_____

Space

LAUREN MICHELLE LEVESQUE AND DARREN FERGUSON

Providence School of Transformative Leadership and Spirituality | Saint Paul University | Canada*

Beyond Skin | Northern Ireland**

ABSTRACT

The word 'space' has gained visibility in peacebuilding literature over the last few years, especially in literature on the dynamics of local peacebuilding processes. Regarding these processes, spatial approaches have extended knowledge of the role that narratives of space play in shaping individual and collective experiences of peace. These narratives include the contested meanings attributed to local landmarks or how notions of 'safe space' inform the design of peace-focused activities in particular communities. Adding to the complexity of usage around the term, musical performance itself has been described as a space through which communities can imagine and enact peace. Given these multiple understandings, engaging in a sustained discussion of the word space is an opportunity to identify ideas and approaches that can bridge emerging discourses on local peacebuilding processes and their relationship to music.

KEYWORDS
space; music; peacebuilding; practice

* llevesque@ustpaul.ca
** net.darren@gmail.com

_____

INTRODUCTION

This article is the result of conversations between myself, an assistant professor and researcher in Canada, and a leading peacebuilding practitioner from Northern Ireland, Darren Ferguson. Our initial conversations for the article took place over the summer of 2019 via videoconferencing (i.e., Skype) as well as through email exchanges.[1] The ideas that emerged have been formulated into a collaboratively conceived contribution on space for this second volume of keywords for music in peacebuilding. More specifically, Darren and I explore three main arguments in the following pages. The first argument is that peacebuilding itself can be understood as a creative process (Lederach, 2005). John Paul Lederach, for example, maintains that peacebuilding can be understood as a 'poetic' act in response to protracted conflict and violence (Lederach and Lederach, 2010). Considering peacebuilding in this way, he argues: "My feeling, is that we have overemphasized the technical aspects and political content [of peacebuilding] to the detriment of the art of giving birth to and keeping a process creatively alive" (Lederach, 2005, p. 70).

Lederach is mentioned here, as one of his ideas provides the springboard for our second argument. In his book *The Moral Imagination*, Lederach describes four principles that support peacebuilding as a creative process, including a principle referred to as a "paradoxical curiosity" (2005, pp. 35-37). Describing the principle, he writes:

> Paradoxical curiosity starts with a commitment to accept people at face value. *Heart value* goes beyond the presentation of appearance and ventures into the way these things are perceived and interpreted by people. It explores where meaning is rooted. It seeks to find the home of the meaning in the experience of people. (ibid., p. 37; emphasis in original)

Noting the tension between face value and heart value, Lederach emphasises the need for scholars and practitioners to sit with a certain puzzle: to take account of peoples' perceptions and interpretations of things while going beyond to discover *where meanings are rooted*. Here, the addition of meanings in the plural is significant, recognizing the complex, multiple and ambiguous experiences that can shape different interactions with music and space in the context of peacebuilding.

With this plurality in mind, our second argument is that the concept of 'paradox' can act as an important lens through which to understand the implications of space in the field of music in peacebuilding. More pointedly, we argue that working with this lens can help scholars and practitioners become attuned to the mystery and unpredictability that is often at play when meaning is created through music and/or space. As Lederach reminds his readers: "In the most profound sense, the human community paradoxically is held together, and pushed apart, by making sense of our soundscape" (2020, p. 140). Stated differently, paradox, or the ability to work with tensions arising from complexity, multiplicity and ambiguity, is necessary to engage with what it means to be held together and pushed apart by sound in the midst and aftermath of conflict (ibid., pp. 150-154). As we see in subsequent sections of the article, this ability can include working with experiences of confusion and/or uncertainty that can unfold in particular peacebuilding projects and/or interventions.

---

[1] Reflections and insights were also contributed through the review of drafts of the manuscript.

Our third and final argument is that to fully grasp the significance of the keyword space, theory must be in dialogue with practice. While this argument may appear self-evident, in the context of an emerging interdisciplinary field such as music in peacebuilding, Darren and I wish to affirm Elaine Sandoval's contention that, where peacebuilding is the objective of musical activity, there is a need to "strengthen the foundation for applied projects, or interventions" (2016, p. 200). Her suggestion underscores, for instance, the importance of scholars taking seriously the diverse perspectives of practitioners and community partners with varied experiences of music and space as part of interdisciplinary exchanges. Our reflections herein represent one example of the potential of these types of exchanges.

In the sections that follow, we deepen and elaborate on our main arguments. The first section provides a brief outline of the initial questions and presuppositions that shape the article as a whole. The second section explores definitions of 'peace', in particular the ways this word has been considered in spatial approaches to peacebuilding (Björkdahl and Kappler, 2017). The third section examines understandings of space, including ideas around safe space and 'shared space' (Hunter, 2008; Lepp, 2018). The fourth section addresses musical spaces and how these inform peacebuilding practice, leveraging examples from the organisation, Beyond Skin, a locus of arts-based peacebuilding in Northern Ireland. In the conclusion, future directions and implications for research into space as a keyword in music in peacebuilding are discussed, including the suggestion that listening is a core competency where music, space and peace are concerned.

SPACE: INITIAL QUESTIONS AND PRESUPPOSITIONS

The concept of space has gained visibility in peacebuilding literature over the last few years, especially in literature on the dynamics of local peacebuilding (McDowell and Baniff, 2015). This visibility has emerged from a range of disciplines including peace and conflict studies (Björkdahl and Buckely-Zistel, 2016) and human geography (McConnell, Megoran and Williams, 2014). In the introduction to their volume *Spatializing Peace and Conflict*, for example, Annika Björkdahl and Susanne Buckley-Zistel write: "Analysing violent conflicts and peace processes from a spatial perspective is slowly but steadily becoming part of peace and conflict studies" (2016, p. 5). Despite growing recognition of this perspective, defining the word 'space' remains a challenge. As discussed throughout this article, space can be understood in multiple ways, depending on context, community or the goals of a particular project.

