The politics of forced internationalization

The moral economies of "research in exile"
Rethinking a field from the perspective of reflexive migration research

Isabella Löhr

In the wake of the violent conflicts in the Middle East many scholars sought to leave their countries because they suffered from censorship, were dismissed, prohibited from working or they faced immediate physical danger to their lives. Subsequently, the political persecution of scholars developed into an issue that gained attention from academic circles in Europe and North America. A large number of private and public, local, national, and European initiatives support scholars and students who seek asylum, live in refugee camps, or are in urgent need of support. Joining forces with long-existing initiatives such as the British Council for At-Risk Academics (CARA) or the two New York based Scholar Rescue Fund (SRF) and the Scholars at Risk Network (SAR), they pursue several aims at a time: to protect the lives of scholars and their families, to take a public stand for academic freedom and to enable what is presumed to be the core of higher education, the sharing and transfer of ideas, arguments and paradigms.

What can be hailed as substantial attempt to defend individuals and the core values of modern science, has also its drawbacks. First, to predicate fiercely desired entry permits to escape persecution upon the evaluation of professional performance by scientific boards presents serious ethical dilemmas. Second, humanitarian motives and the vision to enhance some sort of science dedicated to peace and a universalist dialogue should acknowledge that programs for threatened scholars are historically, socially, and culturally situated and that they participate in the governance of migration – that is, an all-encompassing management system that controls the movement of people by setting up laws, regulations, measures, and procedures that advantage the movement of one group – for example, the "highly skilled" – to the detriment

of other groups – such as "refugees" – whose movement is hindered by complex border control mechanisms. Third, advocating the cause of scholars at risk within the political and moral framework of existing migration policies means carrying the political imbalances of current migration regimes into the university and consequently entangling the politics of migration with prevalent knowledge orders and practices in the university.

It is the contention of this chapter that scholars and university activists need to think about the epistemic and moral frames that inform the drafting of support programs and their implementation as well as the way they speak about and produce knowledge on scholars at risk. More specifically, the chapter posits that help schemes for scholars at risk tend to contribute to the reproduction of policy categories that present migration as external to modern societies and as a problem for social cohesion and the governance of societies. Moreover, the chapter argues that most programs suffer from a conflict of values that stems from divergent moral economies that are inherent in the structural setup of the programs. Following the debate on the so-called reflexive turn in migration studies, the chapter suggests that helping scholars at risk and the way in which individuals, institutions, and private initiatives make sense of this needs to be written back into the field of migration studies and its recent attempts to investigate the categories used to understand and deal with (forced) migration and different forms of mobility. To support this assertion, the chapter denaturalizes the logics that inform the support schemes for scholars at risk. It argues that initiatives to balance forced migration in the university sector contribute to the political-legal categorizations of ethnic and social groups. In doing so, they feed into the selective politics of migration control that enable the movement of particular groups, while EUropean borders and human rights mechanisms remain closed or unattainable for the majority of displaced people. Moreover, the chapter shifts attention to the conflicting logics and values that inform "research in exile" and that result from the fact that the field connects very different contexts with one another – the principles of migration governance, knowledge practices, and university-led activism. It emphasizes the need to make those conflicting values visible and to open up room for a self-conscious discussion.

I do not intend to question any initiative for persecuted scholars and draft measures to remove academics from life-threatening situations. My concern is a different one: I want to sensitize to the fact that the terms, concepts, and methods used to act and speak in favor of scholars at risk are not self-

evident or uncontested but form part of the political and moral governance of migration. Consequently, it is necessary to reflect upon the extent to which current programs enshrine, refashion, or disrupt previously established migration-related configurations and how this becomes incorporated into the discursive knowledge on and management of the individual and professional prospects of the scholars at risk. I argue that only a reflexive perspective on the positionality of "scholar rescue" in the field of migration governance and the rootedness of its language and concepts in the discursive knowledge on migration allows us to understand the imbalances, limits, and opportunities of this sort of activism.

The chapter consists of three parts. The first part presents the main arguments from reflexive migration research. It carves out the difference between policy-oriented migration research and knowledge production that develops its research agenda on the basis of a continuous self-interrogation, which discloses its own social position and reflects its moral premises and values. Part two situates academic support schemes at the "nexus of academia and activism" (Kasparek & Speer, 2013, p. 259), and it elaborates on the conflicting rationalities and values that result therefrom. Taking the German Philipp Schwartz Initiative as a case study, the section argues that support for threatened scholars is embedded in a particular knowledge order that only becomes visible if we perceive programs in support of threatened scholars not as a self-evident and universal endeavor but as a historically, spatially, and institutionally situated practice that is inscribed in colonial legacies of modern science and built upon specific professional value systems and expectations. The third part examines the connections between "research in exile" and migration politics. Starting out from current discussions in migration research on borders, mobilities, and migration regimes, it analyzes the epistemic and moral frames that have guided the governance of academic mobility since the early twentieth century. It argues that the perception and management of migration in higher education is closely linked with the political categorization of different forms of mobility.

