

Chapter 10
Everyday Peace, Human Rights, Belonging
and Local Activism in a 'Peaceful' Nation

Rob Garbutt

Introduction

This chapter explores peace in contemporary Australia. In this context peace appears to be settled, and much has been made in the past of Australia's 'quiet' or peaceful history (Pike 1962) with its absence of civil wars or a war of independence. However, such depictions of Australian history have been critiqued for ignoring the violence of invasion and colonization (see for example, Macintyre and Clark 2003). This violence and its ongoing effects must be exposed in any representation of peace in Australia. Additionally, Australia is a country that has rarely been 'at peace'. The nation has been involved in both World Wars through to conflicts such as those in Iraq and Afghanistan in the early twenty-first century. In addition to being part of a warring coalition, such conflicts have ongoing consequences for citizens who have migrated from current or former 'enemy states' and seek a sense of belonging in Australia. Finally, social norms can often mean that the nation is far from a place of complete peace for a range of groups who suffer exclusion, discrimination and stereotyping. Nevertheless, as a society, contemporary Australia is generally considered a place where people have the opportunity to live together under the rule of law, with a sense of security and free of large-scale conflict in their everyday lives.

Against this background, this chapter explores what Arjun Appadurai (2004: 124) calls the production of 'ordinary, daily peace', and that others characterize as 'everyday peace' (Heitmeyer 2009, Ring 2006, Williams 2007). I am particularly interested in exploring the production of everyday peace at the local level, while taking account of the influence of national and global processes. Everyday peace is made in negotiation between these scales, where local level becomes a stage (Fine 2010: 356) upon which this peace is performed in everyday routines and practices, as well as in events and projects that shape and extend the nature of this peace.

Analysing the performance of everyday peace could be approached in a range of ways. One approach would be to observe and consider aspects of daily life in which peace is made: work which, as Appadurai (2004: 125) notes, is 'going on all the time, and not only in public spaces and spheres like the street and the train and buses and the schools, but also in the neighbourhood'. Here, however, I take a second approach and that is to examine local projects which promote

and extend the production of everyday peace. An advantage of this approach is purely practical as it allows observations to be made of a discrete and time-limited set of social interactions. Secondly, and importantly, this approach allows me to choose projects that enable grass-roots production of everyday peace, but that also critique, implicitly or explicitly, the nature of this peace. In these projects everyday peace is conceptualized as an ongoing social production that is never fully achieved, never settled, and always to be strived for. As objects of inquiry, projects that intervene into the daily production of everyday peace provide both a mirror that can be held up to that peace as well as an indication of the everyday practices that are important in keeping the peace. They demonstrate the ordinary, less-than-ideal peace that can be experienced every day, while pointing to a state of being-together that is still to come.

This chapter proceeds by firstly undertaking an extended discussion of everyday peace and its relationship to the concepts of belonging and human rights. Following this I examine two recent community-based, activist projects and how each articulates and puts into action the concepts of human rights, belonging and peace. The first case study considers a Human (or Living) Library project, where organizers provide members of the public with opportunities to 'borrow' and have 30-minute, one-on-one conversations with people ('living books') from marginalized or stereotyped social groups. The second case study considers the Remembering and Healing Old Wounds project which attempts to counter the militarization of Australian national identity that is taking place in the public discourse surrounding Anzac Day celebrations. The chapter concludes with a consideration of the insights that these projects provide on how ordinary, everyday peace and belonging are maintained, critiqued and extended.

Ordinary Everyday Peace, Belonging and Human Rights

In this chapter, ordinary, everyday peace is conceived as a dynamic, communal state of play. This is a peace characterized, as Arjun Appadurai writes, by 'tolerance, or willingness to live together, or conviviality' (2004: 124). It is not free of tensions, but nor are tensions systemically expressed in widespread everyday violence. The production of this conviviality or tolerance, of being able to hold tension, is always in-process. It is 'a project, and a difficult project at that,' writes Appadurai (2004: 125). While the metaphor of 'project' is useful in conveying the provisional nature and historicity of such a peace, its production is more often experienced and enacted through routines, often repeated daily, sometimes less frequently. In a nation such as Australia, this everyday peace is part of the background against which the world is viewed via the many forms of media that bring nightly stories of large-scale conflict to our homes. Hence, in this sense it is also an ordinary peace, mundane, nothing remarkable, though remarkable enough when it is brought to our attention. This dual aspect of everyday peace, its historical, project-like nature on the one hand and its routine ordinariness on the other, points to a multiply-

scaled production; 'a convergence between individual [and group] efforts and larger structural economic or political factors' (Heitmeyer 2009: 114).

