Peace Studies between Tradition and Innovation

From the Series
Peace Studies:
Edges and Innovations

Peace Studies between Tradition and Innovation

Edited by

Randall Amster, Laura Finley,
Edmund Pries and Richard McCutcheon

Peace Studies between Tradition and Innovation

Edited by Randall Amster, Laura Finley, Edmund Pries
and Richard McCutcheon

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

FOREWORD

TIMOTHY DONAIS

When new acquaintances discover that I make my living as a teacher and researcher in the field of peace and conflict, they often reply to the effect that at least I'll never run out of work. There is, indeed, something Sisyphean about the wider project of peace studies: even in the face of evidence that the world is becoming more peaceful (if not necessarily more just), we are daily reminded – most recently via the ongoing carnage in Syria – of the gap that remains between the promise of world peace and the persistence of armed conflict. Closer to home, the fear and anger that roiled one middle-American town in late 2014 following the death of an unarmed black teenager at the hands of a white police officer provides another sobering reminder not only of the complex relationship between justice and peace, but also of the reality that peacebuilding is not just a project for Afghans, Bosnians, or Liberians.

The conference out of which this edited collection emerges provided a snapshot of the state of peace studies in North America in the second decade of the 21st Century. It was appropriate, and perhaps inevitable, that the conference theme – tradition vs. innovation – speaks to a tension at the heart of the peace studies agenda, for as much as peace studies has always been united by the normative pursuit of a less violent and more just world, it has also been riven by a range of creative tensions. The organizers of the 2013 Peace and Justice Studies Association (PJSA) conference were inspired by the host city of Waterloo, which combines a vibrant high-tech sector with the deep, peace-oriented traditions of the Mennonite church, but they could just as easily have emphasized enduring tensions between the scholarly and activist communities, between pacifists and pragmatists, or between incrementalist problem-solvers and those representing more radical traditions. Far from being a weakness, however, such tensions are a necessity in a field which spans the local to the global, which incorporates activists, educators, and researchers from a broad range of disciplinary perspectives, and which is contained only by the exceedingly loose conceptual limits of what 'peace' can and might mean. Given the wide range of ways in which violence – both direct and structural – is

manifest in the contemporary world, and the myriad paths through which peace can be promoted, nurtured, and sustained, the strength of the peace studies community truly lies in its diversity, and that diversity was in full display in Waterloo.

Yet the wonderful cacophony of voices and perspectives also represents a challenge since, as we often tell our students, an emphasis on breadth can often come at the expense of depth. While it's clear that the pursuit – and the study – of peace and justice has never been more relevant than it is today, it's also worth reflecting on whether the messages emerging from events such as PJSA's annual conference are resonating, both among our neighbours and among our political leaders. Peace studies has always laboured under the label of idealism, with its prescriptions dismissed as naïve and simplistic by those claiming to possess a more realistic (often realist) understanding of how the world works and how best to tackle its more intractable problems. Despite the fact that over the past decade, it is in fact the realist world-view that has been exposed as naïve and simplistic (most graphically by the debacle in Iraq), it's not clear that the peace studies community – as a whole – has been as effective as it might have been in terms of articulating effective alternatives to armed violence (Galtung's 'peace by peaceful means') as an instrument of foreign policy. Indeed, it remains true, as former Canadian Prime Minister (and Nobel Peace Prize laureate) Lester B. Pearson remarked a half-century ago, that while we prepare for war 'like precocious giants', we continue to fall desperately short when it comes to preparing for peace. In a world of failing states, resurgent inter-state conflicts, simmering domestic tensions, and an ongoing preoccupation with terrorists and terrorism, those of us in the peace studies community – following the lead of the authors in the chapters that follow – need to reflect critically on the depth of our own contributions to improving our collective capacities to prepare for peace.

As educators within the liberal arts tradition, meeting the challenge of constructively contributing to peace both at home and abroad is accompanied by the parallel challenge of convincing a new generation of students that the study of peace is worth their time, their intellectual energy, and their tuition dollars. Increasingly, the message coming from business, governments, and even parents seems to be the opposite: that university is a place to get a career rather than an education, and that 'real' jobs come to those who study business, engineering, or science. In this context, my own university's motto – 'Inspiring Lives of Leadership and Purpose' – takes on a different connotation, even if it remains an entirely valid statement of what the liberal arts in general, and peace studies in

particular, should aspire to. More particularly, within a broader political
climate that increasingly sees higher education through the lens of career
preparation – and where peace work, admittedly, remains both insecure
and poorly-remunerated – Martha Nussbaum's argument for the liberal
arts as an engine for the development of engaged citizens, essential for
both renewing our democracies at home and coming to grips with complex
global challenges abroad, remains the kind of manifesto that peace studies
should both actively embrace and loudly proclaim. Ultimately, since only
a handful of our students are destined to become professional peace
activists, the wider mandate of peace education may lie in preparing and
inspiring our students – whatever their primary course of study and
wherever their career paths might lead – to carry with them both a critical
understanding of, and a practical commitment to, questions of peace,
justice and ethical engagement into the wider world.

