


ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Peace in Motion: Rethinking Peace in Contexts of Forced Migration

Claske Dijkema 

Bern University of Applied Sciences, Bern, Switzerland

Correspondence: Claske Dijkema (Claske.dijkema@bfh.ch)

Received: 17 December 2024 | **Revised:** 19 August 2025 | **Accepted:** 21 August 2025

Funding: The author received no specific funding for this work.

Keywords: border violence | forced migration | geographies of peace | methodological nationalism | peace studies | political geography | transnational scales

ABSTRACT

People who flee areas of armed conflict and other forms of violence do not automatically find peace upon leaving. Their lived experiences often involve continued violence across different stages and locations of forced migration, challenging conventional notions of what peace entails. Traditionally, peace is conceptualized in relation to armed violence and specific geographic areas within nation-states where such violence occurs. This article draws on geographic scholarship to reconceptualize peace within a transnational framework, challenging the state-centric perspectives that still prevail in peace research. The article is structured as follows: the first section explores how peace can be understood through the lived experiences of migrants in Europe, foregrounding their perspectives as a lens for rethinking conventional peace narratives. The second section examines key developments in peace and conflict research that provide a foundation for conceptualizing peace in transnational settings. The five shorter sections that follow introduce core arguments for conceptualizing peace in transnational settings: that violence does not necessarily end when war does; that peace, as a dynamic and ongoing process, must also be considered in contexts of so-called non-war violence; that peacebuilding goes beyond nation-building; that peace is an embodied experience; and that, in addition to the well-established spatial turn, peace studies would benefit from a temporal turn. The main contribution this article makes is that it reconceptualizes peace—through the transnational experiences of violence by migrants—as a dynamic, spatially and temporally entangled experience. It introduces temporal complexity, highlighting forms of violence that disrupt linear understandings of time.

1 | Introduction

Peace is generally thought within the borders of a nation-state: a country is at war or at peace. This binary perception of peace has been called into question over the past few decades, showing that war continues through other means, for example through domestic, criminal, terrorist and state violence, and military urbanism (Cockburn 1998; Fregonese and Laketa 2022; Graham 2010; Pearce and Perea 2019; Ingram and Dodds 2009). The perpetuation of experiences of violence in forced migration trajectories—during transit and in destination countries—

challenges narrow spatial conceptualizations of the locations of peace, war and armed conflict.

Over the past two decades important contributions have been made in the field of political geography to understanding peace beyond the absence of violence, breaking with the idea that peace is linear, a matter of time, and the opposite of war. The latter approach to peace, which is still common in political science, represents peace as a political process or as a transition from war to peace, as a result of which peace is a matter of time. However, too many post-war areas still qualify several decades

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2025 The Author(s). *Geography Compass* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

later as post-conflict, where the war has stopped but conflict perpetuates in different ways (Dijkema and Korajac 2022; Houssay-Holzschuch 2021). More geographical approaches to peace that focus on its spatial aspects call this linear representation of peace as time into question, pointing out that during war peace is being made in certain spaces through for example care practices (Vaittinen et al. 2019) and that after war certain spaces continue to operate according to the war logic of separation, militarization and hypermasculinity (Edenborg 2021). For this reason, peace and violence should not be considered as binary or exclusionary categories—where if one is present, the other is absent—but as being present at the same time (Dijkema et al. 2024). These important developments have laid the foundation for thinking about peace in transnational settings.

The question this article seeks to address is what peace means for those who are no longer physically confronted with violence and armed conflict, not because the violence has stopped, but because they have physically fled the places of violence in the context of forced migration. The abundant literature on the perpetuation of violence by other means in migration trajectories (see e.g. Brambilla and Jones 2020; Isakjee et al. 2020; Jones 2016 on border violence) raises the question what peace means in contexts of migration and how to conceive of peace in a transnational context. This first section addresses the question of how to understand peace through the experiences of those seeking asylum in Europe.

2 | Peace Through the Eyes of Those Seeking Refuge

The work of Jacobsen (2022) is groundbreaking for bringing political geography and refugee studies together. She shows that although her research participants—Syrian refugees in Denmark—have physically withdrawn themselves from war, war continues to reverberate in several ways during their lives in refuge. For example, one of her research participants Salam says: “We came here to seek peace, we do not have it. We left the war [in Syria] with guns, rifles, and things like that but we came to another kind of war. A war for existence and a war of ...” (quoted in Jacobsen 2022, 6). Violence reverberates through trauma, continued threat and worry about the ones left behind, and insecurity about the future, but also through “bureaucratic violence”. As a result, Jacobsen’s research participants describe Denmark as a place of war, more specifically as “a war waged by the Danish state against refugees” (Jacobsen 2022, 2). The experiences of violence and war-like experiences that Jacobsen and others describe do not only challenge “consideration of where war is and what counts as war in political geography” (Jacobsen 2022, 2), but also what peace means, and the representation of Europe as being at peace.

The question of how people seeking asylum in Europe represent and experience peace are central in the research I carried out together with two students from the University of Basel.¹ With the use of photo elicitation and relief maps as methods to steer the conversation in focus groups, women at different stages of the asylum procedure in Germany spoke about peace and what it meant in their everyday lives. For example, a woman from

Nigeria, who applied for asylum in Germany said: “there is peace here” in the sense of absence of war. She associated it with laws and safety for her children but also said that with their present status they don’t have it (focus group 29.01.2022). Her legal status and the limitations that come with it are closely related to her everyday experiences of peace or the lack thereof. Another participant explained: “Peace is not just that we don’t have war, we don’t have it. Peace is many things (...) I don’t have peace. Maybe I will try to have peace of mind, [but] I don’t have peace in general, because I just want to be happy, and not to be stressed every day.” (focus group 29.01.2021). The reference to their lived experience of being in a situation that can neither be described as peace nor war is reminiscent of the accounts of persons living in post-conflict areas, where years after war, “post” still means neither war nor peace. Questions around the temporalities of armed conflict and of peace after armed conflict have led to many interesting developments in the study of peace and conflict across disciplines theorizing peace beyond war/peace binaries. These developments challenge the general idea that people who move away from armed violence are in safety and therefore in a situation of peace. The different forms of violence they experience point to the conditions and limitations of a life at peace in a transnational setting. Placing the experiences of migrants at the center of a conceptual inquiry into peace is a means to study peace in transnational settings as experiences of violence and peace are transnational and layered or folded in different spatialities and temporalities.

