Music and Arts in Action | Volume 7 | Issue 3 | 2020
Special Edition - Music in Peacebuilding: Keywords Volume 2

Peacebuilding 2020

OLIVIER URBAIN

Min-On Music Research Institute (MOMRI) | Japan*

ABSTRACT

To explore the meanings of 'peacebuilding,' this article is divided into three parts, first looking at different conceptualizations of the idea of peace. The section titled Peace is based on the observation that the kind of changes peacebuilding actors are trying to implement will depend on their definition of peace. It starts with a critique of the liberal peace and then goes back to the origins of peace studies as a field to see what founding concepts of peace might continue to hold relevance today. In the second section, Peacebuilding, I explain why I consider this word as an umbrella term that includes various activities. I also point out the similarities between my concept of peacebuilding and that of other scholars. In the third part, Sound and Proactive Peacebuilding, I propose the formulation of a specific type of peacebuilding, in order to facilitate the emergence of numerous links between music and peacebuilding. This concept includes four modes: Inner Peacebuilding, Communicative Creativity, Planetary Awareness and Preventive Peacebuilding. My goal in this article is to advance a vision of peace in which anyone can play a role, with an emphasis on the concrete actions people can take in everyday life, building peace day by day.

KEYWORDS

peace; peacebuilding; music; musicking; sound and proactive peacebuilding

* o.urbain@min-on.org

INTRODUCTION

In *The Transformation of Peace* (2005), Oliver Richmond, noted scholar of peace and conflict studies and international relations, states: "the notion of peace simply cannot be deployed without an adjective specifying what type of peace is being referred to, who defines it, and for what reasons" (p. 198). This article was inspired by a similar desire for clarification of the vague and contested concept of peace. This article looks at the different concepts of peace put forward by a variety of individual scholars and philosophical traditions, and the motivations that have guided those concepts.

Richmond also writes: "peace should be understood as an inter-subjective concept in terms of how it is perceived by its multiple agents and the actions required to construct it" (pp. 196-197). In other words, we need to adopt a bottom-up approach, and pay attention to who is contributing to peace, how the 'multiple agents' are connected to each other, and how they create change towards peace. Along the same lines, my goal in this article is to advance a vision of peace in which anyone can play a role, with an emphasis on the concrete actions people can take in everyday life, how peace is built day by day. This is one of the main reasons why this article is entitled 'Peacebuilding 2020' instead of 'Peace'. Another reason is that the concept of peacebuilding is constantly changing based on time and context, and what it means now might be different in the future.

I will look at previous scholars who have contributed to defining the term 'peace,' the establishment of peace studies as an academic discipline, and the contradictions in usages of the term peacebuilding amongst those who work in this field. Finally, in order to facilitate the emergence of numerous links between music and peacebuilding, I propose the formulation of a specific type of peacebuilding called 'sound and proactive peacebuilding'. The article is divided into three parts. Here, I briefly introduce each part.

1. PEACE

In order to explore the meaning of the term peacebuilding, I must clarify what kind of changes I consider peacebuilding actors to be trying to implement, and this will depend on their definition of peace. The thoughts, words, concrete actions and interactions constituting peacebuilding activities are inspired by the ideal of peace, an ideal about which there is no consensus. Far from it, there is a vast range of sometime contradictory definitions, beliefs, conceptualizations and ideals of peace. To illustrate, peace researcher and political scientist Wolfgang Dietrich has published three volumes in a series entitled *Many Peaces* (2012, 2013, 2017).

This section starts with Richmond's devastating critique of the liberal peace (2005, 2011, 2019) which is supported by the latest breakthroughs in postmodern, post-structuralist, postcolonial, feminist and emancipatory theory, and then goes back to the origins of peace studies as a field to see what ideas might continue to hold relevance today.

2. PEACEBUILDING

The term entered the Oxford English Dictionary without a hyphen in 2019, mostly due to a campaign to have it adopted by major dictionaries led by a coalition of peacebuilding organizations (International Alert, 2018). I explain here why I consider it as an umbrella term that includes various activities. Peacebuilding is the fundamental work designed to tackle underlying cultural and structural forms of violence at the local, national, regional and global levels. I also point out the

similarities between my concept of peacebuilding and Fuyuki Kurasawa's idea of 'the work of global justice' (2007).

3. Sound and Proactive Peacebuilding

In order to facilitate the emergence of numerous links between music and peacebuilding, I propose a concept of peacebuilding that is specifically sound and proactive. As I will explain, a *sound and proactive peacebuilding* includes four modes of engagement: *Inner Peacebuilding, Communicative Creativity, Planetary Awareness and Preventive Peacebuilding*.

1. Peace

Kenneth Boulding arguably established the field of Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Michigan by founding the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* in 1957, and the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution in 1959. Johan Galtung established the field of Peace Studies in Norway, by founding the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) in 1959 and the *Journal of Peace Research* in 1964. Among many other contributors to the subsequent development of the field of Peace Studies, two of the most essential are Elise Boulding, and also John Paul Lederach.

This new field was born in the 1950s at the height of the Cold War, "when the development of nuclear weapons and the conflict between the superpowers seemed to threaten human survival" (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Miall, 2016, p. 5). A group of pioneers started experimenting with the application of approaches used in community mediation and industrial relations settings to civil, international, and other large-scale conflicts (ibid.). As Oliver Ramsbotham, Tom Woodhouse, and Hugh Miall explain, "A handful of people in North America and Europe began to establish research groups to develop these new ideas. They were not taken very seriously. The international relations profession had its own categories for understanding international conflict and did not welcome the interlopers" (ibid.). Nevertheless, the field started to develop and spread. By the 1980s, these ideas had started being applied and having an impact in real conflicts (ibid.).

It is after a dialogue with Johan Galtung in 1996 that the idea for my book *Music and Conflict Transformation* (2008) emerged, a project to explore how music might fit into peace studies. In the introduction, I applied Galtung's most basic concepts to musical activities. But after more than twelve years of developments in the field of peace studies and changes to my own ideas about music, I would like to revisit the extent to which Galtung's concepts continue to hold relevance today. I will return to this question below.

In the introduction to *Rethinking Peace* (2019), entitled "Rethinking Peace Studies," Alexander Laban Hinton, Giorgio Shani and Jeremiah Alberg (respectively professors of Anthropology, Politics and International Studies, and Philosophy and Religion) write:

> While serving as useful frames to parse the complexities of peace and convey ideas to a broad audience, formulistic renderings of Galtung's 'truths' by a generation of peace studies scholars illustrate four key and interrelated tendencies: an inclination to employ hypostasis, teleology, normativity and enterprise. (p. xiv)

They clarify what they mean by these four terms, and thereby explain the significance of the title of the volume – what kind of rethinking of peace they attempt to offer:

> First, peace is often hypostasized, or imagined as a substance or concrete reality (e.g., a 'thing' as opposed to dynamic processes). Second, peace is often assumed to have a teleology, or end point (as opposed to being open and multidirectional). Third, this telos is often intertwined with a set of normative goods, ones often linked to a particular genealogy and the Judeo-Christian tradition (as opposed to alternative traditions and beliefs that, if sometimes acknowledged, are largely pushed out of sight). And, finally, these three tendencies conjoin in enterprise, undertakings large and small meant to achieve the ends of peace (but ones of a particular sort that accord with a teleology and normative goals). (p. xv)

This framing of tendencies towards hypostasis, teleology, normativity and enterprise as problematic by Hinton, Shani, and Alberg is helpful because it opens up a dialogue between the original peace theories proposed by one of the founders of the field, how they were developed and understood, and what range of concepts and insights are arguably most effective to understand the realities of today. Yet, despite the ways in which Galtung's ideas have been taken up over the past decades, I do not believe his original concepts should be thrown out. Since Galtung published more than 150 books and 1500 articles on the topic, we can conclude that he has developed and reflected upon his own theories over the years. I will now present some of the most recent contributions to peace research and end this section with a summary of what can still be useful among Galtung's contributions.

1.1 Emancipatory Peace: Oliver Richmond

Oliver Richmond, an expert in peace and conflict theory, and especially its inter-linkages with international relations theory, is well-known for his critique of 'the liberal peace', a specific theory of peace, with its own discourse, framework and ontology. This theory of peace has been defined by numerous authors since the end of the cold war, as Richmond explains:

> All of these texts follow a similar path, […] in which peace is a liberal ideal made possible by correct forms of governance and institutionalization, and are a product of the practices and discourses of the post-Enlightenment development of the international community. (2005, p. 9)

One definition mentioned by Richmond is especially useful due to its clarity: "According to [Ian] Clark, the liberal peace is multilateral, increasingly propagated by Western practices of humanitarian intervention, by globalization, is both regulative and distribution, and is associated with the use of force, human rights regulation and democratization. This is a result of the 'liberal moment' after the end of the Cold War" (2005, p. 9).