    This volume represents, therefore, a timely set of reflections on some
of these larger questions, in addition to presenting a 'state of the field' in
terms of theory, praxis and pedagogy. From Joanna Swanger's critique of
the wider 'liberal peace project' through to Sharon Toffey Shepela's
experiments in engaged learning through public art, readers looking for
(better) answers to the question of 'what might a just and peaceful world
look like, and how might we get there?' will find in these pages both
critical reflection on foundational premises and inspiring real-world
examples of peace 'in practice'. And as always with contemporary
reflections on peace, ethical and normative considerations are never far
from the surface. In the context of peacebuilding, for example, the liberal
triumphalism of an earlier era has been replaced – at least in some quarters
– with uncomfortable questions about whether liberal democratic
principles represent the solution to the problems of peace and injustice in
specific contexts, or a growing part of the problem. Of course, such
concerns – which manifest in practical questions such as how international
NGO's should engage with local civil society actors in Palestine, or
whether the promotion of human rights or gender equality is an
appropriate peacebuilding strategy in a country such as Afghanistan – tie
into larger tensions (to return to an earlier theme) between universality and
particularity, and between self and other, that cannot be avoided by those
who seek a less violent, more just world. Finally, as a collectivity the
chapters presented here also demonstrate with striking clarity that not only
are the borders of what we understand as peace difficult to pin down, they
are also highly permeable; in other words, it is difficult to talk about
peace, or even 'justpeace' (to borrow a term from John Paul Lederach), in

isolation from a wider set of equally complex issues, from sustainability to gender and from technology to governance.

Ultimately, the chapters that follow capture both the ambition and the breadth of the contemporary peace studies agenda; they also illustrate both the opportunities and the challenges faced by a maturing field at a historical moment marked by profound uncertainty about whether the next decade will be more or less violent than the last one. If the wider peace project feels Sisyphean at times, we can at least take comfort in the knowledge that few projects are more important, or more consequential to the lives of the world's citizens, than this one.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

INTRODUCTION

EDMUND PRIES AND RANDALL AMSTER

The enduring tension between tradition and innovation, and between continuity and change, is core to development of Peace Studies as an emergent field of knowledge and action. This volume, incorporating the work of international experts in the field, honors the tradition, history, and accomplishments of the peace and justice studies movement while simultaneously seeking to expand its frontiers in search of new and innovative ways to promote both the practice and culture of peace in a divided world. The collection is based on the 2013 conference proceedings of the Peace and Justice Studies Association, representing a thematically integrated selection of the best sessions from across a wide range of disciplines, professions, and perspectives within Peace Studies. The conference was held in Waterloo, Ontario, Canada on October 17-19, 2013 and was co-hosted by Wilfrid Laurier University and Conrad Grebel University College (affiliated with the University of Waterloo). The title, "Peace Studies Between Tradition and Innovation," is likewise borrowed from the theme of the conference, which sought to examine the place and role of Peace Studies as an academic discipline, in pedagogy, as an activist agenda, and in application for practitioners in various related professional fields.

Central themes explored here include the innovative use of social or communications technology in the promotion of peace, the use of unconventional or unorthodox peace promotion strategies by long-established entities, the comparative accomplishments of 'new' vs. 'old' actors in the field, innovative applications in traditional and alternative educational settings, and the application of foundational principles of nonviolence to cutting-edge sociopolitical issues. The work concludes with an assessment of how scholars and advocates can shape the field's development while honoring its historical roots.

The caption "Between Tradition and Innovation" suggests several possible spectrum locations for Peace Studies. It could indicate a state of suspension, or perhaps even a tension, between two opposing poles, tradition and innovation—or being locked steadfastly in "middle earth"

with neither tradition nor innovation holding sway. On the other hand, the lack of a colon after "Peace Studies" might invoke a sense of movement—and connote a progression from tradition (the past) to innovation (the future). The latter clearly imagines a chronological transition along with a value-laden methodological and theoretical conversion suggesting, possibly, that tradition is obsolete while innovation is imbued with cutting edge relevance. All of these symbolic conjectures and possible imaginaries would ring wholly false for the contributors of this book and for attendees of the conference upon which this book is based. Instead, a much more valuable dynamic is present: Peace Studies, as a growing and vibrant academic discipline and professional field, is weaving together the deep richness of enduring peace traditions and the fresh energy of innovation – and finding new ways to link them. Tradition, therefore, provides the foundation for innovation while innovation reinvigorates tradition.