In taking this approach I am following those scholars who consider peace to be a cultural production, something defined positively in and of itself, rather than as an absence of conflict and war (for example, Appadurai 2004, Heitmeyer 2009, Koopman 2011, Ring 2006, Stolberg 1965, Williams 2007). Laura Ring (2006: 63-64) suggests that this latter approach has been favoured in the West due to a Judeo-Christian religious tradition of the innate sinfulness of humankind, and a Hobbesian philosophical tradition that assumes our 'innate human aggressiveness' (2006: 63). Hence, peace becomes a 'sublimation [of] violent impulses and anxieties [which] are cathartically released through ritual inversions and antistructural ceremonies' (2006: 63); it is what happens after war has ended and 'something that can be kept by occupying troops' (Koopman 2011: 279). In developing alternative conceptions of peace, the issue then becomes one of characterizing actual peace positively, without engaging once more in making an object out of the negation of conflict and war, nor in portraying it as a Heaven-like state of unity or a liberal 'projection of [a] utopian, selfless community' (Ring 2006: 64). Pointing to the work of anthropologists who focus on daily life, Laura Ring proposes a more realistic representation of peace that emerges from practices of 'mutuality and cooperation' as well as 'sanctions, fears, and avoidance' (2006: 64). This leads her to conclude that

What we mean by everyday life could actually be understood as something much more substantive, namely, peace. This is not to deny that violence can have an everyday or routinized character. I am simply suggesting that the 'everyday life' we posit as the site of the nonextraordinary, the not riot, can be reconceptualized in more positive terms as enabling the presence of something we may choose to call peace. (Ring 2006: 66 [citations deleted])

Rather than an absence, then, peace is an ongoing product of daily, 'relentless labour' that is both individual and shared (Ring 2006: 178). It is present in feelings of mutuality and belonging, but also in conflicts and tensions that can be expressed and 'held', in the object-relations sense (Winnicott 1999), without escalating into violence.

In the midst of this mix of belonging and mutuality as well as conflict and tension, ordinary, everyday peace emerges. On the one hand it is unsurprising that daily routines and practices, which situate individuals and groups within supportive social networks, would be an important component of everyday peace. The work of Robert Putnam (2000), for example, on the social bonding and social bridging aspects of social capital is currently often cited as critical to understandings of how to maintain peaceful communities. It is more surprising and perhaps counter-intuitive, however, to include conflict and tension as a crucial part of everyday peace. While having the social networks and cultural resources available to resolve conflict and tension non-violently is important to maintaining peace, conflict

and tension put into play critical mechanisms for social and cultural change and adaptation (Williams 2007). Change, and the possibility of change, is part and parcel of a living culture that is able to accommodate the shifting relationships between individuals, groups and the non-human actors that constitute it.

Tension and conflict may also be the expression of larger-scale (global and national) economic or political factors that militate against some individuals or groups freely participating in the ordinary routines of life. Historical circumstances may, for example, prevent some individuals and groups from embracing celebrations of national belonging. Nevertheless, the nature of everyday peace is such that those individuals are able to bear that tension, or develop alternative resistant routines that not only hold the tension, but also redirect that tension into public debate over traditions (Ring 2006). The ability to create tension, in this case, is a key aspect of belonging, of feeling as though one is able to participate in debates over the type of society one wants to live in. As John Shotter (1993: 193) writes,

To live in a community one *senses* as being one's own, a community for which one feels able to be answerable, one must be more than just a routine reproducer of it; one must in a real sense also play a part in its creative reproduction and sustenance as a 'living' tradition – where [...] a living tradition can be thought of as a historically extended, socially embodied argument containing what one might call reflexive arguments, that is, arguments about what should be argued about and why.

Ordinary, everyday peace then, is in constant dialogue with one's sense of belonging, and the possibilities of belonging, within a community and the wider society. Both are conceptualized here as aspects of human lives and collectives which are constantly being made: everyday peace as a life-affirming social state of living with others in which conflict and tension can always be expressed and are sometimes able to be resolved; and belonging as personal 'experience[s] of being part of the social fabric' (Anthias 2006: 21). These experiences of belonging include membership of collectives, for example, voluntarily becoming a citizen of an adopted country or involuntarily being a member of a group through birth. Importantly, however, belonging also arises from everyday practices and events (Probyn 1996, Sicakkan and Lithman 2005). These practices could include a daily routine of surfing, regular employment, or cooking and sharing a meal with others. In these examples, belonging is experienced in neighbourhoods and communities, through which larger-scale (national and transnational) experiences of belonging are mediated.

The achievement of belonging, however, may be constrained through membership of a group which is socially excluded due to the actions of others including governments and the media. What harms communities in such instances is 'the pre-emptive exclusion [...] of others on the basis of the codification of others as outside relation, belonging nowhere, a threat' (Diprose 2008: 47). In this

chapter, I am interested in projects which involve practices that are intended to challenge the pre-emptive exclusion of others and the codification of hierarchies of local belonging. Such projects, therefore, may also introduce conflict and tension into everyday peace by bringing some members of a local community into tension and conflict with dominant groups, either when established practices are brought into question, or when existing definitions of group membership (which are often unspoken but are nevertheless real) are opened for the admission of new identities and ways of belonging. These types of practices do not leave the centre undisturbed by the periphery. Rather, they are aimed at decentring dominance by opening and extending the experience and understanding of belonging of those who are invested in adhering to established social patterns (Garbutt 2009: 2011). These social patterns of belonging may be thought of in terms of hierarchies of belonging.

