Introduction

Magdalena Kmak and Heta Björklund

It is a truism to say that scientific knowledge does not suddenly emerge from the dust of scholars' offices but is always shaped by their worldviews, values and beliefs, which are also shared by other members of the scientific community¹ operating in a particular historical milieu.² It is perhaps less often discussed, however, that knowledge is also affected by scholars' own individual experiences, incidents, stories and emotions that give meaning to their scientific expression. As Hannah Arendt wrote, "thought itself – (...) – arises out of the actuality of incident, and incidents of living experience must remain its guideposts by which it takes its bearing if it is not to lose itself".³

The main focus of this book is knowledge created in the context of mobility and displacement – the circumstances that generate new communities, experiences and stories affecting the processes of knowledge production. But the book's aim is not solely to trace and account for the concrete forms of knowledge created through different types of movement. We are not interested in the hypermobility of contemporary western scholars (the authors of this book included) who, until the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic, have been privileged in their ability to attend numerous conferences and meetings around the globe every year. Instead, while looking at mobile knowledges this book is particularly interested in knowledges created in and through forced displacement and exile. By asking what is the epistemological value of mobility and displacement for scientific knowledge we shift the perspective from the static, institutionalized settings of knowledge production to mobile and therefore minoritarian forms of knowledge formed through the experiences of movement. As Asli Vatansever describes, displacement is an experience creating "a particularly paradoxical moment for subjectivity, that alters one's existential conditions as well as one's way of viewing the world and the self".⁴ At the same time, displacement also challenges the primacy of the established forms of political, social or scientific membership.⁵ It provides alternative knowledge of societies that is rooted in mobility and, as underlined by Thomas Nail, allow us to understand movement and mobility, as well as those who are on the move, as a socially constitutive power.⁶ The shift towards the figure of the 'displaced scholar' as well as the non-academic mobile knowledge producer that this book attempts to make, also shows displacement, following Vatansever, as "a significant stage in the process of precarization",⁷ bringing

to the fore non-dominant and precarious knowledges, ‘failed’ academic careers, and accounts of lives lost in the context of forced displacement.

On a more general level, therefore, the shift in perspective from static to mobile conditions of knowledge production allows us not only to account for the knowledges produced through the experience of displacement, but also, to understand better the structural margins of contemporary institutional academia⁸ with its gatekeeping practices, precarity of academic work and the societal role of researchers and lecturers. With the addition of the decolonial lens this shift also allows us, as Lucy Mayblin and Joe Turner underline, to ask in particular: “where authoritative and influential knowledge is produced and proliferated, which knowledges are produced by which people, and which languages and media hold legitimacy and have greater global reach” and, finally, who is excluded from participation in this knowledge creation.⁹

This book originally arose from a roundtable discussion at the “Coming Home: The Post-war Return of Refugee Scholarship” conference, held in April 2019 at the University of Helsinki, organized by the Centre of Excellence in Law, Identity and the European Narratives.¹⁰ We asked the panellists of the roundtable – scholars who are refugees themselves or who focus in their research on knowledges created by refugees and migrants – to reflect on their understanding of the meaning of home and its importance for their research, the impact of the experience of displacement on their scholarship or the scholarship of those scholars that they knew or studied, and the meaning of refugee or exile scholarship. The roundtable discussion focused on the links between the reason for fleeing and the topic of one’s studies, the role of language, the adaptation strategies or the general situation in contemporary academia. One emerging theme was also the essentializing quality of the used concepts such as an exile, émigré or a refugee and the way Europe is being narrated through ‘refugee knowledges’.

While the roundtable discussion served as an intellectual point of departure for the analysis of the meaning of ‘refugee scholarship’, this book emerges from a background of scholarly discussion within exile studies and critical migration studies, and draws links between historical and contemporary scholarship.

The aim of this edited volume is to open up, problematize and contextualize the concepts of ‘refugee scholarship’ and, more broadly, ‘refugee knowledge’ in and of contemporary and historical Europe. Even though scientific knowledge is a primary focus of the volume, the meaning, production and scope of ‘refugee scholarship’, generated at the institutions of higher education, is critically discussed. At the same time, this volume focuses on the ‘refugee knowledge’ produced outside of these institutions and scrutinizes conditions of their validation or silencing. The contributors are scholars of various disciplines, with both personal and scholarly interest in ‘refugee knowledges’ and ‘refugee scholarship’, and are differently positioned within the contemporary academia.

