



Tagungsbericht

Proposal Development
for a Network Local Ordering
and Peace

Hamburg, 29. - 30. April 2022

by Anna Kreikemeyer

Project Number
TG 07/19 - WAT 02/20-
2019



Report on the Workshops

Studying Everyday Order and Peace from the Ground Up:

An Interregional and Interdisciplinary Dialogue on Peace Formation in Central Eurasia

8/9 October 2020 (online)

and

Proposal Development for a Network Local Ordering and Peace

29/30 April 2022 at IFSH Hamburg

by Anna Kreikemeyer

Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy

at the University of Hamburg (IFSH)

Dr. Anna Kreikemeyer

IFSH

Beim Schlump 83

D-20144 Hamburg

T. 0049-40-86607767

F. 0049-40-86607788

E-Mail: kreikemeyer@ifsh.de

www.ifsh.de

Table of contents

	Summary	3
1	Online Workshop: “Studying Everyday Order and Peace from the Ground Up: An Interregional and Interdisciplinary Dialogue on Peace Formation in Central Eurasia”	4
2	On-site Workshop: “Proposal Development for a Network Local Ordering and Peace”	12
3	Exploitation of Results	20

Annexes

(in separate files)

Annex 1	Online Workshop: Summary, program, instructions, guiding questions, participants and contributions
Annex 2	On-site Workshop: Preparatory Reader

Summary

On October 8-9, 2020, the international workshop *Studying Everyday Order and Peace from the Ground up. An Inter-regional and Interdisciplinary Dialogue on Peace Formation in Central Eurasia*, sponsored by the German Foundation for Peace Research (DSF), took place online due to the Corona pandemic. As a follow-up, the participants decided to form the informal network “Local Ordering and Peace” and continued discussions and met in six online-meetings. On 29-30 April 2022, network member Anna Kreikemeyer organized an on-site workshop at IFSH Hamburg for a joint development of a network proposal at DSF.

The 2020 online-workshop focused on whether, how, and to what extent communal actors and institutions engage in local ordering(s), conflict settlement, and peace formation in Central Eurasia. It also examined how broader knowledge of local ordering can advance the post-liberal debate on peace-building. While the participants confirmed the relevance of local ordering in many parts of the Central Eurasian region, they saw peace research gaps on regional understandings of peaceful ordering, on practices of conflict containment, on state–society relations, on normative ambivalences, and on the effects of mobility (see report at <https://bundesstiftung-friedensforschung.de/blog/studying-everyday-order-and-peace-from-the-ground-up/>).

The hybrid on-site workshop on 29/30 April 2022 brought together 15 participants from the informal network to jointly work on a planned proposal for a research network. In five plenary sessions and in nine break out groups the participants discussed the rationale, the originality, the aims, the state of research, the concept, structures, procedures and expected results of the planned network. After a final discussion they elaborated on the communication via the IFSH cloud and a corresponding road-map.

1 Online Workshop:
“Studying Everyday Order and Peace from the Ground Up: An Inter-regional and Interdisciplinary Dialogue on Peace Formation in Central Eurasia”

Aims and Objectives. This workshop aimed at examining whether, how, and to what extent communal actors and institutions engage in local ordering(s), conflict settlement, and peace formation. Answers to these questions help fill research gaps on societal peace in customary and illiberal contexts in post-Soviet Central Eurasia. They may also advance the post-liberal debate on ‘the local’ in peacebuilding.

In relation to the state of the research, the workshop had several objectives. First, it aimed to complement predominant state-oriented and securitized IR perspectives with studies on societal conflict, ordering, and peace. Second, it sought to overcome blind spots on local agency and local capacities for peace that have affected post-liberal debates. Third, it aimed to strengthen interdisciplinary peace studies by integrating social anthropological and ethnographic knowledge on culture and customary orders in the study of everyday conflict settlement. Fourth, it was intended to foster interregional dialogue between European and Central Eurasian scholars.

Summary of Panel Contributions and Discussions. The workshop was divided into four sections. Following an introductory section, a regional and empirically oriented panel with experts from Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan presented views and findings on different aspects of communal ordering. A round table focused on conceptual and methodological approaches to societal peace formation, and a third panel took the form of an interregional dialogue.

Panel 1 followed the shift from looking at the causes of violence to looking at the causes of peace in Central Eurasia. From their regional ethnographic expertise, all speakers confirmed the existence of local actors and institutions who contribute to everyday peaceful ordering by presenting findings on local culture, traditional institutions, collective identities, the role of women, and enabling elements of peaceful ordering.

