

Transforming Complex Contemporary Challenges Through Arts and Culture¹

Polly Walker

Bookend Seminar, January 22, 2019

Polly Walker is Director of the Baker Institute for Peace and Conflict Studies and the Elizabeth Evans Baker Professor of Peace and Conflict Studies at Juniata College.

I begin by acknowledging that we are meeting on the lands of the Oneida Nation, the Onyata A Ka, people of the Standing Stone, who had a village here at the time of colonization. Today, I am going to present what I consider to be a work in progress. I want you to see where we are, what we think we have contributed, and what we are grappling with. This project is called Imagining Together Platform for Arts, Culture, and Conflict Transformation (IMPACT), which focuses on transforming complex contemporary challenges through arts and culture. This initiative is funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation in partnership with Brandeis University's Peacebuilding and the Arts program, the Baker Institute for Peace and Conflict Studies at Juniata, and Maseno University in Kisumu, Kenya. IMPACT is an emerging platform designed to support the arts, culture, and conflict-transformation (*acct*) ecosystem. We are working to strengthen the contribution of arts and culture to creatively address complex, contemporary challenges. We acknowledge our efforts to exist in relationship with the lands where we live and work, other players in the ecosystem, and those in other fields, for example, human rights, sustainable development, cultural heritage, and indigenous knowledge, public policy, and education.

Although the Mellon Foundation funded us to design a global infrastructure for arts, culture, and conflict transformation, we have actually found that the process itself has begun to strengthen the infrastructure, or the ecosystem, itself. I see this as a parallel, or maybe a two-layered, process: one is building this infrastructure and supporting it, drawing on our current resources, passions, and creativity, and the other one is a fully fleshed-out idea of what a global infrastructure might look like and the kind of funding it needs. Thus, we are devoting our time, energy, and resources to doing what we can, and we are working collaboratively with funders to fund it in a way that makes it effective and sustainable.

I will start with an illustrative arts example. What we are doing is not just creating a dry list of research and what we have accomplished but showing, rather, why we are doing what we are doing. Consider the Afghanistan National Institute of Music, to which we will return at the end of the presentation. Imagine the sounds of Afghan, North-Indian, and Western classical instruments mixing in the air, originating from the collaborative creativity of girls and boys from a range of ethnic, religious,

and socioeconomic backgrounds. To have boys and girls and young men and young women from a range of different ethnic backgrounds working together, which was not previously allowed in Afghanistan, is quite a feat in an environment rife with destruction from decades of war. This Institute of Music impacts individuals and communities in many ways: by training future music educators, providing economic opportunities for music professionals, mending continuing divisions of society through creating relationships between these young musicians and their audiences, reviving and preserving Afghan musical cultures, and affirming people's right to practice their culture.

Another example of the kinds of work and networks with which we are involved is a project in which women share salt and bread across the closed Turkish-Armenian border. This border mirrors distrust between these two nations, and the phrase “sharing salt and bread” references hospitality and friendship in both languages. These connections around traditional food culture sparked a project in 2015 that linked women across the border to sing, dance, talk, eat, and share meals together. Despite a longstanding divide related to the 1915 genocide of 1.5 million Armenians by the Ottoman Empire, which the international community recognizes and the Turkish government denies, women at the center of this initiative listened and heard one another, with many shifting their internal narratives around what they thought about those women on the other side. Most of the women in this group have no connection to civil-society organizations, and they are mostly left out of official reconciliation efforts. However, with hearts and minds opened through this salt-and-bread process, they now have the potential to break down suspicion and resentment among their family members and communities, an important step in societies coming to terms with their pasts and their current disputes and building their agency to link with civil society. We have looked at hundreds of these kinds of examples, and I will share some of the research findings of that shortly.