Mobility as a mode of knowing

As one of the most famous exile intellectuals, Edward Said wrote in his *Reflections on Exile*,

[m]odern Western culture is in large part the work of exiles, émigrés, refugees. In the United States, academic, intellectual and aesthetic thought is what it is today because of refugees from fascism, communism, and other regimes given to the oppression and expulsion of dissidents.¹¹

To be sure, mobility as a mode of knowing or the production of knowledge through mobility is not a new field of study. The movement or circulation of human beings has been recognized as a necessary element of the transfer of valuable knowledge. In particular, the role of exiled scholars or intellectuals in creating a new scientific knowledge has been widely recognized. As Peter Burke underlines, historically the movement of scholars across borders had tremendous intellectual consequences.¹² Certainly, scholars fleeing political and religious persecutions contributed to the creation of new knowledges through deprovincialization of their own knowledge, mediation between cultures, distanciation and outsidership in relation to dominant cultures and the hybridization of traditions.¹³ Whereas the contribution of exile or displaced scholars to the production of knowledge is a global topic¹⁴ and the impact of many groups of scholars such as French Huguenots or the Russian Diaspora have been well documented,¹⁵ the theoretical and methodological point of departure for this book is the scholarship developed in the wake of the Great Exodus from Nazi Germany. During the 1930s as many as 2,000 scholars were dismissed from German universities and 60% of them went into exile.¹⁶ Those who found positions abroad, mostly at universities in the USA or the UK, contributed to research, scientific discoveries or developments of new scientific disciplines. They often brought this new knowledge, in various forms, back home,¹⁷ influencing political culture and academic research.¹⁸ For instance, according to Kaius Tuori, the experience of exile and immersion in a new academic culture by a group of German-Jewish scholars of Roman law in the 1930s and 1940s contributed significantly to the development of the idea of the shared European legal culture.¹⁹

The aim of this book, however, is to expand the knowledge of refugee scholarship beyond this framework of exile studies and to incorporate other epistemological approaches to exile and displacement that are relevant to Europe today. This includes both the novel methodological approaches, experiences produced outside Europe, as well as contemporary epistemologies of exile and displacement. Nowadays, the number of scholars in displacement remains very high. Since 2011, the Scholars at Risk (SAR) network of universities, which supports displaced scholars, has reported over 1,600 attacks on higher education in over one hundred countries,²⁰ leading to increased displacement of academics. One example among many are Academics for Peace from Turkey, whose displacement was a follow-up of a petition against the Turkish state military offensive in the Kurdish-populated areas of Turkey. The Peace Petition signed in 2016 by 1,128 scholars was followed by purges, sackings and court trials and many of the signatories had to leave the country. Overall, since the funding of the SAR of universities in 2000, it has arranged more than 1,200 positions for scholars seeking assistance. Even though the

conditions for academic work have changed since the 1930s and the field of scientific research is one of the most globalized nowadays, displaced scholars still struggle to continue their scientific work in new environments.

The impact of the experience of displacement on scholarly changes has been accounted for in the literature, both in the first and the second generation of exile studies,²¹ which focused primarily on biographical accounts and the impact the émigrés had in their countries of displacement. The impact of exile scholarship as well as the discipline of exile studies has, however, also affected the countries of origins of these scholars. As Alfons Söllner writes in this volume, through the discipline of *Exilforschung*, exile and emigration became part of the historical consciousness in post-war Germany, also co-shaping, perhaps unconsciously, current German asylum policies (chapter 5). Building on this vast area of knowledge, this volume constitutes an attempt to contribute to the emerging third generation of exile studies, with the focus on the impact of exile experience on combining previously unrelated ideas and the production of new theories.²² This new focus on academic displacement not only brings forward the agency of the émigrés²³ and recognizes the role of affects and emotions in the process of knowledge production,²⁴ but also encompasses the expanding research field of knowledges produced outside Europe and the epistemologies of contemporary migration.

Scholars and intellectuals have often been considered to be those who, more often than other refugees, reflect on their exile or displacement as a condition of general political or cultural significance. While some refused (for various reasons) to be called exiled intellectuals,²⁵ others recognized the impact of exile or migration experience on their academic work and their thoughts. Many understood that they would not have accomplished as much as they did if they had remained in their home countries. Among German-Jewish scholars, for instance, the theologian Paul Tillich reflected in one of his lectures on how exile in the USA had deprovincialized him and his thoughts.²⁶ Another well-known example is Hannah Arendt, whose extensive writings about exile, political justice, and human rights continue to influence the way we think about society and politics, or Palestinian intellectuals such as Edward Said and Munir Fasheh,²⁷ who have had a significant influence on global intellectual movements.