In its place, Richmond consistently advocates in favor of an 'emancipatory peace.' Based on three of his major writings, I will highlight why he believes that the liberal peace has lost credibility, and why he emphasizes the imperative of an emancipatory peace. What emerges chronologically throughout Richmond's work is an increasing disillusionment with the liberal peace which culminates in a radical dismissal and move to emancipatory peace in his 2019 work.

In *The Transformation of Peace* (2005) Richmond describes the liberal peace as consisting of four graduations, the fourth one being the emancipatory graduation of the liberal peace. The problem is apparent from the start: the liberal peace enforcers promise that if people progress through the first three types, they will finally enjoy the emancipatory type. A simplified table of the four graduations of the liberal peace is shown below, based on Richmond's (2005, p. 217).

Graduation	Hyper-Conservative	Conservative	Orthodox	Emancipatory
Method	Use of Force	Force and Diplomacy	Top-down peacebuilding	Top-down and bottom-up.
Ontology	Peace is not possible.	Peace is a product of force and elite diplomacy.	Peace rests on mainly constitutional and institutional measures.	*See below regarding the ontology of emancipatory peace.*

Table 1: The four graduations of the liberal peace, based on Richmond (2005).

In his 2005 book, it seems that Richmond still believed that the liberal peace could do some good, as long as it progressed toward the emancipatory type, but over the years he changed his mind to finally reject the liberal peace as being able to lead to emancipatory peace. The full spectrum of the liberal peace model is now considered ineffective, and even counter-productive, dangerous and manipulative (Richmond, 2019). It is now the local-liberal, post-liberal type of peace that can lead to emancipatory peace. I explain this further below.

The promise of the liberal peace based on the table above is that if people (living in the country or area where the liberal peace is being implemented or imposed) go through the first three phases, then they will be able to enjoy the fourth, emancipatory phase. Richmond describes the ontology of the emancipatory phase of the liberal peace as follows: "Peace rests on social justice and open and free communication between social actors, as well as state/official actors; recognition of difference and otherness" (2005, p. 217).

Six years after the publication of *The Transformation of Peace* (2005), Richmond defines emancipatory peace further in his book *A Post-Liberal Peace* (2011), this time in the context of the emergence of a hybrid form of peace, a local-liberal or post-liberal form of peace:

> What have already emerged in theory and practice are hybrid forms of the liberal peace, which are modified by their contact with the very local context that it claims does not exist, is mistaken or insignificant, or romanticizes and mythologizes. This represents the birth of a post-liberal peace. A 'local-liberal hybrid' is emerging, which constitutes, as this study will illustrate, post-liberal forms of peace. (2011, p. 18)

A local-liberal, or post-liberal peace, gives voice to local people and decision-makers, in collaboration with international interveners, instead of trying to simply impose solutions from outside. Within a post-liberal peace, Richmond explains the emancipatory graduation as "an everyday form of peace, offering care, respecting but also mediating culture and identity, institutions, and custom, providing for needs, and assisting the most marginalized in their local, state, regional and international contexts" (pp. 3-4). This type of peace theory, discourse and framework will hopefully bring about better practices that will affect those concerned more effectively and constructively. In Richmond's account of the post-liberal peace, he drops the hyper-conservative graduation altogether. Thus, only the conservative, orthodox and emancipatory graduations remain.

Such a critique of the entire spectrum of the liberal peace is today inevitable. The liberal peace is a practice based on, and thus imposes, Western values and power.

To illustrate, the promise of the liberal peace, as seen with the US invasion of Afghanistan (2001) and Iraq (2003), is that if we start with imposing the conservative type, through bombing, force, violence and killing, and some diplomacy, then after a while the targeted populations will enjoy orthodox liberal peace, with its combination of top-down peacebuilding, domination by state officials and regular/irregular military forces, and some activities by NGOs. People will still be oppressed and exploited, but if they could wait just a bit more, then they would enjoy full-fledged emancipatory peace. This is essentially a teleological concept of peace, the type that Hinton, Shani, and Alberg are critiquing. Basically, what the liberal peace promises is to facilitate the emergence of emancipation through violent force and domination. With almost no proof that this ever works, even in the very long term, we may have to take seriously Shani's statement that: "liberal peace building [sic] is dead (at least for now)" (2019, p. 43). At the same time, we need to note that some scholars argue that some of it can still be useful (e.g. Paris, 2020).

What Richmond sees as the ideal form of peace in 2011, is described as follows,

> What has emerged from more critical literatures, as a result, is a focus on local ownership, human rights, human security, culture, social and grass-roots resources for self-government, local capacity or agency, even resistance […]. This infers an engagement with the everyday, to provide care, to empathize and to enable emancipation. (p. 9)

Finally, we turn to Richmond's recent chapter "Towards a Peace with Global Justice", in the collective volume *Rethinking Peace* (Richmond, 2019). He writes that "we now know a lot more about an emancipatory peace" (ibid., p. 29) thanks to critical, feminist, post-structural, postcolonial literature, awareness and breakthroughs. We also know that the older elements of the liberal peace – a stable state, an international system with international institutions, collective security, rights of varying sorts – have lost their appeal and credibility (ibid., p. 30). Richmond is more assertive regarding the negative impact of the liberal peace, which has "created new dynamics of violence" (ibid., p. 29).

He emphasizes that the international liberal system is characterized by the high mobility of capital (huge sums of money changing hands constantly) and of weapons (designed, manufactured, shipped and used massively). Richmond states that in order to respond to this global violence-enabling system, emancipatory peace actors also need to be highly mobile:

> [I]f an emancipatory peace is to overcome the contradictions caused in the liberal international system by highly mobile capital and arms, then everyday agency must also be mobile, networked and agile. Peace formation, meaning peaceful, political self-making, which is never complete and always constrained by structure, emerges from related peace formation actors rather than state formation (which represents power sharing over military, territorial and economic resources at best). (ibid., p. 35)

In his conclusion, Richmond points out that the architecture of the liberal peace is now ineffective, and can even be counter-productive: "The peace of Westphalia, the UN peace and even the liberal peace now look as antiquated and anachronistic layers of the international peace architecture and even an obstacle to peace networks and positionality arbitrage" (ibid., p. 37). He states that "In the twenty-first century, relative emancipation and justice for the individual is found through mobility, relationality and networking [...]. Everyday mobility, networked and relational

peace, contributes empathetically to a wider emancipation" (ibid., p. 38). He ends with a warning that there is a danger humanity will apply forms of peace "with or without global justice" (ibid., p. 39).

Some of the key concepts that appear most often in Richmond's writings mentioned above in connection with emancipatory peace are: open and free communication; everyday peace; care; empathy; relationality; and networking. These point to the type of peace qualified by Wolfgang Dietrich as 'Elicitive Conflict Transformation,' focusing on similar ideas of mobility, relationality and networking, but with even greater emphasis on relationships and resonance (see Dietrich, 2012, 2013, 2017). I will return to these concepts in relation to my own definition of peacebuilding below.

1.2 Peace-in-difference: Hartmut Behr and Morgan Brigg

Among the chapters of *Rethinking Peace* (2019) that are most relevant to the subject of this article, I now turn to the contributions of Hartmut Behr (who has a background in International Politics) and Morgan Brigg (who works in Peace and Conflict Studies). For both Behr and Brigg, the ideal concept of peace is 'peace-in-difference,' which celebrates and embraces differences as worthy of respect and productive. They emphasize the imperative of considering this way of thinking in order to challenge the essentialist and imperialist ontologies that have plagued peace studies for decades, and in particular the liberal peace theory.

Behr's chapter is entitled "Peace-in-Difference: Peace through Dialogue About and Across Difference(s): A Phenomenological Approach to Rethinking Peace". His point of departure is that peace is first and foremost about how we relate to 'other' people, and that the question of the other includes that of difference. "Whether or not we act in a peaceful way is therefore a question of how we approach, think and negotiate difference" (p. 173). He points out the advantages of nonessentialist ways of thinking and proposes a specific type of dialogue in order to avoid the rigid ontologies implicit in such terms as 'the state,' 'the West,' 'the other,' or 'the local'. Behr writes: "Essentializing normativities, more or less explicit or implicit in these imaginaries, are to be replaced by the open-ended, generative form of embracing differences through and in dialogue" (p. 173).

Behr criticizes traditional Western ontology, very much grounded in dualistic thinking and in right or wrong judgements and emphasizes concepts such as becoming and interdependence. He focuses on two thinkers from the Western tradition to challenge Western ontology: Jacques Derrida and Emmanuel Levinas.

Derrida coined the neologism '*différance'* (written with an 'a' in French), introduced by Behr as follows: "What Derrida calls deconstruction and '*différance'* is important here inasmuch as the latter refers to deferrals, dislocations and disruptions of cultures, identities, groups, political and legal systems due to their intrinsic dis-unities and tensions" (p. 181).

As a result, there is no reason to assert fixed identities and essentialist thinking. This concept of becoming implies that meaning itself is constructed as an intersubjective phenomenon (since observer and observed are constantly being transformed), and that we need to be careful regarding the meaning that we assign to the other, and to differences.