Given the ideas mentioned above, a particular question has coalesced as the basis for this article: how do we engage with the diversity of meanings and possibilities inherent in the keyword space as theorists and as practitioners? As alluded to in the introduction, we answer this question with the following presuppositions in mind: 1) that recognition of the complex intersections shaping understandings of music, space and peacebuilding help to strengthen the critical lenses needed to address these topics; and 2) that academic accounts of space are enhanced and expanded by the insights of practitioners who live and breathe music in post-conflict settings, such as those provided by Darren in this article. More specifically, one answer we propose is that, as a keyword space requires what Lederach characterises as a "more holistic and paradoxical lens" (2020, p. 141). Echoing the arguments outlined in the introduction, he states: "To understand conflict and peace, we must find ways to account for the elements that go below and beyond the linear modalities of making sense of things. Rational thought cannot disembody itself from who we are as persons" (ibid.). Simply put, the relationship between music, space and peace is not

straightforward and its understanding requires an elaboration and strengthening of such a holistic and paradoxical lens.

This proposed answer corresponds to the diversity of perspectives and experiences reflected in Christopher Small's much quoted definition of 'musicking': "*To music is to take part in any capacity, in a musical performance, whether by performing, by listening, by researching or practicing, by providing material for performance (what is called composing), or by dancing*" (1998, p. 9, emphasis in original). Our proposed answer also underscores the relevance of critically excavating the normative and/or prescriptive conceptualisations of space that inform our work as scholars and/or practitioners. For instance, Sheila Whiteley et al. note that there is often overlap and interrelationship between concepts such as space and place in popular music (2005, p. 2). With regard to place, they write: "Both as a creative practice and as a form of consumption, music plays an important role in the narrativization of place, that is, in the way in which people define their relationship to local, everyday surroundings" (ibid.). As they go on to explain, the narrativization of place through music can create a symbolic space where individuals and communities tap into a sense of collective identity (ibid., pp. 3-4). Pertinent to the current discussion is the recognition of the complex and diverse ways in which popular music helps to 'locate' people: communally, geographically, imaginatively, and so on (see Mazierska et al., 2015; Bennett and Rogers, 2016). In order to delve more deeply into the implications of these ideas for music in peacebuilding, however, it is necessary to provide a working definition of what we mean by peace. We turn to this task in the following section.

UNDERSTANDING PEACE

It is perhaps no surprise to those engaged in peacebuilding that peace, like space, can be an elusive concept (Debiel et al., 2016; Björkdahl et al., 2016). Acknowledging this elusiveness highlights the importance of providing at least a working definition of the word to frame our discussion. This acknowledgement also recognises that analyses on the meaning, impact and function of space take place in relationship to other debates shaping peacebuilding theory and practice. One of these debates concerns the critical evaluation of what it means to imagine and live out 'local' and 'everyday' peace in particular communities (Kappler, 2013). As Björkdahl and Kappler note: "Peace and conflict are manifested and 'take place' in the everyday" (2017, p. 13). Peace, in other words, is 'emplaced' and has implications for how space is conceptualised and lived in post-conflict settings.

Following this line of thinking, Fiona McConnell, Nick Megoran and Phillipa Williams describe peace as a process connected to lived experience in particular places. In the introduction to their edited collection *Geographies of Peace*, they write:

> In this book, we emphasize the importance of problematizing and conceptualizing what we mean by peace: seeing it as process not an endpoint; exploring how actors make peace in certain ways and in certain places; and stressing how practices of peace are embedded in power relations. Peace can be a yearning for a radically new and just social order, or a mechanism employed by the powerful to resist exactly such change. Peace might arise through the conscious or unconscious actions of both powerful geopolitical actors and everyday folk. (McConnell, Megoran and Williams, 2014, p. 2)

Having affirmed the need to critically evaluate understandings of the concepts we use as peacebuilders (Björkdahl, 2013), McConnell, Megoran and Williams'

description suggests that peace is more than simply an end goal. It is something 'made' by a variety of actors and which influences daily life in multiple ways. Here, peace is presented as diverse, fluid and embedded, an experience implicated in dynamics of resistance and/or power on both sides of a conflict divide.

In a similar vein, Branka Marijan discusses the idea of an "uncertain peace", one characterised by a sense of incompleteness and/or of being in-between that can affect experiences of transition (2017, p. 69). Drawing on examples from Bosnia and Herzegovina and Northern Ireland, Marijan emphasises how peace is created and sustained through the agency of ordinary people in the routines of daily life. She pinpoints, for instance, the practices of marking particular places with symbolic meaning and how these markings inform contesting narratives over identity and space in specific neighbourhoods (ibid., pp. 71-73). Such practices form what she calls a "symbolic landscape" in which everyday, local spaces are transformed into sites of empowerment, resistance and/or struggle (ibid., p. 72). Marijan argues, in other words, that ordinary citizens inform the "quality of peace" (ibid., p. 69) that they undergo in their own lives. Far from being powerless, individuals and communities find creative ways to shape peacebuilding processes from the ground up, whether the goal of this shaping is to normalise exclusionary narratives or to push back against them (p. 77).

As the work of these scholars suggest, recognizing the complexity and ambiguity of peace in post-conflict settings and in relation to space is significant. This recognition mirrors the quality of the ideas and experiences expressed in Small's definition of musicking previously cited. Just as musicking is presented as a constellation of imaginings and actions that are multiple and open-ended, so too are peoples' understandings and experiences of peace in particular contexts. Here, Lederach's (2005; also see Shonge, 2017) reflections on space, change and peacebuilding as web-like processes are insightful (pp.75-86). Lederach writes:

> Constructive change and peace are not built by attempting to win converts to one side or another, or by forcing one or the other's hand. Web-making suggests that the net of change is put together by recognizing and building relational spaces that have not existed or that must be strengthened to create a whole that, like the spider's web, makes things stick. (2005, p. 85)

Lederach goes on to outline some of the spaces in which he believes peacebuilders can 'make things stick'. These include hospitals, community markets, youth centers and urban street corners (ibid, p. 86). Peace in these spaces can be imagined as many things, as McConnell et al. attest. By using Lederach's metaphor of the web in dialogue with Marijan's arguments, however, peace can be understood as an idea and/or an experience that intersects and shapes the quality of peoples' everyday lives. The question then becomes: how do we create and sustain spaces where those participating experience peace as something that 'sticks'? In describing such spaces, Lederach hints at the potential of music to act as a platform where this possibility of making things stick can be lived out. He writes: "These [spaces] are the hubs, the heart that throbs the rhythms of change" (2005, p. 85). Before engaging with the potential of musical spaces to act as hubs for change, it is necessary to explore space itself as a complex, ambiguous and multifaceted concept in peacebuilding literature.

