

Gender, Violence, Refugees

An Introduction

Susanne Buckley-Zistel and Ulrike Krause

In February 2015, a report entitled ‘Review into recent allegations relating to conditions and circumstances at the Regional Processing Centre in Nauru’ was published, which inquired into allegations of rape and sex for favours of so-called ‘processees’ in one of Australia’s off-shore immigration processing centres on the island of Nauru (Moss 2015). Upon reception of the report the then prime minister of Australia, Tony Abbott, remarked: ‘Occasionally, I daresay, things happen, because in any institution you get things that occasionally aren’t perfect’ (see Hurst 2015).

We disagree. That occurrences such as rape and sex for favours in institutions hosting refugees do not ‘simply happen’ is the subject of this edited volume. Its central contention is that instances of sexual and gender-based violence, as well as other forms of violence, emerge due to the particular conditions in refugee institutions and situations, and that analysing the underlying currents is a first and necessary step towards efforts to prevent them. What makes refugee situations particular is that individuals and communities are taken out of the everyday context in which their social lives follow certain norms and rules sedimented over time. These norms and rules are challenged and put into doubt by the new demands and limitations encountered in displacement, where much of the social, economic and political world is externally formed and restrictively imposed. Often, refugees end up in a situation of dependency on institutions and people in powerful positions, rendering themselves vulnerable to abuse and exploitation – such as in the example of the Nauru processing centre above. While this does not necessarily, in and of itself, lead to violent behaviour, in some cases it might. And although this concerns all refugees, women,

men, girls and boys all experience it – and are affected by it – differently. These aspects will be covered in the present volume.

Gender, Violence, Refugees provides nuanced accounts of how the social identity of men and women, the context of displacement, and the experience or manifestation of violence interact. It offers both conceptual analysis and in-depth case studies to illustrate how gender relations are affected by displacement, encampment and return, and how this leads to various forms of direct, indirect and structural violence.

Gender, Violence, Refugees

Three intertwined notions are central to our volume: gender, violence and refugees. It is important to note that we use them in a wide sense and that while most contributions focus on all three aspects, some zoom in on just one or two. To elaborate in a slightly different order to our title, the term *refugee* broadly refers to a person who has had to leave their home for one or various reasons, even though ‘what reasons’ and ‘where to’ are sometimes contested, as apparent in contributions to this volume. In a narrow, legalistic sense the term is defined by the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol where it refers to a person who ‘owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality, and is unable to, or owing to such fear is unwilling to, avail himself of the protection of that country’. However, looking at the broad spectrum of people who are on the move involuntarily, refugees as defined by the convention constitute only one of several groups who are more generally called ‘forced migrants’. In addition to refugees, forced migration also includes ‘internally displaced persons’ (IDPs) who seek refuge in their country of origin, victims of trafficking as well as stateless persons. Each of these categories is based on a specific legal definition stipulated in a convention, or in the case of IDPs in the ‘Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement’. While these categories may appear to be neutral – including gender neutral as discussed below – they are interpreted in the context of dynamically changing global norms and are thus highly politicized. It is this ‘politics of categorization’ that enables politicians to artificially separate people by means of imposing these categories (Castles 2007; Foster 2007: 5–21); they divide (forced) migrants from citizens of nation states and contribute to classifying members of categories through distinct legal privileges. Differentiations of (forced) migrants are often based on ‘push and pull’ factors (Castles 2003; Brubaker 2012), stipulating distinctions between voluntary and forced migration and therefore between ‘good’ refugees as those deserving protection and ‘bad’ migrants

or ‘economic’ refugees as those unworthy of aid (Scheel and Squire 2014; Rosenberger and Stöckl 2016: 14). With a focus on refugees, debates about the ‘refugee label’ reveal economic, political and social exclusion and ‘othering’ processes of refugees, as well as identity constructions (Zetter 1991, 2007; Ludwig 2013; Krause 2016a).

In order to draw attention to the fact that people also leave their homes for reasons that do not fall into the narrow definition of the 1951 refugee convention, the term ‘forced migration’ has replaced ‘refugee’ in discourse and practice. It acknowledges that poverty, ecological degradation, development aid, disasters and crises are also legitimate causes for moving (de Wet 2006; Boano, Zetter and Morris 2008; McAdam 2014). Similar to IDPs, forced migrants who do not fall into the definition of what constitutes a refugee thus do not qualify for assistance from the global refugee regime. Although we chose ‘refugees’ for the title of this volume to connect to an ongoing debate in refugee studies, some chapters consider wider causes for flight and explicitly situated themselves in the context of forced migration studies, such as Alexander Betts in Chapter 11.

Regarding *gender*, the volume includes the social categories men, women, boys and girls. An unfortunate lacuna are LGBTIs and their particular difficulties, which scholars have increasingly explored in recent years, pointing out their legal neglect yet also developments in refugee status determination processes (Markard 2013; Türk 2013; Berlit, Doerig and Storey 2015) as well as diverse security risks in countries of origin and of asylum (Forced Migration Review 2013; Spijkerboer 2013). Such academic debates and criticism did not remain unnoticed by central institutions such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and also by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) who have developed guidelines and handbooks on how to treat cases and how to protect LGBTI people (see UNHCR 2008a, 2011a; ORAM 2012).