When I talk about the phrase “*acct* ecosystem,” what do I mean? At a gathering here at Juniata three summers ago, we created this terminology. We convened about thirty leaders, including arts policymakers, arts funders, artists, and scholars of arts and conflict transformation for a three-day meeting to think about how we could enhance the *acct* field. We realized that one of our major problems was that we work in silos even though we are all dependent on one another. Funders are dependent on the good work done by the artists, artists depend on the funders giving them enough money to create the kinds of works that are effective and sustainable, and policy makers are dependent on all of these to help shift the conflicts in the region. After that gathering, we began to talk about ourselves as an ecosystem including all of these parts.

Drawing on the research that we have been doing together and around the world since 2006, we think we can make very strong claims that cultural heritage, cultural practices, and the arts are resources for marshaling attention to urgent concerns, addressing conflicts, reconciling former enemies or

opponents, resisting oppression, and memorializing past atrocities in ways that don't retraumatize but instead support the never-again stance. We also think the arts, cultural heritage, and cultural practices are resources for imagining and giving substance to a more vibrant, less violent, and peaceful future that better respects human rights. Aesthetic and cultural practices reveal our values and our ethical commitments. They enrich our learning by linking thoughts to senses and emotions, and they invite us to make meaning by reflecting on and experimenting with complex ideas. IMPACT is devoted to strengthening the contributions of arts and culture and to the creative transformation of conflict. IMPACT puts ethical considerations at the center in all its work, precisely because we know that aesthetic power has already done a great deal of harm around the world, intentionally and unintentionally, as well as contributed to the transformation of conflict. It can continue to do both.

In working with Mellon and other funders and policy makers, we want to make it clear that we are not focused on some high, idealistic context. Rather, our work is focused on addressing the challenges that we see around us. The arts are particularly well placed for that. Policy makers, practitioners, and educators from diverse fields have started to recognize the full, interwoven range of effects of art in transforming the legacies of colonialism, racism, capitalism, and patriarchy. For those in the arts, culture, and conflict transformation ecosystem, this work also reveals opportunities, such as experimenting with solutions to these complex challenges “across disciplines, cultures, regions, worldviews, and modes of communication.”² We call these “collaborations of integrity” because, in them, we reach both across different disciplines and from different cultural backgrounds.

We have also worked to support such collaborations in increasingly inclusive ways through strategic and ethical use of communication technologies. We know that social media and the internet in some ways have disrupted relationship building, but they have also proven to be powerful tools for building this global coalition we have been working on. We recognize the need for a global civil society to hold leaders accountable and to reaffirm the values that sustain justice and peace. The arts, in particular, can contribute to strengthening civil society and their endeavors towards justice.

How do the arts strategically target these challenges? The *acct* field brings together particular ways of fostering creativity, empathy, and invitations to consider multiple perspectives when addressing today's challenges, for example, by seeking local sources of strength, meaning, and resilience. It is very important not to bring in people from the outside to do this. As we know from working within our own society, it is not easy to support people and communities facing difficult truths or embracing paradoxes such as discipline and freedom, tradition and innovation, and honoring memory while also imagining a shared future with past opponents.

We feel that the *acct* approach is effective in addressing these conflicts by inviting exploration of future possibilities and by encouraging and empathizing with the other. Empathizing is not an acceptance

of injustice or an acceptance of wrong done. Empathizing regarding the complexity of the issues and with the humanity of the people involved may very well be linked to retributive justice initiatives in some cases, but it is handled very differently when there is an empathy for what people have undergone to arrive at the places where they committed those violent acts. We also focus on engaging respectfully with multiple knowledge systems. We believe very strongly in this; it is written into our ethics, yet I can tell you that it is not as easy to practice as it is to espouse.

We think the *acct* initiatives can, and are often crafted to, draw attention to issues that might otherwise be too painful to bear. Sometimes with issues that have been very traumatic, people can sit in a performance or listen to music or see visual art in ways that allow them to access those harms and to begin to deal with the wounds of that violence. *Acct* initiatives can also be crafted to mobilize and animate resistance to human rights abuses and to facilitate communication across differences, even without a shared language (I think that is one of the strengths of the arts). A performance, a dance, visual arts, or music do not always necessarily require understanding the language to fully understand what is being addressed. Some arts pieces require no language at all.