In multi-ethnic Georgia, local traditional institutions (i.e. courts of elders in the Pankisi Valley) play an important role in mediating conflict. In local networks (kinship, education, business, etc.), people support each other even in conflict situations (Jalabadze). In the Khatlon Province of Tajikistan, collective identities (kinship, religion) appear ambivalent (Boboyorov). On the one hand, they determine everyday ordering; on the other, they ensure an unbalanced allocation of power and resources. Local institutions foster a sense of identity; at the same time, they maintain a social order that protects elites, contains conflicts, avoids public court trails, and even legitimates repression (i.e. unpaid child labor on cotton farms).

Peaceful local ordering is possible in some places but not in others. In South Kyrgyzstan, some cities faced a similar risk of conflict during the 2010 unrest, although some managed to avoid violence. This is due to structural and spatial differences. The size of cities, their demographic profile, social heterogeneity, and rural or urban character appear to be relevant to differences in social interaction. With that said, the role of individuals – their motivations and relationalities – matter as well (Khamidov).

The role of women in local ordering is likewise ostensibly ambivalent. Informal women leaders in South Kyrgyzstan follow the customary model of the patriarchal family. They accept gender roles, working behind the scenes and making use of relationality to influence social outcomes to their benefit (“bargaining with patriarchy”, Kandiyoti 1988). These women view themselves not as suppressed but as empowered by their age and socially accepted role in the larger kin group. Nevertheless, inter-generational conflicts are visible on the horizon (Ismailbekova).

More generally, overly narrow interpretations of phenomena (e.g. regarding local customary orders such as gendered or collective identities as a source of suppression) may be misleading. In Tajikistan, many women perceive their work in cotton fields as dignified and as a chance to gain respect and increase their status in society. Self-esteem is important in this context (as it is everywhere), and many build self-esteem by taking pride in their work, which serves as a way of coping with conflict. Interveners who aim to support local actors do not have to agree with local orders, but they should recognize that local perspectives can be very effective in solving conflict (Kluczevska).

Panel 2 was devoted to interdisciplinary perspectives on local ordering. Ethnographic Peace Research proceeds from the assumption that culture constitutes a substrate of every society, a structure on which both conflict and peace are built and that only changes over generations. Systems are more likely to survive where culture is salient to local people. Culture can become a resource for peace, allowing for a deeper understanding of which homegrown solutions are possible when the state is absent. An interdisciplinary approach combining critical peace studies, anthropology, and globalized sociological perspectives could help to overcome blind spots in the post-liberal debate on peacebuilding (Millar, Lewis).

From a more practical peacebuilding perspective, a transition from local ownership to local experiences, local agency, and local peace communities (zones of peace) brings the needs of local communities more clearly to the fore. Here the relevant questions are: Why are some people better than others at maintaining their agency? How is agency organizationally designed? How do peace zones govern themselves? Why are local communities independent of international funding despite having almost no resources of their own (Hancock)?

Local systems of peace may become increasingly accepted as essential to building peace. However, as bottom-up approaches tend to be ignored when ordering becomes hegemonic, issues of power at the local level must be given greater attention. All too often, geopolitics trumps the local, the state is no longer connected to peace architectures, and local frameworks are not representative of those parts of the conflict-affected society they are trying to address. While we tend to assume that the subject is trapped, we need to take a trans-hierarchical perspective, draw broader boundaries, and think in terms of mobility and peace networks (Richmond).

With that said, the regional context should not be underestimated. In Central Eurasia, ordering is localized, hierarchical, hegemonic, and state-centric. Peace is often achieved by powerful local leaders who have the authority to stop the violence if they want to. Here, bottom-up approaches are rarely successful. However, it is useful to understand how the redistribution of resources allows for or reduces new forms of order. It is important to rethink the scales, to put primary emphasis on the state (which can be both the problem and the solution), and to take complexity into account (Lewis).

Last but not least, mobility has repercussions for local ordering. The concept of trans-locality allows us to capture the co-constitution and relatedness of different localities. Studies on local peace must integrate heterogeneity, multiplexity, fluidity and figurations, the relatedness of social and material forces and of different localities, the simultaneity of staying and moving, and questions of imaginaries of the state. Ethnographic studies of local everyday conflict and ordering in view of urban migration in Kyrgyzstan, for example, allow for the study of cosmopolitan versus non-cosmopolitan world views, changes to lifelines, and stratifications (Schröder).