In a settler nation such as Australia, hierarchies of belonging at both the local and national levels are structured by colonialism (Wolfe 1999: 163). As Biermann (2011: 389) writes, '[t]he structure of invasion and colonialism is thus foundational to and remains embedded in national cultures, landscapes and systems of governance, law and education'. This colonialism is expressed, in part, in hierarchies of belonging which are culturally understood but not clearly defined through ideas of who rightly belongs in a place or the nation. This 'right to belong' is a right of the powerful and is, therefore, not a universal right; it is one that grants to those who might be arguably termed 'settler Australians' moral priority to speak for a place and order its everyday life. This group of people finds its power and privilege through historical connections to the United Kingdom, and particularly England, the colonizing mother country of the colonies that federated to create the Australian nation. Aileen Moreton-Robinson (2004) proposes that this ordering of belonging privileges what she names the 'possessive logic of patriarchal white sovereignty'. The concept of patriarchal white sovereignty enables an analysis of how that structure of belonging has been organized, with Indigenous Australians along with the many migrant groups arranged along one axis of the hierarchy of belonging. At the dominant centre of this axis is the patriarchal whiteness of normalized, British-origin 'settlers' who look two ways; 'back' to Indigenous Australians as the invaded and colonized peoples, and in the other direction to those who 'came after' colonization and are typically thought of as 'multicultural' migrants. Intersecting with this axis of the hierarchy are a host of other axes that mark difference, including gender and sexuality, with the totality of axes intersecting each other to produce widely varying effects depending on one's social location (Yuval-Davis, Kannabiran, and Vieten 2006). As Vanessa May (2011: 369) writes:

Belonging is therefore more than just an individual feeling – it is also a hotly contested political issue with collective consequences. ...[It can] have both an emotional component of 'feeling at home' or 'yearning for a home', and a political element of claim-making for space and for recognition.

Thinking about Australian culture in terms of a hierarchy of belonging that is structured according to patriarchal white sovereignty is one productive way to critically engage with the normative production of everyday peace in Australia. It is into the unsettled spaces created by a critical questioning of this everyday peace that the discourse of human rights can speak. For many Australians this primarily concerns so-called third-generation, collective human rights such as the 'right to live in a cohesive and harmonious society' (Ife 2008: 33). As Ife (2008: 14) argues, 'it must be recognized that structures and discourses of oppression, by their very nature, run counter to human rights values'. Human rights here can be understood as those rights which enable people to 'achieve their full humanity in common with others' (Ife 2008: 14). Part of a human rights based practice includes interrogation of the normative assumptions underlying the socially constructed concept of this 'full humanity'. In this sense, human rights are discursive, because they are continually being 'constructed through human interaction and through an ongoing dialogue about what should constitute a common or shared humanity' (Ife 2008: 9).

Third-generation human rights concerns are important because they are intimately connected with the possibility for the Australian nation to uncritically 'live with' first- and second- generation human rights abuses. These abuses may be those which occur elsewhere in the world and that go largely unnoticed in the Australian media or collective psyche. Within the Australian nation, human rights abuses are also made possible on the basis of hierarchies of belonging and notions of 'full humanity'; of who counts when it comes to getting mainstream attention and care. These abuses include the appalling gap between social indicators for Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians: for example, the life expectancy for Indigenous Australians is 17 years lower than for non-Indigenous Australians (Australian Human Rights Commission 2008). Another example of a regular and recurring human rights abuse is the harsh treatment, including indefinite mandatory detention, of asylum seekers who attempt to enter the nation by boat (Department of Immigration and Citizenship 2010; Australian Human Rights Commission 2011). These situations in which the rights of others are neglected are, in part, made possible by a hierarchy of belonging which results in the claims of some groups to a place to belong and to national resources taking priority over, or even excluding, the legitimate and urgent claims of others.

The community projects that I examine in the following two sections sit at the intersection of peace, belonging and human rights that has been discussed above. These terms also function as lenses through which the projects can be understood: everyday peace allows for a focus on those social practices that weave the social fabric; a focus on belonging can illuminate similar individual or group practices, as well as the power structures of marginalization and privileging that produce a hierarchy of belonging; while a human rights lens allows us to chart the ongoing dialogue over the specific nature of those rights which enable people, the privileged as well as the marginalized, to achieve their full humanity.

Human (or Living) Libraries, Everyday Peace, Belonging and Human Rights

The human library concept is a grass-roots response to prejudice and is, as such, aimed at developing the conviviality that characterizes everyday peace. In a human library session a library of living books makes themselves available for borrowing by members of the public for a thirty-minute 'reading'. Human libraries can take a number of forms and be organized for a range of purposes (Kudo, Motohashi, Enomoto, Kataoka, and Yajima 2011). Generalist human libraries are comprised of living books representing a range of backgrounds who might give themselves 'book titles' according to intersections of, for example, ethnicity, religion, sexuality or ability. Some human libraries operate on a regular, ongoing basis, while others are organized for one-off special events such as festivals. The aim is to provide 'ordinary' community members with the opportunity for a conversation with a person they may not ordinarily meet in order to dispel negative stereotypes and prejudice through personal interaction (Garbutt 2008).