We also feel that these endeavors support mourning and trauma healing in ways that revitalize peoples: not focusing just on individual healing but also on social healing and how that healing builds agency for people to continue to work in civil society to address injustices. How do we work toward building relationships of trust in the aftermath of violence? Prof. Celia Cook-Huffman and Juniata students just returned from Rwanda, where they had to consider this concept of how you rebuild enough trust to even start processes of reconciliation. The arts can play an important role in that.

I'm going to share with you now the trajectory of IMPACT. We have done so much over the last eighteen months, and I would like for you to understand the breadth of our work.

We began in September 2017 with meetings of our executive and steering committees. Those members come from different geographic regions in the world and different fields: some funders, some policy makers, numerous scholars, and many artists. We tried to make the committees representative of a range of diversity so that when we started this design, it was not just one more hegemonic plan from the West. We try to be very aware in our leadership meetings that the field of conflict resolution is commonly criticized for being too Westernized, too focused on purporting to save or help other societies.

At that time, we also started and have been continuing conversations with thought leaders, reaching out to forty high-level leaders around the world, whether they are scholars of conflict transformation or, for example, the head of the Salzburg Institute in Austria: people who have been thinking deeply about how to support conflict transformation and about how to do that in an artful, aesthetic way. Starting in December 2018, we have completed quite a number of interviews and online research projects. Several research teams connected with 168 entities around the world: cultural

institutions, universities, funding institutions, networks, art collectives, artists, and peace-building institutions from seven continents.

Between April and June 2018, we carried out three different learning exchanges. One was an in-person exchange in Washington DC with people working on monitoring and evaluation, in which we had both grassroots-level organizations and people working at national and international levels. We had representatives from the State Department, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the United States Institute of Peace trying to address what I think is one of the most problematic areas in the field: how do we evaluate arts-based, conflict transformation work in ways that are compelling to funders and policymakers but that don't skew what people living in the midst of that conflict know about what needs to happen to transform the conflict? Quite often, the funders and policy makers present a package in which the timeline is too short for effective work to be done, or they want measurement done in a way that people feel drastically changes the intent of that work.

After that exchange, we had what I think was a rather bold experiment. We had two online learning exchanges, each lasting two days. We had facilitators in different regions around the world so that wherever you were, you did not have to wake up in the middle of the night to respond to the questions in this online learning exchange. There would be a facilitator on hand to help keep the conversation going and to make comments on people's reflections. One exchange was primarily for people who identify as artists working in this field and leaders of art institutions. The other was primarily for people like myself, people considered scholars in this field, primarily from justice, conflict transformation, and peacebuilding. Those exchanges took place between June and August 2018. Again, we had representatives from different geographical regions around the world and reached out, sometimes in person, to many organizations in a range of countries.

Although we are still reviewing the data and continuing to refine our synthesis of what we have done, we have an initial understanding. In September 2018, we drew findings from all of this data to create a design lab. Twenty-six people who have had a lot of influence in this field from eighteen different countries, including South Africa, Austria, and Australia, gathered at Brandeis University to draw from their knowledge, expertise, and wisdom and participate in this design lab through a systems-theory lens. We know that we are looking at a complex issue. How do you support an infrastructure that reaches around the globe, given all the different languages, social and political contexts, cultures, and moral views? How do you provide some support but, again, not do that in a way that is neo-colonial or hegemonic?

Using this design, we all worked in different groups, looking at the issue through a complexity-theory lens. If issues we were facing were only complex, that means that someone else somewhere in the world may have figured out how to deal with similar problems and we could then look to those people,

institutions, theories, and frameworks. When we were looking at something that had not been done before, we needed to go about the planning through a complexity lens, and it meant building a process that was flexible and fluid, that built in a lot of experiments. We have to take the risk of experimenting. We cannot just rely on best practices because some of these practices do not yet exist. Therefore, we had two facilitators from MC Arts work through a systems-theory lens, and at the end of this design lab, we had the creation of a proposed IMPACT structure. We very clearly saw that there is a structure we wanted and that we needed quite a bit of money to fully fund it. We also saw that we already have people willing to support such a structure, so we will do what we can with the resources that we already have.