DEBATES ON SPACE IN PEACEBUILDING LITERATURE

Responding to a question about the importance of space, Darren captured some of the complexity and ambiguity around this keyword noted in the previous section:

"Space is such an important word when it comes to security, community development and peace yet it can mean something different to everyone. Personal Space, Shared Space, Safe Space, Time, Sky at night Space" (personal correspondence, June 2019). As suggested, complexity and ambiguity arise from the capacity of space to serve as a container for diverse meanings and possibilities. Similar to the concept of peace, space is revealed to be flexible and multifaceted, having an impact on understandings and experiences of everyday life.

Here, another question comes to light: how do we move from this ambiguity and flexibility to an effective understanding of space in peacebuilding theory and practice? One possibility is to consider different ways in which space is currently being discussed in pertinent literature. This possibility helps to make the connection between conceptualisations of this keyword in spatial approaches and those articulated in relationship to music. A complication arises, however, when we recognise that space is rarely discussed in isolation. Rather, it is most often understood in conjunction with other concepts such as agency and place (Björkdahl and Selimovic, 2016). For example, in one of the most comprehensive studies on space in peacebuilding titled *Peacebuilding and Spatial Transformation*, Björkdahl and Kappler define place as both a 'geographical location' and a particular bounded and physical space, such as a bridge or city street (2017, pp. 18-19; see also Björkdahl and Strömbom, 2015).

Space, in their understanding, is "the imaginary counterpart of place", echoing the link between imagination and action as constitutive of a local, everyday peace articulated by Marijan (2017, pp. 19-21). Björkdahl and Kappler go on to state that, "The ways in which people relate to spaces (that is, how they feel about spaces, how they make sense of them and how those spaces impact upon social life) can lead to empowerment or marginalisation, inclusion or exclusion" (2017, p. 21). Agency, in this equation, concerns how individuals and communities engage with spaces of marginalization, inclusion and/or power in particular contexts. Depending on this engagement or agency, the authors suggest that spaces can be turned into particular places and places into particular spaces with fundamental impacts on daily life in post-conflict settings (2017, pp. 26-27). In this articulation alone, one sees the challenge of defining space as it is imagined and lived not only by individuals and communities but also by researchers and practitioners working with them to create Lederach's so-called 'relational spaces'.

S P A C E

To provide one example, in their book Björkdahl and Kappler discuss the interplay of space, place and agency in Northern Ireland (2017, pp. 96-115). More specifically, they analyze Belfast's peace walls and the reimagining of the Maze/Long Kesh prison site. Through their analysis of 'space-making' and 'place-making', Björkdahl and Kappler demonstrate the deeply rooted spatial dimensions of conflict and peace in this particular city. Here, spatial dimensions refer to "the ways in which places and spaces are narrated, used and transformed" by both Republican and Loyalist communities (ibid., p. 97). An examination of peace walls, for instance, reveals that members of the aforementioned communities imbue and reimbue the interface areas in which the peace walls have been erected through diverse practices (ibid., p. 99). Björkdahl and Kappler write: "Most days mundane activities take place along the peace walls, including people dog-walking, jogging, biking or just passing by on their way somewhere else" (ibid., p. 99). In a divided city such as Belfast where communities remain largely segregated (ibid., p. 100), the peace walls are visible reminders not only of the conflict but also of the quality of precarity that characterises experiences of peace for these communities (ibid., p. 98).

Björkdahl and Kappler elaborate, however, on the debates that have surrounded the peace walls and some of the efforts to transform these 'contested spaces' into 'shared spaces' (2017, pp. 104-107). Of interest to this conversation is the focus on arts-based projects as exemplary of such space-making efforts to transform visible markers of conflict into something different. Discussing the *Draw Down the Walls* project, Björkdahl and Kappler note: "Working with some of the most divided and contested places of the city, the project developed an approach of utilising art as an engagement tool to explore mutual understanding and promote dialogue between local communities separated by contested interface barriers" (ibid., p. 105). A key aspect of the project is the recognition that alongside physical markers, the peace walls are experienced by community members on both sides as 'invisible' markers of space (ibid., pp. 104-105). The authors observe that, "The peace walls are both perceived in terms of their concrete and material aspects as well as their ideational meaning, i.e., the representation of imagined boundaries" (ibid., p. 104). These imagined boundaries are, as Björkdahl and Kappler explain, informed by competing narratives over the history of the conflict as well as the symbolism of flags, graffiti and emblems encountered in one's daily life (ibid., p. 102). In these circumstances, what do the descriptors of spaces as 'safe' and/or 'shared' mean? We turn to this question and its own challenges in the section below.

SAFE SPACE, SHARED SPACE = PEACEFUL SPACE?

Discussing the creation of "secure, manageable" spaces in the city of Belfast, Audra Mitchell and Liam Kelly state: "Peace takes space" (2011, p. 307). This seemingly simple statement conceals a litany of adjectives that are used to qualify what kind of space is required to build peace in local communities. In this section, two of these adjectives are addressed: safe space and shared space. Safe and shared are some of the more prominent descriptors used in peacebuilding literature, in particular literature addressing arts-based and/or spatial approaches (Hunter, 2008; Komarova and O'Dowd, 2016). It is important to acknowledge, however, that other descriptors could be explored: contested, local, public, urban, and so on. The notion of safety and the idea of collective belonging that is evoked by the word shared, point to the intersection of issues such as identity, narrative and memory that shape peoples' experiences in post-conflict settings (Michael, Murtagh, and Price, 2016; Kappler, 2018).