The first living library was organized for the 2000 Roskilde Festival in Denmark by the *Stop Volden* (in English 'Stop The Violence') non-government organization. The project aimed to bring individual young people together in a short conversation that would put a story to 'difference'. In the words of the organizers, participants are encouraged to '[m]eet your own prejudice! Instead of talking *about* it, simply *meet* it' (Abergel, Rothmund, Titley and Wootsch 2005: 9). In Australia, the first human library was launched in Lismore, on the far-north coast of New South Wales in November 2006. Sabina Baltruweit, a community activist who initiated the Lismore project, recalls an article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* (Rennie 2005) planting the seed:

The article brought tears to my eyes. I grew up in post-war Germany, witnessing the devastating results of what happens when intolerance and racism is not addressed, leading to xenophobia, nationalism and war. Living peacefully together in all our differences is so important, but unfortunately does not happen by itself. It needs to be nurtured – everywhere. And this Living Library concept, so brilliantly simple by letting people connect one-on-one ... It's about celebrating diversity and fostering respect and appreciation of that diversity. (Baltruweit, McIntyre and Garbutt 2007: 11)

This seed was planted in the soil of the activist's local community in response to a climate that was distinctly national and, indeed, global; a climate which Pain (2009: 468) has called 'globalized fear', characterized by 'the powerful metanarrative ... of fear, terror and security'. This was a time in Australia when mass opinion against the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan apparently counted for little in government decision making, and when working at the local level was one form of activism that might have an effect on community relations. It is a sign of

people's frustration with this climate that the Lismore's Living Library organizers found many people were prepared to embrace the project as books and readers:

It was as if the time was ripe for something that builds bridges. And that's what the Living Library offers: opportunities to reassess one's preconceived ideas, speaking to people's hearts and minds. Indeed people report that it often was a profound experience for both sides engaged in the dialogue. (Baltruweit, et al. 2007: 12)

While evidence of long-term direct causal relationships between peace-building and living library operation is not yet available, a range of small-scale evaluations indicate living library projects have a positive effect on readers' openness towards others (for example, see the 'Evaluations' page on the Human Libraries Australia (2010) site). In the Lismore project it is clear from living books' evaluation survey responses that they often challenged readers' assumptions. One living book remarked that 'some people come with preconceived ideas and [are] surprised at how "normal" we are'. A reader at the project launch remarked that, '[s]peak[ing] to people openly and honestly enriches my life and draws me closer to them as human beings'. Ninety-eight per cent of readers at the launch stated that they learnt something by borrowing a book and there is evidence that negative stereotypes were altered. For example, in a candid comment a reader said that, 'Many of my assumptions were wrong'; and yet another, 'I learnt mostly how different, yet the same, gays are to the heterosexual community' (Garbutt and McIntyre 2006).

The human library concept was conceived as a way of 'promoting intercultural dialogue, human rights and pluralist democracy' (Abergel et al. 2005). By encouraging readers from dominant groups in society to talk with others for extended conversations, these projects promote human rights by developing an understanding of the full humanity of marginalized people. These conversations do more than just educate through the exchange of 'facts', however. They also decentre by placing marginalized people at the centre of conversations, in the role of expert on their own lives, and via communication that is unmediated by the channels through which most people gain knowledge of others. As such, human libraries are not solely about giving voice to marginalized people but also about privileged people listening (Bickford 1996) and developing an awareness of their privilege. Difference from others, which for dominant groups is most often encountered via the media and in stereotypes, is localized and personalized in human libraries; refugees and asylum seekers, are no longer part of a news spectacle but are community members sitting opposite 'the reader', close by, in conversation. Furthermore, through local contact with others, the mainstream 'locals' are encouraged to see the local as comprised of a wider range of ways of belonging than routinely comes to mind.

The conversation for reader and living book is an activity in which both are engaged together to create a contact zone, a space for encounter, that is discursive and embodied (Askins and Pain 2011: 817). We are reminded here that activism

directed at human rights, belonging and peace is not solely about changing ideas, but of changing ways of *being together* in the presence of others (Appadurai 2004: 124). As Kwame Anthony Appiah writes 'in the human community, as in national communities, we need to develop habits of coexistence' (2006: xvii). The Human Library does this by creating an affective space, one in which a new politics of belonging is immanent, tingling in the air (Thrift 2004, Tolia-Kelly and Crang 2010). In this space, which has been designed to feel safe – the living books have been trained in their role and understand their right to respect, and the readers informed of their reciprocal roles and responsibilities – the air is filled with a convivial babble of conversation. Thus while individual encounters allow for a personal exchange of life experience, the space has its own performative and pedagogical role of creating the possibility of a new politics of being together in which difference is as stimulating and enjoyable as sameness might be comfortable.