One important question to pose in the context of our volume is whether refugees have a gender at all. Legally, the 1951 refugee convention with its 1967 protocol stipulates who qualifies as a refugee and who has access to refugee rights and protection. Yet, its description of refugees not only lacks any reference to gender (Valji 2001: 25; Fiddian-Qasimiyeh 2014: 398–400), losing sight of the fact that men and women experience refuge differently (Crawley 2001: 7), but it is based on a male paradigm with an androcentric framework (Greatbatch 1989: 518; Markard 2007: 377f.; Edwards 2010). The persistent separation of public and private spheres of action for men and women has found its way into international refugee law. It is, *inter alia*, based on the assumption that men are more active in politics and thus at higher risk of being persecuted, which explains why ‘dominant androcentric male-as-norm paradigms’ (Edwards 2010: 22) stand in contrast to marginalized women in refugee law. The dichotomies – public/private,

political/apolitical, men/women – strongly informed the idea of the refugee figure at the time when legal frameworks were being drafted (Valji 2001: 26; Edwards 2010), yet since the 1980s, feminist scholars have criticized the neglect of women in refugee policies (Indra 1987; Greatbatch 1989), stressing the various yet also different forms of violence that women encounter (Callaway 1985; Ferris 1990). As a result, policies shifted in the early 1990s to include women’s protection as a key component of refugee protection and to mainstream ‘gender’, as further elaborated in by Susan Martin in Chapter 1 to this volume.

In spite of these development, recent studies still criticize the one-sided, legalistic and humanitarian image of refugees, and call for a more differentiated understanding of refugees in general, and men and women in particular (Kebede 2010; Turner 2010: 43–64; Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2014; Krause 2016b). They argued that flight, expulsion and forced migration should be seen as a gendered process (Hans 2008: 69), leading to an increase in the number of academic contributions with an emphasis on gendered experiences (see Hart 2008; Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2014; Freedman 2015). It is to this body of scholarship that this volume seeks to contribute.

By aiming to implement a gender-sensitive approach to refugee aid (UNHCR 1990, 1991, 2008b, 2011b), women’s needs are increasingly acknowledged in protection and assistance measures. They are often treated as most vulnerable and therefore receive prioritized access to aid and awareness-building projects, and in many cases men are left behind. Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Chloé Lewis and Georgia Cole illustrate in Chapter 6 how aid agencies frequently equate gender and women, and thus provide aid in manners that favour women to the detriment of men, directly affecting gender relations. Such actions may translate into power imbalances between women and men, challenging the pre-flight relationship in which men were mostly breadwinners and decision makers. In some cases, men react with violence in order to maintain their social status as patriarchs (Lukunka 2011).

The notion of *violence* appears in various forms and with different meanings in this volume. A number of chapters focus explicitly on sexual and gender-based violence. According to UNHCR, this refers to ‘violence that is directed against a person on the basis of her or his gender or sex. It includes acts that inflict physical, mental or sexual harm or suffering, threats of such acts, coercion, and other deprivations of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life’ (UNHCR 2008b: 201; see IASC 2015: 5–13). It can take the form of, among others, ‘rape, forced impregnation, forced abortion, trafficking, sexual slavery, and the intentional spread of sexually transmitted infections, including HIV/AIDS’ (UNHCR 2008b: 7, 10). In refugee camps, in particular, sexual and gender-based violence occurs particularly often in the forms of domestic violence, sexual abuse,

structural discrimination and forced recruitment into combatant groups. This is not a new phenomenon but has already been observed and criticized by scholars in the 1980s (Callaway 1985; Harrell-Bond 1986: 155–59; Greatbatch 1989). Studies emphasize that these forms of violence occur repeatedly, perpetrated by fellow refugees as well as by people with an official mandate to protect, such as security forces, government employees, staff of aid agencies and local residents of the home community, often exploiting their power and the dependency of their victims (Ferris 2007; Freedman 2015: 60–68).

Violence also occurs in urban centres. Although refugees may experience fewer restrictions by humanitarian organizations and have more freedom in choosing where to live and work, they can face structural violence in the form of social exclusion and discrimination (Jaji 2009; Crisp, Morris and Refstie 2012). When refugees are not legally allowed to work in host countries, they often have to seek employment in informal sectors. For women, this often means being forced or having to engage in prostitution (Naggujja et al. 2014), exchanging sexual favours for food or shelter (Krause-Vilmar 2011) or facing sexual abuse by colleagues (Crisp, Morris and Refstie 2012).

A number of operational reports have been produced over the past years to shed light on the scope of sexual and gender-based violence against refugees. UN Women (2013), for instance, stresses the danger of early and forced marriage among Syrian refugee girls, while the UN special rapporteur on violence against women (UNGA 2012: 25–29) recently pointed out that female Somali refugees and IDPs, aged from eleven to eighty, face kidnapping, sexual exploitation and abuse, female genital mutilation and forced marriage by al-Shabaab militias, especially in overcrowded camps. ‘Women on the Run’, UNHCR (2015), emphasizes women’s multiple risk factors in South American countries, including threats by criminal armed groups, child recruitment, long-lasting domestic violence, rape and extortion. Moreover, Refugees International (1999) estimates that 25 per cent of female refugees in Tanzania experience sexual violence, and emphasizes the continuity of violence before and after the flight for many Syrian women who seek to escape rape but end up being attacked in camps or suffer from an increase in domestic violence, including marital rape (Refugees International 2012). Similar experiences are reported in the context of the civil wars in Liberia and Sierra Leone, and ensuing refugee and displaced persons’ camps in Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone (Lindorfer 2009; Women’s Refugee Commission 2009: 3; Human Rights Watch 2011). Chapter 2 by Simon Turner critically engages with the normative assumptions of this body of literature.