In her recent book, *At the Margins of Academia*, Aslı Vatansever gives an account of the impact and experience of displacement on the group of Academics for Peace in Germany providing social and political commentary about displacement and knowledge production, the impact of displacement and precarity on subjectivity and the condition of contemporary academia. Another example is the account of the writings about exile by Syrian writer and scholar Yassin al-Haj Saleh in the chapter by ElSayed Mahmoud ElSehamy in this volume. In his writings, al-Haj Saleh articulates the phenomenon of exile beyond its personified, literary and figurative aesthetics. Exile for him is not exclusively about displacement and uprooting; instead, exilement, as a cluster of practices and forces, is a modality of government which is constitutive of the Assadist regime's rule in Syria. It is also

important to remember, however, that many scholars remained for various reasons silent about their own experiences. In her book *Edgar and Brigitte*, Rosemary Bodenheimer writes about her mother, Brigitte Bodenheimer: “she was being true to her nature and training: one did not complain about one’s status as a woman or a Jew, nor did one draw on the vocabulary of victimization”.²⁸ Another exiled lawyer, Otto Kirchheimer, was also very silent about his personal exile experiences, possibly channelling his personal experiences into an extensive chapter on the history and present situation of political asylum in his influential work *Political Justice*.²⁹

The aim of this book, however, is to go beyond simple comparisons between the experiences of historical and contemporary figures. As Kmak and Farzamfar show in this volume, the difference between historical and contemporary narratives lies in the situatedness of historical and contemporary experiences which, even though sometimes surprisingly similar (like complaints about the inability to conduct research due to the increasing number of administrative tasks), would provide a distorted and superficial image. Carol Bohmer, also in this book, concurs that comparison between historical and contemporary displaced scholars shows that current refugee scholars are subject to “a perfect storm of difficult conditions as both academics and immigrants”. This unique situation encompasses both academic and visa precarity and cannot be easily compared with historical examples. Instead, this book attempts to bring historical and contemporary figures into conversation with one another. On the one hand, contemporary scholars can often answer the questions one would want to ask from historical figures but are not able to. On the other hand, the impact of displacement on the production of academic knowledge by contemporary scholars could most likely only be seen from the perspective of time, as in the case of some historical figures discussed in this volume. There are, however, similarities in the biographies in academic narratives that include personal and academic narratives connected to the condition of exile and the experience of asylum and refuge policies and procedures; human rights, justice and the need to act; development of one’s academic career and scholarly identity; and, finally, the relationship to one’s home country, including contesting home regimes, which is a focus of the chapter in this book by Svensson. As he writes, displaced academics are often instrumental in contesting authoritarianism from a point of experienced necessary social change in order to identify and potentially delegitimize the home-state hierarchical systems.

Displacement and contemporary neoliberal academia

Academics for Peace themselves have arguably been most vocal about the current precarious conditions of displacement and this has reflected their situation and has had an impact on their work. As Seçkin Sertdemir Özdemir, Nil Mutluer, and Esra Özyurek wrote:

while working together to decode the legal system in Turkey, navigate immigration law in various European countries, and convince

universities to accept Turkish scholars at risk as visiting scholars, we found ourselves, like other scholars in exile before us, self-reflexively theorizing the exilic conditions of knowledge production and academic employment that now affect our own colleagues' lives.³⁰

In particular, they notice how neoliberal pressure on the universities since 1980 has changed the situation of displaced scholars nowadays in comparison to, for instance, the 1930s and 1940s. As their SAR scholarships end, they claim that they become temporary qualified additions to the academic labour reserve in the commodified education system.³¹ However, the primary focus of exile scholarship has been on the success stories. Even though financial hardships and social and intellectual isolation have been discussed extensively, little is known of those scholars who did not manage to find positions at foreign universities and whose knowledge has been effectively silenced by their exile. Usually those scholars who found academic positions were either recognized and well-connected already before they left or were young enough to re-educate themselves at the host states' universities. Judith Friedlander in her recent book on the University in Exile, established at the New School for Social Research in 1934, calls the selection-making process brutal.³² Even though the competitiveness based on scientific merit applies to all scholars, displaced and non-displaced alike, such practices resembled a very tough recruitment process rather than assistance to scholars in distress. Extremely high requirements were imposed on scholars-refugees from Nazi Germany and this is visible in the scholar classification by Rockefeller Foundation's director, Alan Gregg:

Categories of scholars to be aided: Distinguished scholars of established reputation (Class I), and brilliant younger scholars of proved ability (Class II), the young men of promise (Class III), on the other hand, should be excluded.³³

