studies from the Margins to the Center. Rethinking Europe in an Unequal World" konnten sowohl das Themen- und Perspektivspektrum als auch die internationale Vernetzung der deutschsprachigen Friedens- und Konfliktforschung erweitert werden. Die hohe Anzahl eingegangener Beiträge zeigt, dass die Internationalisierung des Kolloquiums insgesamt gut angenommen wurde. Durch die

Kooperation mit dem europäischen Dachverband EuPRA wurde nicht nur die Zusammenarbeit und Vernetzung der europäischen Forschungs-Communities gestärkt, sondern auch Deutschland als Standort der Friedens- und Konfliktforschung sichtbar gemacht. Zwischen Forschenden aus dem europäischen und dem außereuropäischen Ausland entstanden zahlreiche Kontakte mit Aussicht auf zukünftige Kooperationsprojekte. Ein transdisziplinärer Programmpunkt war u.a. die Podiumsdiskussion „‘Liberal Peace’? Civil Wars and Hybrid Peace in a Post-Colonial Era of Global Transition“, auf der neben einer (Politik-)Wissenschaftlerin, auch eine (Entwicklungs-)Politikerin und eine (Friedens-)Aktivistin sprachen.

Im Hinblick auf die fachliche Diskussion stellte die herausragende Keynote „Decolonizing Peace and Conflict Studies“ einen innovativen Ansatz zur Reflexion von Eurozentrismus sowie globaler Machtasymmetrien und Ungleichheiten dar, die den Teilnehmenden für die gesamten Tagung eine Inspiration zur Hinterfragung ihrer Forschungskonzepte und -praktiken bot. So wurden in den Panels u.a. der Diskurs zu Geflüchteten als Bedrohung und Auslöser einer ‚Krise‘ sowie Konzepte wie Radikalisierung und humanitäre Hilfe hinterfragt. Vielen Beiträgen lagen dabei kritische und post-/dekoloniale Theorie-Ansätze zugrunde. Andere Beiträge befassten sich in allgemeinerer und traditionellerer Hinsicht mit Konflikten, die in Verbindung mit aktuellen politischen Herausforderungen – v.a. bei der Rolle Europas – stehen, wodurch die Perspektivenvielfalt gewahrt wurde.

## **2. Ergebnisverwendung/Veröffentlichungen**

Die Tagung wurde erstmals durch einen Blog begleitet, der vom Arbeitskreis junger Wissenschaftler\*innen der AFK betreut wurde. Dort fanden sich bereits im Vorfeld der Konferenz alle Abstracts der Panels und Einzelbeiträge. Der Blog wurde von den Tagungsteilnehmenden während des Kolloquiums interaktiv genutzt: [Blog](#).

Des Weiteren erschien bereits ein Bericht über die Tagung in der Zeitschrift „Wissenschaft und Frieden“ (Ausgabe 2/2017). Dieser ist hier online einzusehen: [Bericht](#).

Die Friedensnobelpreisträgerin Tawakkol Karman berichtete über ihren eigenen Beitrag auf ihrer Homepage und erreichte damit auch ein internationales Publikum über die Wissenschaft hinaus: [Bericht](#).

Wie bereits in den letzten Jahren wurden die Vortragenden des AFK-Kolloquiums ermutigt, ihre Beiträge auf Grundlage der Diskussionen und Kommentare zu überarbeiten und anschließend zur Veröffentlichung in der „Zeitschrift für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung“ (ZeFKo) einzureichen. Da die ZeFKo in deutscher Sprache erscheint, ist dieses Angebot in erster Linie für die deutschsprachigen Teilnehmer\*innen interessant.

### **Abstract**

Vor dem Hintergrund jüngster politischer und gesellschaftlicher Entwicklungen in Europa, wie etwa der Versicherheitlichung von Grenzen und der Zunahme rassistischer und rechtspopulistischer Bewegungen, beschäftigte sich das AFK-Kolloquium 2017 mit der Herausforderung, die gegenwärtige Friedens- und Konfliktforschung von den Rändern her neu zu denken. Unter dem Titel „Peace and Conflict Studies from the Margins to the Center. Rethinking Europe in an Unequal World“ fand die Tagung nicht nur in Kooperation mit der Evangelischen Akademie Villigst, sondern auch mit dem europäischen Dachverband European Peace Research Association (EuPRA). Dadurch konnte die internationale Vernetzung von Friedens- und Konfliktforscher\*innen gefördert und ein besonders diverses Spektrum an Themen und Perspektiven vorgetragen und diskutiert werden. In insgesamt 22 Panels, einer Keynote und einer Podiumsdiskussion diskutierten die über 100 Teilnehmenden aktuelle

Entwicklungen und Konflikte v.a. der europäischen Politik und hinterfragten ihre eigene Position und Forschungspraktiken vor dem Hintergrund der Frage nach Zentren und Rändern der Macht. Hierbei sollten vor allem Alternativen zu ‚klassischen‘ wissenschaftlichen Ansätzen diskutiert werden, um Europas Rolle in einer Welt globaler Ungleichheiten und Machtasymmetrien kritisch zu reflektieren. Während viele Beiträge dem dekolonialen Impetus der Keynote von Dr. Meera Sabaratnam (SOAS, University of London, UK) über “Decolonizing Peace and Conflict Studies” folgten, wurden auch klassischere Forschungsperspektiven und -praktiken vorgetragen und diskutiert. Dabei standen Konzepte wie ‚Peacebuilding‘, ‚liberaler Frieden‘, ‚Radikalisierung‘ und ‚Humanitäre Hilfe‘ sowie etwa der politische und mediale Diskurs über Migration auf dem Prüfstand. Neben etablierten Forschenden präsentierten zahlreiche Nachwuchswissenschaftler\*innen ihre Arbeit und erhielten die Gelegenheit zur internationalen Vernetzung. Der multidisziplinäre wissenschaftsinterne Diskurs wurde zudem durch praktische Perspektiven aus der Politik und dem Friedensaktivismus bereichert, wie etwa durch die Friedensnobelpreisträgerin Tawakkol Karman (Jemen).