Although the true scope of sexual and gender-based violence against refugees remains unknown (Freedman 2015: 79), because it is still a taboo

and often entails stigmatization and the danger of increased violence after reporting attacks (Martin 2004: 31, 116; Jansen 2011: 87; Krause 2015: 245), most studies continue to focus on violence against women. In this process, binary structures of female victims and male perpetrators are maintained and reproduced, while the scope and impact on male victims is neglected. In contrast, Chris Dolan's (2014: 2) recent study on Congolese refugee men in Uganda shows that 13.4 per cent of male refugees had experienced an incident of sexual violence in the preceding year, and 38.5 per cent reported assaults at some point in their lives.¹ As few studies have focused on male victims of sexual and gender-based violence, there is a distinct need for further research. In this volume, Maria O. Ensor (Chapter 9) and Maja Janmyr (Chapter 10) seek to broaden the discussion by including boys and men, albeit mainly in terms of gender-based violence.

In addition to these direct forms of violence, structural violence is – explicitly and implicitly – central to a number of contributions to this book. Structural conditions during flight, in the place of refuge as well as upon return, may take on forms that harm women and men (often in different ways). In camps, it may be the result of camp structures and hierarchies, gender disparities or negative relations between host and refugee communities. In most cases, refugees are not granted the same opportunities as nationals from the asylum or host countries, and are confronted with wide-scale discriminations in their everyday lives in exile (Jansen 2011; Crisp, Morris and Refstie 2012). This may prevent refugees from meeting basic requirements necessary for a stable and secure life. Even without any direct assault, structural violence may be physically harming when it leads to poor nutrition or limited access to health facilities (for instance for victims of sexual violence). Dale Buscher (Chapter 7) looks at the economic aspects of these types of indirect violence, and Melanie Hartmann (Chapter 5) at the structural.

Violence may also take on a more conceptual form when it refers to what Michel Foucault calls 'biopolitics' (Foucault 2010). This concerns the practice of regulating subjects – in our case, male and female refugees – through numerous techniques that serve to subjugate and ultimately control them. Refugee or displaced persons' camps but also aid institutions assume this role when they determine what is right and wrong behaviour regarding gender roles. Importantly, this type of violence does not operate in the open; it is much more subtle since it is rooted in regulations and regulatory mechanisms. Chapter 4 by Emma Mc Cluskey contributes to this discussion.

In addition to the main themes of *Gender, Violence, Refugees*, chapters in this volume connect empirically. To begin, a number of settings are central to the case studies collected in our volume, including refugee and IDP camps. Temporally, various phases can be delineated – conflict, flight,

refuge, return – each of them providing their own particular circumstances, even though it has been argued that there is a continuum of sexual and gender-based violence against women and men (Ferris 1990; Cockburn 2004). While Barbra Lukunka discusses conditions of Burundian returnees in Chapter 12, Ulrike Krause contributes to the continuum discussion in Chapter 8. Many authors moreover focus on the intervention of external agents – humanitarian or aid agencies, development organizations, human rights NGOs, faith-based actors – who might, through their actions, provide services to ‘beneficiaries’. In doing so, they have an impact on the living conditions, both materially and socially and on gender relations.

Connecting Gender, Violence, Refugees

How do the experiences of displacement, be it in camps, settlements or in urban settings, have an effect on gender relations? To begin, many refugee situations are long term, thus affecting social relations for years and sometimes decades. Over time, it has transpired that camps exist much longer than anticipated, leading to so-called protracted refugee situations with an average duration of twenty-six years (UNHCR 2016: 20). Structurally, the conditions are very similar all over the world: initially established as short-term, interim solutions, they are confined to a designated space and adhere to organizational and administrative rules and regulations. In addition to UNHCR, national and international aid organizations as well as the national governments of host countries are involved in their administration. This long duration of refugee situations affects the way refugees relate to each other, including along gender lines. Rules and regulations by administrative bodies, such as the command over resources, as well as control and decision-making processes, affect the lives of women and men significantly since they regulate living conditions and opportunities.

Refugee situations may also impact on gender relations since conflict and flight often destroy the fabric of communities and families (Turner 1999; Martin 2004: 15; Carlson 2005), leading to a rearranging of the social relations under new and different conditions. Moreover, the experience of conflict and flight might affect individuals who find it difficult to cope with what they have encountered (Karunakara et al. 2004; Onyut et al. 2009; Lukunka 2011). Some studies point to an increase in drug and alcohol abuse and an associated increase in aggression and violence towards women in particular, including domestic violence (Barker and Ricardo 2005; McCleary 2013). The daily life of refugees is moreover influenced by the labour market, or the lack of perspectives, which again has an impact on gender relations (Carlson 2005: 11; Krause 2015; see also Buscher in this volume). As illustrated by Tania Kaiser (2006), restrictive civil liberties and

work permits, coupled with the lack of economic livelihoods, and of access to resources and markets, often led to refugees not being able to perform their former gender roles. For instance, men might be unable to fulfil the role of the family provider, and women might have to take on additional responsibilities (Martin 2004: 15; UNHCR 2008b: 39–40; Buscher 2009: 90).