Reflexive migration research and the moral economies of knowledge production

Migration research is witnessing a "migration knowledge hype" (Braun et al., 2018, p. 9) that was initially situated in the context of the events in

2015 when thousands of people arrived in the European Union. This has led to an increasing demand for expert knowledge in politics, media, and the public. Subsequently, migration experts were expected to create "useful" knowledge that would provide the basis for drawing up evidence-based, more restrictive policies to regulate and control migration movements from the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region to the EU (Scheel & Ustek Spilda, 2019). While this led to a remarkable growth of funding schemes and the foundation of migration-related research institutes, it also prompted strong criticism from within the interdisciplinary field of migration studies that problematized the impact of the, at times, close relationship between research and policymaking (Stierl, 2020). Though this perspective has become more prominent, it is not new. As early as the 1990s and 2000s, social scientists pointed out that many studies on migration, mobility, and forced migration perpetuate nationalized notions of society that take concepts of national territory, belonging, and non-belonging for granted (Malkki, 1995). Similarly, scholars from refugee and forced migration studies discussed the problems of research designs that privilege the world views of policymakers and practitioners by taking their "categories, concepts and priorities . . . as their initial frame of reference" (Bakewell, 2008, p. 432). This has cemented policy labels and produced figures to whom a particular, mostly reductive set of rights and options is assigned (Zetter, 2007).

More recently, the reflexive engagement with epistemic frames and the drafting of one's own practices of categorization has been transferred to other migration-related subjects. For example, Rogers Brubaker (2013) critically reflected on the study of the religiously defined immigration population in European countries. Taking the category "Muslim" as a starting point, he argued that scholars actively contribute to establishing epistemic frames that define a particular social group in religious terms with the result that alternative sociopolitical frames of reference to explain, for example, marginality recede into the background. Consequently, he stressed that scholars must differentiate between politics and analysis by making categories that are politically contested to their object of analysis instead of taking them for granted. In a similar way, recent analysis focuses on the paradigm in Western Europe to integrate different ethnic groups and provide moral monitoring of their efforts. Schinkel (2017) and others critically argued that this integrationist focus often construes a specific image of society as a homogenous, stable entity and an essentialist understanding of ethnic and

cultural differences, with certain groups assumed to be in particular need of integration.

Accordingly, an increasing number of scholars have called for a more self-conscious perspective on the production of knowledge on migration. They have proposed to conceive migration-related categories as a means to produce differences because of ethnicity, class, gender, or religion and to direct attention to the epistemological underpinnings of their writings. The vision is to embark upon a research that disconnects the field from the migration apparatus and perceives movement as an integral part of society and social theory (Bojadžijev & Römhild, 2014; Dahinden, 2016). A reflexive perspective perceives migration not as a self-evident, given object of analysis but as a product of changing constellations and categorizations that are themselves used to allocate resources and reorder sociopolitical hierarchies. It asks how research itself contributes to constituting migration as a "social fact" (Löhr & Reinecke, 2020). Drawing on multiple sources – science and technology studies, feminist standpoint theory, postcolonialism, methodological nationalism, transnational approaches, or social constructivism – the different strands of reflexive migration research join together in an attempt to investigate the categories used to make sense of and deal with migration and different mobilities. The challenge is to acknowledge that research on migration always forms part of the social negotiation of what a migration-related phenomenon is.

Part of this endeavor is to understand which moral premises migration research or, more generally, the production of knowledge on migration has been built upon. In this context, Boris Nieswand (2021) proposed to position the knowledge production on migration in a moral framework that comprises political discourses, expert knowledge, and commonplace moral judgments alike. He argued that because migration is socially and politically contested, researchers always take a particular stand in this debate. Though he conceded that concepts of good and bad inherent in the knowledge that social sciences produce differ from other techniques of moralization, he posited that their underlying logics and effects are nonetheless comparable as they hierarchize persons and groups. A reflexive perspective, Nieswand (2021) concluded, allows for a meta-perspective that reflects upon the opportunities and limits of scientific knowledge production. It scrutinizes the social position of researchers, their relationships to their objects of research, and the leading questions, assumptions, or paradigms.