3 | Developments in Peace Research: What Political and Feminist Geographers Have to Offer

Novel and interdisciplinary approaches to peace propose a positive definition of the term, looking at it from spatial (Björkdahl and Buckley-Zistel 2016, 2022; Macaspac and Moore 2022), temporal (Mueller-Hirth and Rios Oyola 2019; Souza 2024), feminist (Väyrynen et al. 2021; Wibben and Donahoe 2020) and decolonial points of view (Stavrevska et al. 2022). Spatial and temporal lines of inquiry put to the fore that “peace takes place somewhere and is always connected to other wheres”; that peace does not happen when the fighting stops, that it is not only spatially, but also temporally folded; and that peace is an everyday lived experience (Dijkema et al. 2024, 513). These temporal and spatial connections have gained important attention in the recent spatial and temporal turns in social sciences.

For a long time questions of war and peace were not directly addressed in geography, leaving these to the disciplines of political science and its subdisciplines of international relations, peace and conflict studies and geopolitics. A series of publications changes this beginning 21st century (Flint 2005; Koopman 2011, 2019; Loyd 2012; Mamadouh 2005; McConnell et al. 2014; Megoran 2011). In *Geographies of peace* McConnell et al. (2014) are the first to present geographies of peace as a coherent research agenda. They provide a review of authors with empirical work in a range of settings. They approach peace as situated forms of knowledge within different cultural settings, a central question being how and why peace arose in particular ways and particular places. Their meaningful

engagement with grassroots perspectives is an important alternative approach to the “top-heavy institutional and problem-solving approach” to peacebuilding that has dominated international relations scholarship (p. 11). McConnel, Williams and Megoran convincingly make the argument that “peace is inherently spatial, shaped by the spaces through which it is produced and reproduced” (2014, 19). They conceive peace as a fragile contingent process that is constituted through everyday relations and embodiments which are also inextricably linked to geopolitical processes. The spatial turn in peace research represents a valuable contribution to challenging state-centered approaches to peace by explaining peace as a process in space and productive of space. Such an approach to peace is more grounded in local contexts (Björkdahl 2013) and brings into focus areas that remain under the radar of most peace research such as locations of violence and peace at a supra- and sub-state level. Peace is both connected to geopolitical and intimate relations (Hörschelmann and Reich 2017; Pain 2009, 2015, 2021). In the tentative to overcome methodological nationalism — by which Wimmer and Glick Schiller mean the limited understanding of global phenomena as a result of a narrow focus on the nation-state that fails to account for the ways people, ideas, and institutions operate across and beyond national borders — geographers have made an important contribution to connecting the scales from the local to the global while avoiding oversimplified linear connections.

Scales are entangled, with cross connectors that Pain and Smith (Pain and Smith 2008) envision as something like strands of DNA. Pain’s work on intimacy geopolitics (2015) and Brickell’s on intimate peace (Brickell 2015) point to how not only does the macro shape the micro, but ideas and practices of peace at intimate scales also sustain ideologies at larger scales, and indeed violence at home and in the streets go beyond influencing each other but are intimately connected.

(Dijkema et al. 2024)

It is these non-linear connections between different scales from the local to the global and the interest in the interactions between direct and structural violence, also in non-war contexts that are helpful for conceiving of peace in a transnational setting of migration. This “continuous” way of thinking about peace or thinking about peace as a continuum — despite the justified critique that continuums are also linear representations and do not do justice to more layered, multi-scalar, entangled representations of the relation between peace and war and between the global and the local — offer important insights for thinking about peace across different geographical settings. In the following sections I present five arguments that lay the foundation for conceptualizing peace in transnational settings. They are that violence does not necessarily end when war does; that peace, as a dynamic and ongoing process, must also be considered in contexts of so-called “non-war” violence; that peacebuilding goes beyond nation-building; that peace is an embodied experience; and that, in addition to the well-established spatial turn, peace studies would benefit from a temporal turn.

4 | Violence Does Not End With War

For those fleeing violence and seeking refuge in Europe, violence is perpetuated in different ways during transit and in destination countries. Dempsey (2020) observes that experiences of violence are a continuum for people who are forced to migrate from source to transit countries and even after arriving in EU host states. Based on her interviews with migrants in asylum camps in the EU, she makes a difference between physical, non-linear, sexual, psychological and verbal violence. According to these accounts, sexual and physical violence are more prevalent in source countries and non-linear and psychological violence come more to the fore in destination countries. Non-linear violence refers to the “disrupted potential for a life with some stability and growth/life integrity” (Dempsey 2020, 3). I understand this violence as the impossibility of seeing and building toward a future for oneself, which I come back to later. In destination countries violence is for example perpetuated through the afterlives of traumatic events and their consequences for people’s physical and mental health (Bunn et al. 2023); through the continued threat that people may face in destination countries; the continued concern for the ones left behind; and through the continued insecurity that asylum seekers face during the asylum procedure, waiting for a decision whether they will be allowed to stay (Dempsey 2020). Fischer and Insberg show that also when asylum has been granted violence continues in what are supposed to be “safe havens” like Switzerland and Norway (Fischer 2023). The forms of violence they identify partly overlap with the violence described by Dempsey (2020) but insecurity about the future comes less to the fore in research with those who have been granted asylum.