Many humanitarian agencies and refugee-supporting organizations recognize these changes in general and their impact on sexual and gender-based violence in particular, and become entangled in the renegotiation of relations and the forging of new identities. They often launch specific projects to impact on gender relations, such as the empowerment of women (Martin 2004: 81f.), leading to new hierarchies and power structures (Hyndman 2004: 204; Ferris 2007: 586ff.; Gozdziaik 2008: 186ff.). Mulumba's study on Ugandan refugee settlements, for instance, illustrates that for some female refugees empowerment is a liberating process since they gained access to land which traditionally is passed on through the male line of the family (Mulumba 2005: 181). In this process, though, men may lose status, power and influence, rendering them unable to take care of their families. As already argued above, this is a significant shift, since in many cultures the role of the breadwinner is the most important form of recognition and respect a man can receive from his wife and family (Dolan 2002: 60–67; Edward 2007: 140–41) so that the empowerment of women might lead to the disempowerment of men (Krause 2013: 193 ff., and 2014). The perceived loss of status and the related social degradation of men in camps is referred to as emasculation in the literature (Dolan 2009: 204; Grabska 2011; Lukunka 2011).

Importantly, people working for humanitarian aid agencies – both nationals and non-nationals – may themselves engage in sexual abuse. There is an increasing awareness, and increasing data, that people who are mandated with assisting and protecting refugees sometimes misuse their powerful position to exploit them sexually (Ferris 2007; Freedman 2015: 64ff.). This might express itself in the form of direct attacks or sex for favours related to food and relief items, to performance at school or access to medical care. Even though boys and girls are affected, girls aged thirteen to eighteen seem to be most susceptible, in particular if they live in single-parent or child-headed households, are unaccompanied, or work as street traders (Ferris 2007).

What becomes apparent when connecting gender, violence and refugees is that not only the gender or the biological sex of a person is of importance, but also other factors such as age, economic status, origin and education. In short, it highlights what is referred to as intersectionality, pointing to the intersection of different social identities on multiple and often simultaneous levels (Crenshaw 1989). This is discussed in more detail by Melanie Hartmann in Chapter 5 to this volume.

About the Volume

Part I of our edited volume is entitled *Conceptualizing Gender, Violence, Refugees* and provides various perspectives on distinct concepts and their connections. It begins with Susan F. Martin who, in Chapter 1, historically traces the more recent developments of UNHCR concerning a more gender-sensitive approach to refugee assistance. In 1990, almost four decades after UNHCR was founded and acted upon its mandate to protect and assist refugees worldwide, it adopted its first Policy on Refugee Women. While the policy is understood to be a significant milestone in the refugee protection regime – especially for women – Martin questions how effective it has been and highlights various challenges. The chapter is based on her own role in the evolution of the Policy on Refugee Women – including in drafting the UNHCR Guidelines on Protection of Refugee Women of 1991, which were meant to help to implement the policy – as well as on research about the application and impact of the policy.

In Chapter 2, Simon Turner challenges the core assumptions on which many studies and programmes on sexual violence are based. Situated in the analysis of grey literature, he provides a critical reading of current discourses and their dominating narratives. He argues that much of this literature relies on images of refugee societies as being morally in decline, with unbridled young men sexually assaulting women, and a degree of violence that is pathological. These images produce and reproduce orientalist and neocolonial representations of violence and refugees. Without belittling the scope and extent of violence in refugee contexts, Turner calls for an understanding of its occurrences that moves beyond these normative assumptions.

This criticism resonates with the argument of Elisabeth Olivius in Chapter 3, who examines how violence against refugee women is conceptualized in humanitarian policy and practice. She argues that agencies often interpret this form of violence as a sign of underdevelopment and backwardness of refugee communities, and in response seek to engage in processes of social engineering in order to change social, cultural and religious patterns. Drawing on field research in Bangladesh and Thailand, she demonstrates how these practices can lead to conflict and resistance, at times obstructing rather than advancing the empowerment of women.

A somewhat different take on gender, violence and refugees is advanced by Emma Mc Cluskey who, in Chapter 4, explores the notion of violence not in terms of physical harm but as a subtle method through which the lives of refugees are ranked, assessed and criticized by their host community. Based on in-depth field research in a small Swedish town in which a larger group of mainly Syrian refugees found a temporary home, she analyses how the local population evokes a discourse around decency and

gender equality as central to what constitutes gender relations in Sweden, in a sense degrading the refugees for having other concepts about the relationship between men and women. In her case study, this turned against and thus further isolated mainly Syrian women, who were criticized for their dress codes, behaviour and poor childcare.

Taking a spatial turn, in Chapter 5 Melanie Hartmann assesses the structural conditions of German reception and accommodation centres where refugees who find their way to Germany first live while they wait for their asylum applications to be processed. She identifies the gendered inequalities enshrined in their structures, and how this affects women in particular. While sexual violence is only an extreme form of their repercussions, their daily lives are affected by insecure situations due to the poor quality and inadequacy of the centres as well as the way they are governed. Importantly, though, (female) refugees have the possibility of appropriating these spaces through their everyday practise.