In the following, I seek to show that we can fruitfully transfer this debate to the field of "research in exile". Though knowledge production is mostly implicit, the fact that it is deeply rooted in the university allows us to question the field about the relationship between humanitarian and scientific values and about its relationship to the contested governance of migration. "Research in exile" forges a particular relationship between knowledge and forced migration that condenses university, activism, knowledge production, and migration governance. Imbued with moral concepts of mobility and knowledge production, it assigns forced migration a specific position in the university, and it informs the discursive knowledge on the relationship between university and forced migration. Following Didier Fassin (2009), the term *moral economies* is used to direct attention to the political dimension as well as to the complexities and contradictions in which "research in exile" is embedded. The subsequent sections make these complexities and contradictions visible and open up the space for a reflexive perspective on "research in exile".

The double grounds of research and activism: Humanitarianism, employment prospects, and postcolonial legacies

In the following, the focal point is how the link between humanitarian assistance and knowledge practices is framed within the university. I will explore the intersection of the university, activism, and knowledge and elaborate on the conflicting rationalities and values that result therefrom. More specifically, the section argues that support for threatened scholars is embedded in a particular knowledge order that only becomes visible if we perceive "research in exile" not as a self-evident and universal endeavor but as a historically, spatially, and institutionally situated practice that is inscribed in colonial legacies of modern science and built upon specific professional value systems and expectations.

The connection between activism and research is not new. A number of research fields in the social sciences deal with politically and socially contested issues, with some researchers aiming to intervene in public debates and policymaking. Prominent examples are feminist research and gender studies that critically engage with power dynamics and patterns of discrimination, or critical border studies that intend to denounce and work against the consequences of the border enforcement mechanisms at the EU border.

Seeking the practical implications of their findings, scholars problematize and visualize unequal processes of integration or exclusion, the uneven distribution of access to resources, or the discrimination of groups because of language, religion, gender, education, social background, citizenship, or ethnicity-related classification. To achieve this, they produce empirical material in order to challenge official reports, statistics, or maps (Casas Cortes & Cobarrubias, 2018), or they explore new ways of narrating migration-related discrimination (Wonders & Jones, 2019). Most of this research develops within the framework of universities. They provide the institutional and infrastructural environment required, such as the material prerequisites (salaried positions, libraries, databases, and research funds) and an affiliation that transforms the researchers into full and acknowledged members of the scientific community with evidence-based research methods and evaluation procedures as core elements. Ultimately, their activities profit from their position as researchers who are free to think, a position which is guaranteed by the universities' constitution.

University-led refugee initiatives also sit at the crossroads of research and activism. They share a number of common features with activist research (Carstensen et al., 2014), such as the interventionist character, the activation of the people concerned, and writing as a means to garner support, to reflect experiences, or to map the field (EUA, 2020; Watenpaugh et al., 2014). At the same time, the relationship among the university, knowledge practices, and activism is different, as weights are shifted from knowledge production to assistance for individuals. Support schemes intend to enable threatened researchers to resume their research activities by relocating them to an institutional context that provides for physical, intellectual, and academic integrity. To this end, universities and research institutes work in close cooperation with non-governmental organizations such as the SAR network or CARA. They gather information on the overall political situation in the respective countries, they single out the researchers who are in immediate danger or urgently need support, and they match the scholars with universities. However, we would not fully grasp the complexity of the mechanisms at play if we were to reduce humanitarian assistance for scholars solely to the practical measures to help people in need. The support schemes are firmly rooted in the university, they build upon the rules and practices of the scientific community, and they are inscribed in epistemic frames about what makes up "good" science. Thus, it is imperative to determine how these connections become manifest in the support schemes.

The German Philipp Schwartz Initiative may serve as a case in point. The Initiative grants funds to research institutes or universities that want to host a scholar, and it is part of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (AvH), a government-funded research foundation that advances the internationalization of German higher education by sending researchers abroad and by offering international scholars research stays in Germany. AvH's selection committees consist of renowned members of the scientific community, in the case of the Philipp Schwartz Initiative, including the German National Academy of Science – Leopoldina and the German Research Foundation. It is fair to say that the initiative attempts to square the circle in that it is situated at the juncture of the moral economy of humanitarian assistance and an imperative to achieve scientific excellence, yet with a clear tendency to give preference to the professional prospects. Though the program intends to help "researchers who are demonstrably at risk" (AvH, n.d.), the initiative aims at transforming the emergency situation into something that ultimately serves scientific knowledge production. The funding criteria bring scientific eligibility and prospects to the fore. Applicants are not the scholars but the university or research institute that wants to host a scholar because of the researcher's track record. Consequently, the granting of the sometimes lifesaving scholarships is bound to a peer review process that decides the "scientific qualification of the guest" (AvH, n.d.) and evaluates if the professional profile matches that of the host institution. Against this background, career prospects play a crucial role. Scholars have to "have the potential to be integrated in the (broader academic) employment market," a precondition that is mirrored in the requirement that candidates must have completed a doctorate in medicine or law and are obliged to "provide evidence of equivalence to a research PhD" (AvH, n.d.). The Philipp Schwartz Initiative is firmly embedded in the research apparatus of universities. The imperative to help is situated in an environment that is structured by scientific standards and routines of the host country, which translates the humanitarian situation into a professionally framed set of skills and expectations. The field thus intertwines two perspectives on scholars at risk that are hardly dissoluble: individual researchers in need who receive help under the condition that they create a research-related added value and a structural setup that is situated at the interface of humanitarian assistance, migration policy, and knowledge production.