Here are the key learnings from all the research and data gathering. We have now designed an infrastructure for strengthening the field. We are recommending a multifaceted platform that incorporates aspects of our initial vision but that is augmented by what we have learned from the activities and conversations from our first twelve months. Some elements of this platform are already activated, some are aspirational, and some have been planned and are seeking funding. Obviously, there are many more learnings, but what follows are the key patterns that we saw repeating, independent of which body of data we were analyzing.

One finding is that the *acct* ecosystem is vast. Therefore, an infrastructure to support the field must be multifaceted and have the capacity to accommodate diverse initiatives that arise from and meet the needs of players in different regions of the world who are engaging different art forms, embodying different theories of change, and working in different institutional and community contexts as practitioners, researchers, policy makers, and funders. We realize that the platforms must create opportunities for open exchange, both face-to-face and virtually, given the reach of the network. We need to provide opportunities for exploration of difference, accountability to ethical standards, and collaboration. Several important networks already exist, and we do not intend to supplant these networks but to find ways to link them more globally. For example, one of the most exemplary networks we looked at is called The Hemispheric Institute that has a network of people working in arts and conflict transformation across the global North and the global South. We want to find ways to link with those networks and extend their reach.

The second finding is that the field already enjoys many strengths, and it is animated by the knowledge deriving from diverse sources. These include embodied practices, wisdom, aesthetic and ethical sensibilities from indigenous and other traditional cultures, artistic practices, related bodies of theory in multiple genres and forms, and frameworks arising from numerous scholarly disciplines and policy fields.

Although initiatives to document and assess the activities of this field are limited in comparison to the volume of work that is being done, there are some important books, articles, and films that have

been produced in recent decades. Several institutions in the global North cultivate and link leaders from different parts of the world, and programs and courses related to *acct* are hosted at a modest number of academic institutions, including Juniata College.

A third key learning is that there remain important obstacles to artistic and cultural initiatives reaching their full potential to contribute to the transformation of conflict. We have created a document called “The Emerging Story” that highlights these obstacles, but two stand out on a regular basis.³ One obstacle is the fissures across power divides that limit trust, and the second is the lack of sufficient resources to undertake sustained initiatives. Since we started meeting around the world with different individuals and institutions in 2006, we see time and time again that the people in one area are not aware of other work being done or that the work they are doing is not known, so we need something that helps sustain those initiatives.

The fourth main research finding is that the effectiveness of the *acct* field is limited by important needs. How do we provide sustained attention to questions of ethics, grapple with them, and make our work more rigorous? Another need is strategic communication and advocacy. We quite often advocate for ourselves, but we need more powerful voices to advocate for the field. Again, we need opportunities for sustained exchange across regions that are not created by happenstance. We need to know where we can go to access information to start these conversations. We needed evaluation protocols to help make our work more rigorous and more effective. It is not enough to just claim that we have built peace or that we have transformed conflict. We have some initial protocols, but we need to work with people around the world so that we have a multiplicity of processes that are appropriate for different contexts.

The fifth learning is that the *acct* field is emerging differently in different regions of the world, and we need to respect that. One of the paradoxical issues we have grappled with is how we build a global infrastructure and yet allow for self-determination and self-organization. It is not that we would try to disallow it, but how do we keep from hindering it unintentionally? Some examples of the range of different ways that we see this being enacted are first that South America enjoys a highly developed arts and social transformation network with expertise in implementing cultural policy at municipal and national levels. Second, western Europe benefits from cultural policies that acknowledge the pro-social contributions of community arts and enjoys substantial funding from national governments, the European Union, and numerous foundations. Third, countries of the Balkans do not generally enjoy the same level of benefits. Fourth, initiatives in southeast and west Africa have developed culturally sensitive, creative approaches to reconciliation and the aftermath of mass violence. Given this diversity of contexts and experiences, IMPACT intends to develop a more robust analysis of regional strengths and needs.