To understand the forms of violence that migrants experience in transit and in destination countries, social scientists from different disciplines use conceptual tools that have been fundamental for peace and conflict studies, such as armed conflict, direct, indirect, structural, and cultural violence (Galtung 1969, 1990). Heller and Pezzani describe migration in terms of an “armed mobility conflict” (2018) and Hess approaches the European border as “conflict zone” (2018). Vergnano (2024) warns that violent border regimes not only have an effect on migrants but also increase the conflict potential in EU societies due to political divergencies on how to deal with migration. The violence of migration control also challenges what peace means in Europe. In Stierl’s words migration should be understood as a form of “mass disobedience” of violent forms of population control that “de-centers and distorts Europe’s narrative as a community of peace, unity, and humanitarianism” (Stierl 2019, 10) and hence questions Europe as a political project.

Heller and Pezzani (2018) refer to the violence against migrants across the maritime frontier as indirect violence, inflicted by policies and operations that turn the sea into a hostile environment. The deaths of roughly 30,000 people who died from drowning in the Mediterranean since 2014 (Missing Migrants Project 2025) can be seen as a form of violence.² This form of violence is indirect because no actors carry direct responsibility for their deaths, nobody killed them, but they are left to die (Heller et al. 2012). The analysis of hostile environments as a technique to deter migration can be extended to the Alpine

region (Del Biaggio 2019) and the Sahara (Amani and Gatelier 2020). Galtung's idea of structural violence comes back in Jacobsen's conceptualization of "bureaucratic violence" as a war waged by the Danish state against refugees (Jacobsen 2022). Gatelier et al. (2017) take up Galtung's term of cultural violence and apply it to the field of migration, which they combine with the concept of epistemic violence (Spivak 1988). Both have in common the construction of knowledge frameworks that legitimize and enshrine practices of violence and domination (Galván-Álvarez 2010). Gatelier and Naudin (2020) use the term epistemic violence to understand the ways in which asylum seekers are deprived of their voice and reduced to subalterns during the asylum procedure, who cannot defend their cases in their own terms.

References to war, such as the one waged by the Danish state mentioned above and "a war on migrants" (Garelli and Tazzioli 2018) have been widely used in activist discourse and in critical migration studies scholarship over the past decades, especially in the aftermath of the 2005 killings in the Spanish enclaves on the European border in Northern Morocco. For example, Bauder states that "international borders have become deadly barriers of a proportion rivaled only by war or natural disaster" (Bauder 2016, 5). For Heller and Pezzani the action of Doctors Without Borders in the Mediterranean, whose work is associated with medical assistance in the contexts of war, signaled that both the scale of deaths and the militarisation of borders responsible for these deaths "have turned the Mediterranean into a war zone" (2016, 19). Garelli and Tazzioli (2018) speak of "biopolitical warfare" on migrants in reference to the evolution toward a transnational military approach to migration management in the Mediterranean. However, they warn that warfare is not synonymous to a war being waged on migrants. Although the notion "war on migrants" fulfilled a clear political purpose to denounce the institutional violence inherent in EU migration policies, Garelli and Tazzioli find that "it progressively lost specificity when it got used for "any governmental approach to migration management" (2018, 187). Also Bigo (2014) finds that the term is misleading given the complexity of border control under violent practices and simplistic geopolitical narratives. Bigo explains that the practices of migration containment are not a form of warfare, as the disposition of the coast guard is not to kill, but as Heller and Pezzani argue, the disposition is to leave and let die through policies of non-assistance on the part of states (2016, 2019). The Coast Guard on the European border are not interested in war or border control per se, but in the containment of migration through military technology (2016). In conclusion, we can speak of migration warfare but not of war in reference to persistent biological technology for governing transnational populations on the move. These important discussions about violence in the context of migration and the drawn connections to armed conflict and war remind of McConnel, Williams and Megoran's critique that often war and violence is dealt with in refined theoretical terms but that peace is left largely undefined, existing only as "a point of reference, an empty signifier defined by an absence of violence" (2014, 9). An observation that more recent developments in the study of peace have sought to address, looking at how to conceptualize peace in areas beyond armed conflict.

5 | Expanding Peace Research to Non-war Contexts

A focus on experiences of violence and peace in the transnational context of migration in transit and destination countries contributes to the nascent, but still scarce interest in studying peace in non-war contexts. Peace and conflict studies have so far shown very little interest in the study of violence in non-war contexts. This is especially true for American and European non-war contexts. Dijkema and Djontu make the case for broadening the empirical scope of peace and conflict studies to include non-war situations, such as urban violence in France (2023). Two arguments in favor of extending the empirical scope of peace research to non-war violence in the US and Europe are first that in countries considered "at peace" politicians regularly declare war on transnational threats like drugs and terrorism. This argument can be extended to the discourse on migration in Europe, where war has been declared on "smuggling" (Albahari 2018), and where politicians generally frame migration in terms of a "crisis" (Bamberg 2019; Dines et al. 2018), calling for exceptional, that is non-parliamentary measures (Davitti 2018) (see e.g. Netherlands).³ This designation "has enabled the deployment of exceptional military, humanitarian and political 'solutions'" (Heller and Pezzani 2016). Second, peace in Europe has been represented as stable and has long — at least until the Russian invasion of Kyiv in 2022 — been taken for granted. Instead of a stable political state, peace is a dynamic process and always continues to be made and remade and is threatened by various forms of violence. Hence it is not a luxury to also conceptualize peace in non-war contexts. The special issue in *Geopolitics* on "Making Space for Peace in Contexts of 'Non-war' Violence" presents a series of articles that broadens the empirical scope of peace research to contexts of non-war violence (e.g. military urbanism and counterterrorism in Kenya (Naji and Schildknecht 2024)); resistance against police violence in Latin America (Kynsilehto 2024); and violence related to extractivism (Glaab and Stuvøy 2021; Jakubchik-Paloheimo and de Buena Esperanza 2024). Despite the innovation of studying peace in non-war contexts these cases still mainly focus on the Global South, reinforcing what Loyd has called the "liberal geographic imagination of war abroad and peace at home" (2012, p. 486), which this article seeks to challenge through a transnational inquiry into peace, looking for peace at different scales beyond the state.