Amazingly, this setup remains silent in two regards. First, it does not attempt to connect with ongoing debates on how to put Dipesh Chakrabarty's

(2008) well-known claim to provincialize European thought into practice. Since the 2000s, the social sciences and humanities, history in particular, have tackled the epistemic legacies of today's knowledge production and politics. Connecting these with the imperial and colonial past, they assumed that the asymmetrical power relations between European and non-European countries since the nineteenth century were at the heart of the formation of modern science as the dominant institution of knowledge production in the modern world. This perspective inscribes the history and sociology of science and knowledge in its colonial past. It points out that the colonization of large parts of the world was to a large extent based on the process of acquiring and institutionalizing botanic, geographic, medical, demographic, legal, or ethnographic knowledge about the populations and countries incorporated into colonial rule (Bauche, 2017). A postcolonial critique of academic epistemologies contested the universal claim of basic concepts, and more importantly, the very process and strategies with which the production of knowledge is legitimized and presented as evidence-based and, accordingly, purportedly universal knowledge (Sivasundaram, 2010). This also holds true for universities and research institutes that situate and nourish these bodies of knowledge for the knowledge practice of academic disciplines and for the strategies and mechanisms with which they reproduce their claim to a knowledge monopoly. Against this background, Shalini Randeria and Regina Römhild (2013) emphasized that the non-reflection of the colonial past of science and knowledge results in a Eurocentrism that has European (and North American) knowledge production and the respective university values at its unnamed center. Even though the transfer of these values and institutional schemes has produced a wide array of knowledge practices worldwide (Shils & Roberts, 2004), the very fact that European and North American universities possess a significant institutional, financial, and discursive power reinforces their hegemonic positions and the very asymmetries that enabled the rise of European concepts of science and university to a global standard.

This postcolonial critique of science and knowledge production mirrors the mechanism at play in the process of selecting scholars at risk for fellowships that enable them to leave threatening constellations. At the core of the selection procedure is the question of whether the applicants meet with specific standards of knowledge production, yet without historicizing these standards and situating them in their cultural, political, and social contexts. As a result, they are presented as being given and purportedly

universal instead of perceiving them as the historical outcome of the dynamic entanglement between Europe and its former colonies. We must take this consideration into account for two reasons. First, most of the scholars at risk come from regions that were formerly under colonial rule, and second, this has left its traces in the building of the respective systems of higher education, which in most cases are not competitive with the universities in the countries of application. Thus, the selection criteria reinforce the predominance of Western standards in the field of science and knowledge to the detriment of the scholars at risk.

Moreover, the programs have remained silent about what Asli Vatansever (2018, p. 153) called "academic work under precarious conditions" (see also Vatansever in this volume). She highlighted the inherent contradictions in current support schemes that simultaneously involve a humanitarian discourse that victimizes the scholars, their empowerment by offering application opportunities, and the limits of a highly competitive academic labor market that produces precarious subjects, which become even more precarious with the missing prospects of a steady position in the context of a "forced nomadic way of living." While Vatansever has striven to turn the structural and political precariousness into a resource that might challenge established and institutionalized forms of intellectual subjectivity, her argument made another point visible that has been left unsaid. As I have argued elsewhere (2021), we can only understand the patterns of the forced mobility of scholars if we write it back into the global history of academic mobility and conceive of it as labor migration. From this perspective, we must then ask how the support for scholars at risk affects or even co-produces the categorization of other forms of mobility.

Border politics: Higher education and the governance of migration

This section expands on the intersections between "scholar rescue" and the governance of migration and carves out how the endeavors for researchers in distress are connected with political discourses and measures. To this end, it seeks to uncover the epistemic and moral frames that "research in exile" shares with restrictive migration policies. In so doing, it highlights the dynamic interplay between the embodied individual mobility of scholars and the selective governance of migration. The section gives a brief overview of recent findings on borders, migration regimes, and mobility, and it suggests

that they provide the analytical framework to contextualize the mobility options in higher education. The section seeks to create awareness of the fact that support for threatened scholars is always inscribed in the contingent and contested politics of migration.