The creative codependency of tradition and innovation for effective Peace Studies was clear at the conference. The strong presence of aboriginal traditions of peacemaking through public ceremony and drum circles, keynote speakers, public protest and panelists/presenters highlighted not only the continued inspirational leadership provided by representatives of the Aboriginal traditions, but also projected the growing awareness of Canada as a Métis nation (Saul 2008). The continual welcome and inclusion of European cultures by Aboriginal societies throughout past centuries resulted in the retention of a deeply rooted Aboriginal social foundation, along with the maintenance and preference of negotiated solutions over violence and the welfare of all in an egalitarian society, best described as an inclusive circle. As John Ralston Saul explained in his 2008 book *A Fair Country: Telling Truths about Canada*, the Cree negotiated "on the basis of Witaskewin—how people, not necessarily coming out of the same nation, can live together. It is an idea of carefully negotiated and continually renegotiated peaceful co-existence" (p. 51). He elaborates further:

> The idea of co-existence is based on a related concept of sharing, which includes the idea of sharing the space, and is dependent upon Wahakohtoin, which means relationships that work because they follow a complex, unwritten code of ethics. The outcome is intended to be Miyo-wicehtowin—good, healthy, happy, respectful relationships (Ibid.)

The abnegation of its Métis identity always leads Canada down a difficult and conflicted path. Relations with Aboriginal communities may have unfolded differently in the United States than in Canada, but there too the richness and vitality of the aboriginal traditions is being

rediscovered. However, in one important aspect the agenda of Canada and the United States in relation to the Aboriginal communities is the same: both countries are recognizing the importance of correcting historical records that often falsified or misrepresented the Aboriginal communities and their frequent mistreatment. In Canada, this agenda has been most recently highlighted by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission on Residential Schools, which has sought to unearth the truth about Canada's cultural genocide against Aboriginal communities.

The conference witnessed equally robust participation by scholars and activists from many religions, with particularly strong representation from the historic peace churches (i.e. churches that have held to a strictly pacifist position through the centuries, such as Mennonites and Quakers). Old terms like "historic peace churches" are diminishing in relevance, however, as Peace Studies is claimed as a domain for many religions and cuts across most denominations. Even among those who have grappled with Peace Studies as their primary agenda for centuries, however, there is an ongoing evolution of thought and practice and an ever-present agenda of innovation. Music, similarly, has always been a focal component of peace—and conflict. It represents another ancient tradition that has become an important conductor between tradition and innovation—and indeed between past and present. Perhaps better than any other form, it crosses the borders between academy and community, between activism and practice. It also allows broad participation. For example, the performance of Benjamin Britten's *War Requiem* at the conclusion of the conference harnessed the voices of over 200 singers, including a youth choir along with a double orchestra, as it brought to life the haunting World War I poetry of Wilfred Owen (killed in action during the last week of that war) with the ancient form of the requiem mass. Peace Studies is always engaged in multiple dimensions—both across geography and across time—and learning the past in the present while striving for a peaceful future.

It is not only culture, history, religion and art that inform the traditional learning side of Peace Studies, but other legacies also. The philosophical traditions related to peace and ethics are not only drawn from the ancients but are being actively engaged by scholars seeking to (re)interpret and add to our understanding of human relations and to imagine anew how to understand the human predicament of conflict.

Innovation is rarely the creation of something new *ex nihilo*, but of reinvigorating , reinterpreting or refashioning the ancients—sometimes in a way that leaves the old visible; at other times all but overshadowing the roots of the innovation. The creative new angles were displayed in all their

breadth at the Conference – and are visible in this book. Frequently, the innovation is not in a new creation, but the discovery or development of fresh collaborations. Practitioners who were formerly seen as absent from the peace agenda are now finding their ideas being solicited. The business community, for example, presented ways that peace and justice was central to enterprise and discussed how this could be expanded. Teachers explored means for greater effectiveness of peace education in the classroom. Peacebuilding scholars dissected successful and unsuccessful approaches to post-conflict and mid-conflict efforts to expand capacity for the existing social and political structures and developing new partnerships. This book provides a representative sample of the innovative scope in the field of Peace Studies. There remains, however, widespread recognition that we are only witnessing the beginning of the innovation tsunami within Peace Studies. The field is growing rapidly, creatively, and interdisciplinarily as innovation and tradition move forward in a dynamic partnership.