Drawing on his own experiences and understandings of music and peacebuilding, Darren raises an important line of thinking with regard to the notion of shared space. "The arts", he affirms, "are the best way of integrating people and nurturing community relations and peace processes. Ironically, the term safe space becomes the conflicting word when using arts in peacebuilding" (personal correspondence, June 2019). He goes on to suggest that safety does not necessarily preclude encounters with challenging material and/or situations. Speaking of the tensions between notions of safety and challenge as these pertain to space, Darren shared the following reflection:

> Some of our artists made a video called, *Confused*. 'It's ok to be confused' was the message. 'People who say they get it, how can you look into the night sky into space and say you get it' (Mark Smulian). And for us as an organisation, we find this very interesting especially when arts/creativity sensory activities are at the centre of the space, it's ok for there to be a percentage of that space that is a mystery, the confusion. (personal correspondence, June 2019)

In these statements, the impression is given that understandings of safe space and shared space can inform each other. They are not always, or need to be, mutually exclusive.

In her article "Cultivating the art of safe space", Mary Ann Hunter notes that creative tensions exist between conceptualisations of safety and risk in the creation of spaces in peacebuilding. Participants in such spaces, specifically when the focus is on artistic performance, can experience risk on multiple levels: in one's aesthetic expressions, the emotions one may feel, and/or the experience of opening oneself to being in relationship with others (2008, pp. 8-9). Based on her engagement with a particular project and her negotiation of the creative tensions between safety and risk, Hunter argues that safe space can be understood as a process. She writes: "I suggest that safe space is better described as a euphemism for the processual act of ever-becoming, of messy negotiations - both within collaborative actions of representation and oft-times paradoxical presentations and positionings of self" (ibid, p. 16). Here, the notion of 'ever-becoming' refers to an understanding of process as characterised by change and a sense of dynamism (i.e., one's participation in a safe space is dynamic rather than static). This understanding echoes the impression given above that safe space and shared space are not mutually exclusive. Safety does not automatically rule out, as Darren suggests, the possibility of being uncomfortable, confused, or uncertain.

For his part, Lederach has identified risk as another foundational aspect of building peace. Affirming Hunter's ideas on safe space as process, Lederach defines risk as mystery and as a journey. He argues that, "Risk means we take a step toward and into the unknown" (2005, p. 163). This stepping toward and into the unknown involves both those tasked with the act of creating spaces as well as those invited to enter into them as participants. In spaces intentionally categorised as safe and shared, the conceptualisation of risk as mystery and as a journey can affirm and/or support an understanding of space as a process of ever-becoming, one which does not push away the messy negotiations and paradoxes that can characterise daily life in post-conflict settings. These ideas connect to articulations of space, for example, as a focal point of encounter in such settings (Harrowell, 2017).

Although pertinent to the creation of and participation in particular spaces such as workshops or community programmes, the understandings discussed become difficult to translate into broader notions of shared space as concrete, physical and

geographically delineated. How can a neighbourhood street and/or park be both a safe and shared space? In Northern Ireland, for instance, discourses around shared space are not straightforward (Rallings, 2014). Speaking of these discourses, Darren notes: "Shared Space has been the buzzword regarding community relations and the peace process in Northern Ireland. Areas divided by physical walls and invisible walls separating space between Catholics and Protestants, as much more to the core of the conflict. British or Irish space?" (personal correspondence, June 2019).

These difficulties are emphasised because they signal some of the important nuances to consider as both theorists and practitioners when it comes to the keyword space. What kind of space are we actually working with? In what context and for what purpose? Spatial approaches to peacebuilding explore particular sites, places and spaces as well as their potential to contribute to and/or hinder prospects for peace. As has been argued in previous sections of this article, scholars and/or practitioners applying these approaches examine both the visible and invisible dimensions of sites, places and spaces, bringing our attention to the complex relationship between them in local communities. Arts-based projects can participate in shaping this relationship, as evidenced by the example of the *Draw Down the Walls* project cited by Björkdahl and Kappler. This relationship, however, looks quite different if we are working within an intentionally labelled and bounded space such as a workshop, a school or community programme versus a particular geographical place that becomes a space through the interplay of identity, memory and everyday practices (see Kappler, 2018; Murtagh, 2018).

The questions outlined above are significant when bringing music in peacebuilding into the conversation. Discussions of space in relationship to music and peace are not new, however (Buchanan, 2007). In his exploration of the United States' Civil Rights movement, for example, Baruch Whitehead cites the contribution of the Highlander Folk School in Mounteagle, Tennessee, to the movement's mobilization of song (2008, pp. 82-84). He recounts that, "The Highlander Folk School was one of the earliest venues that incorporated the unofficial civil rights anthem 'We Shall Overcome'" (ibid., p. 83). While the word peace is not used explicitly in Whitehead's discussion of the Highlander Folk School, his characterization of the School as an important 'venue' points to complex intersections that can arise when engaging with different understandings of music, space and peace. Stated differently, Whitehead underscores the ways in which a particular space helped Civil Rights activists learn and live the music that would accompany their struggles for nonviolent social change. Providing a different interpretation of these intersections, June Boyce-Tillman (2011) examines the ways in which music can create spaces that are 'liminal'. A liminal musical space, she suggests, is one where those participating are afforded profound experiences of the self as deeply connected with the other (2011, pp. 188-190). These in-between spaces of encounter can be catalysts for transformation, as Boyce-Tillman describes in the context of a particular project titled *Space for Peace* (ibid., pp. 190-199).