Mobility studies have suggested rereading the emergence of modern societies through a mobility lens and conceiving of mobility as an "ensemble of highly meaningful social practices that make up social, cultural and political life" (Adey et al., 2014, p. 3). Mobility studies have emphasized the relational character of mobilities in at least two respects. First, they propose to connect different forms of mobility and to ask how different categorizations of movements interrelate with one another and how specific forms of mobility are framed in political, legal, or sociocultural terms. Second, mobility studies have proposed to think of mobility and immobility as relational concepts that constitute each other. The invitation to question mobility categories instead of taking them for granted has brought the question to the fore as to how the interplay among categories of (im)mobility contributes to drawing the line between inside and outside, belonging and non-belonging, and exclusion and inclusion (Sheller, 2018). Border studies add to this perspective a critical engagement with the normalization of national borders and the political rationalities and value orders that inform border regimes (Hess & Schmidt-Sebdner, 2021). They conceive of geopolitical borders as a complex assemblage of control and contestation that is shaped by a multitude of divergent actors, forms of agency, knowledge formations, and sociopolitical practices. Border studies point to the multi-locality of borders, or, in the words of Etienne Balibar (2002, p. 84), to "the ubiquity of borders" with its overall rationality to control and prevent (un)desired movement. From this perspective, border regimes perform multiple functions: they delineate the boundaries of national societies; they are the sites where ethnocentric visions of national societies are performed, implemented, and contested; they mobilize and immobilize; and, consequently, they are at the heart of the categorizing and governing of human mobility (De Genova & Peutz, 2010; Walters, 2015). Finally, research on migration regimes has contributed to this perspective a focus on the actual practices of control and mobility (Pott et al., 2018). This strand of research does not take migration as a starting point but rather the contested, complex, and at times contradictory nature of migration policies, which are perceived as a reaction against migrant practices. Thus, a regime perspective takes the agency of the migrants into account and connects it with "the intertwined

patterns of global mobility and current orders of power and inequality" (Horvath et al., 2018, p. 302).

These approaches are of particular interest for our context. Borders, migration regimes, and the politics of (im)mobility are instruments with which "regimes of mobility" (Glick Schiller & Salazar, 2013) are established that create unequal social relations across the globe by doing both connecting and separating people. Thus, border and migration regimes differentiate between different forms of mobilities and allow for the selective channeling of people. A good example of this is the differentiation between illegalized migrants, the temporary movement of tourists, and the oftentimes encouraged movement of the highly skilled. These categories are connected with different sets of rights that enhance the movement of one group while immobilizing the other. Thus, migration politics produce the figure of the migrant, their, his or her (im-)mobilization and (il)legalization and, subsequently, the establishment of different classes of people (Mezzadra & Neilson, 2013).

This also applies to the university sector. The history of higher education illustrates that mobility options have always depended on how students or researchers were categorized and put in relation to other mobile groups. The history of Chinese migration to the US in the decades before and after the turn of the nineteenth century is well researched. We know a lot about how restrictive and racialized migration regimes contributed to constructing the figure of the illegal Chinese immigrant. Historians have elaborated on how the border regions of the United States were transformed into sites of contestation over illegal migration; immigration and labor policies; bilateral relations; and the framing of race, citizenship, class, and gender (Lee, 2007). However, less well-known is the travel of Chinese students to the US from 1908 onwards in the context of the so-called Boxer Indemnity Scholarships. This scholarship program was set up in 1908 in a bilateral treaty between the Chinese empire and the US and was intended to discharge some of the compensatory payments imposed on China by an international military alliance in 1900, in the aftermath of the violent repression of the Boxer Rebellion (Ye, 2001). The outstanding reparations were converted into scholarships with the aim of attracting the future Chinese elite to take up their studies in the US. In that way, the US government hoped to gain a dual benefit for its own global position. On the one hand, it wished to extend its sphere of influence in East Asia by influencing the far-reaching reform policies the Chinese government was introducing. On the other hand, it sought to enhance its own claim to ascendancy in the Pacific by supplanting

the imperial capital of Japan as the main destination for Chinese students abroad with its own rising system of higher education. For this purpose, the restrictive immigration rules and quotas were rescinded for Chinese *students* while they were upheld for Chinese *migrants* (Hsu, 2015).