How to respond to and assess gender relations might be enshrined in a national culture, as the case of Sweden shows, yet it can also be an aspect of religious belief. In Chapter 6, Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Chloé Lewis and Georgia Cole examine how faith-based images of masculinity and femininity are employed by development and aid organizations with a religious background to affect gender relations in refugee communities in order to reduce the prevalence of sexual and gender-based violence. Based on extensive field research in Sahrawi refugee camps in South West Algeria and displacement contexts in the Democratic Republic of Congo, they argue that in the Sahrawi case, faith is rendered invisible by the dominating discourses in the camp which seek to portray an image to the outside that depicts the camps as secular. In this context, sexual violence is silenced, too. In contrast, in Congo the faith-based programme ‘Transforming Masculinities’ addresses sexual violence directly and thus has the potential to lead to a transformation of gender relations.

In Chapter 7, Dale Buscher explores the intersectionality of forced migration, gender, violence and livelihoods. He argues that not only does displacement affect men and women differently, but that livelihoods, too, are gendered. Putting the notion of livelihood assets at the centre of his analysis he traces how assets drive conflicts and how, at the same time, their depletion as a consequence of conflict might force people to migrate. In displacement, negative economic coping strategies might lead to gender-based violence, in particular if they further disempower women and adolescent girls. Outside intervention, Buscher concludes, should thus provide equal access and opportunities for all.

Part II of the volume, *Experiencing Gender, Violence, Refuge*, zooms in on conditions and contexts affecting refugees in various settings. It begins in Chapter 8 with Ulrike Krause’s focus on the continuum of violence during

conflict, flight and encampment. Based on a case study of Congolese refugees in a refugee camp in Uganda, she moves beyond the prevailing context-focused research of either conflict or exile by understanding refugee camps as explicit post-conflict contexts. By means of that, she reveals how women especially are confronted with sexual and gender-based violence during the different phases of their flight, outlining a continuum of violence.

Next, in Chapter 9, Marisa O. Ensor analyses wartime displacement and its opportunities and challenges by zooming in on boys and girls. Drawing on field research amongst South Sudanese refugees in Uganda as well as returnees in South Sudan, she discusses the protracted cycle of war and displacement, and the gender-specific impacts on refugees in camps for both stayees and returnees. In spite of their challenging experiences, she emphasizes that boys and girls reveal a remarkable degree of agency and resourcefulness in their efforts to cope with the situations.

In Chapter 10, Maja Janmyr shifts the perspective towards refugee men and explores the military recruitment of Sudanese refugees by the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA) in refugee camps in Northern Uganda. She argues that the Ugandan government's military and political interests in Sudan exacerbated the protection concerns for many Sudanese refugees, as did the largely negligible approach taken by UNHCR. Based on her field research in Uganda, she discusses how Sudanese refugee men were under persistent pressure to join the SPLA, and that, coupled with the lack of security caused predominantly by the insurgency movement Lord's Resistance Army, the threat of recruitment by the SPLA forced many individuals into a mode of recurrent flight to nearby towns or even to the capital Kampala. As such, these Sudanese refugees became effectively 'displaced' within their country of asylum.

In contrast to the focus on refugees and the challenges to refugee protection, in Chapter 11 Alexander Betts explores how Angolan security forces treated Congolese survival migrants, a social group that falls outside of the refugee protection regime. Between 2003 and 2013, Angola carried out four waves of deportations of these migrants during which women, in particular, were confronted with serious levels of sexual abuse. Yet not only Angola but also the international community failed to establish protective measures for survival migrants, subjecting them to great security risks and leaving them in a state of limbo.

In the final chapter, Chapter 12, Barbra Lukunka analyses the situation of returnees to Burundi who face interpersonal violence over land. After years in exile due to the civil war, returning refugees find themselves in an environment where they encounter land scarcity, or their ancestral land is occupied by neighbours or strangers. Lukunka explores the challenges returnees face and how these affect social relations, leading to violence

and killings. She argues that a history and memory of violence, economic needs and structural and contextual issues, in combination with abject poverty, marginalization of the poor and corruption, contribute to the rise in interpersonal violence over land in Burundi.

As we draw this volume to a close in winter 2016, we witness a continuing uprooting of people from African countries such as South Sudan, Central African Republic and Burundi, yet also continued flight from countries such as Syria, Iraq and Yemen, some of whom seek to find their way to Europe. Those who have already arrived are confronted with serious challenges regarding status, shelter and protection, as well as in the longer run regarding employment and economic stability. We are observing this situation with much concern, not least since a number of incidences of violence have occurred, from individuals and groups of the host communities who do not want the refugees to be in their country, from amongst camp populations, as well as sexual attacks against refugees and host country women, the latter most visibly in Cologne on New Year's Eve 2015. Some of the violence in the camps, we assume, may be largely due to conditions of personal insecurity, overcrowded camps, absence of activities, burdening experiences during times of flight, animosities between identity groups, and many other challenges and conditions that are central to refugee institutions and situations. To return to the quote of the former Australian prime minister at the outset of this introduction, in this context violence is not an occasional occurrence that happens by chance. It is very much conditioned by the particular circumstances and living conditions of refugees. This is what we seek to highlight with this book.