This volume is divided into four parts (Enduring Questions, Organizing and Activism, Peace Pedagogy, and Practical Applications), each of which includes chapters authored by acclaimed scholars and activists. Reflecting the diversity of the field of Peace Studies, the book draws from a variety of disciplinary traditions and interdisciplinary fields of inquiry, including justice studies, theology, history, anthropology, education, philosophy, language and literacy, political science, sociology, criminology, women's and gender studies, and global studies. The eclectic nature of Peace Studies, however, is not meant to suggest that it is merely a cobbling together of other fields; indeed, Peace Studies possesses a substantive core that emphasizes nonviolence and conflict transformation (among other values) as well as a methodological preference for direct engagement and collaborative mechanisms. In this sense, we might say that Peace Studies is not so much interdisciplinary as it is post-disciplinary—in other words, that it tends to eschew discipline in favor of diversification.

The book opens with an examination of some of the most deeply theorized and at times divisive issues in the field. These *Enduring Questions* prompt academics and activists alike to continually examine our ideologies, pedagogies, and practices. From ethical issues to key questions about gender roles and diversity in the movement to how to conceptualize our commitment to justice in an unjust world, the chapters in this section offer thoughtful and important commentary on some of the field's most compelling topics. Joanna Swanger sets the tone by examining how changing technologies and cultural mores are impacting the development

of Peace Studies. As Michael Minch discerns, at root many of the core inquiries in the field devolve upon issues of power and ethics—a point illustrated by Jennifer Tupper in examining the ongoing implications of "settler" culture and its colonial interpositions. As Kelly Kraemer concludes, profound issues of militarism continue to plague societies, even as individuals and communities work to construct new forms of engagement with the pressing issues of the day.

As this emphasis on engagement suggests, the field of Peace Studies is more than a set of theories: it strives to promote action that yields a more just and peaceful world. From a deeply rooted focus on disarmament and curtailing warfare, to the promotion of civil rights and women's rights, peace practitioners have often been at the forefront of movements for change. Drawing upon the traditional bases of peace activism (including the foundational contributions to the field of iconic figures such as Gandhi and King), the chapters in the *Organizing and Activism* section emphasize the innovative ways in which Peace Studies addresses cutting-edge issues, informs contemporary social and environmental movements, and unites the best practices of the past with the needs of the present—while embracing positive visions for the future. In particular, looking at movements around issues including economic justice, indigenous sovereignty, women's rights, and climate justice, the respective chapters in this section seek not only to offer perspectives on contesting inequality and injustice but also, as Mark Mattaini indicates, to develop a working vision of positive peace that parallels Gandhi's "constructive programme."

As with peace activism, peace education takes many forms. While remaining true to the notion of teaching not just *about* peace but *for* peace as well, today's peace educators seek to use innovative practices in the classroom. Peace educators not only address students' learning but their affect as well, seeking to foster the development of empathic students who will help create a more just and peaceful world. Further, the work of peace educators does not end in the classroom but rather is essential to transforming entire schools and even communities. Chapters in the *Peace Pedagogy* section discuss a range of peace education work occurring in the U.S. and Canada, including creative uses of popular fiction, documentary films, and practices of restorative justice bridging the school, campus, and community divide. Educational settings can provide potent opportunities for innovative practices in the context of meeting traditional needs for the transmission of knowledge and cultural norms. As the chapters in this section demonstrate, part of the task of peace education is to help foster the development of tools to both engage and transform society, by

critically examining baseline policies and practices while nurturing a sense of empowerment and the cultivation of skills necessary to make change.

Continuing in this vein, in the final section on *Practical Applications* the authors offer insights into how the field of peace and justice studies is informing the creation of new institutions and cutting-edge programs today. This section provides readers with a wealth of information and ideas related to the institutionalization of more peaceful, just, and humane practices, in settings as diverse as prisons and NGOs, and includes recommendations for more strategic grassroots organizing. This work brings us into some of the world's most challenging settings, exploring the skills and tools necessary for developing practices such as unarmed peacekeeping and post-conflict peacebuilding. Ultimately, the aim is to develop a perspective that integrates the theoretical and pedagogical foundations of Peace Studies with the practical need for direct engagement with the profound challenges of the contemporary era. Peace Studies possesses the virtue of being willing to take on such matters, being equally inclined to reach back into traditional settings and embrace cutting-edge technologies in the service of effective commitment to positive change. The overarching intention of this volume is nothing less than an attempt to combine the lessons of yesterday with the innovations of tomorrow to meet the challenges and opportunities before us today.

PART I

ENDURING QUESTIONS

As is true with many traditional disciplines, the field of Peace Studies has long grappled with a number of core issues about human behavior at micro, mezzo, and macro levels of analysis. Peace Studies scholars have approached these questions in a variety of ways, from philosophical and historical inquiries to sociological and political analyses of key social events. As some of the authors in this section demonstrate, the field of Peace Studies has at times been behind the curve in critical intellectual engagement, too often buying into a "liberal peace project" when what may be needed is a deeper, more radical analysis that rejects the assumptions of contemporary Western societies. In other instances, Peace Studies scholars have been charting innovative ways of understanding the richness of potential human opposition to structures of violence whether in specific forms of war, such as the conflict with Iraq, and suggesting ways to courageously and directly address long-standing histories of colonial injustices, as tragically seen in residential schools and other forms of violence towards aboriginal peoples in North America and globally.