The politics of the selective categorization of human mobility continued and were adapted in the decades after the Great War, as the history of humanitarian assistance for researchers from Europe shows. The US-American immigration laws of 1921 and 1924 extended the restrictive immigration policies by means of quotas for specific regions of the world. But the laws stipulated exceptions for so-called "'nonquota' immigrants," a category that gave preference to immigrants with specific occupational skills. Professors and, after 1924, students were among those preferred groups if, in the case of professors, they had held an academic appointment for at least two years prior to their visa application (Lee, 2008, p. 14). From 1933 onwards, this stipulation allowed for the immigration of scholars who had lost their professional position and were persecuted because of denomination or ethnic categorization by Nazi rule. Although the US government extended its restrictive migration policy in the context of American isolationism, economic depression, and anti-Semitism to refuge issues (Zucker & Flink Zucker, 1996), persecuted scholars were exempted from the rule. They received entry permits provided that they had an employment contract with a US-American university before leaving the country (Krohn, 1993). Thus, the academic support schemes were built upon earlier classifications of migrant groups. They continued earlier politics of (im-)mobilization by exposing scholarly skills and emphasizing the practical value displaced scholars from Central Europe would bring to American universities. The underlying rationalities and values were comparable with the ones at the turn of the century: a competitive framework that perceived higher education as part of international relations and migration issues in particular as a means to underscore US-American claims to be a site of global knowledge production while access to most other sectors of the labor markets remained restricted on the basis of sociopolitical and racialized factors. Accordingly, programs in favor of scholars were eager to uphold the differentiation among refugees (connected with a number of fears and stereotypes, e.g., Communism, anti-Semitism, and labor competition) and the highly skilled. Their mobility options were

maintained by detaching them from other migrant groups and focusing on their contribution to the advancement of American society.[1]

These patterns have been remarkably persistent over the course of the twentieth century, and they inform today's programs and initiatives. As the application rules of the Philipp Schwartz Initiative illustrate, the humanitarian side of being at risk plays a minor role when it comes to the drafting and implementation of university-related support measures. Currently, the same mechanisms apply as in the 1930s: while border procedures and opportunities to grant asylum for so-called third-country nationals are increasingly restricted on the European level (Wessels, 2021), the number of initiatives on behalf of persecuted scholars has steadily risen. In Germany alone, there exists an impressive spectrum of support structures, including networking opportunities (Academics in Solidarity [AiS], Chance for Science at Leipzig University, and the Off-University), institutional funding schemes at the federal (Philipp Schwartz Initiative) and state levels (e.g., the Hamburg Programme for Scholars at Risk (HPSAR), the *HessenFonds*, and the Einstein Foundation), and individual sponsorship opportunities (e.g., The Academy in Exile, the Scientific Integration Initiative). Moreover, the current schemes converge with those in the inter-war period with regard to the humanitarian aspect. Though the precarious humanitarian situation has triggered support measures, they are not enforced under the umbrella of human rights law but under that of labor legislation. The portal Science4Refugees of the European Commission puts it in a nutshell with the slogan "Welcome refugee researchers and students looking for a suitable job!" (EURAXESS, n.d.). This fits with recent findings that require us not to overemphasize the humanitarian but to take moralities, political motives, and contexts under close consideration. As Didier Fassin (2016) pointed out, moral grounds provide a powerful instrument for developing transnational, national, or local policies. For him, the practices of labeling mobile groups as refugees, asylum seekers, or refugee researchers involve more than a difference in vocabulary or status. Rather, they express a difference in the politics of recognition that emerges from the moral horizon of migration and asylum policies of a society at a given historical moment. What Fassin

1 Nonetheless, as Claus-Dieter Krohn (1993) has noted, labor competition and anti-Semitism were also contentious issues in the university sector, as well as the procedural obstacles that the US-American consulates in France and Portugal established regarding the visa issuance from 1938 onward.

(2009) called the moral economies of asylum policies entails not only the way in which societies speak about and create a problem-driven perception of mobility but also the far-reaching consequences for the groups concerned – their mobility options, their individual credibility, and the degree to which they are presented as society's other.

Conclusion

This chapter pursued a double goal: to examine the schemes of support for scholars at risk as a context-dependent endeavor that operates with specific notions of science, migration, and humanitarianism, and to trace the epistemic and moral values as well as the politics of science and migration that structure current efforts to assist threatened scholars. From this perspective, the patterns and rationales of support schemes appear in a different light, less optimistic, but as an integral part of the contested politics of migration and the historical past. However, a problem-oriented approach to "scholar rescue" does not question the field as such. Rather, it sensitizes us to the selective and uneven character of migration and refugee policies and helps us to comprehend its drawbacks. It discloses the epistemic and moral positions that imprint the drafting of specialized support schemes, and it furthers our understanding of the entrenchment of science and university in politics. This is what the analysis of the Philipp Schwartz Initiative and the connections of the field with European migration and border policies illuminate. They highlight the relational character of help schemes, their political enmeshment, and the complexities of the forced migration of scholars who move in and out of political and legal categories. Thus, a reflexive perspective allows us to better grasp the dynamics at play and to balance the humanitarian label carefully with what is at the core of "scholar rescue" – competitive and precarious academic labor policies and the contested negotiation of scientific standards and claims to universalism between scholars from the "Global South" and the "Global North."