Remembering and Healing Old Wounds, Australian National Identity and Everyday Peace and Belonging

The second project considered here requires some brief cultural contextualization. From World War One to contemporary times, Australian national identity has been closely connected with the 'Anzac spirit'. The major celebration of this connection takes place each year on Anzac Day, April 25, which is a day for the commemoration of wartime sacrifice. Anzac Day specifically recalls the 25 April 1915 landing of the Australian and New Zealand Army Corps (ANZAC; the acronym is now generally capitalized as the proper noun Anzac) on the Gallipoli Peninsula in Turkey during World War One in the service of the British Empire. This ill-fated mission ended in retreat after eight months with heavy losses on all sides of the conflict. Despite the defeat, this gruelling battle has emerged as a symbolic demonstration of 'Australian values' such as mateship, endurance in adversity, and courage. Additionally, with World War One being the first major conflict in which the federated Commonwealth of Australia took part, Anzac is also popularly said to represent the birth of the nation on the world stage. Each year the memory of the Anzacs is refreshed via a national holiday, which for many is *the* preeminent national day; in most villages, towns and cities a Dawn Service is timed to coincide with the time of the Anzac landing at Gallipoli, and later in the morning a march takes place through the town centre by returned soldiers, serving military personnel, and often schoolchildren and the descendants of returned soldiers (Stanley 2008).

With World War One almost faded from living memory one might imagine that the popularity of Anzac Day would be declining. In fact, the contrary is the case. Attendances at Anzac Day ceremonies increase each year, as does the flow of 'pilgrims' from Australia to Anzac Cove on the Gallipoli Peninsula (Scates 2006). This increase in the popularity of Anzac remembrance is partly due to the material and political support of successive Australian governments, including a

campaign to teach Anzac values in schools (Clark 2008). In response, critics have argued that this increase in popularity has been a deliberate strategy to engage popular support for unpopular wars in Afghanistan and Iraq in the aftermath of the September 11 2001 attacks on the World Trade Centre in New York. The result is a developing sense that Australian identity has become increasingly militarized with an accompanying increase in nationalistic fervour (Lake, Reynolds, McKenna and Damousi 2010).

Remembering and Healing Old Wounds (RaHOW) is a community-based project which aims to 'promot[e] understanding and peace between people from all countries' (Sword 2011). It creates ceremonial events on and prior to Anzac Day for those members of the community who feel uneasy with the official ceremonies; including those whose heritage is not from a wartime Australian-allied nation or from an 'enemy nation', or those who feel alienated by the nationalist and militarist purposes with which Anzac Day has become associated. As with the Lismore's Living Library project, RaHOW is a local response to national and global issues. In 2009, the first year of the project, two events were organized in Lismore: an Anzac Eve service, and the Remembering and Healing Old Wounds ceremony, held on Anzac Day following the official program that is regulated by the Returned Services League (RSL). The same pattern of events has been followed each year since. Around 100 people attended the first Anzac Eve multi-faith service in Lismore's Uniting Church which included a reconciliation ceremony involving Australian and Japanese representatives. The Anzac Day peace ceremony involved 'people representing many different faiths and backgrounds, from Christians and Jews to Muslims, Japanese, refugees, young people and many others' (Sword 2009).

Unlike the Lismore's Living Library project, this project has caused public tension within the local community because of the close connection between Anzac Day, wartime casualties and Australian national identity. As the secretary of the Lismore sub-branch of the RSL wrote in the lead up to Anzac Day 2009:

I cannot understand or fathom why this group insists on holding [the ceremony] on Anzac Day. It's beyond belief that they would choose a day that is sacred to the ex-service community and the citizens of Australia when they could have it on any other day of the year ... Anzac Day is more significant to the general public psyche of what it means to be Australian than any other day and, as such, it should ... not be diminished in any way. I find their self-interest in holding this event when they have been asked not to goes totally against the spirit of Anzac Day, which is about self-sacrifice for the common interest. (Sword 2009)

A past national president of the RSL provided an alternative view:

While Anzac Day is about commemorating those who gave their lives in the defence of Australia and the service of those who returned, it is appropriate to remember all those who have died in war, including our enemies, if we are to

reinforce the lesson of the futility of war and renew our commitment to peace... In my experience, it is those who have been through the worst of war who are the first to acknowledge its folly. (Sword 2009)

These comments on the Remembering and Healing Old Wounds project are representative of two main points of view which are annually expressed in letters to the editor. With the stated aim of promoting peace and harmony, this division over the project makes it an interesting intervention to analyse. The events that the group organizes are in the form of religious ceremonies in which like-minded people celebrate together their common humanity and commitment to peace. Yet alongside the strong sense of peacemaking, connection and humanity that is evoked at RaHOW ceremonies, there is also an understanding that to participate in them is to varying extents, to go against the grain. For the prominent community members that RaHOW incorporates into their events, the city mayor and a Federal member of parliament, this requires making public statements which tread the fine line between respect for sacrifice in war and a commitment to peace. The events themselves are expressions of peacefulness and peacemaking rather than noisy, agitating, anti-nationalist, anti-war demonstrations, but they do also serve as Anzac counter-commemorations, or in Roger Simon's terms 'insurgent commemorations' (1994: 131). As such, along with the intent to promote peace, RaHOW creates spaces in its ceremonies and in the media for critical reflection on the traditional Anzac commemoration and its place in the national calendar and psyche. By creating tension the project has the potential to 'revitalize and rearticulate what one sees as desirable and necessary for an open, just and life-sustaining future' (Simon 1994: 131).