Susanne Buckley-Zistel is professor for Peace and Conflict Studies at the Center for Conflict Studies, Philipps University in Marburg, Germany. She holds a PhD in International Relations from the LSE and has held positions at King's College, London, the Peace Research Institute, Frankfurt, and the Free University, Berlin. Her research focuses on issues pertaining to peace and conflict, violence, gender and transitional justice. At present, she directs a research project entitled 'Gender Relations in Confined Spaces: Conditions, Scope and Forms of Violence against Women in Conflict-related Refugee Camps', funded by the German Foundation of Peace Research.

Ulrike Krause is a research fellow at the Center for Conflict Studies of the Philipps University of Marburg in Germany, and the director of the research project 'Global Refugee Protection and Local Refugee Engagement'. She is a member of the executive boards of both the German Network Refugee Research (Netzwerk Flüchtlingsforschung) and the

German Association for Peace and Conflict Studies (Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung e.V.). She received her doctorate in political science from Magdeburg University in Germany, and has worked for international organizations in several countries. Her research focus is on conflict-induced displacement, refugee governance, refugee protection and assistance, and gender sensitivity, with a regional focus on sub-Saharan Africa. She has authored a number of articles and working papers as well as the book *Linking Refugee Protection with Development Assistance* (Nomos, 2013).

Note

1. Among others, Johnson et al. (2010) reveal that women carried out conflict-related sexual violence. See also de Brouwer (2015) and Sjoberg (2016).

Bibliography

- Barker, G., and C. Ricardo. 2005. 'Young Men and the Construction of Masculinity in Sub-Saharan Africa: Implications for HIV/AIDS, Conflict, and Violence', Social Development Papers, Conflict Prevention and Reconstruction, No. 26. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Berlit, U., H. Doerig and H. Storey. 2015. 'Credibility Assessment in Claims Based on Persecution for Reasons of Religious Conversion and Homosexuality: A Practitioner's Approach', *International Journal of Refugee Law* 27(4): 649–66.
- Boano, C., R. Zetter and T. Morris. 2008. 'Environmentally Displaced People: Understanding the Linkages between Environmental Change, Livelihoods and Forced Migration', *Forced Migration Policy Briefing* No. 1. Oxford: Refugee Studies Centre.
- Brubaker, R. 2012. '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.
- Buscher, D. 2009. 'Women, Work, and War', in S.F. Martin and J. Tirman (eds), *Women, Migration, and Conflict: Breaking a Deadly Cycle*. Heidelberg, London and New York: Springer, pp. 87–106.
- Callaway, H. 1985. *Women Refugees in Developing Countries: Their Specific Needs and Untapped Resources*. Oxford: Refugee Studies Programme.
- Carlson, S. 2005. 'Contesting and Reinforcing Patriarchy: Domestic Violence in Dzaleka Refugee Camp', *RSC Working Paper Series* No. 23. Oxford: Refugee Studies Centre.
- Castles, S. 2003. 'Towards a Sociology of Forced Migration and Social Transformation', *Sociology* 37(1): 13–34.
- . 2007. 'The Migration–Asylum Nexus and Regional Approaches', in S. Kneebone and F. Rawlings-Sanaei (eds), *New Regionalism and Asylum Seekers: Challenges Ahead*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 25–42.

- Cockburn, C. 2004. 'The Continuum of Violence: A Gender Perspective on Violence and Peace', in W. Giles and J. Hyndmann (eds), *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, pp. 24–44.
- Crawley, H. 2001. *Refugees and Gender: Law and Process*. Bristol: Jordan Publishing.
- Crenshaw, K. 1989. 'Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics', *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 140: 139–67.
- Crisp, J., T. Morris and H. Refstie. 2012. 'Displacement in Urban Areas: New Challenges, New Partnerships', *Disasters* 36, Suppl 1: S23–42.
- de Brouwer, A.-M. 2015. 'The Importance of Understanding Sexual Violence in Conflict for Investigation and Prosecution Purposes', *Cornell International Law Journal* 48(3): 639–66.
- de Wet, C.J. 2006. *Development-Induced Displacement: Problems, Policies and People*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Dolan, C. 2002. 'Collapsing Masculinities and Weak States: A Case Study of Northern Uganda', in C. Dolan and F. Cleaver (eds), *Masculinities Matter! Men, Gender and Development*. London: Zed Books, pp. 57–83.
- . 2009. *Social Torture: The case of Northern Uganda, 1986–2006*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- . 2014. 'Into the Mainstream: Addressing Sexual Violence against Men and Boys in Conflict', Workshop, 14 May. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Edward, J.K. 2007. *Sudanese Women Refugees: Transformations and Future Imaginings*. New York and Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Edwards, A. 2010. 'Transitioning Gender: Feminist Engagement with International Refugee Law and Policy 1950–2010', *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 29(2): 21–45.
- Ferris, E.G. 1990. 'Refugee Women and Violence'. Paper presented at the World Council of Churches, Geneva.
- . 2007. 'Comparative Perspectives Symposium: Women in Refugee Camps. Abuse of Power: Sexual Exploitation of Refugee Women and Girls', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 32(3): 584–91.
- Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E. 2014. 'Gender and Forced Migration', in E. Fiddian-Qasmiyeh et al. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 195–408.
- Forced Migration Review. 2013. 'Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity and the Protection of Forced Migrants', *Forced Migration Review* 42.
- Foster, M. 2007. *International Refugee Law and Socio-economic Rights: Refuge from Deprivation*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, M. 2010. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1978–1979*. London: Picador.
- Freedman, J. 2015. *Gendering the International Asylum and Refugee Debate*, 2nd edition. Basingstoke, UK and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gozdziaak, E. 2008. 'Pray God and Keep Walking: Religion, Gender and Identity of Refugee Women', in M. Hajdukowski-Ahmed, N. Khanlou and H. Moussa (eds), *Not Born a Refugee Woman. Reclaiming Identities: Challenges, Implications*