In tracing these patterns, the chapter argues for a reflexive perspective on "scholar rescue" that displays the epistemic and moral positionalities and imbalances of higher education, as well as their contribution to the co-production of migration, and that scrutinizes the national order of higher education. Reflecting on "scholar rescue" can thus be a vantage point from which we can see the entire network of embodied, social, political, and

academic relations that make up higher education. On the one hand, this allows us to grasp forced migration in academia as a social process in the course of which knowledge positions and transnational access to resources are negotiated. On the other hand, it becomes possible to search for the means by which we can decolonize the structural asymmetries between universities and knowledge production in different world regions and to provide for scholarly exchange on an equal basis prior to political threat. Such an approach places the agency and lived experience of the scholars and their capacity to act at the very center. Networking activities such as the Off-University, the AiS program, Chance for Science, the Academy in Exile, or Science4Refugees move in this direction. However, these need to be connected with a critical assessment of the very infrastructure of professional knowledge production – for example, intellectual property rights, open access strategies, university rankings, and indexing of journals – and the moral grounds that guide academic employment procedures and put academic mobility in perspective with regard to other forms of migration.

References

Adey, P., Bissell, D., Hannam, K., Merriman, P., & Sheller, M. (2014). Introduction. In P. Adey, D. Bissell, K. Hannam, P. Merriman, & M. Sheller (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of mobilities* (pp. 1–20). London: Routledge.

Alexander von Humboldt Foundation – AvH (n.d.). Philipp Schwartz Initiative. Retrieved from https://www.humboldt-foundation.de/en/apply/sponsorship-programmes/philipp-schwartz-initiative#h14796

Bakewell, O. (2008). Research beyond the categories: The importance of policy irrelevant research into forced migration. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 21*(4), 432-453. https:// doi:10.1093/jrs/fen042

Balibar, É. (2002). *Politics and the other scene.* London/New York: Verso.

Bauche, M. (2017). *Medizin und Herrschaft. Malariabekämpfung in Kamerun, Ostafrika und Ostfriesland (1890–1919)*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag.

Bojadžijev, M., & Römhild, R. (2014): Was kommt nach dem „transnational turn"? Perspektiven für eine kritische Migrationsforschung. *Berliner Blätter*, *65*, 10–24.

Braun, K., Georgi, F., Matthies, R., Pagano, S., & Schwertl, M. (2018). Umkämpfte Wissensproduktionen der Migration. Editorial. *movements. Journal for Critical Migration and Border Regime Studies*, *4*(1), 9–27.

Brubaker, R. (2013). Categories of analysis and categories of practice: A note on the study of Muslims in European countries of immigration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 36*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2012.729674

Carstensen, A.L., Heineshoff, L.M., Jungehülsing, J., Kirchhoff, M., & Trzeciak, M. (2014). Forschende Aktivist_innen und Aktivistische Forscher_innen: eine Hinleitung. In L.-M. Heimeshoff, S. Hess, S. Kron, H. Schwenken, & M. Trzeciak (Eds.), *Grenzregime II. Migration, Kontrolle, Wissen. Transnational Perspektiven* (pp. 257–268). Berlin/Hamburg: Assoziation A.

Casas Cortes, M., & Cobarrubias, S. (2018). It Is obvious from the map! Disobeying the production of illegality beyond borderlines. *movements. Journal for Critical Migration and Border Regime Studies, 4*(1), 29–44.

Chakrabarty, D. (2008). *Provincializing Europe. Postcolonial thought and historical difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dahinden, J. (2016). A plea for the 'de-migranticization' of research on migration and integration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 39*(13), 2207–2225. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2015.1124129

De Genova, N., & Peutz, N. (2010). *The Deportation regime. Sovereignty, space, and the freedom of movement*. Durham: Duke University Press.

EURAXESS – Researchers in Motion. (n.d.). Welcome refugee researchers and students looking for a suitable job! Retrieved from https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/jobs/science4refugees

European University Association – EUA (2020). Researchers at risk: Mapping Europe's response. Report of the InspirEurope project. InspirEurope. Retrieved from https://eua.eu/downloads/publications/inspireurope%20report%20researchers%20at%20risk%20-%20mapping%20europes%20response%20final%20web.pdf

Fassin, D. (2009). Moral economies revisited. *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales, 64*(6), 1237–1266.

Fassin, D. (2016). Vom Rechtsanspruch zum Gunsterweis: Zur moralischen Ökonomie der Asylvergabepraxis im heutigen Europa. *Mittelweg, 36*, 62–78.

Glick Schiller, N., & Salazar, N. B. (2013). Regimes of mobility across the globe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 39*(2), 183–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2013.723253

Hess, S., & Schmidt-Sebdner, M. (2021). Perspektiven der ethnographischen Grenzregimeforschung: Grenze als Konfliktzone. *Zeitschrift für Migrationsforschung, 1*(1), 197–214.