6 | Seeking Peace Elsewhere: Challenging Methodological Nationalism

Following the critique, mainly formulated in the discipline of anthropology, that peacebuilding is more than state building (Brown 2015), peace and conflict research has made an important shift in focus from state-to subnational and local actors in peacebuilding, leading to a local turn in peace and conflict studies. The local turn has granted abundant attention to the substate level, such as the urban (Björkdahl 2013) and the everyday (Berents and McEvoy-Levy 2015; Mac Ginty 2021) but has disregarded so far the study of peace in transnational settings. Wimmer and Glick Schiller have criticized the tendency

in social sciences to assume that “the nation-state is the natural social and political form of the modern world” and hence self-evident (2002, 301). They argue that this leads to “methodological nationalism,” which hides from view that transnationalism has become a defining feature of modern life. Wimmer and Glick Schiller identify three variants of methodological nationalism: ignorance in theorizations across disciplines; naturalization; and territorial limitation (2002). For this article the variant of territorial limitation is especially applicable. According to Wimmer and Glick Schiller, the focus of analysis in social sciences is mainly limited to processes within nation-state borders, which is problematic because it means that *trans*-border connections and processes remain under the radar. It can be countered that this is not the case in research dealing with armed conflict and violence. For example, there is ample literature on transborder conflicts (Dodds 2021; Onah 2015; Orhan 2014) and violent international networks (e.g. terrorist networks in Ingram and Dodds 2009). In geography Springer and Le Billon (2016) demonstrate how local forms of violence are part of wider assemblage of space. More recently there is also attention for diaspora conflicts, when violent clashes between diaspora groups—such as Hindu-Muslim riots and Kurdish-Turkish altercations—erupt abroad (Féron and Baser 2023). However, a lot remains to be explored to develop a transnational approach to peace in the context of migration. The critique of the narrow territorial focus on the nation-state that Wimmer and Glick Schiller apply to migration studies is also relevant for understanding peace and peacebuilding and how it intersects with migration. What people typically do in contexts of armed conflict or experiences of violence, is to (attempt to) go to places where they can be physically and emotionally safe. People seek peace elsewhere. People who flee violent conflict or its legacy exactly do what Lederach describes as peacebuilding: they seek to restore life to themselves and their families in the face of violence. They may not build peace exactly in the way Lederach intended it, as a way to “restore their collective lives” through (re)building communities and political institutions (Lederach 1997; cited in Brown 2015, 132), but I argue that even if they do not restore their lives collectively, they do so at a more individual level.

7 | Peace as an Embodied Experience

From a state-centered approach to peace and security, feminist approaches in political geography, geopolitics and IR shift emphasis from the state to the intimate, embodied, affective and emotional effects of violence (Hyndman 2001; Koopman 2011; Mountz 2011; Myadar and Dempsey 2022), calling for an emotional geopolitics (Pain 2009). Authors in the field of migration reiterate this need for attention for the intimate and finer scales of displacement and forced mobility (Hyndman 2019; Jacobsen 2023). Myadar and Dempsey point out that a state-centered approach is problematic in the area of forced displacement as it does not do justice “to intimate, embodied, affective and emotional landscapes in understanding and problematizing the effects of the regulation of forcibly displaced peoples” (2022, p. 369). They call for de-centering the state and for challenging the conventional production of geopolitical knowledge in order to foreground the intimate and nuanced scales of displacement and

forced mobility. Jacobsen shows that her research participants, who are excluded from official political processes in Denmark hold important knowledge about peace. The insights from her research participants call for taking into account the experiences of migrants in conceptualizing peace beyond the state at a local and experiential level. From the previously cited research with women at different stages of the asylum procedure in Germany we can learn that peace is a corporeal experience, that it involves the freedom of movement instead of being stuck in space and time, as well as the right to stay and belong, and that it includes the possibility to make choices about one’s future, to give it a direction. Värnyen’s proposal to see war and peace as socio-political institutions that begin and end with bodies resonates with these observations (2019 cited in Selimovic 2022). In their work on “geopolitical trauma” and “trauma in transnational refugee regimes”, Loyd et al. (2018, 377) demonstrate that migration trajectories are embodied, non-linear, and spatially folded. These observations have important consequences for understanding and researching the perpetuation of violence after the end of war and in contexts of non-war violence and what is needed to be able to experience peace in destination countries. When we consider that peace is an embodied experience and when we agree that building peace also takes place at the level of individuals disregarding where they are, then peace should be thought of in a transnational context.