With these ideas in mind, it could be said that, music as it relates to space is ambiguous, complex and multiple. In this regard, the experience of music can be subjective, private, intimate as well as relational, social and public (Born, 2013). Also drawing on perspectives in geography to address these interrelated experiences, Georgina Born writes: "Space is here conceived as plural, as the outcome of social and material practices and as indivisible from time; […] it should be interpreted as inherently mobile and in motion" (2013, p. 21). Born's statements on space as plural and mobile point to the specific problematic of 'boundaries' in

relation to music in peacebuilding. This problematic relates to how the notion of boundaries is defined, where and with particular objectives in mind.

To offer another example from popular music studies, in a 2016 article Andy Bennett and Ian Rogers discuss the intersection between unofficial live music venues, space and the creation of cultural memory. As they explain with regard to particular venues in cities throughout Australia, unofficial live music venues are at once specific places that become musical spaces through a constellation of emotions, experiences, memories and relationships (2016, pp. 491-492). They write:

> The venue is a place in which a collective sharing and celebration of musical taste unfolds - the latter being underpinned through the venue's function as an occasion for sociality. In the case of the unofficial live music venue, the intimacy and shared sense of belonging may take on an added dimension of importance, particularly in cases where a venue has been established to meet a specific demand among a local community of music listeners whose tastes and/or notion of musical enjoyment appear at odds with what is made available within the official nighttime economy. (2016, p. 402-403)

Based on material from three different sites, Bennett and Rogers' reflections provide an iteration of how the idea of boundaries can shift, becoming more complex in relationship to place, space and music. Describing a venue known as *The Church* in Adelaide, the authors highlight its multi-use as a "place of residence", "performance site", "practice space" and "recording studio" (ibid., p. 496). Complexifying the notion of boundaries, they note that, "In this venue, the music and memories recalled and evoked by the building are not neatly confined to live presentation; the venue's presence spills out into the social and home lives of *The Church*'s residents, into the acoustic properties of the sounds recorded there and it takes on a more central role in the biographies of the clique of people utilizing the venue" (ibid., p. 497). Given the varied uses described, how would the concept of boundaries apply to this particular place? Furthermore, what does it mean to engage with a place whose presence 'spills out' beyond the so-called physical boundaries of the building in which it is housed?

This example, coupled with the reflections on the challenge of delineating safe space and shared space discussed earlier, suggests that the adjectives we use to categorise and/or demarcate space have various implications. As Bennett and Rogers underscore, these implications include the relationship to other concepts such as place, site, venue, and so on. Additionally, with regard to spatial approaches to peacebuilding, a challenge remains that, in post-conflict settings, adjectives used do not always capture the ways in which spaces overlap and are experienced as simultaneous and plural: at once subjective, safe/unsafe, shared, public, contested and used for multiple purposes (see Shimada and Johnston, 2013). Complicating these reflections further is the reality that, as we elaborate below, sound and music do not always comply with the boundaries, visible and/or invisible, that communities erect in the aftermath of conflict and as peace is negotiated in everyday life (Obert, 2014). With regard to sound and music then, a final question emerges for us as theorists and as practitioners: how do we navigate this messy, ever-becoming and plural concept of space?

MUSICAL SPACES: LIMITS AND POSSIBILITIES OF BUILDING PEACE THROUGH MUSIC

Adding to the complexity of the word space outlined in the previous section, musical performance itself has been described as a space through which communities can imagine and enact peace (Pruitt, 2013). Given this description, what is the role of music in understanding space as a conceptual lens and as a peacebuilding process? How does music contribute to or problematise the debates and questions addressed throughout this article? Darren, for example, proposes that sound is one of the primary vehicles through which people experience space. "Sound shapes our space the most", he notes, "We feel at ease or uncomfortable". Providing a case in point, he affirms:

> Take West Belfast as an example, where the black taxis services are in that part of the city (majority Catholic). The daily background noise of the diesel engines - you know you are in that part of the city. For people living there the sound is part of their environment - a sound of comfort and familiarity. (personal correspondence, June 2019)

This idea of 'sound shaping space' and people's lives in fundamental ways echoes Lederach's argument that before there was 'the word', there was sound. He writes: "Most traditions believe that all that we have been given and share on our extraordinary living planet began in sound" (2016, p. 197). Making sense of the soundscapes in which we live, in other words, is a principal vehicle through which human beings, as individuals and as communities, create meaning. As Lederach argues and as has been noted with regard to the idea of a holistic, paradoxical lens, creating meaning involves navigating both "human consonance and dissonance" in particular contexts (ibid.).

These ideas echo Andrew Eisenberg's remarks on the interweaving of sound and space in human experience. Emphasizing the intimacy of this interweaving, he asks readers to imagine one without the other (Eisenberg 2015, pp. 193-195). He writes: "Imagine sound without space, vibrating everywhere and nowhere" (ibid., p. 193). A few paragraphs later, he ponders: "Now imagine space without sound - space imbued with absolute, undifferentiated silence" (ibid., p. 194). Reflecting on what he calls the "spatialities of sound" in his chapter, Eisenberg discusses the overlap of sound, space and citizenship in the port town of Mombasa, Kenya (ibid., pp. 195-200, pp. 200-202). He affirms:

> Layered atop the sonorous spatial practices and politics surrounding the Islamic soundscape in Mombasa Old Town, another kind of soundscape introduces another kind of sonic spatiality, that of popular media circulation. Through musical practices, sonic artefacts of transnational circulation enter into the same public spaces that vibrate with the Islamic soundscape, supplying raw semiotic materials for a different way of imagining one's place in the world. (ibid., p. 201)

Resonating with Bennett and Rogers' description of the constellation of factors that trouble simplistic understandings of boundaries in relation to unofficial live music venues, Eisenberg draws his readers' attention to the complexity, simultaneity and multi-use of sound as it constitutes space and vice versa (ibid., p. 194). In this one place, he suggests, there are multiple soundscapes and these soundscapes help to shape the diverse spaces informing the ways people imagine themselves in the world.