Horvath, K., Amelina, A., & Peters, K. (2018). Re-thinking the politics of migration. On the uses and challenges of regime perspectives for migration research. *Migration Studies, 5*(3), 301–314. https://doi:10.1093/migration/mnx055

Hsu, M. Y. (2015). *The good immigrants. How the yellow peril became the model minority*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kasparek, B., & Speer, M. (2013): At the nexus of academia and activism. Bordermonitoring.eu. *Postcolonial Studies*, *16*(3), 259–268.

Krohn, C.-D. (1993). *Intellectuals in exile. Refugee scholars and the New School for Social Research*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Lee, E. (2007). *At America's gate. Chinese immigration during the exclusion era, 1882–1943*. Chapel Hill/London: The University of North Carolina Press.

Lee, E. (2008). A nation of immigrants and a gatekeeping nation. American immigration law and policy. In R. Ueda (Ed.), *A Companion to American Immigration* (pp. 5–35). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

Löhr, I. (2021): Refugee scholars as employees: Connecting the history of forced migration of scholars with the global history of higher education. In L. Dakhli, P. Laborier, & F. Wolff (Eds.), *Scholars at risk: History and politics of the protection of endangered scholars*. Wiesbaden: Springer (in print).

Löhr, I., & Reinecke, C. (2020, October 27). Not a given object: What historians can learn from the reflexive turn in migration studies. *Migrant Knowledge*. Retrieved from https://migrantknowledge.org/2020/10/27/not-a-given-object/

Malkki, L. (1995). Refugees and exile. From "refugee studies" to the national order of things. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *24*, 495–523.

Mezzadra, S., & Neilson, B. (2013). *Border as method, or, the multiplication of labor*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Nieswand, B. (2021). Konturen einer Moralsoziologie der Migrationsgesellschaft. *Zeitschrift für Migrationsforschung*, *1*(1), 75–95.

Pott, A., Rass, C., & Wolff, F. (2018). *Was ist ein Migrationsregime? What is a migration regime?* Wiesbaden: Springer.

Randeria, S, & Römhild, R. (2013). Das postkoloniale Europa: Verflochtene Genealogien der Gegenwart – Einleitung zur erweiterten Neuauflage (2013). In S. Conrad, S. Randeria, & R. Römhild (Eds.), *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus. Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften* (pp. 11-31). Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag.

Scheel, S., & Ustek Spilda, F. (2019). The politics of expertise and ignorance in the field of migration management. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 37*(4), 663–681. https://doi: 10.1177/0263775819843677

Schinkel, W. (2017). *Imagined societies. A critique of immigrant integration in Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sheller, M. (2018). *Mobility justice. The politics of movement in the age of extremes*. London/New York: Verso.

Shils, E., & Roberts, J. (2004). The diffusion of European models outside Europe. In R. Rüegg (Ed.), *A history of the university in Europe. Vol. 3: Universities in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (1800–1945)* (pp. 163–231). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sivasundaram, S. (2010). Sciences and the global. On methods, questions, and theory. *Isis*, *101*(1), 146–158.

Stierl, M. (2020). Do no harm? The impact of policy on migration scholarship. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/2399654420965567

Vatansever, A. (2018). Academic nomads. Changing conceptions of academic work under precarious conditions. *Cambio*, *8*(15), 153–165. https://doi.org/10.13128/cambio-22537

Walters, W. (2015). Reflections on migration and governmentality. *movements. Journal for Critical Migration and Border Regime Studies*, *1*(1), 1–25. http://movements-journal.org/issues/01.grenzregime/04.walters--migration.governmentality.html

Watenpaugh, K.; Fricke, A. L., & King, J. R. (2014). *The war follows them. Syrian university students and scholars in Lebanon*. New York: Institute of International Education.

Wessels, J. (2021, January 5). The new pact on migration and asylum: Human rights challenges to border procedures. FluchtforschungsBlog. Retrieved from https://blog.fluchtforschung.net/the-new-pact-on-migration-and-asylum-human-rights-challenges-to-border-procedures/

Wonders, N. A., & Jones, L. C. (2019). Doing and undoing citizenship: The multiplication of citizenship, citizenship performances, and migration as social movement. *Theoretical Criminology, 23*(2), 136–155.

Ye, W. (2001). *Seeking modernity in China's name. Chinese students in the United States, 1900–1927*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Zetter, R. (2007). More labels, fewer refugees: Remaking the refugee label in an era of globalization. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *20*(2), 172–192.

Zucker, N. L., & Flink Zucker, N. (1996). *Desperate crossings: Seeking refuge in America*. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.