Calling upon Levinas, Behr recommends the avoidance of ontological imperialism, which he defines as "an explanation, exploration, interpretation ('logos') and action upon the world from the vantage point of the 'self'/'Self'/the 'ego'" (p. 179), to be

replaced by a dialogical movement towards the other. All this is reminiscent of Richmond's statement that "peace should be understood as an inter-subjective concept" (2005, pp. 196-197) quoted at the beginning of this article.

Behr also provides us with useful ideas that can be applied to music in peacebuilding, when he writes that we need to *listen first* before declaring that there is a difference and that there are only *here and nows* and no fixed identities. He also offers a definition of peace that implicitly condemns the liberal peace: "peace is to be seen as a permanent process of and dialogue about the articulation and meaning(s) as well as critical reflection about difference(s) as they become expressed in political, social and cultural conflicts" (p. 184). Let us keep in mind these three concepts for later use: *listen first*, the *here and nows*, and peace as *a permanent process of dialogue about differences*.

Morgan Brigg supports the same idea of peace-in-difference in his chapter in *Rethinking Peace*, entitled "From Substantialist to Relational Difference in Peace and Conflict Studies." He introduces the 'relational-essential' approach to difference and shows how it is already included in indigenous traditions, relationality, conflict resolution, and feminist scholarship.

Brigg starts by noting that thinking in terms of entities is 'identitarian' and 'substantialist', and leads to considering people and groups as 'things'. This creates major cognitive distortions, because cultures, religions, groups and nations for instance, are not internally consistent or mutually exclusive. In addition, this European-derived way of thinking imposes a specific vision of human diversity and denies the variety and differences of diverse peoples. He therefore proposes to remedy these flaws by rethinking difference as simultaneously *relational* and *essential* and presents four approaches that emphasize relations instead of entities: relationality scholarship, Indigenous traditions, foundational conflict resolution scholarship, and feminist scholarship.

To develop these points briefly, *relationality scholarship* focuses on processes and relations, based on complexity theory, relational biology and the study of complex adaptive systems, among others. According to several *Indigenous traditions* – for instance, among Aboriginal Australian peoples – all beings, including humans, come into being through relationships, and it is the relationships between people and the land that explains and organizes how the world functions. Brigg points out that Jane Addams and Mary Parker Follet advocated for a relational approach to peace and conflict resolution many years before Boulding and Galtung, and he calls their contributions *foundational conflict resolution scholarship*. He finally describes the contribution of *feminist scholarship* as resistance against the tendency to resolve contradictions into larger wholes, and a capacity to let apparently incompatible positions coexist. There is a striking similarity here with Dietrich, who also emphasizes this aspect of letting dissonant chords resonate (see 2013, 2017).

While Behr's embracing of differences and Brigg's emphasizing relationality deserve a more thorough examination, I hope to have demonstrated in this section that they point to a promising direction regarding the future of the idea of peace, and the praxis of peacebuilding.

1.3 Back to the Beginning: Johan Galtung's Peace as Nonviolence, Empathy and Creativity

Based on the important recent interventions in peace studies by Richmond, Behr, and Brigg, what are some of the concepts and insights of Galtung that have stood the test of time and can facilitate progressive thinking in peace studies today?

1.3.1 Empathy, nonviolence and creativity

Galtung defines peace as "the capacity to handle conflicts with empathy, nonviolence and creativity" (Galtung, 2000a). He started with the idea of defining the ABC of peace studies, and chose the terms attitude, behavior and contradiction because of their initial letters (Galtung, 1996, p. 72). Then he matched each one with what he thought was its most effective aspect: an attitude (A) of empathy, a behavior (B) of nonviolence, and the capacity to handle the contradictions (C) at the heart of conflicts with creativity (Galtung, 2000b, p. 91). I find this ABC useful because it is based on human qualities, which anybody possesses, and which can be enhanced through personal effort.

This definition denotes a belief in human potential, which can be found in different forms in most traditions around the world. For instance, in the type of Japanese Nichiren Buddhism practiced by the lay organization Soka Gakkai – the non-Western tradition I am most familiar with – empathy, nonviolence and creativity, together with courage, wisdom and compassion, are clearly recognized as essential for a healthy and contributive life (Urbain, 2010, p. 201). The same can be said about the inclusion of these qualities as integral virtues contributing to the local praxis of peacebuilding in countless communities throughout the world.

In addition, these characteristics are relational, considered by Galtung as the most useful attitude (empathy), behavior (nonviolence) and ways to deal with contradictions (creativity) as mentioned above, when relating to people. It is about how we treat ourselves and each other. This definition of peace fits very well into what I call 'inner peacebuilding' as will be explained later.

1.3.2. Direct, cultural and structural violence

In the current literature – including in *Rethinking Peace* – the terms "direct, structural and cultural" violence, coined by Galtung (1996, p. 2), are part of the vocabulary and overall conceptual tools that are used by most thinkers today. They refer, respectively and succinctly, to destructive ways of behaving, organizing and thinking such as killing and maiming (direct), oppression and exploitation which are embedded in laws, traditions and customs (structural), and racism, sexism, and all forms of discrimination (cultural). To illustrate, Hinton, Shani, and Alberg describe in their introduction, how Galtung's ideas contribute to the *rethinking* at the basis of their book.

> Contemporary examples of structural violence include gender and racial discrimination, as highlighted in the United States by the '#MeToo' and Black Lives Matter movements, social or economic inequality, poverty, unemployment, illiteracy and lack of educational opportunities. (2019, p. xvi)

Note that even though strictly speaking, 'gender and racial discrimination' should be considered as 'cultural violence', they generate so much structural inequality and unfair *structures* that they can be included in structural violence, as Hinton, Shani, and Alberg do here. These are not absolutely discrete categories. They continue:

> Galtung's concept of 'cultural violence' opens up the possibility of viewing the reified, hypostatized, teleological and normative conception of peace

> favoured by the 'international community' — the 'Liberal Peace' (Paris 2010) — as potentially a source of violence. (p. xvii)

It appears therefore that the target of the *rethinking* is not so much the building blocks established by Galtung as the specific type of operationalization of peacebuilding in practice that is the now very much discredited liberal peace.

1.3.3. Positive and negative peace

Finally, Galtung's distinction between positive and negative peace has not aged, since first, the mere absence of war and direct violence will never qualify as full-fledged peace, with the hidden presence of structural and cultural violence seething under the surface. Second, once we focus on the absence of structural and cultural violence, we are still left with a definition of what peace is not. Seen from a different angle, with these concepts, Galtung sought to point out that the first step towards a better understanding of peace issues is the awareness that while war is the most destructive and massive organization of direct violence, peace is constantly threatened by more subtle, but equally destructive forms of violence, of the structural and cultural types. As a result, one can define peace by describing what it is not (negative peace), meaning peace as an ideal situation where there is no war, but also no direct, structural or cultural violence: "Negative peace is the absence of violence of all kinds" (Galtung, 1996, p. 31). This negative definition of peace can be a source of inspiration in the struggle against what we want to remove from the equation: violence of all types.

Regarding positive peace, in addition to coining the term, Galtung has offered a typology that includes 'nature peace' (meaning cooperation between species instead of struggle), as well as direct/structural/cultural positive peace (1996, pp. 31-32). New generations of peace researchers continue to produce their own description of what 'positive peace' would look like when fully operationalized. It is a very broad umbrella term that can include and accommodate various lighthouse narratives of peace. For instance, Richmond's descriptions of the emancipatory peace highlight some crucial aspects of Galtung's overarching positive peace.

Séverine Autesserre, an expert in peacebuilding, humanitarian aid and African politics with years of experience in the field, refers to Galtung's concept in her 2017 article entitled "International Peacebuilding and Local Success: Assumptions and Effectiveness":

> In sum, to use Galtung's (1969) well-known distinction, peacebuilding initiatives aim to create not only 'negative peace' – the absence of war and violence – but also 'positive peace' - the conditions that make peace sustainable over the long term – both in interstate wars and in civil conflicts. (Autesserre, 2017, p. 115)

In *Rethinking Peace*, political scientist and philosopher Shin Chiba shares his vision of positive peace as follows: "This well-known phrase within peace research first and foremost means social cooperation, social justice, equity, kyosei (living together or conviviality), harmony, overcoming of both structural and cultural violence and elimination of extreme poverty" (p. 155). This echoes my definition of positive peace proposed in *Music and Conflict Transformation* (2008):

> The kind of peace I have in mind here is not just the absence of war. I view peace as the vibrant and dynamic state of a society in which everyone can enjoy life to the fullest, with full employment, adequate social protection, abundant food, water, pure air, and shelter, warm and joyful communication

> between people, participation in governance, justice, equality, freedom, mutual respect, and a fulfilling intellectual and cultural life. (Urbain, 2008, p. 5)

This "vibrant and dynamic state of a society" (Urbain, 2008, p. 5) has never been recorded as a real situation in the history of humanity, and must be considered as an ideal, a lighthouse narrative, a vision that can continuously inspire peacebuilding activities and actions for global justice. Lighthouse narratives are essential for those of us who want to improve collective human life. For instance, focusing on justice, one of the major ingredients in many definitions of peace, Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote: "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere" (King, 1963, cited in Barash, 1999, p. 145). This statement highlights the fact that the work of global justice will never be complete, since there will always be some place where someone suffers some injustice. The ideal of justice is therefore a lighthouse narrative that provides a sense of direction as we navigate through the stormy seas of the real world. The same can be said regarding the ideal of peace, and of many of Galtung's concepts and formulas.