As Kaius Tuori shows in this volume, beyond a small number of well-known scholars who developed their careers in exile, the vast majority never achieved such success. For many, exile was a process of marginalization and silencing due often to both structural or personal factors, and their academic careers were either put on hold or abandoned completely. However, the ethos of the exiled intellectual has often been glorified and only success stories attracted attention. This is even more important to consider in the case of contemporary scholars in neoliberalized academia who point out that scholarships are usually granted to those educated in North American and European universities and publishing in high-ranking journals in the dominant academic languages of English, French and German. In their words, academic competitiveness becomes the most important basis for protection from persecution.³⁴ As Aslı Vatansever, a displaced academic from Turkey herself, writes, academic knowledge in this context can be viewed "as both capital and commodity in today's capitalism",³⁵ contributing to the precarity of scholars and researchers. In her study on de-subjection and re-subjection of Academics

for Peace she shows that “the precariousness caused by the short duration of risk-scholarships is perceived by the signatories as a trouble primarily related to being in exile”. As Vatansever claims, however, in fact this precarity is conditioned by the structure of the academic labour markets.³⁶ Therefore the solution to such a situation – stepping out of being ‘exiles’ and becoming ‘academics’ – is unable to channel re-subjection as, when their exile scholarships end, they join the surplus academic labour force.³⁷

This condition of the academic precarity of displaced scholars is fuelled by globalized academia, which encourages internationalization and mobility. Universities obsessively count publications and visiting scholarships, and mobility is seen as the way to market or brand the university itself.³⁸ According to Gurminder Bhambra, the current marketization of the university actually attacks the diversity of knowledges, resistance, and meaningful social critique within academia.³⁹ In addition, the political economy of academic work pushes knowledge production outside of the academia through outsourcing and subcontracting,⁴⁰ including the intellectual work of refugee and migrant scholars. As Nadine Hassouneh and Elisa Pascucci show in their chapter in this volume, mainstream humanitarian organizations employing or contracting refugees to conduct humanitarian work and research in the field, manage knowledge and knowledge production in ways that uphold, rather than question, global racialized inequalities. As they show, forms of knowledge brought to refugee and humanitarian regimes by people with a refugee background tasked with providing protection and assistance to refugees, is often not credited or recognized through remuneration. Hassouneh and Pascucci’s chapter also shows that studying the impact of exile and displacement on knowledge production cannot be limited to the knowledge produced by scholars and intellectuals. Thanks to, for instance, existing letter correspondence and memoirs of historical figures, as well as the current development of digital technology, the knowledge produced by all refugees and displaced persons has been and will be accessed and shared. Pedro Magalhães and Laura Sumari in this volume also show the important role of migrant communities for the production of knowledge. By quoting the study of Tekalign Ayalew Mengiste, they highlight how knowledge is produced by migrants, their families and friends at home and in diaspora, as well as co-travellers along the migration routes.⁴¹ Therefore, despite its primary focus on scientific knowledge production, the aim of this volume is also to consider knowledge production in exile by decentering the figure of the intellectual – historically white, male and western – to highlight the figure of the exiled, displaced and migrant knowledge worker, who is not necessarily based at academic institutions.

The aim of this volume is therefore to present an alternative narrative of exile and ‘refugee knowledge’ or displaced knowledge that is generative, yet that does not tap into the neoliberal productivity discourse. Focusing on the multifaceted forms of knowledge emerging in the context of migration and mobility not only allows one to understand movement and mobility, as well as those who are on the move, as a socially constitutive power but also to go beyond methodological nationalism and Eurocentrism.⁴² The editors and

authors are, however, aware of difficulties linked with avoiding methodological nationalism, as Magalhães and Sumari underline in this volume. Indeed, de-naturalizing nation-states in migration research requires careful consideration of the situatedness of academic knowledge production. In particular, it underlines the responsibility of the researcher to become more aware of their beliefs and positionalities. Doing research requires constant and continuous self-reflexivity regarding multiple positionalities and power (a)symmetries, questioning the naturalized role of the nation-state in social sciences and especially migration and refugee studies.

Like methodological nationalism, the attempt in this volume has been to tackle the problem of Eurocentrism in research – where dominant producers of global knowledges coming from Europe and the Anglophone West can “write with authority about anywhere”, but those from outside these regions are only allowed to write about “particular places and when doing so must use the frameworks of the global knowledge producers”.⁴³ This is what Keguro Macharia calls ‘being area-studied’⁴⁴ and Vatansever “thematic apartheid”.⁴⁵ For instance, Prem Kumar Rajaram shows in his chapter in this volume how Eurocentrism is visible in both historical and contemporary accounts. His research on narratives of migrant tea workers in colonial India and the problems that displaced people face in accessing higher education in Europe nowadays exposes the approach to knowledges by colonial subjects and refugees. As Rajaram writes, subaltern others enter into formal and public relations as lesser subjects, having to adapt to dominant norms while having their own narratives and ways of knowing diminished in value. This derogation of value enables the dominant positions of key concepts that fuel methodological nationalism and Eurocentrism like the nation-state or what Rajaram defines as state-nation-community. In the same manner the Peace Academics displaced in Europe highlight how they “are persistently expected to give talks, interviews, and lectures and do research on Turkey exclusively – regardless of their actual disciplines and research interests”.⁴⁶ Similarly, one of the interviewees in Kmak and Farzamfar’s study shows how displaced scholars are often considered to be experts only on their own region, such as an expert on whatever happens in Africa, as if it would be a unified continent.