In her rich and far-reaching chapter, Joanna Swanger takes her cue from contemporary university students who have begun to question if Peace Studies has provided an adequate platform of analysis to engage in effective social change. Swanger identifies the core components of a "liberal peace project" that too often buys into the very core assumptions of modern North American social and political structures to advance social movements for peace and justice. She suggests that while anti-intellectual elements have sometimes held sway, there is a hopeful current to open spaces for "critical intellectual engagement." In her analysis there is hope for a "fourth" generation of Peace Studies to begin to effectively address a re-visualizing of justice upon which fruitful peace movements can build. This forward movement, rooted in critical theory, will "recognize difference rather than insisting on the erasure or containment of difference." As this new wave investigates representation it will necessarily take seriously the core notion that conflict can be "transformative" and not something that needs to be suppressed. In the

end, Swanger's analysis leads towards a deeper meditation on the nature of power and conflict transformation, a topic picked up in the following chapter.

Philosopher Michael Minch's chapter invites the reader into a deep consideration of power, ethics, and how the relationship between those relates to conflict transformation. Minch is deeply concerned that too often conflict transformation work is "engaged by persons insufficiently trained in matters of power and ethics." After a careful analysis of the pitfalls presented in well-known perspectives on power represented by Weber and Foucault, he proceeds to suggest a more nuanced approach to the enduring question of how power relates to the ways we act in the world. Central to that understanding is, for him, the observation that both power and morality are comprised of numerous complex, dynamic variables. When they are brought together it becomes clear that any conflict transformation work ultimately must be "adaptive and expansive." Even as we see the complexities engaged by these powerful concepts, Minch reminds us that Peace Studies also carries with it and within it the seeds of hope found in creativity and imagination. The complexity Minch engages is also reflected in the social movements that have sprung up to address war and other forms of injustices.

While the field of Peace Studies has well studied the role of maternal peacemaking, Kelly Rae Kraemer explores a further innovation in both the social movement that runs parallel to the scholarly analysis of peace and justice, while also supplying an innovative analysis of the core question of what motivates those who engage in protesting direct forms of violence, like war. Taking her cue from three social movement organizations that sprang up in response to the war with Iraq, Kraemer pushes the analysis of maternal peacemaking to the level of family-based social movements. In a fascinating case study, she shows how the same motivators for mother-based movements are at work through fathers, siblings, and other family members. Her chapter suggests an expansion of the feminist analysis and critique of core questions about gender, peace, and justice. In this her chapter echoes Swanger and Minch in a call as well for a more subtle understanding of complexities inherent in the work for peace and justice.

Just as each of the previous three chapters has challenged us in innovative ways to consider deeply core questions related to the field of Peace Studies, Jennifer Tupper invites us to confront the relationship of deeply ingrained forms of symbolic violence that run throughout Western interactions with aboriginal peoples in North America and, by extension, globally. In her chapter we come up against the harsh realities of ingrained racism that at times may even play itself out in what Swanger identifies as

a "liberal peace project." Tupper begins with a brief analysis of responses to contemporary movements to highlight injustices perpetrated against First Nations peoples in Canada. As she engages with these attitudes, she uncovers deeper forms of violence that mirror concerns expressed by Swanger—engaging in a critical analysis of what Bourdieu called symbolic violence, she shows that there are indeed deep cultural narratives that prevent true reconciliation and peacebuilding with aboriginal persons in North America. Until these narratives are disrupted, movement towards a more just relationship is hard to imagine. In her attempt to help "disrupt epistemologies of ignorance" she invites us all to Treaty Education, which she conceives also as a form of critical peace education.

A consistent theme that runs through these four chapters, then, is a call to ongoing critical engagement with enduring questions at the heart of Peace Studies. The hope is found in this very engagement, for without it the dream of a more just and peaceful world withers away in unquestioned assumptions and unexamined lives.

CHAPTER ONE

REVISUALIZING (IN)JUSTICE: PEACE STUDIES IN THE EARLY 21ST CENTURY

JOANNA SWANGER

The topic of this brief essay was inspired by my undergraduate students over the last decade, who are expressing more doubt about the possibilities of the kind of deep, transformative change that would engender greater justice and facing even more frequent charges of "apathy" than even "Generation X," the original "apathetic" generation, did in the 1980s. It must be emphasized at the outset that herein I am speaking from and in relation to a specific location, the United States, and from a fundamental starting premise that colors my own approach to Peace Studies, which is that chances at sustainable peace in any location in the world will be best supported by reorientations of and within the United States, as the current hegemon. That being said, colleagues in Canada have suggested that what I discuss here is applicable there as well.