The real work, while inspired by ideals and lighthouse narratives, is all about relationships and concrete action, in other words, peace*building*. It is worth noting that while these narratives might be considered 'teleological', the ideals that inspire peacebuilding action are simply pointing in a direction for a while, and can be replaced, updated, or discarded. Peacebuilding is another term coined by Galtung and refers to the actual and concrete building of peace in daily actions and connections.

2. PEACEBUILDING

The term peacebuilding was coined by Galtung in 1976 in his pioneering article "Three Approaches to Peace: Peacekeeping, Peacemaking and Peacebuilding". He did not give a definition of peacebuilding at that time but contrasted the term with peacekeeping and peacemaking.

He calls *peacekeeping* the "dissociative approach" (Galtung, 1976, p. 282): "This approach is basically dissociative: the antagonists are *kept away from each other* under mutual threats of considerable punishment if they transgress, particularly if they transgress into each other's territory" (emphasis in the text, ibid.). *Peacemaking* he equates with the "conflict resolution approach" (ibid., p. 290): "This sounds obvious: get rid of the source of tension, the underlying conflict, and the rest will take care of itself; not only the war, but also the war race and eventually the war machinery itself will wither away. In fact, no such automatic causal chain can be assumed" (ibid.). Finally, he calls *peacebuilding* "the associative approach" (ibid., p. 297). In the section on peacebuilding, Galtung comes closest to providing a definition when he suggests that peace must have a structure: "More particularly, *structures must be found that remove causes of wars and offer alternatives to war in situations where wars might occur*" (emphasis in the text, ibid., p. 298).

He proposes six characteristics that these structures must have (equity, entropy, symbiosis, broad scope, large domain and superstructure), and gives two examples of communities that are operationalizing these structures, the Nordic countries, and the European Community (EC) countries:

> In both cases there is a norm of equity, no party shall be exploited. […]. Relations are 'entropic', meaning that not only governments - or in more general terms, the elites, the centers - participate […]. There is symbiosis, meaning a high level of interdependence […]. There is a broad scope,

> meaning that there are many types of exchange, not only economic. There is a large domain, meaning essentially that there are more than just two or three parties to the exchange […]. Finally: there is a superstructure. It is weak in the case of the Nordic countries […]. It is very strong in the case of the EC, to the point where it has become transnational rather than international (the 'eurocrats'). (p. 299)

In summary, he describes peacekeeping as keeping parties in conflict away from each other, peacemaking as resolving conflicts by removing the causes of tension, and peacebuilding as the organization of communities based on six characteristics, for example the Nordic countries and the EC in 1976.

Two decades later, Galtung (1996) bases his descriptions of the three terms of the ABC triangle described above (attitude, behavior and contraction), and without explanation, uses hyphens:

> *Peace-keeping*: control the actors so that they at least stop destroying things, others, and themselves (B-oriented).
>
> *Peace-making*: embed the actors in a new formation; in addition, transform attitudes and assumptions (A-oriented).
>
> *Peace-building*: overcome the contradiction at the root of the conflict formation (C-oriented). (p. 103)

Here we can see an example of how some of Galtung's ideas have evolved and transformed over the years, whereas the basic building blocks mentioned above seem to remain in place.

After Galtung's original coining of the term in 1976, it then took almost half a century for it to enter the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) in 2019:

> **Peacebuilding** *n*. the action of advocating, encouraging, or bringing about peace; (in later use) *spec*. the implementation of measures intended to create or sustain peace in a region affected by war or other conflict, typically through support for economic, political, and social development.

This definition highlights the major difference between peace (an ideal, a narrative) and peacebuilding, which is about taking action, and about implementation based on the many ideals of peace available.

2.1. A GENTLE CHALLENGE TO THE OED DEFINITION

This recognition of the term in the OED was the result of a campaign by a coalition of peacebuilding organizations such as African Peacebuilding Network, Alliance for Peacebuilding, International Alert, Peace Direct, Search for Common Ground and several others (International Alert, 2018). They were able to get peacebuilding into major dictionaries using twitter and Facebook to spread the word. They had proposed the following definition: "A broad range of measures implemented in the context of emerging, current or post-conflict situations and which are explicitly guided and motivated by a primary commitment to the prevention of violent conflict and the promotion of a lasting and sustainable peace" (ibid.). I find this definition easy to embrace, and very inclusive, in particular because it takes into account three temporal aspects of peacebuilding (emerging, current or post-conflict) and acknowledges the centrality of a 'commitment' to lighthouse narratives defined as "the prevention of violent conflict and the promotion of a lasting and sustainable peace" (ibid.).

In contrast, when it comes to the OED definition above, I can agree that peacebuilding is about "advocating, encouraging or bringing about peace" (OED, 2019), but I find the definition to be lacking because it does not require specification of the kind of peace being promoted. As Oliver Richmond has demonstrated, we need to specify what kind of peace we are talking about (2005, p. 198), as mentioned in the opening paragraph of this article. The second part of the OED definition (economic, political and social development) fits into the type of liberal peace that current thinkers are painstakingly and carefully deconstructing and rejecting. The idea that peacebuilding is supposed to take place "in a region affected by war or other conflict" (OED, 2019) also seems too limiting: in reality, there is a tremendous amount of work we can do, and that is being done, here and now to enhance peacebuilding in our communities and societies, even when there is no apparent "war or other conflict" (OED, 2019) around us.

First, there is 'preventive peacebuilding', which people can start working on when they sense that a violent conflict might emerge where they are. Second, there is 'proactive peacebuilding', which people can start implementing here and now in their communities, even if there is no sign whatsoever that a violent conflict might emerge. A basic condition for proactive peacebuilding is to scratch under the surface and discover the iceberg of structural and cultural violence hidden at home, and how the most banal daily activities affect people around the globe due to the principle of interconnectedness.

This OED definition also gives the impression that peace is a real entity, that can be brought about or sustained. I find it more inspiring to consider peace as an ideal, to which one can make a commitment, that can inspire, guide and motivate us to act in the here and now of our concrete situations. As was mentioned in our exploration of Behr and Brigg's peace as difference, and peace as relationality, considering peace as a real entity, a thing, is not the most useful way to conceptualize it.

Going back to the three temporal aspects of peacebuilding (emerging, current or post-conflict) mentioned above, whereas preventive peacebuilding is meant to address emerging conflicts, proactive peacebuilding constitutes a fourth category, to be implemented even if conflict seems to be absent. The OED definition, by including "in a region affected by war or other conflict" (OED, 2019) restricts the scope of peacebuilding to only two types, concerning current or post-conflict situations.

2.2. THE LOCAL TURN

Today the concrete work of peacebuilding must be focused on the local and the everyday with great care, and this is confirmed by a growing number of peace scholars and practitioners in recent years. About the local, in her 2017 article mentioned above, Autesserre clarifies the term: "In this article, 'local' means at the level of the individual, the family, the clan, the district, the province, and the ethnic group when it is not a national-level one" (p. 116). She then goes on making a compelling case in favor of much more respect for and priority on the local. This is consistent with a critique of the liberal peace, with its heavy emphasis on international interventions, which inevitably come from outside:

> In fact, outsiders may at times pose obstacles to the process of domestic change. For instance, when talking with foreign interveners, Congolese youth activists emphasize that they would prefer outsiders to leave, because

> international peacebuilders get in the way of local people trying to hold their government accountable. (2017, p. 124)

About the everyday, Mac Ginty's (2014) work on 'everyday peacebuilding' is described as follows by Autesserre: "In their day-to-day lives, ordinary people engage in actions that researchers often view as banal, mundane, and unimportant, and that are unrelated to formal peacebuilding initiatives, but that in fact help prevent local outbreaks of violence and, at times, even directly deal with conflict and tensions" (Autesserre, 2017, p. 124).

It was noted earlier that 'everyday peace' is also one of the major components of Richmond's 'emancipatory peace'. A focus on the local and the everyday in peacebuilding theory and practice opens vast horizons for more grounding and effectiveness. Autesserre also emphasizes that the means of peacebuilding activities should be consistent with the ends, when it comes to basic attitudes such as respect for the dignity of life, and appreciation for the people we work with:

> Interveners widely believe that inhabitants of conflict zones lack the knowledge, skills, qualities, and resources they need to resolve their own predicaments. For instance, a French expatriate deployed in eastern Congo explained to me that leaders in the country are unreliable, 'so only the . . . [sic] foreigners are capable of enacting reforms.' These negative perceptions reached such a point that, during interviews, other interveners emphasized how 'surprised' they were when they met 'good' local people, such as hardworking citizens and authorities that were not corrupt or did not try to abuse their positions of power. I heard similar discourse in each of my field sites, from Afghanistan to Israel to Timor-Leste: Interveners viewed local and national authorities as lacking in knowledge, competence, motivation, work ethics, and funding, and local people as similarly deficient in education, capacity, and personal qualities. (ibid.)