The sixth learning, as I've mentioned already, is that just coming together to work on this for eighteen months has actually strengthened the ecosystem. There are a number of people taking responsibility for different aspects of the field.

The seventh key learning is that theories related to complexity theory, complex problems, and systems thinking can be useful to IMPACT as we articulate our own theory of change. We have drawn extensively on systems thinking and on emergence theory. For example, emergence theory relates well both to what we see happening currently and to what we would like to facilitate. It describes three stages of network-based trajectories: First is the development of networks in which people find likeminded others and organize themselves, both for self-interest and to improve their work. In the past, we have seen this emerge all around the world but without very many connections to sustain it. Second is the development of communities of practice where people organize themselves into groups to share common work, provide mutual support, and share new practices. I think that is where we are now. Third is the emergence of systems of influence, where practices developed by communities become a norm and inform policy and strategies. Through the different groups that we are working with, we are strengthening the field where it does have emergent systems that engage with governments, policymakers, and others.

Where are we going from here? This presentation is a just a peek into our design, what we are doing now, and what we aspire to do. The executive committee consists of Cynthia Cohen from Brandeis University; Kitche Magak from Maseno University in Kisumu, Kenya; Lee Perlman from Tel Aviv University, in Israel; and myself. We have also formed a leadership circle that includes members from a coordination and strategy team, working groups, a virtual learning exchange team, a regional hub team, an advocacy team, and an ethics team. Because we are looking at the work through a systems theory lens, we are calling this work experiments. We want to see how they are going to work. Part of our attention has to be on where they are effective and where they are not. How do we shift and change as we need to?

The first initiative is the ethics team. Because someone on this team fell ill, I am now deeply immersed in this team. What we have completed is a survey of the ethical principles of related organizations and initiatives. We have asked what other people in this ecosystem are doing and how are they articulating those ethical principles. Currently, we are working very intensely on developing IMPACT discourse principles that address how such principles might be put into practice and what action steps build on them. Thus far, we have only clearly articulated about four principles, and, as the rest of the members of the group join, we have planned the development of practical tools based on discourse principles, a testing of these discourse principles across the network, a refinement of them after that testing, and then the development of these principles in ways that we could share with governments, policy makers, and funders.

I want to share a story from practice. When we were at the design lab at Brandeis with people from all around the world, we were intending to live up to these ethical principles about not being neocolonial or hegemonic while expecting differences. Unfortunately, I was implicated in our failure to live up to our principles. I was working with a colleague who is a storyteller, is head of a storytelling foundation, and does really interesting work around the world. We were asked to find a creative way for people to introduce themselves and to introduce their work and not just go around the room. We had a whole story process worked out, and we asked the facilitators of the whole design lab whether we could have more time if we needed it to allow someone to tell their story. The answer was, “No, you still have to stick strictly to the schedule.”

We started the design lab session with people telling their stories. Some people actually disappeared outside to create their approach, and we had a hard time getting them back in. We asked participants to start telling their stories even though everyone was not yet back. People from a range of different worldviews and cultures found it very violent (that was the word they used) that they were not given the time and space needed to tell their stories the way that they wanted. We saw that, in this diverse group of participants, to restrict participants to introducing themselves in the little boxes of a fairly tightly controlled workshop did violence to many people and their ways of knowing. It was a very structured experience, with the stories told in English under great time pressure because the facilitator had refused to extend time, which upset people from a range of cultures. Even with our best intentions, we really blew that one.