8 | Taking a Temporal Turn

Time and temporalities are important analytical tools to capture peace. From the empirical research with women in Germany we understand that having some idea of what one’s future looks like, to know where one’s life is going, and to have control over it, are important factors for being able to experience peace. Söderström and Olivius (2022) propose time as an important conceptual tool to address some of the methodological challenges of making peace researchable (see also Ramirez-Hurtado and Comins-Mingol 2021). Thinking about peace in transnational settings breaks with linear representations of war and peace. Loyd et al. (2018) challenge not only mainstream ideas about linear migration trajectories from violence to safety, but also between past and present, proposing trauma (pre-, during and post-migration) as a way to make visible new temporal and spatial connections. Recently, the spatial turn has been complemented by a temporal turn. In geography D. Massey (1995) and D. B. Massey (2005) has been key to rethinking the relationship between space and time: that time is a constitutive element of space. Kratochvíl described in another context the ways in which “multiple spatialities and temporalities interact, creating specific spatiotemporal constellations which interweave and fold in with one another” (2022, 938). A growing number of studies in geography have engaged with temporality (Holloway et al. 2019; May 2007; Thrift 2007) and the intrinsic connection between space and time. However, many of the ideas about time and temporality still follow a division through linearity (past, present, future), which is also very prevalent in common understandings of peace as a transition from war to peace (Souza 2024). Important work to break these linear representations comes from research about the effects of the Israeli occupation on people living in the Palestinian territories

(Griffiths 2017; Jamal 2016; Levy 2021; Peteet 2018; Weitzel 2022), where the Israeli state uses waiting as a strategy to manage marginalized populations. Power over people is partly exercised through the control of their time, affecting their mobility. This analytical attention to temporal aspects related to direct and structural violence is also very relevant in the context of migration. Non-linear violence is the term Dempsey uses for “the disrupted potential for a life with some stability and growth/life integrity” (2020, p. 4). Being stuck in migration trajectories, the time of migrants is made useless because they cannot exchange it for money, as Stock found out in her research on forced immobility in Morocco (Stock 2019). In addition, traumatic experiences during migration confuse neat distinctions between past, present and future. Memories of the past impose themselves in the present, but it is also hard to concentrate on the present as long as the future is entirely uncertain. Temporal aspects of migration also point to concepts of hope, future perspectives and agency (Griffiths 2017; Pine 2014). But these hoped for futures, often remain out of reach. It is what Ehrkamp, Loyd and Secor call “the crisis of futurability in the spacetime of refugee settlement” (2022, 508). More knowledge is needed about the role of future perspectives and temporal predictability in the possibility of peace as an experience.

9 | Conclusion

Thinking peace transnationally, across geographies of forced migration moves peace scholarship forward in several ways. Following the spatial and temporal turns in human geography, this article first challenges the war/peace binary and its pitfall of methodological nationalism by showing how violence and peace coexist across borders and timeframes. Second, foregrounding migrants' lived experiences through feminist geographies emphasizes that peace is an embodied, affective, and personal condition rather than a geopolitical abstraction. Third, it provides a critique of the territorial limitations of mainstream peace and conflict research, advocating for a transnational lens that captures the entangled scales of violence and peace—from the intimate to the geopolitical. Fourth, the concept of “non-linear violence” invites peace scholars to rethink time not as a linear progression but as a folded, disrupted, and political dimension. Hence, the article offers insights into the different scales of violence, the perpetuation of violence after the end of war and its impact on more peace as an embodied experience.

The avenues for future research in political geography opened up by this article are conceptual and methodological. Conceptually, it calls for the integration of temporal analysis into spatial research. When seeking to break with linear temporal (from war to peace) and spatial (war or peace) representations, it is necessary to reconceptualize time and temporality in experiences of peace. It raises the question of how migrants' temporal experiences of waiting, uncertainty, and disrupted futures reshape the understanding of peace, safety and security. Methodologically, it points to the use of visual and affective methods for capturing lived experiences of peace and violence. In addition the conceptualization of peace developed in this article has a political interest as it supports advocacy efforts that challenge the myth of Europe as a space of peace, and insists that the

lived, embodied, and transnational experiences of migrants are key to rethinking peace in Europe.

Acknowledgements

Open access publishing facilitated by Berner Fachhochschule, as part of the Wiley - Berner Fachhochschule agreement via the Consortium Of Swiss Academic Libraries.

Ethics Statement

Ethics Approval for the empirical data laying at the basis of this study have been obtained from the University Ethics Committee (UEK) of the University of Basel. Reference No. 106.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability Statement

The metadata for this study are available on Zenodo (<https://zenodo.org/records/8054866>).

Endnotes

¹ Leonie Bozenhardt and Felicitas Winker, Research Lab Report “Everyday Peace - How is peace understood, experienced, and manifested in migrants' everyday lives in Germany?”, University of Basel. 2022.

² <https://missingmigrants.iom.int/region/mediterranean>, accessed 2 June 2025.

³ The Dutch government demands special or exceptional legal authorities to deal with the “migration crisis”. <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/regering/regeerprogramma/2-grip-op-asiel-en-migratie>, accessed 02.05.2025.

References

- Albahari, M. 2018. “From Right to Permission: Asylum, Mediterranean Migrations, and Europe's War on Smuggling.” *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 6, no. 2: 121–130. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2331502418767088>.
- Amani, M. M., and K. Gatelier. 2020. “La violence des frontières, le désert.” *Non Violence! 4e Rencontres de géopolitique critique* 4: 69–71. <https://www.modop.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/cahier-non-violence-2020.pdf>.
- Bamberg, K. 2019. “Moving Beyond the ‘crisis’: Recommendations for the European Commission's Communication on Migration.” [Discussion Paper]: 1–24. https://www.epc.eu/content/PDF/2019/Moving_beyond_the_crisis.pdf.
- Bauder, H. 2016. *Migration Borders Freedom*. 1st ed. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315638300>.
- Berents, H., and S. McEvoy-Levy. 2015. “Theorising Youth and Everyday Peace(Building).” *Peacebuilding* 3, no. 2: 115–125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21647259.2015.1052627>.
- Bigo, D. 2014. “The (In)securitization Practices of the Three Universes of EU Border Control: Military/Navy – Border Guards/Police – Database Analysts.” *Security Dialogue* 45, no. 3: 209–225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010614530459>.
- Björkdahl, A. 2013. “Urban Peacebuilding.” *Peacebuilding* 1, no. 2: 207–221. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21647259.2013.783254>.