This type of bias almost guarantees a top-down, hierarchical relationship placing the international interveners above the local people they are supposed to help. This fits into the framework of liberal peace, as well as structural and cultural violence, which inevitably, or at least in most cases, lead to direct violence. Considering everything discussed in this article so far, this must be avoided at all costs. Autesserre describes a much healthier and more effective attitude:

> Conversely, as Anderson and Wallace emphasize, 'systems and skills to prevent overt violence between groups already exist in every society' (2013, p. 2). And indeed, in each of my field sites, I met expatriates who pointed to local and national authorities who had the knowledge, competence, motivation, work ethics, and skills essential to peacebuilding, and to local people who were intelligent, knowledgeable, selfless, reliable, honest, and hardworking. (ibid., p. 125)

Autesserre concludes that the most effective peacebuilding activities are those that allow local and foreign peacebuilders to work together respectfully: "The communities that 'opted out of war' in Colombia, the Philippines, and Sri Lanka are prime examples of this kind of successful cooperation" (ibid., p. 126). This is the type of collaboration that Richmond points to when he describes a "local-liberal hybrid" (2011, p. 18), which constitutes post-liberal forms of peace as mentioned earlier.

The Oxford entry assertion that peacebuilding is supposed to take place "in a region affected by war or other conflict" (OED, 2019) also ignores the immense amount

of work people can do to prevent violence (direct, structural or cultural violence) from taking hold and continuing undetected in their communities, and from affecting countless other communities throughout the world. Preventive peacebuilding needs to be recognized, emphasized and developed in a more proactive way. An increasing number of peacebuilding scholars recognize the importance of pre-conflict peacebuilding, even though most peacebuilding interventions take place in post-conflict situations (see e.g. Sandole, 2010, p. 12).

2.3. THE HOURGLASS MODEL

According to Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Miall, peacebuilding is most effective before any violence has occurred, and can help prevent it from emerging, and also after violence has subsided, when reconciliation and reconstruction are possible. They present the lifecycles of conflicts in a diagram called the hourglass model, adapted and reproduced below (after Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, and Miall, 2016, p. 18). It visually represents the narrowing of the political space which occurs when a society experiences an escalation from differences (wide) to war (narrow), and the widening of options and political space characteristic of de-escalation from war (narrow) to reconciliation (wide). It describes conflict, violence and peacebuilding as processes following an almost mathematical formula, and societies moving from one discrete state to another.

Conflict transformation Conflict settlement	Difference Contradiction Polarization	Cultural peacebuilding Structural peacebuilding Peacemaking
Conflict containment	Violence **WAR** Ceasefire	Peacekeeping **War limitation** Peacekeeping
Conflict settlement Conflict transformation	Agreement Normalization Reconciliation	Peacemaking Structural peacebuilding Cultural peacebuilding

Table 2: The hourglass model, after Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, and Miall (2016)

The crucial part of their explanation for our purposes, is that peacebuilding includes what people can do before polarization has solidified on the slippery slope towards war, and after an agreement has been reached in the early stages of reconciliation and reconstruction after war. In other words, when preventive peacebuilding is practiced effectively, societies can avoid polarization, violence and war. I use the term 'preventive' peacebuilding to emphasize what we can do here and now in societies that are apparently free of violent conflict, but where violent conflict might emerge and where preventive measures should be taken.

As mentioned above, going further than the preventive type, proactive peacebuilding is firmly within the reach of anybody living in apparently 'peaceful' locations. Societies enjoying negative peace are often exposed as being replete with cultural and structural violence when one starts scratching under the surface. Peacebuilding can take place before, during or after a conflict, it is therefore not always preventive. It also often takes place once there is an urgent need due to emerging violence, or once reconciliation and reconstruction are feasible and required.

Considering the validity of the hourglass model, I agree with Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, and Miall that cultural and structural peacebuilding can take place before polarization (and prevent it) and after an agreement has been reached (accelerating normalization and reconciliation). However, instead of their use of the terms peacebuilding, peacemaking and peacekeeping as separate categories, I prefer peacebuilding as an umbrella term that includes the latter two categories, along with other tasks, as Autesserre does:

> Peacebuilding actors accomplish a very wide variety of tasks. The most widespread - and most skeletal - definition of peacebuilding refers to actions aimed at creating, strengthening, and solidifying peace (Boutros-Ghali, 1992). At a minimum, it involves reestablishing a measure of security. Tasks therefore include peacemaking - the process of bringing parties in conflict to an agreement through peaceful means - and peacekeeping (United Nations Security Council 2016), which denotes the 'deployment of international personnel to help maintain peace and security' after a war (Fortna, 2008, p. 5). (Autesserre, 2017, p. 115)

2.4. PEACEBUILDING AS MESSY WORK

The hourglass model represents conflict, violence and peacebuilding processes as predictable and well structured. Such a model is perhaps illustrative of Hinton, Shani and Alberg's critique that peace has tended to be understood teleologically. An alternative to the hourglass model can be found in John Paul Lederach's concept of messy work. Indeed, the processes and interactions of our individual and collective lives, where peacebuilding takes place, are not inherently well-organized, linear or manageable nor do they unfold through planning and execution. In *The Moral Imagination* (2005) Lederach wrote:

> When we attempt to eliminate the personal, we lose sight of ourselves, our deeper intuition, and the source of our understandings - *who we are* and *how we are* in the world. In so doing we arrive at a paradoxical destination: We believe in the knowledge we generate but not in the inherently messy and personal process by which we acquired it. *The Moral Imagination* is about this messiness of innovation. (p. viii)

Lederach emphasizes that this major book in peace studies is mostly about the messy nature of the work:

> My effort here is not to propose rigorous academic definitions nor whole new theories in the classical sense of the term. In fact, the inverse may be true: I wish to hold myself close to the actual messiness of ideas, processes, and change and from such a place speculate about the nature of our work and the lessons learned. (p. x)

In the foreword to a special issue of the *Journal of Peace Education* entitled "Music and Peace Education" (2016), Lederach offers a direct connection between the messy nature of the work and musicality. First, he emphasizes that our bodies are made of vibration, sound, and so are human relations:

> Most traditions believe that all that we have been given and share on our extraordinary living planet began in sound. Research now suggests that music, which I define here as the intentional and shared use of controlled vibration, pre-dated the formal use of language and created the tissue, the glue that made possible the notion of 'social' relations […] Based essentially on vibration, music provides a very different kind of medium by which to

> explore any of the deep human experiences mobilized around conflict and peace. We are in a very real sense made for and from sound. Our earliest experience of life takes place within a womb where we are surrounded by a steady rhythm and sound. Understanding conflict and peace must find ways to account for the elements that go below and beyond the linear modalities of making sense of things as if rational thought can disembody itself from who we are as beings made of sound and vibration. (Lederach, 2016, p. 197)

Second, he emphasizes repetition and circularity, a deepening of our presence in the here and now:

> Without rejecting linearity completely, sound and music provide a metaphoric shift needed to take into account repetition and circularity, allowing us to understand that healing often takes place by a deepening of our connection with the experience of living in the moment, what Morrison calls the 'eternal now.' The rhythmic repetition of rituals in the Abrahamic and other religions, the chanting of mantras in Buddhism, all point to a deepening through circling behavior. When violence makes us numb and vibrationless, sound and music often help us reconnect with the essence of our being as vibration, enabling individuals to enter a process of re-humanization essential to rebuild flourishing communities. We need metaphors based on vibration, sound, and music in order to understand the essence of peacebuilding. (Lederach, 2016, p. 198)

For peacebuilders, an understanding of life and peacebuilding processes as being only messy work, nonlinear, chaotic, potentially repetitive and disorganized, can lead to confusion and inaction. Faced with an array of global issues, one might find it difficult to try to focus on peacebuilding action in the here and now.

2.5. The Work of Global Justice

We may find an empowering perspective in the book *The Work of Global Justice: Human Rights as Practices* (2007), where Fuyuki Kurasawa places the spotlight on the work that millions of people are doing here and now in order to improve their lives and that of their communities. In the context of human rights Kurasawa shows that instead of focusing on normative and institutional human rights (for instance the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the United Nations General Assembly), we need to observe, notice, praise, analyze and support what millions of people do every day to defend and protect these rights, what he calls *the work of global justice*. In addition, even if one does not believe in the lighthouse narratives provided by normative and institutional human rights, whatever one places in their stead will serve as the motivator for *the work* of global justice, which is not contingent on the framework of the liberal peace. In other words, peacebuilding = *the work*, it is what people do.