In a similar vein, Julia C. Obert notes both the consonant and dissonant interplay of sound in her analysis of Belfast soundscapes. As a significant aspect of peoples'

daily lives, she underscores the ways in which sound "slips" across borders and boundaries that bodies and their visual perceptions cannot (Obert, 2014, p. 16). Sounds can provide a sense of familiarity and home as well as a sense of threat and fear. Obert observes:

> Sound is, of course, sometimes reflective of sectarian tension - particularly during parade season when flutes and lambegs commandeer local airwaves - but it also transcends this tension in surprising ways; communities with precious few other connections can have a common means of relating to place. Shared soundspace makes for a shared sense of 'homeplace' - a sentiment that rubs against the grain of interface areas' mutually exclusionary visual cues. (ibid.)

Combined, the observations of the authors explored in this section imply that sound can be understood as foundational to shared human experiences, including those of space. Similar to Small's notion of musicking, their observations highlight that, as a shared human experience, sound is emergent, fluid and mobile. With these ideas in mind, Obert notes that space is not simply something we experience with our eyes but also "an immersive auditory field" (ibid., p. 15). She writes: "Lived landscape, that is to say, is also soundscape; our perceptual relationships to place are defined as much by the ear as they are by the eye" (ibid.).

The main insight here is that recognizing emergence, immersion, fluidity, mobility and unpredictability as possible attributes of sound is not irrelevant to understanding the role of musical spaces in peacebuilding practice. Craig Robertson's work, for example, discusses the multiple factors that can contribute to the creation of musical spaces in the contexts of conflict transformation and/or peacebuilding processes (2016, 2018). Addressing research undertaken with choirs in Sarajevo and London, Robertson identities belief, emotion, identity and memory as important intersecting points shaping musical spaces and experiences in the aforementioned contexts. Echoing Eisenberg and Obert, his examination of these particular factors foregrounds the need to move beyond simplistic and/or reductionist assessments of musical spaces and experiences as effective platforms for conflict transformation and/or peacebuilding. Of interest is the acknowledgement that even within projects that are purportedly functioning out of a belief in the power of music to effect change, there exists a diversity of opinions and tensions around what this means in the concrete (Robertson, 2018, p. 44). In a sense, Robertson reminds us of the need to complexify, revisit and hold tensions in our approaches to musical spaces and experiences as theorists and as practitioners. This reminder connects to Darren's prior comments on the possibility of encountering mystery and confusion when engaging with music and space for the purposes of building peace.

Reading through the objectives, values and strategy of Beyond Skin, this need to complexify and revisit approaches is evident. The first objective of the organisation points to the creation of shared space as a fundamental dimension of building a culture of peace: "to address racism & sectarianism in Northern Ireland through creative process, shared space and platforms". The various projects accessible through the organisation's website make clear that living out this objective involves multiple stakeholders and multiple visions of what 'creative process, shared space and platforms' entail in different communities and/or contexts. These projects leverage music and the arts to engage with a diversity of issues: mental health, education, community relations and youth. In learning about particular projects such as *The Big Lunch Community Walk*, one has the sense of peacebuilding as

relational, something rooted in as opposed to separate from peoples' daily lives (Beyond Skin, N.D.2).

In our conversations, Darren also provided insight into this sense of peacebuilding as complex, creative, emergent and relational. Speaking of space in particular, he notes: "Leading on from examples above we creatively use space in a non-traditional way whenever possible. A space where people can participate in their own way and time but behind the scenes we are gently 'shaking the tree' as we call it" (personal correspondence, June 2019). Affirming the reflections of researchers discussed in this article, he considers the need to situate peacebuilding as both a theory and a practice squarely in the flow and spaces that make up daily life: "We are at our best around food, drink, music, arts and interacting with the natural world. We all know the best conversations are in a cafe, pub, around a meal table or during a walk in a park" (ibid.). These statements resonate with the spaces that Lederach outlines as hubs with the potential to make things 'stick': the places and spaces, imagined and lived, that shape and transform the everyday of our human existence.

The examples and insights that Darren and the organisation he founded provide remind the theorists among us, that in complexifying and revisiting our approaches, we may discover that they are in fact fluid, embedded, emergent, relational and replete with creative tensions. Particular approaches arise out of particular places and are imagined as part of particular spaces. Similar to music, they leverage our beliefs, emotions, identities and memories, to use Robertson's categories (2018). Recognizing the impact of space in the very construction of our theoretical and applied approaches, we are brought back to Small's concept of musicking and the complexity and diversity it affords: "Whatever it is we are doing, we are all doing it together - performers, listeners (should there be any apart from performers), composer (should there be one apart from the performers), dancers, ticket collectors, piano movers, roadies, cleaners and all" (1998, p. 10). As a keyword for music in peacebuilding, it can be said that space can be many things. It can also be posited that space remains a challenge, an open question and an ongoing conversation.

A value of this keyword, and perhaps one of its primary implications, is to invite consideration of paradox as a lens to work with those aspects that support what Darren has called 'non-traditional' uses of space or a 'gentle shaking of the tree'. These aspects include confusion, mystery, risk, and unpredictability, to name a few. While this idea may seem counterintuitive in the context of peacebuilding, it emphasises that reflection and change are not just experiences scholars and/or practitioners ask others to undertake. Discussions of music, space and peace highlight that these experiences are present throughout peacebuilding as a whole, affecting scholars, practitioners and local communities in diverse and meaningful ways.

CONCLUSION: FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

In this article, we have reviewed some of the challenges and debates surrounding the keyword space. We have underscored the importance of examining the concepts and labels we use as theorists and as practitioners. We have also suggested that dialogue between theory and practice remains a significant platform for this examination and that strengthening this dialogue requires a recognition of the ways in which complexity, multiplicity and ambiguity shape our approaches. These arguments help to constitute what has been described herein as a 'paradoxical curiosity': an ability to work with tensions arising from the complexity, multiplicity and ambiguity characterizing interrelationships between music, space and peace.