- and *Transformations in Research, Education, Policy and Creativity*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, pp. 180–95.
- Grabska, K. 2011. ‘Constructing “Modern Gendered Civilised” Women and Men: Gender-Mainstreaming in Refugee Camps’, *Gender & Development* 19(1): 81–93.
- Greatbatch, J. 1989. ‘The Gender Difference: Feminist Critiques of Refugee Discourse’, *International Journal of Refugee Law* 1(4): 518–27.
- Hans, A. 2008. ‘Gender, Camps and International Norms’, *Refugee Watch* 32: 64–73.
- Harrell-Bond, B.E. 1986. *Imposing Aid: Emergency Assistance to Refugees*. Oxford, New York and Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Hart, J. 2008. ‘Dislocated Masculinity: Adolescence and the Palestinian Nation-in-exile’, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21(1): 64–81.
- Human Rights Watch. 2011. ‘Liberia: Protect Refugees against Sexual Abuse: Ivorian Women and Girls Compelled to Trade Sex for Food, Shelter’. Retrieved 3 October 2015 from <https://www.hrw.org/news/2011/04/20/liberia-protect-refugees-against-sexual-abuse>.
- Hurst, D. 2015. ‘“Things Happen”: Tony Abbott on Sexual Assault Allegations in Offshore Detention’. *Guardian*, 20 March 2015. Retrieved 3 October 2015 from <http://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2015/mar/20/things-happen-tony-abbott-on-sexual-assault-allegations-in-offshore-detention>.
- Hyndman, J. 2004. ‘Refugee Camps as Conflict Zones: The Politics of Gender’, in W. Giles and J. Hyndman (eds), *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, pp. 193–212.
- IASC (Inter-Agency Standing Committee). 2015. ‘Guidelines for Integrating Gender-Based Violence Interventions in Humanitarian Action: Reducing risk, promoting resilience and aiding recovery’. Geneva.
- Indra, D.M. 1987. ‘Gender: A Key Dimension of the Refugee Experience’, *Refuge* 6(3): 3–4.
- Jaji, R. 2009. ‘Masculinity on Unstable Ground: Young Refugee Men in Nairobi, Kenya’, *Journal of Refugee Studies* 22(2): 177–94.
- Jansen, B. 2011. ‘The Accidental City: Violence, Economy and Humanitarianism in Kakuma Refugee Camp Kenya’. PhD thesis. University of Wageningen, NL.
- Johnson, K., et al. 2010. ‘Association of Sexual Violence and Human Rights Violations with Physical and Mental Health in Territories of the Eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo’, *Journal of the American Medical Association* 304(5): 553–62.
- Kaiser, T. 2006. ‘Between a Camp and a Hard Place: Rights, Livelihood and Experiences of the Local Settlement System for Long-Term Refugees in Uganda’, *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 44(4): 597–621.
- Karunakara, U., et al. 2004. ‘Traumatic Events and Symptoms of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder amongst Sudanese Nationals, Refugees and Ugandans in the West Nile’, *African Health Sciences* 4(2): 83–93.
- Kebede, S.S. 2010. ‘The Struggle for Belonging: Forming and Reforming Identities 1.5-Generation Asylum Seekers and Refugees’. *RSC Working Paper Series* No. 70.
- Krause, U. 2013. *Linking Refugee Protection with Development Assistance: Analyses with a Case Study in Uganda*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