- Björkdahl, A., and S. Buckley-Zistel, eds. 2016. *Spatializing Peace and Conflict*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137550484>.
- Björkdahl, A., and S. Buckley-Zistel. 2022. "Space for Peace: A Research Agenda." *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*: 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17502977.2022.2131194>.
- Brambilla, C., and R. Jones. 2020. "Rethinking Borders, Violence, and Conflict: From Sovereign Power to Borderscapes as Sites of Struggles." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 38, no. 2: 287–305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775819856352>.
- Brickell, K. 2015. "Towards Intimate Geographies of Peace? Local Reconciliation of Domestic Violence in Cambodia." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 40, no. 3: 321–333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12086>.
- Brown, A. M. 2015. "Social Anthropology and Peacebuilding." In *Routledge Handbook of Peacebuilding (First Issued in Paperback)*, edited by R. Mac Ginty, 132–146. Routledge.
- Bunn, M., N. J. Murakami, and A. Haidar. 2023. "Culture, Trauma, and Loss: Integrative Social Work Practice With Refugees and Asylum Seekers." In *Integrative Social Work Practice with Refugees, Asylum Seekers, and Other Forcibly Displaced Persons*, edited by N. J. Murakami and M. Akilova, 275–306. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-12600-0_12.
- Cockburn, C. 1998. *The Space Between Us: Negotiating Gender and National Identities in Conflict*. Zed Books; Distributed in the USA by St Martin's Press.
- Davitti, D. 2018. "Biopolitical Borders and the State of Exception in the European Migration 'Crisis'." *European Journal of International Law* 29, no. 4: 1173–1196. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chy065>.
- Del Biaggio, C. 2019. *On a fermé la montagne*. 86. L'Alpe. <https://www.lalpe.com/lalpe-86-a-saute-frontieres/>.
- Dempsey, K. E. 2020. "Spaces of Violence: A Typology of the Political Geography of Violence Against Migrants Seeking Asylum in the EU." *Political Geography* 79: 102157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2020.102157>.
- Dijkema, C., P. Anctil Avoine, and S. Koopman. 2024. "Making Space for Peace in Contexts of 'Non-War' Violence: Challenging War-Peace Binaries Through Feminist, Spatio-Temporal, and Decolonial Approaches." *Geopolitics*: 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2024.2379316>.
- Dijkema, C., and H. M. Djontu. 2023. "Geographies of peace in the Wake of Non-War Violence in the City: *Agir pour la Paix* in a Marginalised Neighbourhood in France." *Peacebuilding* 11, no. 4: 463–481. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21647259.2023.2236412>.
- Dijkema, C., and A. Korajac. 2022. "Urban Peace, a Spatial Approach. In Search for Peacescapes in the Post-War City of Brčko." *Swisspeace Working Paper Series* 2: 21.
- Dines, N., N. Montagna, and E. Vacchelli. 2018. "Beyond Crisis Talk: Interrogating Migration and Crises in Europe." *Sociology* 52, no. 3: 439–447. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038518767372>.
- Dodds, K. 2021. "The New Border Wars: The Conflicts That Will Define Our Future." *Diversions Books*.
- Edenborg, E. 2021. "Queer Theories of Peace and Security." In *Routledge Handbook of Feminist Peace Research*, edited by T. Väyrynen, S. Parashar, and E. Féron, 50–59. Routledge.
- Ehrkamp, P., J. M. Loyd, and A. J. Secor. 2022. "Trauma as Displacement: Observations From Refugee Resettlement." *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 112, no. 3: 715–722. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2021.1956296>.
- Féron, É., and B. Baser. 2023. "Diasporas and Transportation of Homeland Conflicts: Inter-Group Dynamics and Host-Country Responses." *Ethnopolitics* 22, no. 4: 375–383. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449057.2023.2199598>.
- Fischer, C. 2023. "Asyl, Schutz und Gewalt: Einblicke in den Alltag anerkannter Geflüchteter." *Psychiatrische Pflege* 8, no. 3: 16–19. <https://doi.org/10.1024/2297-6965/a000488>.
- Flint, C. 2005. "The Geography of War and Peace: From Death Camps to Diplomats." Oxford University Press: [2020]. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195162080.001.0001>.
- Fregonese, S., and S. Laketa. 2022. "Urban Atmospheres of Terror." *Political Geography* 96: 102569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2021.102569>.
- Galtung, J. 1969. "Violence, Peace and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research* 6, no. 3: 167–191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002234336900600301>.
- Galtung, J. 1990. "Cultural Violence." *Journal of Peace Research* 27, no. 3: 291–305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022343390027003005>.
- Galván-Álvarez, E. 2010. "Epistemic Violence and Retaliation: The Issue of Knowledges in "Mother India"." *Atlantis* 32, no. 2: 11–26.
- Garelli, G., and M. Tazzioli. 2018. "The Biopolitical Warfare on Migrants: EU Naval Force and NATO Operations of Migration Government in the Mediterranean." *Critical Military Studies* 4, no. 2: 181–200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23337486.2017.1375624>.
- Gatelier, K., C. Dijkema, and H. Mouafo. 2017. *Transformation de conflit: Retrouver une capacité d'action face à la violence*. Éditions Charles Léopold Mayer.
- Gatelier, K., and S. Naudin. 2020. "Du récit inaudible à la prise de parole: Expérience d'un atelier radio avec des personnes à la recherche d'un refuge en France." *Mémoire(s), identité(s), marginalité(s) dans le monde occidental contemporain* 22. <https://doi.org/10.4000/mimmoc.4043>.
- Glaab, K., and K. Stuvøy. 2021. "The Politics of Violence in Extractivism: Space, Time, and Normativity." In *Our Extractive Age*. Routledge.
- Graham, S. 2010. *Cities under Siege: The New Military Urbanism*. Verso.
- Griffiths, M. 2017. "Hope in Hebron: The Political Affects of Activism in a Strangled City." *Antipode* 49, no. 3: 617–635. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12301>.
- Heller, C., and L. Pezzani, and Situ Studio. 2012. "Report on the "Left-To-Die Boat." *Forensic Architecture*: 1–90: Forensic Oceanography. <https://forensic-architecture.org/investigation/the-left-to-die-boat>.
- Heller, C., and L. Pezzani. 2016. *Ebbing and Flowing: The EU's Shifting Practices of (Non-) Assistance and Bordering in a Time of Crisis*. Near Futures Online. <http://nearfuturesonline.org/ebbing-and-flowing-the-eus-shifting-practices-of-non-assistance-and-bordering-in-a-time-of-crisis/>.
- Heller, C., and L. Pezzani. 2018. "The Mediterranean Mobility Conflict: Violence and Anti-Violence at the Borders of Europe." *Humanity Journal*. <http://humanityjournal.org/blog/heller-and-pezzani/>.
- Hess, S. 2018. "Border as Conflict Zone: Critical Approaches on the Border and Migration Nexus." In *Border as Conflict Zone: Critical Approaches on the Border and Migration Nexus*, 83–100. De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110600483-006>.
- Holloway, S. L., L. Holt, and S. Mills. 2019. "Questions of Agency: Capacity, Subjectivity, Spatiality and Temporality." *Progress in Human Geography* 43, no. 3: 458–477. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132518757654>.
- Hörschelmann, K., and E. Reich. 2017. "Entangled (In)Securities: Sketching the Scope of Geosocial Approaches for Understanding "Webs of (In)Security"1." *Geopolitics* 22, no. 1: 73–90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2016.1214821>.