My students have been asking both about the possibilities for social *movements*, which are not manifesting within their view in part because they do not conform to what they expect to see, and, given this, they are asking about what an *individual* is to do—i.e., the possibilities of "individual resistance." A generous interpretation of this latter question is that perhaps it is inspired by the Foucauldian understanding of micro-resistance, but translated through the frame of liberalism, "micro-resistance" generally becomes transformed into small-scale attempts at assuagement of guilt through attempts at individual de-implication, such as that expressed in familiar form in a question like: what can *I* do to ensure that *I* am not supporting Wal-Mart's corporate greed (or any other "evil" that one might wish to name as such)? Most students who bring their vexation with these questions to my attention are Peace Studies students, who have taken upon themselves the burden of finding ways to respond, starting first with seeking guidance from the older generations. They do not find easy answers from me, and I think we owe them more than that.

They *could* find somewhat easier answers from the field of Peace Studies more broadly, but this, in my estimation, is part of the problem. As an intellectual field of inquiry, Peace Studies needs to become more conceptually sophisticated, for too often it takes as premises the same premises that drive the issues to which the field is seeking to respond. When we take up these questions posed by students, what is it that we leave out of consideration? When their questions arise from the frame of individual action, students frequently receive answers that arise from certain conceptualizations of "empowerment" and are encouraged to try to move themselves into positions of leverage in extant political structures. When they ask about the possibilities for social movements, they are most often given answers that either point to contemporary movements that are showing signs of success but that are being staged outside the borders of the United States, such as the work of Idle No More in Canada, and/or answers that somehow harken back to a much earlier generation of protest, with its last visual referents having been produced sometime around 1972. I, too, have provided these answers, and searching for alternatives is what is currently guiding my writing and my teaching.

If we take as premises first that peace is fundamentally a question of justice, and second that justice cannot be glimpsed, let alone effected, without an examination of the workings of power, then we begin to see what I consider to be some all-too-common limitations in the field of Peace Studies, which in turn generate the limited range of these rather unsatisfactory answers. In the field, the writings of Gene Sharp, who has been called the "Machiavelli of Nonviolence," still have tremendous influence. Even though it has been criticized (Martin 1989; Schock 2005), Gene Sharp's (1973) understanding of how social movements succeed is still being formally taught in the classroom (See Burrowes 1996; Dajani 1995; Galtung 1980 and 1989; Martin and Varney 2003; Zunes et al. 1999). Perhaps more importantly, it still undergirds common conceptions about how movements toward greater justice work. Sharp writes,

> Basically, there appear to be two views of the nature of power. One can see people as dependent upon the good will, the decisions and the support of their government or of any other hierarchical system to which they belong. Or, conversely, one can see that government or system dependent on the people's good will, decisions and support. One can see the power of the government as emitted from the few who stand at the pinnacle of command. Or one can see that power, in all governments, as continually rising from many parts of the society. One can also see power as self-perpetuating, durable, not easily or quickly controlled or destroyed. Or political power can be viewed as fragile, always dependent for its strength and existence upon a replenishment of its sources by the cooperation of a

multitude of institutions and people—cooperation which may or may not continue. Nonviolent action depends on the second of these views: that governments depend on people, that power is pluralistic, and that political power is fragile because it depends on many groups for reinforcement of its power sources (1973, 8).

Sharp's approach works from a commodity metaphor of power, in which power is "held" by the authorities of the state until such time as it is "removed" from said authorities by being "taken," via the withdrawal of consent, into the hands of "the people" (1973, 8). It also works from a Habermasian (1962) notion of the public sphere, which is taken to be the primary field of action for social movements. It should be clear, therefore, that Sharp's work looms over two of the areas that continue to most strongly mark the field of Peace Studies: questions of policy and questions of activism. Both of these aspects of Sharp's work have been thoroughly criticized, but I wish to direct attention to yet a third problem. What is unspoken—but still ever-present—throughout the long shadow of Sharp's approach is an assumption of what it is that happens in this "public sphere" which is thought to move "the people" to engage in this kind of action. Sharp's work also makes assumptions about how that movement is thought to happen. This is where the visual comes into play.