What we had created did not work as well as it would have if it had happened as introductions, but, working with the facilitators, we created another space the next day so people could introduce themselves the way they wanted. What happened did not look anything like what had been set up. People spoke in their own languages, and they quite often did not translate. Some people spoke in their own language, and then they translated it for others. Other people would say, “Okay, there is a song that goes with this,” or “There's a drum that goes with this.” We included and espoused principles of epistemological pluralism, admitting that, in the first round of introductions, we did not live out our principles very well. We need to be quite careful, and, in the future, I will push back harder about differences in time cosmologies, one of the discourse principles we are looking at. When we have people coming from time cosmologies that are cyclical or in which past, present, and future coexist, you need to take the right time to address the issues that arise. Because such cosmologies quite often conflict with Western time cosmologies, which tend to be time-urgent and measured by clock and calendar, we need to find ways to deal with these differences. Writing down a list of ethics is not the same thing as living them.

One of our most active teams is our advocacy team, which is working to reach high-level advocates around the world who can make a difference in this work. We have planned for a gathering of

policymakers at the Salzburg Institute in Austria for funders of major art-space funding organizations in 2019. I argued that it needs to be at Juniata, but other people do not think that being in the middle of the Allegheny mountains is a great idea and say it should be in Washington DC or New York. However that plays out, we are going to bring thought leaders together.

How can we build an advocacy approach that survives? How do we acknowledge their expertise and build a really powerful team? We are going to bring those people together either in June or in the fall. At that gathering, we will develop and begin to implement strategies. Four or five funders are already quite interested in working very collaboratively with us to help organize this gathering to build an advocacy team.

The other aspect of IMPACT is the virtual learning exchange. I mentioned those two global online learning exchanges that we had were very popular among the people who participated. They said they had never had this opportunity to learn from others in the field and that they had learned so much. Some wanted to hear what really works for us and what we are really facing. So, we have a team now that has funding to do six more days of learning exchanges this year. That funding came from the Max and Sunny Howard Memorial Foundation through Brandeis University. In March, we are going to have a learning exchange in Spanish on the *acct* field. In April, we will have a learning exchange about the role of universities and colleges in supporting IMPACT. In May and June, we will have two more online learning exchanges, but we have not actually picked the topics. Under discussion now is how we create opportunities and resources so that these online learning exchanges can go on. It costs about \$8,500 for six days of learning exchanges, and we have the funding, which is money very well spent. Although the exchanges are not expensive, if we want to continue to offer these learning exchanges and to document the knowledge that we see arising from them, we must find ongoing funding.

We also have an experiment with a regional hub team. As we have talked about the differences around the world in context, culture, and worldviews, we know we cannot just have a central hub in North America that will adequately continue progress on this work. We have teams all across the world already building these regional hubs. We have some already in place and some that are aspirational. We have planned a one-day meeting about a Southeast Asia regional hub during the Mindanao Peacebuilding Institute and their annual training in Davao City, Philippines, in May. In the Middle East and North Africa region, we will have a gathering of academics and practitioners at the Cypress Regional Center for *acct* in June or July to discuss the possibility of a regional hub there. Again, these are experiments, and we have to find sustainable funding. Then, under discussion but not yet fully funded, is a regional hub in the Balkans region, for which Dijana Milošević is taking the lead. They are looking towards a 2020 convening of artists, cultural workers, and activists from countries that were part of the former Yugoslavia. In the South Africa region, we have the development of a Center for Arts and Politics in

Johannesburg. In the South Asia region, we are working on connecting to activists, artists, and research organizations and with a university in Lahore, Pakistan, all of which are already deeply engaged in *acct*. They are working to jumpstart a dialogue about a regional hub. In the Caucasus region, we have a group doing a mapping exercise throughout the area to identify players because we lack information from that region. We are also looking at convenings in East Africa, South America, and East Asia.

I have been working with Kristin Parker, the head of a cultural heritage organization, who wants to start looking at what happens when her organization goes in after a conflict during which they had worked to protect cultural heritage or after which they had worked to repair cultural heritage. She noted that, while they know about their own discipline, they do not know enough about conflict transformation. They want to work with IMPACT to learn more about conflict transformation because they are right in the middle of it. They do not want to make things worse and want to help transform conflict in the direction of a just peace. Parker is focused now on training cultural heritage professionals on conflict transformation in Syria and Iraq, where they are working to protect cultural heritage. Some ask, “What’s the relationship between cultural heritage and this field?” Parker says, “We see cultural heritage as a touchstone for people who’ve lost their bearings based on either violent conflict or a natural disaster, and coming back to their cultural heritage can help them find their way forward into rebuilding.” Cynthia Cohen is editing an issue of the *International Journal of Transitional Justice* focused on the arts and culture; many of us are contributing chapters. I will contribute a chapter on the role of arts in cognitive justice.