- . 2014. 'Analysis of Empowerment of Refugee Women in Camps and Settlements', *Journal of Internal Displacement* 4(1): 29–52.
- . 2015. 'Zwischen Schutz und Scham? Flüchtlingslager, Gewalt und Geschlechterverhältnisse', *Peripherie: Zeitschrift für Politik und Ökonomie in der Dritten Welt* 35(138/139): 235–59.
- . 2016a. "It seems like you don't have identity, you don't belong". Reflexionen über das Flüchtlingslabel und dessen Implikationen', *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen* 23(1): 8–37.
- . 2016b. 'Hegemonie von Männern? Flüchtlingslager, Maskulinitäten und Gewalt in Uganda', *Soliale Probleme* 27(1): 119–45.
- Krause-Vilmar, J. 2011. *The Living Ain't Easy: Urban Refugees in Kampala*. New York: The Women's Refugee Commission.
- Lindorfer, S. 2009. *Verletzlichkeit und Macht: Eine psycho-soziale Studie zur Situation von Frauen und Mädchen im Nachkriegsliberia*. Cologne: medica mondiale.
- Ludwig, B. 2013. "Wiping the Refugee Dust from My Feet": Advantages and Burdens of Refugee Status and the Refugee Label', *International Migration* 54(1): 5–18.
- Lukunka, B. 2011. 'New Big Men: Refugee Emasculation as a Human Security Issue', *International Migration* 50(5): 130–41.
- Markard, N. 2007. 'Fortschritte im Flüchtlingsrecht? Gender Guidelines und geschlechtsspezifische Verfolgung', *Kritische Justiz: Vierteljahresschrift für Recht und Politik* 4: 373–90.
- . 2013. 'Sexuelle Orientierung als Fluchtgrund – Das Ende der "Diskretion": Aktuelle Entwicklungen beim Flüchtlingschutz aufgrund der sexuellen Orientierung', *Asylmagazin* (3): 74–84.
- Martin, S.F. 2004. *Refugee Women*, 2nd edition. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- McAdam, J. 2014. 'The Concept of Crisis Migration', *Forced Migration Review* 45: 10–11.
- McCleary, J.S. 2013. 'An Exploration of Alcohol Use in Karen Refugee Communities in the Context of Conflict-related Displacement'. PhD thesis. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Moss, P. 2015. 'Review into Recent Allegations Relating to Conditions and Circumstance at the Regional Processing Centre in Nauru: Final Report'. Retrieved 3 October 2015 from <http://apo.org.au/research/review-recent-allegations-relating-conditions-and-circumstance-regional-processing-centre>.
- Mulumba, D. 2005. 'Gender Relations, Livelihood Security and Reproductive Health among Women Refugees in Uganda: The Case of Sudanese Women in Rhino Camp and Kiryandongo Refugee Settlements'. PhD thesis. University of Wageningen, NL.
- Naggujja, Y., et al. 2014. *From The Frying Pan to the Fire: Psychosocial Challenges Faced by Vulnerable Refugee Women and Girls in Kampala*. Kampala: Refugee Law Project.
- Onyut, L.P., et al. 2009. 'Trauma, Poverty and Mental Health among Somali and Rwandese Refugees Living in an African Refugee Settlement: An Epidemiological Study', *Conflict and Health* 3(6).
- ORAM (Organization for Refuge, Asylum & Migration). 2012. 'Opening Doors: A Global Survey of NGO Attitudes towards LGBTI Refugees & Asylum Seekers' (June). San Francisco.

- Refugees International. 1999. 'Hope in the Fight to Reduce Gender Violence in Tanzanian Refugee Camps'. Retrieved 3 October 2015 from <http://reliefweb.int/report/united-republic-tanzania/hope-fight-reduce-gender-violence-tanzanian-refugee-camps>.
- . 2012. 'Syrian Women & Girls: No Safe Refuge'. Retrieved 3 October 2015 <http://refugeesinternational.org/policy/field-report/syrian-women-girls-no-safe-refuge>.
- Rosenberger, S., and I. Stöckl. 2016. 'The Politics of Categorization – Political Representatives with Immigrant Background between “the Other” and “Standing for”', *Politics, Groups, and Identities* (June): 1–20.
- Scheel, S., and V. Squire. 2014. 'Forced Migrants as “Illegal” Migrants', in E. Fiddian-Qasmiyeh et al. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Refugee and Forced Migration Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 188–202.
- Sjoberg, L. 2016. *Women as Wartime Rapists: Beyond Sensation and Stereotyping*. New York: New York University Press.
- Spijkerboer, T. (ed.). 2013. *Fleeing Homophobia: Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Asylum*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Türk, V. 2013. 'Ensuring Protection to LGBTI Persons of Concern', *International Journal of Refugee Law* 25(1): 120–29.
- Turner, S. 1999. 'Angry Young Men in Camps: Gender, Age and Class Relations among Burundian Refugees in Tanzania', *New Issues in Refugee Research*, Working Paper No. 9.
- . 2010. *Politics of Innocence: Hutu Identity, Conflict and Camp Life*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- UNGA (United Nations General Assembly). 2012. 'Report of the Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women, its Causes and Consequences, Rashida Manjoo. Addendum: Mission to Somalia', A/HRC/20/16/Add.3. New York.
- UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees). 1990. 'UNHCR Policy on Refugee Women'. Geneva.
- . 1991. 'UNHCR Guidelines on the Protection of Refugee Women'. Geneva.
- . 2008a. 'UNHCR Guidance Note on Refugee Claims Relating to Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity'. Geneva.
- . 2008b. 'UNHCR Handbook for the Protection of Women and Girls'. Geneva.
- . 2011a. 'Working with Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender & Intersex Persons in Forced Displacement'. Geneva.
- . 2011b. 'Action against Sexual and Gender-based Violence: An Updated Strategy'. Geneva.
- . 2015. 'Women on the Run: First-Hand Accounts of Refugees Fleeing El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Mexico'. Geneva.
- . 2016. 'Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2015'. Geneva.
- UN Women. 2013. 'Inter Agency Assessment of Gender-based Violence and Child Protection among Syrian Refugees in Jordan, with a Focus on Early Marriage'. Amman, Jordan.
- Valji, N. 2001. 'Women and the 1951 Refugee Convention: Fifty Years of Seeking Visibility', *Refugee* 19(5): 25–35.
- Women's Refugee Commission. 2009. 'Refugee Girls: The Invisible Faces of War'. Retrieved 3 October 2015 from <https://womensrefugeecommission.org/programs/youth/763-girlsstories>.

Zetter, R. 1991. 'Labelling Refugees: Forming and Transforming a Bureaucratic Identity', *Journal of Refugee Studies* 4(1): 39–62.

———. 2007. 'More Labels, Fewer Refugees: Remaking the Refugee Label in an Era of Globalization', *Journal of Refugee Studies* 20(2): 172–92.