If we listen to almost any discussion of attempts to effect change, whether in the realm of social movements or in the realm of policy, we hear an emphasis on the importance of "consciousness-raising." When we consider "activism," for example, most of the visual images that come to mind that signify it, i.e., showing that there has been a genuine "action" or even an "event"—the march, the sit-in, the demonstration, the flash-mob, protest art—are almost certainly those that are designed to force a moment in which revelation in both senses of the word is newly possible: directing the viewer's gaze, making visual that there is anomaly present, that someone, somewhere, has seen fit to dissent to the status quo. This strategy is entirely reliant on an attempt at engendering an extraordinary visibility, the bringing to view something that was not known, or that had been purposely concealed, or that in some way had not been seen before. The media, of course, are absolutely necessary for this movement to take place. I would argue that Sharp's approach needs to be historicized, for he first published this work in 1973, at the height of the success (and the beginning of the failure) of this strategy of moving to action via a visual gesture. Yet it is not properly historicized; it is taken as ahistoric "advice" to all future generations. The U.S. media took an important lesson from the time period that we now know simply as "The Sixties," namely, a refusal to show the movements for social change would effectively starve

these same movements, thereby removing their aspirations from the consideration of what is even possible, a lesson that certainly inflected historical understandings of what was (or was not) happening in the U.S. for at least a couple of decades starting in the mid-1970s. This conversation brings us to the question of social media.

It is Sharp's conceptualization of social movements and activism that tends to underlie the consensus view that social media are going to change the equation once and for all, that never again will tight channels of control be placed upon the exchange of (particularly visual) information, so that we can all see—immediately and quite easily—whatever it is that is presented to our view, from any possible direction or angle. This is the same view, to draw on a current example, which holds that it was social media that fueled the so-called Arab Spring. In fact, while it is too early to tell whether those particular movements have been "bent toward justice," we do see the social media playing just this kind of role in movements throughout the world. In the U.S., meanwhile, there is no shortage of "blitz campaigns," a term I use to designate short-lived campaigns that grab attention quickly and that succeed one another just as quickly due to the short attention spans of the audience, the sheer number of injustices that spur such campaigns, or both. Today we see blitz campaigns responding to particular outrages such as instances of police brutality; the injustices of the judicial system (e.g., the acquittal of George Zimmerman for the murder of Trayvon Martin, among so many other similar atrocious miscarriages of justice); the offenses of racism, misogyny, and homophobia; the illustrations of obscene concentrations of wealth, on the one hand, and poverty, hardship, and general economic insecurity, on the other; and environmental and ecological devastation at every turn. However, we rarely see people in the streets.

Many of those who look to social media to spur positive social change do not think that "people in the streets" is a requirement any longer. One example is Jennifer Earl and Katrina Kimport's recent work (2011), *Digitally Enabled Social Change*, which highlights the relatively inexpensive organizing tools offered by the Internet and argues that what the authors call "copresence"—the actual physical gathering in the space of "the streets"—is not required, when electronic petition drives and boycotts have at least at times proven effective. Earl and Kimport introduce their treatment of Web- and Internet-based activism and protest movements with a comparison of the January 2007 March on Washington against the war in Iraq with the August 1963 March on Washington, taking as the fundamental basis for comparison that the two would look similar in their visual contours—masses of people gathered in the same public site,

carrying signs, and making claims that demanded action by governmental authorities—but go on to make the point that the two differed radically in how they were produced, with the former being much more labor-intensive, given the necessity of printing flyers and distributing them through labor-intensive channels. Earl and Kimport call this particular form of Internet activism "e-mobilization," in that it utilizes the relatively inexpensive organizing tools offered by the Web and the Internet in order to stage the familiar protest event: a demonstration in which people come together in the space of "the streets." But they go on to discuss many other forms of Internet activism that do not require this "copresence."

Perhaps there have been successes, but besides the relative void in "the streets," another fundamental difference between the U.S. and the sites of many other more successful and more radical social movements, and a more important point in my view, is that in the U.S., when we examine the political landscape for any kind of response at all to these campaigns, we frequently see political paralysis tempered by occasional tepid reforms. Indeed, we often must content ourselves with mere apology.

The analysis of Earl and Kimport—which I reference as an exemplar of the growing body of literature that argues social media will fundamentally enable justice movements—leaves out of the picture several salient matters that I believe the field of Peace Studies must address. First, since 1974 and especially since the rise of the Internet, in large part because of hyper-saturation of the visual image, the gesture of attempting to raise an injustice into extraordinary visibility is neither as possible as it once was, nor does it carry the same power to move political powers from unjust to just or people from inaction to action. Instead of taking for granted that the power of the visual image remains unchanged, scholars in the field of Peace Studies should devote energy to theorizing the utilization of the visual image in an era of hyper-saturation (Brown 2010; Swanger and Richards 2006). Second, and more importantly, this unexamined strategy of reliance upon the visual leaves out of consideration two phenomena which much of the field of Peace Studies tends to leave unseen: first, the frame of liberalism, which is the frame said to enable the Habermasian public sphere; and second, the fact that since 1974, neoliberal capitalism has changed the equation so profoundly that the frame that in turn fixes liberalism—i.e., the boundaries of the nation-state—the very frame we have been encouraged to count upon as the site of the staging of the claims of social movements and the one upon which so many analyses in the field of Peace Studies still depend—no longer holds.