This approach is also visible in the tendency to classify and contain the community of refugees and displaced persons into one particular unit that also orients the dominant form of thinking about them. It is, for instance, visible in the ways that the European Union defines its identity against the refugee or a migrant, rather than accepting that it is itself shaped by refugees’ knowledge about it. The EU pretends to have knowledge of the refugee rather than being known by the refugee. As Bergholm and Toivanen demonstrate in this volume, these dominant narratives contribute to categorizing refugees and migrants in stereotypical and harmful ways that hinder recognition of the refugees’ own knowledge and hearing their voices. Refugees are seen as a source of the ‘crisis’, as a dangerous unknown, as a group that needs to be helped, or as saviours of Europe, able, for instance, to balance the demographic dependency ratio.

This volume is an attempt to go beyond these hegemonic perspectives and in doing so to recognize the multiplicity of ways to know, think or write about the knowledges that are not only being affected by Europe or European citizens, but are also affecting how Europe or European citizens see themselves. This volume underlines that scholarly self-reflection on the nature of their own subjectivity and the context in which they create scientific knowledge is rooted in many locations and homes. This approach proves particularly fruitful for the endeavour undertaken by this book as it challenges the national order of things and institutionally structured ways of knowing.

This approach also confirms that the dichotomy of belonging and not belonging rooted in rigid categories of citizenship and nationality is misleading and that displaced persons may belong simultaneously to more than one place.⁴⁷ For instance, even though John Herz, a lawyer and scholar of international relations, called himself a traveller between two worlds, and, according to his biographer Jana Puglierin, never felt completely happy with this in-betweenness,⁴⁸ he seemed to accept his cosmopolitan position. In the interview with Puglierin in 2005 (just before he died in December that year), he said:

I now actually feel less like a traveller between two worlds than a traveller between all worlds. That is, I see myself less as a European or American and more as a resident of this planet, a planet that is becoming too small. I feel cosmopolitan more than limited to a particular cultural field or part of the earth.

Similarly, sociologist Reinhard Bendix, who thought of himself as a cultural hybrid and as never fully belonging to one community, underlined that:

In the modern world of Western civilization, all of us confront the triple issue of the individual, the nation, and the intermediate groups, a division which is ultimately incompatible with individualism, and the nation-state. But only ultimately. In the proximate world in which we live, all three exist in uneasy combination.⁴⁹

Nomadic knowledges

How therefore does one reconcile the precarity of displacement with this mobile, or, in the words of Herz, cosmopolitan subjectivity? As Ash Vatansever shows in her book, such reconciliation would require a shift in focus in an affirmative fashion from exile towards the nomadic mode of existence as a source of subjectivity.⁵⁰ She writes:

[t]hus, as it turns out, one of the main obstacles facing a re-subjection is not the exilic or nomadic situation per se, but the romanticization and absolutization of exile in a way as to exclude a certain group of people as an “extraordinary case” from the regular discourse on labour relations within the academic sector.⁵¹

This would mean adopting a nomadic identity and accepting the permanent, self-imposed exile as an academic way of life – a practice adopted by such contemporary thinkers as Edward Said, Michel Foucault or Rosi Braidotti.⁵² Similarly, Svensson in this volume shows how a primary identity of his interlocutors is the global nomad, as they choose the uncertainty of global settings with like-minded individuals in preference to home regimes. Despite the upsurge of authoritarian governments across the world, alternative prospects such as the choice to become nomadic may also be increasing to enable individuals such as Svensson's interlocutors to criticize and transcend repressive mechanisms.

Would such an attempt at re-subjection, however, still lead to exceptionality attached to academics who can turn their lack of fit into the world into their academic identity? For Vatansever, such a perspective could rather lead to new collective and innovative modes of resistance against the structural conditions of precarity.⁵³ She refers to the concept of nomadic identities, developed by Rosi Braidotti, as allowing one to leave the “purgatory” of being kept in reserve as a surplus academic labour force towards “active production of multiple forms of belonging” and allegiances.⁵⁴ How, however, does one become nomadic in the contemporary academia? In conversation with Aslı Vatansever facilitated by SAR Italy in October 2020, Magdalena Kmak discussed the particular difficulty of such a position that challenges the habitual way of thinking rooted in academic tradition and academic identity and forces new ways of doing research. This position can be illustrated by an account by a doctoral student interviewed by Vatansever:

What I am trying to do now is to mobilize my intellect and the intellectual activities that I value, so that I can continue to pursue those activities anywhere in the world. And this sank in: I am trying not to make any life plans depending on a place, an institution, or a country anymore. I internalized the knowledge that anything can happen anytime. Thus, I am trying to come up with ideas for intellectual activities that I can continue to do wherever I should go in the world.⁵⁵

In addition to the difficulty of de- and re-subjection as a nomadic scholar that this quote illustrates, the danger is that nomadic identity, despite being difficult to imagine and understand, may become romanticized in contemporary scholarship, leading to its superficial application as a solution to the precarious conditions of contemporary migrants, refugees and academics. One response to this might be to focus on precarity as a general condition “experienced by different segments of the reserve army of labor”.⁵⁶ Or, as Ali Ali writes in this volume, such an approach could lead to understanding that precarity does not only concern scholars at risk in contemporary academia or academics as such but that it is a general feature in the contemporary world that can become a source of emancipation. An experience and embodiment of precariousness can contribute to the creation of yet another form of knowledge – a noteworthy and grievable knowledge, emphasizing the need

for and importance of individual and collective grieving and grievability for the production of knowledge on how to live and survive socially.

Content of the book

Scholarly knowledge is the primary focus of the volume, but the meaning, production and scope of “refugee scholarship”, generated at institutions of higher education, is critically discussed. At the same time, this volume focuses on the “refugee knowledge” produced outside of these institutions and scrutinizes conditions of their validation or silencing. The contributors are scholars from various disciplines, with both a personal and a scholarly interest in refugee knowledge and refugee scholarship.

This book falls into three thematic parts. The first part, “Beyond Methodological and Eurocentric Nationalism in Research on Scholarship”, lays the methodological basis of the book in its first two chapters, Pedro Magalhães and Laura Sumari’s “Methodological Nationalism and Migration Studies: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives” and Prem Kumar Rajaram’s “Refugee and Migrant Knowledge as Historical Narratives”. Reflecting on how Europe and European citizens see themselves, Bea Bergholm and Reetta Toivanen analyse the reactions by different European institutions to the 2015 influx of asylum seekers in Europe in their chapter “Narratives on ‘Refugee Knowledge’ in the Institutions of Europe”, while ElSayed Mahmoud ElSehamy explores Yassin al-Haj Saleh’s concept of exile in the chapter “The World as an Exiling Political Structure. Yassin al-Haj Saleh’s Conceptualization of Exile”.

The second part, “Refugee Scholarship and Scholarly Identity”, opens with a history of science perspective provided by Alfons Söllner’s chapter “Exile and Emigration from the Third Reich – Stages and Results of Research in Germany”. The history of exile scholars in Europe – focusing on those fleeing from Nazi Germany in the 1930s and 1940s – and the relationship of academic exiles to modern scholars at risk is examined by Magdalena Kmak and Mehrnoosh Farzamfar in their chapter “Personal and Academic Narratives of Exiled and Displaced Scholars”, while Carol Bohmer brings in an important historical perspective with a focus on the role of UNHCR and the 1951 Refugee Convention in her chapter “Refugee Scholars Then and Now”. Christian Franklin Svensson uses an anthropological approach to networks aimed at helping refugees and vulnerable scholars – Scholars at Risk (SAR) and International Cities of Refuge Network (ICORN) – in his chapter “Beyond Authoritarianism: Migration, Uncertainty and a Sense of Belonging Among Public Intellectuals”.

There is a tendency to celebrate the success stories of exiled scholars who either brought with them new ideas to their new home country, who reinvented themselves during or after exile, or whose scholarly ideas flourished after exile in their new home countries. However, for the vast majority of academic refugees, this was not the case. This is explored in the third part of the volume, “Silencing and Gatekeeping Knowledges”. In his chapter “The

Silenced Majority: Academic Refugees and the Vicissitudes of Readaptation”, Kaius Tuori outlines some of the major dangers and negative factors facing refugee scholars. Issues of silencing and marginalization are tackled in more detail in Ali Ali’s chapter, “Reframing the Subject – Affective Knowledge in the Urgency of Refuge”, which threads together the issues of precarity, subjectivity and grievable knowledges. The book closes with a strongly contemporary chapter, drawing on interviews with Syrian aid workers, by Nadine Hassouneh and Elisa Pascucci, “Nursing Trauma, Harvesting Data: Refugee Knowledge and Refugee Labour in the International Humanitarian Regime”.

Even though the chapters do not aim to provide a comprehensive approach to take on the topic of “refugee scholarship” or “refugee knowledges”, the book serves as a starting point for further discussion not only about the historical and contemporary role of refugee and exiled scholars but also about the conditions of contemporary European academia.