Observing what people actually do might be a good method to highlight the failures generated by projectization, which is defined in the Collins online dictionary as "the direction of aid to developing countries towards a specific project, without regard to wider issues or needs" (Collins Online Dictionary, 2020). Hinton, Shani, and Alberg consider that the idea of designing projects itself is problematic:

> Kant's tract [*Perpetual Peace*] illustrates a key Enlightenment dynamic that undergirds positive peace, the design of projects, based on science and reason, which will lead to progress and social transformation towards a better, sometimes utopian state - an idea that again manifests the aforementioned four disciplinary undercurrents of peace studies: *hypostasis*, *teleology*,

> *normativity* and *enterprise*. In their more extreme manifestation, such projects may entail massive projects of social engineering, often legitimated in utopian terms that end in failures large and small. (Hinton, Shani, and Alberg, 2019, p. xvii)

According to the Collins definition above, the main issue seems to be the lack of "regard to wider issues or needs" (Collins Online Dictionary, 2020). Indeed, one can imagine that a project designed in offices in New York or Geneva, fully funded and afterwards imposed as a solution in a particular part of the world will have few positive, and potentially highly destructive effects. The vision proposed by Kurasawa is based on the showcasing of what millions of people are already doing where they are, without waiting for planners to suggest projects from faraway places.

Kurasawa highlights five major modes of this work, a conceptual development which has proven useful in my research on music in peacebuilding. I understand these five modes as follows and add musical examples to illustrate. I include these examples to demonstrate different more popularly known moments of music's use in each of Kurasawa's modes, although I acknowledge that the examples I use indicate some of the projectization that I earlier critiqued. Given these critiques, I hope that more musical activity in everyday life and amongst everyday people can be promoted in pursuit of the work of global justice.

Bearing witness: when the voices and testimonies of the survivors of massacres and atrocities are heard. It is essential to be able to receive the testimonies and other signs from victims to prevent these events from falling into oblivion. During the 2017 Nobel Peace Prize concert in Oslo, US singer John Legend performed on one of the few Hibaku Pianos that survived the 1945 atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. These pianos were damaged, but not destroyed by the nuclear explosions, and they have been restored so that today, we can hear the vibration and sounds people used to enjoy around these instruments in 1945 (Nobel Peace Prize Concert, 2017).

Forgiveness: once atrocities have been committed and people have no choice but to go on living together. Ingoma Nshya is a group of women drummers in Rwanda. It was established to promote reconciliation between members of communities in conflict during the 1994 genocide. It also challenged gender-based discrimination since in their tradition, drums were historically only performed by men. By the end of 2019, they were still going strong (The New Times, 2019). They became the topic of the documentary film *Sweet Dreams* (2020).

Foresight: when we imagine the kind of future that awaits us and get to work here and now to either realize a future we want or avoid a future we do not want. The music video "Nobody Speak" by DJ Shadows shows a future for the United Nations that nobody wants, with something that looks like a General Assembly turning into chaos, fistfights and potentially killings (Nobody Speak, 2020).

Aid: if all else fails and people are dying of lack of basic resources, it is time to provide water, food, and other goods as fast as possible. The most famous example is the Live Aid benefit concert and music-based fundraising initiative, which took place simultaneously at Wembley Stadium in London (audience of 72,000) and at the John F. Kennedy Stadium in Philadelphia (audience of 100,000) on July 13, 1985 to raise funds for relief of the ongoing famine in Ethiopia. The results were not as beneficial as expected, but it provides a model of what can be done in terms of collecting funds for aid through music. The performance of the rock band Queen

in London is still considered today as one of the greatest of all times (New York Times, 2018) and serves as a symbol of music for aid.

Solidarity: the capacity of people to work together, the glue that makes all other modes of *the work* possible. One of the best examples in the United States is probably Pete Seeger, who was able to bring complete strangers to sing along for all kinds of causes promoting social justice (see the movie *Pete Seeger: The Power of Song*). Folk singer, musician and author Rik Palieri included an exclusive interview of his mentor Pete Seeger on that topic, in his chapter "Working in the Trenches" of the book *Music and Conflict Transformation* (2008).

In similar fashion, whereas Kurasawa proposes five modes to make the huge amount of work more manageable conceptually, the seventeen Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) proposed by the United Nations (SDGs, 2020) have a similar effect, empowering peacebuilders to comprehend and focus on specific issues. One of the best musical illustrations of the appeal of the SDGs to youth is the music video "Tell Everybody" (2015). I have added this reference to the SDGs to show the complexity of the debates surrounding peacebuilding. The SDGs can be considered by some as an example of the 'liberal peace' and 'projectization'. At the same time, we must recognize that there are today tens of millions of people doing *the work* in their communities, inspired by the lighthouse narratives scripted by the SDGs.

Building upon the concepts described above, I turn to ideas of peacebuilding that pay attention to *sound*, in addition to *proactivity* that was introduced above.

3. Sound and Proactive Peacebuilding

Ethnomusicologist Marcia Ostashewski defines her keyword 'Sound Community' as follows at the beginning of her article in this issue: "This keyword comprises three core concepts: 'community' integrating a sense of plurality and 'sound' in two senses, (a) as a noun (sonic and acoustic phenomena such as music) as the basis of a community; or as an (b) adjective (valid, robust or good condition)" (Ostashewski, 2020, p. 64). This double meaning of the word sound can be applied to peacebuilding in the same way that it is applied here to community. I will further develop this idea below, after an exploration of the term 'proactive'.

By proactive peacebuilding, I mean a range of activities for peace that various agents undertake based on their understanding of what they can do in the here and now, even when there is apparently no violence occurring nor any violent conflict emerging. Going back to the definition of peacebuilding presented by the peacebuilding coalition mentioned above, I want to focus on the timing of peacebuilding: "A broad range of measures implemented in the context of emerging, current or post-conflict situations" (International Alert, 2018).

In post-conflict situations, proactive peacebuilders do not fall victim to projectization, but assess what needs to be done based on thorough consultations with the people around them, who know best what the situation calls for. In current conflict situations, they do not rely on abstract formulas and recipes, but design courses of action quickly and flexibly, understanding the uniqueness of each episode. In emerging conflict situations, and even when there seems to be no conflict at all, they are are constantly aware of the ever-present undercurrents of cultural and structural violence in their societies, even when direct violence does not occur. Rather than waiting for disaster to strike or for someone to call for help, proactive peacebuilders are tuned in to the hidden currents running through the places where they live.

This is a way of thinking and acting that does not rely on states or international structures of power. Neither does it rely on the current staples of the liberal peace, Western democracy, Western-defined human rights and neoliberal free-market economy. It actively works against essentialist and identitarian epistemologies and imperialist ontologies. It should also be clearly distinguished from former Japanese Prime Minister Abe's 'proactive pacifism' or 'proactive contribution to peace', (*sekkyokuteki heiwashugi* in Japanese) which according to Shin Chiba concretely aims to justify "deterrence-based positive military expansionism" (Chiba, 2019, p. 154). Proactive Peacebuilding (which I would translate to Japanese as *sekkyokutekina heiwakouchiku*) is as far away from these as one can imagine. Even more so with sound and proactive peacebuilding.

A quick review of the concepts examined in the section on peacebuilding above, allows for a brief checklist of what sound and proactive peacebuilding is, and is not.

It is not necessarily post-conflict, and not necessarily in conflict zones. It is grounded in the local and the everyday and embraces the messiness of the work. It is about a deepening of one's participation in the here and now, based on repetition and circularity that is one of the functions of music according to Lederach. However, it is not entirely messy and benefits from frameworks such as the five modes of *the work* proposed by Kurasawa, or the organization of common objectives for 2030 in the seventeen Sustainable Development Goals. It is an acceptance of chaos, but mixed with hope and enthusiasm for concrete action.

Lighthouse narratives of peace are helpful to those working in peacebuilding, and the aforementioned scholars (and the disagreements between them) give us some ideas of what qualities of peace this vision might promote.

I have previously defined four value concepts to consider as components of peacebuilding (Urbain, 2016). After a few years, I came to realize that the four could be termed elements of proactive peacebuilding. Further research and learning have allowed me to add the elements of the here and now, the messy work, and the overall longing for interdependence and musical qualities, such as harmony, resonance, and rhythm. This is how the term sound and proactive peacebuilding emerged.

I have mentioned earlier that I use proactive in the sense of being able to work for peacebuilding in the here and now, even when nothing seems to indicate that violent conflict will erupt in the future. Taking into account the embracing of difference and relationality (Behr, 2019; Brigg, 2019), avoiding the heavy planification, outside interventionism and plain violence of the liberal peace (Richmond, 2019), prioritizing the local (Autesserre, 2017) and everyday peace (Mac Ginty, 2014), I was looking for the right metaphor to express all of the above. In this context, the emphasis on musicality proposed by John Paul Lederach mentioned earlier felt like a perfect fit, in particular these passages which I repeat here for emphasis:

> Based essentially on vibration, music provides a very different kind of medium by which to explore any of the deep human experiences mobilized around conflict and peace. We are in a very real sense made for and from sound. […] Understanding conflict and peace must find ways to account for the elements that go below and beyond the linear modalities of making sense of things as if rational thought can disembody itself from who we are as beings made of sound and vibration. (Lederach, 2016, p. 197)

It is this vibrational quality of the "deep human experiences mobilized around conflict and peace" (Lederach, 2016, p. 197) in the here and now that I describe as

sound experiences. The term proactive was missing this dimension, and I therefore use the phrase sound and proactive peacebuilding to capture this aspect. The essence of this type of peacebuilding was already included in the four value concepts.