Remembering and Healing Old Wounds ceremonies are not only about promoting peace, but about questioning the everyday peacefulness of Australia. This happens in a range of ways. Those who are part of the multicultural nation of Australia, but also find themselves outside the circle of belonging that is drawn around the allies in World Wars One and Two, and the Western Christian-dominated alliances of the First and Second Gulf Wars (to just note four conflicts of which Australia has been a part) are provided with a space to gather, and if not gather, an awareness there are others in the community feeling similarly about their sense of (not) belonging to this aspect of the nation. There is also a time in the ceremonies for remembering all who have been affected by war, which is particularly directed towards those made refugees by recent conflicts around the world, but in more general terms includes the remembrance of abuses of human rights which are part of all wars. In a more general sense, the ceremonies are also spaces for people with pacifist and anti-war beliefs. The convergence of people at RaHOW events who direct their attention at peace, belonging and human rights are participating in what can be thought of as a political performance of hope (Giardina and Denzin 2011: 322) that intervenes into the sensitive cultural politics and sacred space of national identity. While the nation deploys the sacred nature of sacrifice in war to dominate, set apart and put beyond question such issues of identity, RaHOW

uses the sacred form of ritual and religious ceremony to insert opposition, to start conversation, and therefore to democratize everyday peace.

Everyday Peace and Belonging in Dialogue with Human Rights

This chapter has attempted to consider the 'peaceful' nature of a nation such as Australia, by focusing on the concepts of everyday peace, belonging and human rights together with two case studies of local activist projects. The peacefulness that characterizes Australian life is not straightforward. The ongoing legacy of this society that has been structured by colonialism is a hierarchy of belonging that can be crudely categorized as being dominated by a 'settler' group of British heritage that looks two ways, to the dispossessed Indigenous population on the one hand, and the later arrivals of 'multicultural' migrants. This hierarchy of belonging has pervasive effects which serve to both marginalize and privilege all Australians, depending on their situation in social structures.

Australian peace is, therefore, far from perfect and yet for many Australians life is characterized by peace in a positive sense; a peace which can be conceptualized in terms of everyday peace, belonging and human rights. Each of these terms is conceived of as both noun and verb. Belonging and everyday peace can be thought of, for example, as 'states' of being, individually and collectively: we can have a sense of belonging and be at peace. Yet both concepts may be thought of as always in process and unfinished, with peace and belonging being continually made through everyday routines and practices. This includes practices which introduce tension into everyday peace, and which challenge hierarchies of belonging. In this sense the terms are dialogic: always in internal conversation with their constitutive processes; never fixed but always emerging. In a different way, the concept of human rights has also been conceived of dialogically. On the one hand human rights can be thought of as principles which express of our care and respect for each other's embodied vulnerability (Turner 1993, 2006) while simultaneously being continuously negotiated and redefined through social discourse (Ife 2008).

Finally, in its conceptual framework, the chapter has also attempted to place everyday peace and belonging in dialogue with human rights. Human rights could be understood as the language in which the dialogue between belonging and everyday peace takes place. Everyday peace (as a sense of conviviality and safety) is connected with belonging (as a desire to be part of the social fabric) through the care and respect that is part and parcel of our embodied vulnerability and expressed in the principles of human rights. Simultaneously, everyday peace (as the collective practices and processes that creatively hold tension) is connected with belonging (as the opportunity to question established hierarchies of belonging) through the discourse that sees human rights continually being negotiated and redefined.

The two activist projects discussed here provide windows through which we can see this dialogue in action. The Lismore's Living Library project engages readers from the mainstream in a dialogue with stereotypes by enabling a personal

conversation with someone from a marginalized group. The routine of everyday peace, marked as it is with the constant repetition of stereotypes in the media, is disrupted by engagement with the individual before them. This is a personal encounter, but also one that occurs in a safe place that is buzzing with conviviality, and exchanges of meaning across difference. Remembering and Healing Old Wounds, on the other hand, creates a sacred space for ceremony as well as a public discussion that interrupts the sacred nature of national identity. The language that is used in these projects can be understood as a language of human rights; principles and ideas on the right to belong in a place in peace and how that might be achieved. These projects also demonstrate the role of conviviality in holding tension, as well as the role of tension in creating the hope of a better but still imperfect everyday peace. This is an everyday peace that is in process and in which we all have a right to be co-participants.