Acknowledgments

This work is part of the Academy of Finland-funded Centre of Excellence in Law, Identity and the European Narratives (funding decision numbers 312154, 336676, 312431, and 336678).

Notes

- 1 Kuhn, 1994.
- 2 Foucault, 2002.
- 3 Livholts and Tamboukou, 2015, 121.
- 4 Vatansever, 2020, 8.
- 5 Agamben, 2008.
- 6 Nail, 2015.
- 7 Vatansever, 2020, 8.
- 8 Mayblin and Turner, 2020, 8.
- 9 Mayblin and Turner, 2020, 33.
- 10 www.eurostorie.org/
- 11 Said, 2001, 180.
- 12 Burke, 2016, 208.
- 13 Burke, 2017.
- 14 Burke, 2017, 34.
- 15 Burke, 2017.
- 16 Krohn, 1993.
- 17 Ash and Söllner, 1996; Söllner, 1996; Fermi, 1968; Coser, 1984; Krohn, 1993; Rösch, 2014.
- 18 Jay, 1996; Söllner, 2006.
- 19 Tuori, 2019a; Tuori, 2019b; Tuori, 2020.
- 20 Scholars at Risk, 2020.
- 21 Camurri, 2014.
- 22 Tuori, 2020, 20; Burke, 2017; Kettler and Wheatland, 2019.
- 23 Tuori, 2020, 11.
- 24 Boccagni and Baldassar, 2015.

- 25 See, for instance, Arnold Brecht, Letter to Anette Bushman, June 12, 1938. Arnold Brecht papers, The German and Jewish Intellectual Émigré Collections, SUNY Albany.
- 26 Tillich, 1961, 139.
- 27 Sukarieh, 2019.
- 28 Bodenheimer, 2016, 60.
- 29 Söllner, 1988, 58.
- 30 Özdemir, Mutluer, and Özyürek, 2019, 6.
- 31 Özdemir et al., 2019, 6.
- 32 Friedlander, 2019.
- 33 Edgcomb, 1993.
- 34 Özdemir et al., 2019, 17.
- 35 Vatansever, 2020, 29.
- 36 Vatansever, 2020, 119.
- 37 Vatansever, 2020, 136.
- 38 Ahmed, 2012, 52.
- 39 Bhambra, 2016, 965.
- 40 Sukarieh and Tannock, 2019.
- 41 Ayalew Mengiste, 2018.
- 42 These intellectual approaches in the broad social scientific research take the nation-state as a basis for societal organization, including the production of knowledge. See, for instance, van Baar, 2016; Braidotti, 2010; Sager, 2016, 43.
- 43 Mayblin and Turner, 2020, 35.
- 44 Macharia, 2016.
- 45 Vatansever, 2020, 56.
- 46 Vatansever, 2020, 57.
- 47 Sager, 2016, 48.
- 48 Puglierin, 2008, 423.
- 49 Puglierin, 2008, 424.
- 50 Vatansever, 2020, 136.
- 51 Vatansever, 2020, 146.
- 52 Vatansever, 2020, 148.
- 53 Vatansever, 2020, 80.
- 54 Vatansever, 2020, 81.
- 55 Vatansever, 2020, 111.
- 56 Vatansever, 2020, 8.

Bibliography

- Agamben, Giorgio. 2008. "Beyond Human Rights." *Social Engineering* 15: 90–95.
- Ahmed, Sara. 2012. *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. London: Duke University Press.
- Ash, Mitchell G., and Alfons Söllner, eds. 1996. *Forced Migration and Scientific Change: Émigré German-Speaking Scientists and Scholars after 1933*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ayalew Mengiste, Tekalign. 2018. "Refugee Protections from Below: Smuggling in the Eritrea-Ethiopia Context." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 676, no. 1 (March): 57–76. doi:10.1177/0002716217743944.
- van Baar, Huub. 2016. "Evictability and the Biopolitical Bordering of Europe." *Antipode* 49, no. 1: 212–230.