My four components of peacebuilding were described as follows, emerging from a blend of the European-based ideas of Johan Galtung and the Japanese Buddhism-inspired insights of Daisaku Ikeda. These should not be considered as discreet categories, but as aspects of peacebuilding activities that can be highlighted when useful.

Inner Peacebuilding: the enhancement of one's own virtues such as courage, wisdom, compassion, nonviolence, empathy and creativity, to maximize our capacity to deal with daily life, to connect with other people and living beings, and find solutions to conflicts.

Communicative Creativity: a set of skills that enables people to connect with each other, in order to bring out the best in oneself and others, with words, symbols, or vibrations, sounds and movements, enhancing our capacity to find collective solutions to problems large and small.

Planetary Awareness: an expansion of the concept of global citizenship that includes the whole biosphere and our planet. This type of thinking allows us to transcend isolation, discrimination and separateness, that produce racial, gender and all sorts of discrimination, including the illusion that we are separate from the rest of the biosphere, which is one of the causes of climate change and resource depletion.

Preventive Peacebuilding: the awareness that anyone can act towards implementing one's lighthouse narrative of peace, in the here and now. Peacebuilding does not happen only where there is a post-conflict situation or when violence is about to break out. Preventive peacebuilding includes conflict prevention, but above all it encourages a proactive attitude regarding what can be done where we are (see Urbain, 2016 for more details).

Returning to the previous analysis of other writers, I found several resonances with these four value concepts, that have allowed me to reflect on this previous writing.

Derrida's *différance* was highlighted by Behr as an effective way to avoid essentialization and practice peace-in-difference, enhancing one's awareness of being-in-becoming, differing from oneself at any given moment, in a state of potential. This allows us to consider that other people too, do not have a fixed substance, but also have the potential to enhance these qualities within themselves at any given moment. I find that both the value concepts of Inner Peacebuilding and Communicative Creativity are enhanced by this focus on *différance*. In any situation, one can always find better ways to envision one's perceived circumstances. Since we are constantly different from ourselves, it must be possible to be even a bit more courageous, wise and compassionate in the next moment. The quality of our connection with particular people can always be improved if we understand that they, also, are constantly changing and becoming.

Here, I will add musical examples to illustrate a few points from now on.

Inner Peacebuilding: listening to one's favorite music can gradually change one's mood for the better (a boost in courage, wisdom and compassion). This can be studied as a form of Inner Peacebuilding. This can then lead to Communicative Creativity and all sorts of productive dialogues.

There is a caveat here, because there are many situations where this is impossible, and where some emancipative action must be taken before dialogue is possible. In the case of asymmetric conflicts and repressive societies, there must often be a phase of resistance and rebellion before reconciliation and communicative creativity are possible. As a result, I am aware that to recommend to simply work on oneself and enhance one's inner qualities would be nothing short of insensitive in situations where severe structural and cultural violence are tearing communities apart due to asymmetric power relations. For instance, while emphasizing the primacy of spiritual strength and nonviolence, in his words, the imperative "of meeting physical force with soul force" (King, 1963), Dr. King's movement made massive use of demonstrations and other protest actions. Inner Peacebuilding, in the situations where its application is possible, and where it will probably lead to Communicative Creativity, falls under the category of relationality scholarship and practice, as promoted by Behr, Brigg and several other authors in *Rethinking Peace*.

Communicative Creativity: consider singing in a local choir and deepening the relationship with fellow singers. This activity can be analyzed as an expression of Communicative Creativity, which practiced through musicking (Small, 1998) emerges as a great medium to apply Behr's recommendations listed earlier, *listen first, here and nows*, and peace as *a permanent process of dialogue about differences*. We can imagine a jazz quintet with all musicians doing just that, listening first to the environment before formulating a solo, being thoroughly plunged in the here and now and inviting the audience to feel the same way, and musicking with the other members of the quintet in a permanent process of communicating and improvising. Mark Smulian, jazz musician, composer, producer and teacher, has observed while on tour, that no matter how exhausted or frustrated they might be, jazz musicians were consistently able to pull off fabulous performances when three conditions were met. He describes these as 'harmonic codes', principles of respect, responsibility and listening:

> **Respect** - understanding, respecting and enjoying the individuality of others and yourself. **Responsibility** - understanding one's own positioning as an individual within the group at any given moment. **Listening** - stepping back, observing and hearing the collective and self as a single event. (Redpath, 2020)

Smulian's work expresses the role of emotional intelligence and social skills in musical performance, and this resonates well with the concept of communicative creativity.

Planetary Awareness: one serious and urgent issue regarding the neoliberal policies that inform the liberal peace nowadays is its almost complete disregard for the catastrophic effects of climate change, which have already started to severely affect our biosphere and our lives. A full awareness of the destructive effects of the liberal peace, combined with a profound respect for the local and the everyday, point towards the kind of thinking that resonates with Planetary Awareness, and gives us the strength to resist the propaganda and seduction of the materialistic, business-as-usual neoliberal obsession of bottom-line and profit-first thinking.

To be inspired to act for the biosphere and the planet after attending a concert promoting the Sustainable Development Goals can amplify one's proactivity, and ability to resist tendencies to give and follow instructions from afar, as in the projectization issue. A growing number of initiatives also emphasize the way the music industry could participate in the SDGs by transforming the way they treat the environment during their activities, for instance tackling the issue of plastic cups

during festivals, or sourcing the materials used to produce musical instruments. For instance, the organization Bash the Trash states their mission as "Building, performing and educating with musical instruments made from trash since 1991" (Bash the Trash, 2020). All of this resonates with Planetary Awareness.

Preventive Peacebuilding: there are many cases where peacebuilding has to be reactive instead of proactive, and post-conflict or post-catastrophe rather than preventive. The work of all those providing the best support possible in these situations is to be praised and valued, improved and supported constantly. At the same time, there is a danger that for people living in seemingly peaceful conditions, the illusion that peacebuilding is only the responsibility of experts saving lives in distant places is utterly disempowering. A constant and massive spraying of meaningless tweets, disparate news items and short videos leave many of us with the conviction that there is no connection between our daily lives and the deep currents and high-level decisions affecting society and the biosphere.

Kurasawa's description of the interconnected cosmos that constitutes the work of global justice resonates with Preventive Peacebuilding. *The work* can be done actively here and now even if there is no apparent conflict occurring around us, in an attempt to get back our power, by switching our focus to all the things we can do here and now once we are aware that everything is connected and that our lives matter. Everything is so intertwined that violence and catastrophes happening on the other side of the planet or closer are in fact deeply connected to our way of life here and now.

Based on Lederach's ideas regarding sound, vibration, repetition and circularity mentioned above, I have recently added sound to describe the application of music in the type of *proactive peacebuilding* described above. Listening seriously to lyrics exposing current and ongoing oppression of minorities and becoming more aware of the situation and more willing to act, can enhance our proactivity. All the examples of musicking activities mentioned above show how our musicality and love for music can allow us to redefine peacebuilding activities in more fluid and interconnected terms.

CONCLUSION: PEACEBUILDING HERE AND NOW, IN 2020

The article started with Oliver Richmond's challenge, asking us to clarify what type of peace we want to promote through peacebuilding, and the answer provided is that it should not be the liberal peace, but should be emancipatory, embrace differences, and even dissonances.

While rejecting many concepts and definitions of peacebuilding that have proven unhelpful, I believe we can safely keep many of Johan Galtung's founding contributions to the field, in particular the three virtues of empathy, nonviolence and creativity, the distinction between cultural, structural and direct violence, between negative and positive peace, and cautiously, the acceptance of temporary projects and actions inspired by lighthouse narratives giving us direction.

Following Lederach, we should embrace the messy and the here and now, and in the footsteps of Autesserre, we should embrace the local and the everyday, recognizing that international interveners are only useful if they work in respectful collaboration with the people they intend to support at the local level.

At this point, this is the definition of peacebuilding I would like to propose:

> I define peacebuilding as the vast range of initiatives and actions that people take every day to change their circumstances for the better, inspired by the

> lighthouse narrative of their own vision for peace. To confront the disillusionment caused by the ineffectiveness of the liberal peace in recent years, I propose the four elements of Inner Peacebuilding, Communicative Creativity, Planetary Awareness and Preventive Peacebuilding as the main aspects of a sound and proactive peacebuilding. This is a dynamic and ever-changing way of viewing the world that can potentially highlight and enhance the work of global justice conducted by millions of people in the here and now, in their everyday life and in their local surroundings.