References

- Aberge, R., Rothmund, A., Titley, G. and Wootsch, P. 2005. *Don't Judge a Book by its Cover! The Living Library Organizer's Guide*. Budapest: Council of Europe.
- Anthias, F. 2006. Belongings in a Globalising and Unequal World: Rethinking Translocations, in *The Situated Politics of Belonging*, edited by N. Yuval-Davis, K. Kannabiran and U. Vieten. London: Sage, 17-31.
- Appadurai, A. 2004. Minorities and the Production of Daily Peace, in *Feelings are Always Local*, edited by J. Brouwer, A. Mulder, N. Muller and L. Martz. Rotterdam: V2_Publishing/NAi, 118-229.
- Appiah, K.A. 2006. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. London: Penguin.
- Askins, K. and Pain, R. 2011. Contact Zones: Participation, Materiality, and the Messiness of Interaction. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 29(5), 803-821.
- Australian Human Rights Commission (2008). *A Statistical Overview of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples in Australia*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.hreoc.gov.au/social_justice/statistics/index.html [accessed: 4 October 2011].
- Australian Human Rights Commission (2011). *Australian Human Rights Commission Submission to the Joint Select Committee on Australia's Immigration Detention Network*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.hreoc.gov.au/legal/submissions/2011/201108_immigration.html [accessed: 4 October 2011].
- Baltruweit, S., McIntyre, S. and Garbutt, R. 2007. Lismore's Living Library: Building Communities Conversation by Conversation. *New Community Quarterly*, 5(4), 11-15.

- Bickford, S. 1996. *The Dissonance of Democracy: Listening, Conflict, and Citizenship*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Biermann, S. 2011. Knowledge, Power and Decolonization: Implication for Non-Indigenous Scholars, Researchers and Educators, in *Indigenous Philosophies and Critical Education: A Reader*, edited by G. Dei. New York: Peter Lang, 386-398.
- Clark, A. 2008. *History's Children: History Wars in the Classroom*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
- Department of Immigration and Citizenship (2010). *Fact Sheet 82 – Immigration Detention*. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.immi.gov.au/media/fact-sheets/82detention.htm> [accessed: 4 October 2011].
- Diprose, R. 2008. 'Where' Your People From Girl?': Belonging to Race, Gender, and Place Beneath Clouds. *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 19(3), 28-58.
- Fine, G.A. 2010. The Sociology of the Local: Action and its Publics. *Sociological Theory*, 28(4), 355-376.
- Garbutt, R. 2008. The Living Library: Some Theoretical Approaches to a Strategy for Activating Human Rights and Peace. *Activating Human Rights and Peace: Universal Responsibility Conference 2008 – Conference Proceedings*, edited by R. Garbutt. Lismore: Southern Cross University, 270-278.
- Garbutt, R. 2009. Social Inclusion and Local Practices of Belonging. *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, [Online], 1(3), 84-108. Available at: <http://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/ojs/index.php/mcs/article/view/1080> [accessed: 4 October 2011].
- Garbutt, R. 2011. *The Locals: Identity, Place and Belonging in Australia and Beyond*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Garbutt, R. and McIntyre, S. 2006. *Lismore's Living Library Evaluation Report*. [Online]. Available at: <http://humanlibrary.org/assets/files/evaluation/Living%20Library%20-%20Lismore%20evaluation.pdf> [accessed: 4 October 2011].
- Giardina, M.D. and Denzin, N.K. 2011. Acts of Activism <=> Politics of Possibility: Toward a New Performative Cultural Politics *Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies*, 11(4), 319-327.
- Heitmeyer, C. 2009. 'There is Peace Here': Managing Communal Relations in a Town in Central Gujarat. *Journal of South Asian Development*, 4(1), 103-120.
- Human Libraries Australia 2010. *Human Libraries Australia: A National Strategy for Bringing Communities Together*. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.humanlibraries.org.au/> [accessed: 2 October 2011].
- Ife, J. 2008. *Human Rights and Social Work: Towards Rights-based Practice*. Revised edition. Port Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Koopman, S. 2011. Alter-geopolitics: Other Securities are Happening. *Geoforum*, 42(3), 274-284.
- Kudo, K., Motohashi, Y., Enomoto, Y., Kataoka, Y. and Yajima, Y. 2011. *Bridging Differences Through Dialogue: Preliminary Findings of the Outcomes*