- Houssay-Holzschuch, M. 2021. "Keeping You Post-ed: Space-Time Regimes, Metaphors, and Post-Apartheid." *Dialogues in Human Geography* 11, no. 3: 453–473. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20438206211992256>.
- Hyndman, J. 2001. "Towards a Feminist Geopolitics." *Canadian Geographies/Géographies Canadiennes* 45, no. 2: 210–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0064.2001.tb01484.x>.
- Hyndman, J. 2019. "Unsettling Feminist Geopolitics: Forging Feminist Political Geographies of Violence and Displacement." *Gender, Place & Culture* 26, no. 1: 3–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2018.1561427>.
- Ingram, A., and K. Dodds. 2009. *Spaces of Security and Insecurity, Geographies of the War on Terror*. Ashgate.
- Isakjee, A., T. Davies, J. Obradović-Wochnik, and K. Augustová. 2020. "Liberal Violence and the Racial Borders of the European Union." *Antipode* 52, no. 6: 1751–1773. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12670>.
- Jacobsen, M. H. 2022. "Wars in Refuge: Locating Syrians' Intimate Knowledges of Violence Across Time and Space." *Political Geography* 92: 102488. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2021.102488>.
- Jacobsen, M. H. 2023. "A Feminist Geopolitics of Living: Syrians' Struggles to Maintain and Reunite Intimate Ties Across Borders." *Gender, Place & Culture* 30, no. 9: 1303–1324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2023.2169255>.
- Jakubchik-Paloheimo, M., and S. K. de Buena Esperanza. 2024. "Making Space for Feminist Decolonial Geographies of Peace With the Shuar in the Ecuadorian Amazon: A Case for 'Cuerpo Territorio.'" *Geopolitics*: 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2024.2366316>.
- Jamal, A. 2016. "Conflict Theory, Temporality, and Transformative Temporality: Lessons From Israel and Palestine." *Constellations* 23, no. 3: 365–377. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.12210>.
- Jones, R. 2016. *Violent Borders: Refugees and the Right to Move*. Verso.
- Koopman, S. 2011. "Alter-Geopolitics: Other Securities Are Happening." *Geoforum* 42, no. 3: 274–284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2011.01.007>.
- Koopman, S. 2019. Peace. Keywords in Radical Geography: Antipode at 50, 207–211.
- Kratochvíl, P. 2022. "Temporality and Geopolitics: The Case of Global Catholicism." *Geopolitics* 27, no. 3: 921–947. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2020.1842363>.
- Kynsilehto, A. 2024. "Navigating Spaces of Everyday Peace and Violence: Societal Protest, Care, and Solidarity in Post-180 Chile." *Geopolitics*: 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2024.2313540>.
- Lederach, J. P. 1997. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Levy, L. 2021. "Temporalities of Israel/Palestine: Culture and Politics." *Critical Inquiry* 47, no. 4: 675–698. <https://doi.org/10.1086/714537>.
- Loyd, J. M. 2012. "Geographies of Peace and Antiviolence." *Geography Compass* 6, no. 8: 477–489. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-8198.2012.00502.x>.
- Loyd, J. M., P. Ehrkamp, and A. J. Secor. 2018. "A Geopolitics of Trauma: Refugee Administration and Protracted Uncertainty in Turkey." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 43, no. 3: 377–389. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12234>.
- Macaspac, N. V., and A. Moore. 2022. "Peace Geographies and the Spatial Turn in Peace and Conflict Studies: Integrating Parallel Conversations through Spatial Practices." *Geography Compass* 16, no. 4: e12614. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12614>.
- Mac Ginty, R. 2021. *Everyday Peace: How So-Called Ordinary People Can Disrupt Violent Conflict*. Oxford University Press.
- Mamadouh, V. 2005. "Geography and War, Geographers and Peace." In *The Geography of War and Peace: From Death Camps to Diplomats*, edited by C. Flint, 26–60. Oxford University Press.
- Massey, D. 1995. "Places and Their Pasts." *History Workshop Journal* 39, no. 1: 182–192. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hwj/39.1.182>.
- Massey, D. B. 2005. *For Space*. SAGE.
- May, J., ed. 2007. *Timespace: Geographies of Temporality (Transferred to Digital Print)*. Routledge.
- McConnell, F., N. Megoran, and P. Williams. 2014. *Geographies of Peace*. New York I.B. Tauris.
- Megoran, N. 2011. "War and Peace? An Agenda for Peace Research and Practice in Geography." *Political Geography* 30, no. 4: 178–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2010.12.003>.
- Mountz, A. 2011. "Where Asylum-Seekers Wait: Feminist Counter-Topographies of Sites Between States." *Gender, Place & Culture* 18, no. 3: 381–399. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2011.566370>.
- Mueller-Hirth, N., and S. M. Rios Oyola, eds. 2019. *Time and Temporality in Transitional and Post-conflict Societies*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Myadar, O., and K. E. Dempsey. 2022. "Making and Unmaking Refugees: Geopolitics of Social Ordering and Struggle Within the Global Refugee Regime." *Geopolitics* 27, no. 2: 367–374. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2021.1924552>.
- Naji, N., and D. Schildknecht. 2024. "Containing the 'Suspect' Other: Perpetuating Colonial Spaces Through a Global Counterterrorism Regime in Nairobi." *Geopolitics*: 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2023.2294803>.
- Onah, E. I. 2015. "The Role of Trans-border Ethnic Groups in Intra-State and Inter-state Conflict in Africa." *Journal of borderlands studies* 30, no. 1: 85–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08865655.2015.1012734>.
- Orhan, M. 2014. "Transborder Violence: The PKK in Turkey, Syria and Iraq." *Dynamics of Asymmetric Conflict* 7, no. 1: 30–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17467586.2014.909946>.
- Pain, R. 2009. "Globalized Fear? Towards an Emotional Geopolitics." *Progress in Human Geography* 33, no. 4: 466–486. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132508104994>.
- Pain, R. 2015. "Intimate War." *Political Geography* 44: 64–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2014.09.011>.
- Pain, R. 2021. "Geotrauma: Violence, Place and Repossession." *Progress in Human Geography* 45, no. 5: 972–989. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132520943676>.
- Pain, R., and S. J. Smith. 2008. *Fear: Critical Geopolitics and Everyday Life*. Ashgate.
- Pearce, J., and C. M. Perea. 2019. "Post War and Non-War Violences: Learning About Peace and Peacebuilding From Latin America." *Peacebuilding* 7, no. 3: 247–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21647259.2019.1632057>.
- Peteet, J. 2018. "Closure's Temporality." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 117, no. 1: 43–64. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-4282037>.
- Pine, F. 2014. "Migration as Hope: Space, Time, and Imagining the Future." Supplement, *Current Anthropology* 55, no. S9: S95–S104. <https://doi.org/10.1086/676526>.
- Ramirez-Hurtado, C., and I. Comins-Mingol. 2021. "Time for Peace." *Peace Review* 33, no. 4: 479–487. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10402659.2021.2043007>.
- Selimović, J. M. 2022. "Challenging the 'Here' and 'There' of Peace and Conflict Research: Migrants' Encounters With Streams of Violence and Streams of Peace." *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 16, no. 5: 584–599. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17502977.2022.2124348>.
- Söderström, J., and E. Olivius. 2022. "Pluralism, Temporality and Affect – Methodological Challenges of Making Peace Researchable." *Conflict, Security and Development* 22, no. 5: 411–433. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14678802.2022.2123218>.