I hope to contribute to the ongoing conversations regarding the definitions and applications of peacebuilding and to honor the work of pioneering ethnomusicologist John Blacking, who defined music as "Humanly Organized Sound" (1973, p. 3). Blacking's work encapsulates the hopes of those of us who love the harmonies and rhythms of musicking, and who wish to see more of this in the real world, as "Soundly Organized Humanity" (ibid., p. 89).

The associations and connotations of the term peacebuilding are shifting quickly based on the realities of different environments and moments in time. This particular keyword might need to be updated regularly, and to highlight this conceptual fluidity, I have added the current year in my title. Other authors might already consider contributing "Peacebuilding 2022" in the future, especially with the unpredictable transformations our world is going through due to the 2020 Covid-19 pandemic.

REFERENCES

Anderson, M. and Wallace, M. (2013). *Opting Out of War: Strategies to Prevent Violent Conflict*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Autesserre, S. (2017). International peacebuilding and local success: assumptions and effectiveness. *International Studies Review* 19, pp. 114–132.

Barash, David P., ed. (1999) *Approaches to Peace: A Reader in Peace Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bash the Trash. (2020). Homepage of the organization. Available at: https://www.bashthetrash.com [Accessed 27 August 2020].

Behr, H. (2019). "Peace-in-Difference". In A. L. Hinton, G. Shani, and J. Alberg, eds., *Rethinking Peace: Discourse, Memory, Translation and Dialogue*, 1st edition. London and New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Blacking, J. (1973). *How Musical is Man?* Seattle and London: The University of Washington Press.

Boutros-Ghali, Boutros. (1992). *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-Keeping*. New York: United Nations.

Brigg, M. (2019). "From substantialist to relational difference in peace and conflict studies". In A. L. Hinton, G. Shani, and J. Alberg, eds., *Rethinking Peace: Discourse, Memory, Translation and Dialogue*, 1st edition. London and New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Chiba, S. (2019). "The crisis of Japan's constitutional pacifism: the Abe administration's belated counter-revolution". In A. L. Hinton, G. Shani, and J. Alberg, eds., *Rethinking Peace: Discourse, Memory, Translation and Dialogue*, 1st edition. London and New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Collins Online Dictionary. (2020). Available at: https://www.collinsdictionary.com/ [Accessed 27 August 2020].

Dietrich, W. (2012). *Interpretations of Peace in History and Culture*. (Many Peaces Series). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dietrich, W. (2013). *Elicitive conflict transformation and the transformational shift in peace politics.* (Many Peaces Series). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dietrich, W. (2017). *Elicitive Conflict Mapping*. (Many Peaces Series). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

DJ Shadow. (2008). Nobody Speak featuring Run the Jewels (Official Video). Available at:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NUC2EQvdzmY&list=PL_K4VLsfatS4S1AdKkVjFPsbwdr-gX-x&index=5 [Accessed 27 August 2020].
Fortna, V. P. (2008). *Does Peacekeeping Work? Shaping Belligerents' Choices after Civil War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research* 6 (3), pp. 167–191.
Galtung, J. (1976). Three approaches to peace: peacekeeping, peacemaking and peacebuilding". In J. Galtung (ed.), *Peace, War and Defence: Essays in Peace Research*, vol.2, pp. 282-304. Available at: https://www.galtung-institut.de/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/galtung_1976_three_approaches_to_peace.pdf [Accessed 27 August 2020].
Galtung, J. (1996). *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization*. London: Sage Publications.
Galtung, J. (2000a). Personal communication with the author.
Galtung, J. (2000b). *Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means (the Transcend Method): Participants' Manual/Trainers' Manual. United Nations Disaster Management Training Programme*. Available at: https://www.transcend.org/pctrcluj2004/TRANSCEND_manual.pdf [Accessed 27 August 2020].
Hibaku "Atomic" Piano Intro. (2017). Hibaku "Atomic" Piano Intro. John Legend and Zara Larsson. The 2017 Nobel Peace prize Concert. Available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_VJxlv5CiSs [Accessed 27 August 2020].
Hinton, A. L., Shani, G., and Alberg, J., editors. (2019). *Rethinking Peace: Discourse, Memory, Translation and Dialogue*. London and New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
International Alert. (2018). *Let's get peacebuilding in the dictionary*. Available at: https://www.international-alert.org/stories/lets-get-peacebuilding-in-the-dictionary [Accessed 27 August 2020].
King, M. L. Jr. (1963). "Letter from a Birmingham jail". In Barash, David P., ed., *Approaches to Peace: A Reader in Peace Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 145.
King, M. L. Jr. (1963). *March on Washington for jobs and freedom speech*. Available at: https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/mlkihaveadream.htm [Accessed 27 August 2020].
Kurasawa, F. (2007). *The Work of Global Justice: Human Rights as Practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lederach, J. P. (2005). *The Moral Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Lederach, J. P. (2016). Foreword, *Journal of Peace Education*, 13(3), pp. 197-199.
Mac Ginty, R. (2014). Everyday peace: Bottom-up and local agency in conflict-affected societies." *Security Dialogue*, 45(6), pp. 548–564.
New York Times. (2018). When Queen took 'Bohemian Rhapsody' to Live Aid. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/09/arts/music/bohemian-rhapsody-queen-live-aid.html [Accessed 27 August 2020.]
Ostashewski, M. (2020). Sound communities. In *Music and Arts in Action*, 7(3), pp. 63-84.
Oxford English Dictionary. (2019). Available at: https://www.oed.com/ [Accessed 27 August 2020].
Palieri, R. (2008). Working in the trenches: surviving conflicts through Folk music and tales." In O. Urbain, ed., *Music and Conflict Transformation: Harmonies and Dissonances in Geopolitics*. London: I.B. Tauris.
Paris, R. (2010). Saving liberal peacebuilding. *Review of International Studies* 36(2), pp. 337-365.
Pete Seeger: The Power of Song. (2020). PBS page about the movie. Available at: https://www.pbs.org/video/american-masters-pete-seeger-power-song/ [Accessed 27 August 2020].
Ramsbotham, O., Woodhouse, T. and Miall, H. (2016). *Contemporary Conflict Resolution*. Fourth edition. Cambridge: Polity.
Richmond, O. (2005). *The Transformation of Peace*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Richmond, O. (2011). *A Post-Liberal Peace*. London and New York: Routledge.
Richmond, O. (2019). Towards a Peace with Global Justice. In A. L. Hinton, G. Shani, and J. Alberg, eds., *Rethinking Peace: Discourse, Memory, Translation and Dialogue*, 1st edition. London and New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
Redpath, S. (2020). Team tuning: how the behavioral codes of professional musicians can unleash transformational performance in any team setting. Available at:

https://mindharp.world/team-tuning/#.Xw6ZwigzaUk [Accessed 27 August 2020].
Sandole, D. (2010) *Peacebuilding: Preventing Violent Conflict in a Complex World. Cambridge:* Polity.
SDGs (2020). About the Sustainable Development Goals. Available at: https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/ [Accessed 27 August 2020].
Shani, G. (2019). Saving Liberal peace building? From the 'Local Turn' to a Post-Western peace. In A. L. Hinton, G. Shani, and J. Alberg, eds., *Rethinking Peace: Discourse, Memory, Translation and Dialogue*, 1st edition. London and New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
Small, C. (1998). *Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.
Sweet Dreams. (2020). Webpage of the film. Available at: http://www.sweetdreamsrwanda.com/film/ [Accessed 27 August 2020].
Tell Everybody. (2015). Tell Everybody: the global goals campaign. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iDhP41MGVCM [Accessed 27 August 2020].
The New Times. (2019). Ingoma Nshya: Drumming for the passion, for the love. Available at https://www.newtimes.co.rw/entertainment/ingoma-nshya-drumming-passion-love [Accessed 27 August 2020].
United Nations Security Council. (2016). *Resolution 2282*. New York: United Nations.
Urbain, O., ed. (2008). *Music and Conflict Transformation: Harmonies and Dissonances in Geopolitics.* London: I.B. Tauris.
Urbain, O. (2010) *Daisaku Ikeda's Philosophy of Peace: Dialogue, Transformation and Global Citizenship*. London: I.B. Tauris.
Urbain, O. (2016). A statement of values for our research on music in peacebuilding: a synthesis of Galtung and Ikeda's peace theories, *Journal of Peace Education*, 13:3, 218-237.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Olivier Urbain is the director of the Min-On Music Research Institute (MOMRI, Tokyo), which focuses on the application of music in peacebuilding activities, in short, "Music in Peacebuilding." He is the editor of the first book on the topic, *Music and Conflict Transformation* (2008), as well as co-editor of *Music and Solidarity* (2011) and *Music, Power and Liberty* (2016). He is part-time lecturer at Soka University, Tokyo and Visiting Research Professor at Queen's University Belfast.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank all the colleagues, teachers, friends, mentors, significant others and all who have provided me with inspiration regarding peacebuilding over the past decades. In particular, I want to express my gratitude to those who have offered their support during the three years that I spent thinking through, writing and revising this article. Special thanks go to the editors of this special issue, for granting me the rare permission to go over the word limit, and to the reviewers, who made such pertinent and compelling comments.