We also intend to curate and disseminate an annotated list of existing core materials. If we had a virtual resource center where people could reach those materials for little or no cost, that would really strengthen this field. It is probably not that hard to imagine that you might be working with someone who does not know what is already available. For example, I was in Stockholm, where I met an artist from Uganda. That person did not know about the books and the documentary that we have put together on peacebuilding performance. This was not surprising. I was, however, stunned when Emily Welty, part of the Nobel Peace Prize winning International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons who spoke at Juniata College, said, “Until you spoke at the Peace and Justice Studies Association, I had no idea those resources existed.” Part of that is because we are not conceptualized as a field by many people and because so many endeavors, some of which are excellent and have achieved a lot are taking place with very little communication. Those are some of the issues we are addressing in the working groups.

One of the documents that came out of the United Nations last year cited some of our work about how the arts are crucial to fuller measures of human rights, considering the transformative potential for arts and culture. We think it lies in the nature of the aesthetic experience, which links our cognitive faculties and intellectual analysis with our sensory experiences and our emotions, thereby creating

platforms rich in potential for learning, reflection, experimentation, and embracing complexity. Violence affects more than our intellects or our policies. It affects our bodies, our emotions, our senses. We need to respond in those much fuller and multiple sensory ways through the arts. Artistic and cultural practices can offer experiences of noncoercive, constructive meaning-making and empowerment that can be crafted to the creative transformation of conflict and the enjoyment of basic human rights.

In closing, let us return to Afghanistan. In a few days, I will be teleconferencing with a teacher from the Afghanistan Institute of Music. She didn't come to me through the IMPACT network (another example emphasizing how much we need to build an infrastructure for the field). The teacher found me because of my TEDx talk here at Juniata. She said, "I didn't know anybody was doing any work on justice in music or on music and conflict transformation until I saw your TEDx talk. Can you tell me about this?" I was so impressed with the work at this Institute that I'm going to share with you just an exemplary musical performance. It was particularly meaningful to me because of my relationship with one of the conflict zone alumnae from Juniata. I remember vividly the day she came to me, devastated because one of her best friends had been murdered in front of her mother because she was educated and because she was supporting the education of young women. The Afghanistan Institute of Music addresses such violence through integrated ensembles and music that directly address the rights and aspirations of young women in Afghanistan. See this ensemble's work in their "Girl Child Song" at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AKJueNp4rHg>.

NOTES

1. A great deal of the material in this presentation is drawn from the interim IMPACT report: Armine Avetisyan, Cynthia Cohen, Emily Forsyth Queen, and Toni Shapiro-Phim, "Transforming Complex Contemporary Challenges through Arts and Culture: An Emerging Platform to Strengthen the Arts, Culture and Conflict Transformation Ecosystem." *IMPACT: Imagining Together Platform for Arts, Culture and Conflict Transformation*, Brandeis.edu, January 25, 2019, <https://www.brandeis.edu/ethics/peacebuildingarts/impact/index.html> (accessed June 10, 2020).
2. Ibid.
3. Armine Avetisyan, Cynthia Cohen, Emily Forsyth Queen, Toni Shapiro-Phim, LaShawn Simmons, and Polly Walker, "The Arts, Culture and Conflict Transformation Field: Summarizing IMPACT Research through an Emerging Story." *IMPACT Design Lab*, Brandeis.edu, August 2018, https://www.brandeis.edu/ethics/peacebuildingarts/images/impact/2018_08_20-impact-emerging-story-final.pdf (accessed June 10, 2020).