- of the Human Library in a University Setting*. Paper to the 2011 Shanghai International Conference on Social Science (Shanghai). [Online]. Available at: <http://humanlibrary.org/paper-from-dokkyo-university-japan..html> [accessed: 4 October 2011].
- Lake, M., Reynolds, H., McKenna, M. and Damousi, J. 2010. *What's Wrong with ANZAC? The Militarisation of Australian History*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
- Macintyre, S. and Clark, A. 2003. *The History Wars*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- May, V. 2011. Self, Belonging and Social Change. *Sociology*, 45(3), 363-378.
- Moreton-Robinson, A. 2004. The Possessive Logic of Patriarchal White Sovereignty: The High Court and the Yorta Yorta decision. *Borderlands e-journal* [Online], 3(2). Available at: http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol3no2_2004/moreton_possessive.htm [accessed: 4 October 2011].
- Pain, R. 2009. Globalized Fear? Towards an Emotional Geopolitics. *Progress in Human Geography*, 33(4), 466-486.
- Pike, D. 1962. *Australia: The Quiet Continent*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Probyn, E. 1996. *Outside Belongings*. New York: Routledge.
- Putnam, R. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Rennie, D. 2005. Library That's Having a Lend of Us. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 27 August, 15.
- Ring, L.A. 2006. *Zenana: Everyday Peace in a Karachi Apartment Building*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Scates, B. 2006. *Return to Gallipoli: Walking the Battlefields of the Great War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shotter, J. 1993. *Cultural Politics of Everyday Life: Social Constructionism, Rhetoric and Knowing of the Third Kind*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Sicakkan, H., and Lithman, Y. 2005. Politics of Identity, Modes of Belonging and Citizenship: An Overview of Conceptual and Theoretical Challenges, in *Changing the Basis of Citizenship in the Modern State: Political Theory and the Politics of Diversity*, edited by H. Sicakkan and Y. Lithman. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1-36.
- Simon, R. 1994. Forms of Insurgency in the Production of Popular Memories: The Columbus Quincentenary and the Pedagogy of Countercommemoration, in *Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies*, edited by H.A. Giroux and P. McLaren. New York: Routledge, 127-142.
- Stanley, P. 2008. The Gallipoli Campaign: History and Memory, Myth and Legend, in *Making Australian History: Perspectives on the Past Since 1788*, edited by D. Gare and D. Ritter. South Melbourne: Cengage Learning, 311-317.
- Stolberg, I. 1965. Geography and Peace Research. *The Professional Geographer*, 17(4), 9-12.

- Sword, T. 2009. Peace is a Many Splintered Thing. *Northern Rivers Echo*, [Online], 8 April. Available at: <http://www.echonews.com.au/story/2009/04/08/26061-peace-is-a-many-splintered-thing/> [accessed: 4 October 2011].
- Sword, T. 2011. Service Aims to Mend Old Wounds. *Northern Rivers Echo* [Online], 14 April. Available at: <http://www.echonews.com.au/story/2011/04/14/peace-service-aims-to-mend-old-wounds/> [accessed: 4 October 2011].
- Thrift, N. 2004. Intensities of Feeling: Towards a Spatial Politics of Affect. *Geografiska Annaler, Series B*, 86(1), 57-78.
- Tolia-Kelly, D. and Crang, M. 2010. Affect, Race, and Identities. *Environment and Planning A*, 42(10), 2309-2314.
- Turner, B.S. 1993. Outline of a Theory of Human Rights. *Sociology*, 27(3), 489-512.
- Turner, B.S. 2006. *Vulnerability and Human Rights*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Williams, P. 2007. Hindu-Muslim Brotherhood: Exploring the Dynamics of Communal Relations in Varanasi, North India. *Journal of South Asian Development*, 2(2), 153-176.
- Winnicott, D.W. 1999. *The Family and Individual Development*. London: Routledge.
- Wolfe, P. 1999. *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: the Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*. London: Continuum.
- Yuval-Davis, N., Kannabiran, K. and Vieten, U. (Eds.). 2006. *The Situated Politics of Belonging*. London: Sage.

Chapter 11

Mediation, Human Rights and Peace-building in the Asia-Pacific¹

Dale Bagshaw

Mediation has been made the *primary* dispute resolution process in family law in Australia and is increasingly being promoted in other legal contexts. Basic national accreditation standards for mediators have recently been developed in Australia and mediation is on its way to becoming a profession in its own right. Mediators are drawn from many different professional backgrounds, bringing with them different values and approaches to intervention. My professional background is in social work, which places a high value on social justice and human rights. From this perspective, I challenge dominant Western constructs of mediation which have been imported into many countries (including Australia) from the United States and discuss the issues involved in building culturally fluent models of mediation, which acknowledge traditional ways of resolving conflict, but also redress power imbalances and challenge structural inequalities to ensure just outcomes for all involved. In this process I will also examine the links between mediation, social justice, human rights, peacemaking and peace building.

Globalization and the introduction of information technology have altered the boundaries of our conflicts and our practices, and have fostered the domination of Western ways of knowing. In particular, North American cultural assumptions about conflict and how to resolve it are embedded in the rational, individually-oriented, interest-based mediation models which have emanated from the United States and dominate mediation practices in many Western countries, including Australia. Courts in other countries in the Asia-Pacific region are currently adopting Western styles of mediating and are engaging Western trainers to educate their judiciary and others who will practice as mediators. However, Western mediation trainers may engage a 'residue of imperialism when they attempt to transfer Western models to other cultures as the right way to resolve conflict' (Lederach 1995: 3). This chapter explores this issue and examines the influence of culture and the cultural context on mediation. Emphasis will be placed on the need to appreciate non-Western values and approaches to dispute resolution.

¹ Sections of this chapter are drawn from Chapter 1 Bagshaw, Dale 'Challenging Western constructs of mediation' in a co-edited book: Bagshaw, Dale and Porter, Elisabeth (Eds). *Mediation in the Asia Pacific: Transforming Conflict and Building Peace*. Routledge: New York and London, 2009.