- Souza, M. 2024. "The Spatial Turn in Peace and Conflict Studies: Contributions, Limitations and Opportunities for Research on Space–Time Heterogeneity." *Space and Polity*: 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562576.2024.2363177>.
- Spivak, G. C. 1988. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader [reprinted]*, edited by P. Williams and L. Chrisman, 66–111. University of Illinois Press: Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg.
- Springer, S., and P. Le Billon. 2016. "Violence and Space: An Introduction to the Geographies of Violence." *Political Geography* 52: 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2016.03.003>.
- Stavrevska, E. B., S. Z. Carvajal, and N. Luci. 2022. "Peace' Across Spaces: Discussing Feminist (And) Decolonial Visions of Peace." In *Feminist Conversations on Peace*, edited by S. Smith and K. Yoshida, 34–46. Bristol University Press. <https://doi.org/10.51952/9781529222074.ch003>.
- Stierl, M. 2019. *Migrant Resistance in Contemporary Europe*. Routledge.
- Stock, I. 2019. *Time, Migration and Forced Immobility: Sub-saharan African Migrants in Morocco*. Bristol University Press Policy Press.
- Thrift, N. 2007. *Non-Representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect*. Routledge.
- Vaaitinen, T., A. Donahoe, R. Kunz, S. B. Ómarsdóttir, and S. Roohi. 2019. "Care as Everyday Peacebuilding." *Peacebuilding* 7, no. 2: 194–209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21647259.2019.1588453>.
- Väyrynen, T., S. Parashar, and E. Féron, eds. 2021. *Routledge Handbook of Feminist Peace Research*. Routledge.
- Vergnano, C. 2024. *Alpine Border Conflicts: Migration and Social Polarization in the Everyday Life of Intra-EU Borders*. 1st ed. Lexington Books/Fortress Academic.
- Weitzel, M. D. 2022. "Access Denied: Temporal Mobility Regimes in Hebron." *Borderlands Journal* 21, no. 1: 171–200. <https://doi.org/10.21307/borderlands-2022-008>.
- Wibben, A. T. R., and A. E. Donahoe. 2020. "Feminist Peace Research." In *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Peace and Conflict Studies*, 1–11. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11795-5_146-1.
- Wimmer, A., and N. Glick Schiller. 2002. "Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation–State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences." *Global Networks* 2, no. 4: 301–334. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0374.00043>.