Explaining the role of 'witnessing' in engagements with violence and music, Jonathan P. Stock reflects: "Making spaces available for the musical utterances of others is only part of the process of witnessing. Witnessing thus behooves us to be there, be silent, listen well, and allow those who now hold the microphone to structure the event" (2018, p. 101). A related implication to emerge from our conversations as a scholar and as a practitioner is the idea of listening to others, including local communities and the musical spaces and experiences which they find meaningful. Listening, as reflected in our own collaboration, is a core competency shaping both theory and practice. It has the potential to 'make peace stick', to use Lederach's turn of phrase, by creating space for reflection and insight between scholars and practitioners, to name one example.

Given what has been articulated throughout this article, perhaps we can return to Lederach's notion of moving beyond and below linear modalities to elaborate on this implication and its use in the field of music in peacebuilding. At a conceptual level, engaging in 'listening' can help scholars identify the ways in which their approaches can shift in new and/or constructive directions. In other words, and as argued in previous sections of the article, in the work to discover where meanings are rooted in the experiences of others, we can also listen to our own senses of safety, risk and uncertainty. How can this listening change our perspectives and/or deepen our theoretical suppositions? How do we create spaces in which to listen in this way? Such questions are also relevant to the sphere of practice. Where are the meanings rooted that affect an individual practitioner's methods? How do these meanings influence building rapport with particular communities? In bringing a paradoxical curiosity to bear on our own approaches and methods, we suggest that scholars and practitioners are not only invited to listen to each other but also to live out Lederach's call to flow beyond and below linear modalities of thought and action.

By doing so, perhaps we can uncover intersections with other keywords such as dialogue (Gottesman, 2018), emotion (Dieckmann and Davidson, 2018) and/or trust (Middleton, 2018). How, for example, would one incorporate a spatial and sonic understanding of dialogue and/or trust into a peacebuilding intervention? Which emotions fuel and/or inhibit the creation of effective spaces for musical exploration of everyday peace? The dissemination of stories and possibilities that can be accessed on the Beyond Skin website suggest a future direction for research where these intersections are concerned: the translation of the ideas discussed to the rapidly changing space of social media. To pose one possible research question: What is the function and import of the keywords mentioned in the creation of virtual spaces? Perhaps Bennett and Rogers' acknowledgement of the ways the presence of particular places 'spills out' into different spaces provides an interesting (re: non-linear) take on this question. As a whole, therefore, the arguments examined herein underscore the necessity of continuing conversations around the keyword 'space'. They also suggest the significance of deepening our understanding of peacebuilding itself as a creative process, allowing for the mystery, messiness and tensions that this will likely entail.

REFERENCES

Becker, K. M. (2017). The Nile Project: Music making for peace in the Nile Basin region. *Music and Arts in Action*, 6(1), pp. 80-98. Available at: https://musicandartsinaction.net/index.php/maia/article/view/146/pdf [Accessed 15 August 2019].

Bennett, A. and Rogers, I. (2016). In the scattered fields of memory: unofficial live music venues, intangible heritage, and the recreation of the musical past. *Space and Culture*, 19(4), pp. 490-501.

Bennett, A. and Rogers, I. (2016). *Popular Music Scenes and Cultural Memory*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Beyond Skin. (N.D.1). Objectives. Available at: https://www.beyondskin.net/objectives [Accessed 6 October 2019].

Beyond Skin. (N.D.2). Blog: An appetite for introductions #thebiglunch. Available at: https://www.beyondskin.net/an-appetite-for-introductions-thebiglunch [Accessed 6 October 2019].

Björkdahl, A. (2013). Urban peacebuilding. *Peacebuilding*, 1(2), pp. 207-221.

Björkdahl, A. and Strömbom, L., eds. (2015). *Divided Cities: Governing Diversity*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.

Björkdahl, A. and Selimovic, J.M. (2016). A tale of three bridges: agency and agonism in peace building. *Third World Quarterly*, 37(2), pp. 321-335.

Björkdahl, A., Höglund, K., Millar, G., van der Lijn, J., and Verkonen, W., eds. (2016). *Peacebuilding and Friction: Global and Local Encounters in Post-Conflict Societies*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Björkdahl, A. and Buckley-Zistel, S., eds. (2016). *Spatializing Peace and Conflict: Mapping the Production of Places, Sites and Scales of Violence*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Björkdahl, A. and Kappler, S. (2017). *Peacebuilding and Spatial Transformation: Peace, Space and Place.* Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Björkdahl, A. (2018). Republika Srpska: imaginary, performance and spatialization. *Political Geography*, 66, pp. 34-43.

Born, G., ed. (2013). *Music, Sound and Space: Transformations of Public and Private Experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buchanan, D.A. (2007). *Performing Democracy: Bulgarian Music and Musicians in Transition.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Boyce-Tillman, J. (2011). Making musical space for peace. In F. Laurence and O. Urbain, eds., *Music and Solidarity: Questions of Universality, Consciousness, and Connection* (Vol. 15). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, pp. 185-201.

Debiel, T., Held, T. and Schneckener, U., eds. (2017). *Peacebuilding in Crisis: Rethinking Paradigms and Practices of Transnational Cooperation.* Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Dieckmann, S., and Davidson, J.W. (2018). Emotions. *Music and Arts in Action*, 6(2), pp. 29-44. Available at: https://musicandartsinaction.net/index.php/maia/article/view/190/173 [Accessed 1 July 2019].

Eisenberg, A. (2015). Space. In D. Novak and M. Sakakeeny, eds., *Keywords in Sound*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Gottesman, S. (2018). Dialogue. *Music and Arts in Action*, 6(2), pp. 16-28. Available at: https://musicandartsinaction.net/index.php/maia/article/view/191/172 [Accessed 1 July 2019].

Harrowell, E. (2018). Towards a spatialized understanding of reconciliation. *Area*, 50(2), pp. 240-247.

Hunter, M. A. (2008). Research article: cultivating the art of safe space. *Research in Drama Education,* 13(1), pp. 5-21.