- Bhabra, Gurinder K. 2016. "Postcolonial Reflections on Sociology." *Sociology* 50, no. 5: 960–966.
- Boccagni, Paolo, and Loretta Baldassar. 2015. "Emotions on the Move: Mapping the Emergent Field of Emotion and Migration." *Emotion, Space and Society* 16 (August): 73–80. doi:10.1016/j.emospa.2015.06.009.
- Bodenheimer, Rosemary. 2016. *Edgar and Brigitte: A German Jewish Passager to America*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 2010. "Nomadism: Against Methodological Nationalism." *Policy Futures in Education* 8, no. 3: 408–418.
- Burke, Peter. 2016. "Silver Lining: On Some Intellectual Benefits of Exile." *Storia Della Storiografia* 69, no. 1: 39–48.
- Burke, Peter. 2017. *Exiles and Expatriates in the History of Knowledge, 1500–2000. The Menahem Stern Jerusalem Lectures*. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press/ Historical Society of Israel.
- Camurri, Renato. 2014. "The Exile Experience Reconsidered: A Comparative Perspective in European Cultural Migration during the Interwar Period." *Transatlantica. Revue d'études Américaines. American Studies Journal* 1. doi:10.4000/transatlantica.6920.
- Coser, Lewis A. 1984. *Refugee Scholars in America: Their Impact and Their Experiences*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Edgcomb, Gabrielle Simon. 1993. *From Swastika to Jim Crow: Refugee Scholars at Black Colleges*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.
- Fermi, Laura. 1968. *Illustrious Immigrants: The Intellectual Migration From Europe 1930–1941*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 2002. *Archaeology of Knowledge*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Friedlander, Judith. 2019. *A Light in Dark Times The New School for Social Research and Its University in Exile*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Jay, Martin. 1996. *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923–50*. 2nd ed. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Kettler, David, and Thomas Wheatland. 2019. *The Brute Facts of Political Life: An Intellectual Biography of Franz Neumann*. New York: Anthem Press.
- Krohn, Claus-Dieter. 1993. *Intellectuals in Exile, Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research*. Translated by Rita Kimber and Robert Kimber. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. 1994. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 2nd ed. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Livholts, Mona, and Maria Tamboukou. 2015. *Discourse and Narrative Methods*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Macharia, Keguro. 2016. "On Being Area-Studied: A Litany of Complaint." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 22, no. 2: 183–189. doi:10.1215/10642684-3428711.
- Mayblin, Lucy, and Joe Turner. 2020. *Migration Studies and Colonialism*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Nail, Thomas. 2015. *The Figure of the Migrant*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Özdemir, Seçkin, Nil Mutluer, and Esra Özyürek. 2019. "Exile and Plurality in Neoliberal Times: Turkey's Academics for Peace." *Public Culture* 31, no. 2: 235–259. doi:10.1215/08992363-7286801.
- Puglierin, Jana. 2008. "Towards Being a 'Traveller between All Worlds'." *International Relations* 22, no. 4: 419–426.

- Rösch, Felix. 2014. *Émigré Scholars and the Genesis of International Relations*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sager, Alex. 2016. "Methodological Nationalism, Migration and Political Studies." *Political Studies* 64, no. 1: 42–59. doi:10.1111/1467-9248.12167.
- Said, Edward W. 2001. *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Scholars at Risk. 2020. Last visited May 13, 2021. <https://www.scholarsatrisk.org/event/free2think2020/>.
- Söllner, Alfons. 1988. "Otto Kirchheimer in Amerika. Emigrationserfahrung Und Internationalisierung Der Politikwissenschaft." *Zeitschrift Für Gesellschaftspolitik* 27: 52–60.
- Söllner, Alfons. 1996. "From Public Law to Political Science? The Emigration of German Scholars after 1933 and Their Influence on the Transformation of a Discipline." In *Forced Migration and Scientific Change: Émigré German-Speaking Scientists and Scholars after 1933*, edited by Mitchell G. Ash, and Alfons Söllner, 246–272. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Söllner, Alfons. 2006. "'Exilforschung' as Mirror of the Changing Political Culture in Post-War Germany." *Journal of the Interdisciplinary Crossroads* 3, no. 1: 63–74.
- Sukarieh, Mayssoun. 2019. "Decolonizing Education, a View from Palestine: An Interview with Munir Fasheh." *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 28, no. 2 (April): 186–199. doi:10.1080/09620214.2019.1601584.
- Sukarieh, Mayssoun, and Stuart Tannock. 2019. "Subcontracting Academia: Alienation, Exploitation and Disillusionment in the UK Overseas Syrian Refugee Research Industry." *Antipode* 51, no. 2: 664–680.
- Tillich, Paul. 1961. "The Conquest of Theological Provincialism." In *The Cultural Migration: The European Scholar in America*, edited by Franz L. Neumann, 138–156. New York: A Perpetua Book.
- Tuori, Kaius. 2019a. "Exiled Romanists between Traditions: Pringsheim, Schulz and Daube." In *Roman Law and the Idea of Europe*, edited by Kaius Tuori, and Heta Björklund, 35–52. London: Bloomsbury.
- Tuori, Kaius. 2019b. "Introduction." In *Roman Law and the Idea of Europe*, edited by Kaius Tuori, and Heta Björklund, 1–14. London: Bloomsbury.
- Tuori, Kaius. 2020. *Empire of Law: Nazi Germany, Exile Scholars and the Battle for the Future of Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vatansever, Ashi. 2020. *At the Margins of Academia: Exile, Precariousness, and Subjectivity*. Leiden: Brill.