Taking the second of these first: such is the power of transnational capital that moves taken that go against the primacy of the needs of transnational capital are made at the risk of extreme peril. As the recent (and recurring) debacle in the U.S. over the debt ceiling has shown all too well, such are the limitations upon political actions that have economic consequences—actions that are ostensibly limited to and justified in reference to the bounds of the nation-state (e.g., the U.S. Congress acting on a budgetary matter)—that it puts the lie to older notions of nation-state sovereignty. As Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2005, 170) write, "To the extent that corporations and their law firms develop an international and even global regime of *lex mercatoria* and thereby establish the normative processes that regulate globalization, capital creates in its weakest form a kind of 'global governance without government.' The resulting regime of global law is no longer a captive of state structures and no longer takes the form of written codes or preestablished rules but is purely conventional and customary." Sharp's "withdrawal of consent" cannot operate in a situation in which "consent" is not required in the same form, if at all. Within the United States, both the activist and the policy worlds have been slow even to acknowledge this, let alone begin to formulate responses that proceed with this massive shift as premise. This is the first "unseen" that Peace Studies must take into consideration when conceptualizing questions of justice and injustice and ways to address injustice, for in this historic moment, I am suggesting that nothing overrides the alibi of the economic.

However, not only is that frame (and its implication in injustice) left largely unexplored, but much work within Peace Studies also remains committed to an unquestioned acceptance of liberalism as the best if not the only means of remedying injustice. In other words, we are caught in a dilemma: on the one hand, our field for contesting such injustice *appears* limited, bounded by the borders of the nation-state (and in fact is not so bounded, in that attempted remedies to injustice can easily be overridden from without); on the other hand, the sources of the injustices to which we seek to respond are hardly ever so bounded. It is telling that a great majority of the images driving the social media blitz campaigns in the U.S. involve real or perceived violations of or attempted incursions upon individual freedoms. If the supremacy of transnational capital means that the United States is no longer bounded in quite the same way by the boundaries that demarcates its geographical borders, and if U.S. exceptionalism is increasingly an even more fraudulent narrative than it always has been, there remains one way in which the United States retains a degree of uniqueness: the staunchness of its cultural attachments to an

atomistic individualism. Thus the social media are said to be so promising in part because they allow an immediate multiplying effect, reaching thousands, if not hundreds of thousands or even millions, of individuals, in such a short time that it is as if these individuals can be "gathered" nearly simultaneously. And as a telling demonstration of the point on attachment to atomistic individualism, I would note that the only mass social movement in the U.S. to gain lasting attention in the media is the Tea Party, which is driven by its claim of the protection of individual freedom.

It is this attachment that shows up frequently in the dominant branch of Peace Studies, which Vivienne Jabri (2010) implicates in her critique of what she calls the "liberal peace project." Jabri defines the "liberal peace project" as proceeding from the premise that liberal societies are the paramount agents of transformation (ostensibly toward greater peace) in that liberal institutions (enactments of a distinctly Eurogenic modernity) are those best suited to the guarantee of human rights. To be sure, there is a distinct connection between a degree of respect for "human rights" and the possibilities of sustainable peace. It is a problem, however, that the branch of Peace Studies implicated in Jabri's "liberal peace project" proceeds from an uncritical acceptance of what constitutes "human rights" and in fact, in its "race to prescribe," brings to bear an entire toolkit of techniques that are said to be able to bring "peace" to any context in which they are properly deployed. Mikkel Vedby Rasmussen (2010, 175, 187) makes a similar critique when he writes that the liberal peace project—which he refers to as the "ideology of peace"—reduces "peace" to a technocratic question, as if peacebuilding were a "recipe." Similarly, John Heathershaw (2008, 602, 609) rightly notes that the "race to prescribe . . . has plagued peace research from its beginnings as a field." Heathershaw says it well when he writes, ". . . [T]he development of new techniques for civil society peacebuilding obscures a highly political debate on the nature of civil society between radicals and moderates. In its most radical form, civil society peacebuilding demands the taming of power politics for humanitarian ends. . . ."

That this has become the overwhelmingly dominant branch within Peace Studies is somewhat surprising, given the more radical roots that have also inflected the field from its beginnings as a formal academic field. One of the most important gestures in the early days of Peace Studies, as the field was forming, was Galtung's elaboration of the concept of structural violence. The gesture was that of revealing violence where, prior to that, a scene might have been viewed (by many, if not all) as merely unfortunate—unfair, perhaps, but certainly not rising to a level that would justify the use of the term "violent"—or worse: completely