Kappler, S. (2013). Everyday legitimacy in post-conflict spaces: the creation of social legitimacy in Bosnia-Herzegovina's cultural arenas. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding,* 7(1), pp. 11-28.

Kappler, S. (2015). The dynamic local: delocalisation and (re-)localisation in the search for peacebuilding identity. *Third World Quarterly*, 36(5), pp. 875-889.

Kappler. S. (2017). Sarajevo's ambivalent memoryscape: spatial stories of peace and conflict. *Memory Studies*, 10(2), pp. 130-143.

Komarova, M., and O'Dowd, L. (2016). Belfast, 'the shared city'? Spatial narratives of conflict transformation. In A. Björkdahl and S. Buckley-Zistel, eds., *Spatializing Peace*

and Conflict: Mapping the Production of Places, Sites and Scales of Violence. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 265-285.

Lederach, J.P. (2005). *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lederach, J.P. (2016). Foreword. *Journal of Peace Education*, 13(3), pp. 197-199.

Lederach, J.P. (2020). Music writ large: the potential of music in peacebuilding'. In J. Mitchell, G. Vincett, T. Hawksley, and H. Culbertson, eds., *Peacebuilding and the Arts*. Cham: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 139-156.

Lepp, E. (2018). Division on ice: shared space and civility in Belfast. *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development*, 13(1), pp. 32-45.

Marijan, B. (2017). The politics of everyday peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Northern Ireland. *Peacebuilding*, 5(1), pp. 61-81.

Mazierska, E. and Georgina, G., eds. (2015). *Relocating Popular Music*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

McConnell, F., Megoran, N., and Williams, P., eds. (2014). *Geographies of Peace*. London and New York: I.B. Tauris.

McDowell, S., and Braniff, M., eds. (2014). *Commemoration as Conflict: Space, Memory and Identity in Peace Processes*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Michael, L., Murtagh, B. and Price, L. (2016). Where conflict and peace take place: memorialization, sacralization and post-conflict space. In A. Björkdahl and S. Buckley-Zistel, eds., *Spatializing Peace and Conflict: Mapping the Production of Places, Sites and Scales of Violence*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 221-241.

Middleton, I. (2018). Trust. *Music and Arts in Action*, 6(2): pp. 73-90. Available at: https://musicandartsinaction.net/index.php/maia/article/view/187/176 [Accessed 1 July 2019].

Mitchell, A. and Kelly, L. (2011). Peaceful spaces? "Walking" through the new liminal spaces of peacebuilding and development in North Belfast. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 36(4), pp. 307-325.

Murtagh, B. (2018). Contested Space, Peacebuilding and the Post-conflict City. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 71(2), pp. 438-460.

Mullen, P. (2018). Community music. *Music & Arts in Action*, 6(2), pp. 4-15. Available at: https://musicandartsinaction.net/index.php/maia/article/view/182/171 [Accessed 1 July 2019].

Obert, J.C. (2014). "Shared space": A Belfast soundscape study. *New Hibernia Review*, 18(1), pp. 13-29.

Pruitt, L.J. (2013). *Youth Peacebuilding: Music, Gender, and Change*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Rallings, M.R. (2014). "Shared space" as symbolic capital: Belfast and the "right to the city"? *City*, 18(4-5), pp. 432-439.

Robertson, C. (2016). Musicological ethnography and peacebuilding. *Journal of Peace Education*, 13(3), pp. 252-265.

Robertson, C. (2018). Musical processes as a metaphor for conflict transformation processes. *Music and Arts in Action*, 6(3), pp. 31-46. Available at: https://musicandartsinaction.net/index.php/maia/article/view/178/182 [Accessed 1 July 2019].

Sandoval, E. (2016). Music in peacebuilding: a critical literature review. *Journal of Peace Education*, 13(3), pp. 200-217.

Shimada, L.D. and Johnston, M. (2013). Tracing the troubles through the trees: conflict and peace in the urban forest of Belfast, Northern Ireland. *Journal of War & Culture Studies*, 6(1), pp. 40-57.

Shonge, M.S. (2017). Spinning the web: grassroots human rights work inspired by peacebuilding approaches. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 9(3), pp. 447-456.

Small, C. (1998). *Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Stock, J.P.J. (2018). Violence. *Music and Arts in Action*, 6(2), pp. 91-104. Available at: https://musicandartsinaction.net/index.php/maia/article/view/188/178 [Accessed 1 July 2019].

Urbain, O. (2016). Introduction. Journal of Peace Education, 13(3), pp. 193-196.

Whitehead, B. (2008). We shall overcome: the roles of music in the US civil rights movement. In O. Urbain, ed., *Music and Conflict Transformation: Harmonies and Dissonances in Geopolitics*. London: I.B. Tauris, pp. 78-103.

Whiteley, S., Bennett, A. and Hawkins, S. (2005). Introduction. In S. Whiteley, A. Bennett,

and S. Hawkins, eds., *Music, Space and Place: Popular Music and Cultural Identity*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 1-22.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Lauren Michelle Levesque is an assistant professor in the Providence School of Transformative Leadership and Spirituality at Saint Paul University, Ottawa, Canada. Her doctoral research explored the dynamics of contemporary protest music performances and their capacity to reimagine socially engaged spiritualities in the context of the 'War on Terror'. She is a co-editor of the 2016 volume *Advancing Nonviolence and Social Transformation: New Perspective on Nonviolent Theories*, published with Equinox Press, UK. Her current research interests include engaged scholarship, spatial approaches to local peacebuilding, and nonviolent social change.

Darren Ferguson is a musician, community worker and peace activist born in Belfast. Involved in local community work and development aid work in Gambia and Romania in his teens, Darren went on to set up the organisation Beyond Skin (www.beyondskin.net) in 2004 with an aim to enable the arts to address racism and sectarianism. Through Beyond Skin, Darren has developed many innovative intercultural peace projects with partners locally and abroad with flagship programmes in Colombia, Sri Lanka and, most recently, in Japan.