In summary, although the debate has focused on local order for some time, open questions remain: How does local order play out? What are the conditions under which people push for change? What happens when geopolitical actors interfere in local orders? How can we better distinguish between local everyday life and actual peace activism? How can we scale up local initiatives and strengthen collaborative research with peace workers (Lottholz)?

Panel 3 focused on an inter-regional dialogue among participants from Europe and Central Eurasia. Perspectives on intersectionality (the study of discrimination within discrimination) and questions of inclusive peace processes appeared unfamiliar to Central Eurasian participants. Agency in this regional culture is not necessarily visible or loud, but silence can be political as well, and it is important to ask what happens in contexts of silence. Interveners are known for having the power to empower. From a critical perspective, this kind of empowerment can be seen as a violent process in itself (Lazic). On the ground, the local population adapts to efforts in empowerment by double talk and by performance, while in everyday life these views are not really applied (Ismailbekova).

Social anthropology is helpful for understanding such practices as it is interested in exploring how local people make sense of conflict situations that they have come to perceive as normal. To deal with everyday situations, people view normality as subjective. They do not necessarily perceive themselves as victims of conflict as they use local orders and navigate the legal pluralism that persists everywhere (Voell).

Of particular interest are practices of avoidance and silencing that occur when grievances remain unaddressed for the sake of maintaining social harmony (Schröder). Avoiding one another and non-communication often seem like good answers to conflict. In reality, however, this kind of local approach cannot reduce or resolve conflict at the national level (Voell). Social groups that have little contact with each other largely enjoy peace; it is heterogeneity that leads to conflict (Jalabadze). Here avoidance can be effective, but in the long term it is often based on suppression (Boboyorov).

Finally, perspectives on informality are relevant to ordering in Central Eurasia. Differentiating between state-defined meaning and non-state-defined moral meanings (e.g. gender hierarchies) helps to clarify whose order and whose morality is applied in local ordering (Steenberg). In Georgia, for example, this varies between different local communities (Jalabadze). Distinctions between formality and informality are also relevant in the field of local law enforcement. In general, authorities are interested in enforcing the law. Under conditions of neopatrimonial rule, however, maintaining authority is a central legal interest – one that is sometimes ensured by breaking the law (Heathershaw). In such contexts, the state is more interested in informal pacts among and with elites, which are of mutual benefit and result in hybrid social orders (Dewey).

The final discussion addressed disputed issues such as how to understand the local, the role of the state and of international peacebuilding, and problems of interdisciplinarity. Many participants agreed that ‘the local is everywhere’ (Simth-Simonsen). Many also emphasized that ‘the local’ is not necessarily peaceful (Millar) and warned of romanticizing indigenous customary ordering (Boboyorov). How the state manifests itself in local orders was also discussed. Some participants argued that the state often appears absent at this level. This can strengthen local peace, but violence often arises when the state is absent (Hancock). Others argued that state structures are always present in personalized and/or informal rules, often related to repressive practices (Boboyorov, Ismailbekova, Steenberg). To better understand problems of both disconnect and complexity in society–state relations, more comprehensive approaches are needed (Millar, Lewis). On the one hand, we should reflexively examine the degree to which the conceptual tools we use in conflict studies are state-focused (Steenberg). On the other, we should avoid viewing local orders as black boxes and recognize that, at the local level, the state is in the first place part of the local community (local officials, police, teachers, etc.). Alt-

though they are positioned within society, local orders also refer to – and use – state power (Kluczevska).

A few participants touched on issues of international–local interaction in peacebuilding. Most of them agreed that local ordering is helpful for building peace in places beyond the reach of the state. Some raised the question: How does it come about that these examples cannot be broadened to other scales (Lottholz)? From an anthropological perspective, possible answers center not on broad but on more regionally bound concepts. Social anthropological perspectives are critical of *building activities* and want to distance themselves from colonial heritages (Voell, Smith-Simonsen). The post-liberal perspective has long acknowledged the challenges of engaging with ‘the local’. In international organizations, however, practical problems often remain unresolved. Access to local information is often only possible through contact with English-speaking locals, who in turn provide access to the broader population as intermediary actors. Furthermore, local actors are often wary of admitting project “failures” for fear of being denied funding in the future (Kluczevska). Solving these problems may require a shift towards ethnographic peace studies on local cultures and orders (Millar, Lottholz) and on promoting respect for (and possibly the autonomy of) local perspectives from the ground up (Kreikemeyer).

Results and open research questions. In their contributions, all regional experts confirmed elements and relics of customary social orders in the Central Eurasian region that can be observed by ethnographic fieldwork. It became clear that bridging concepts are needed to make use of this knowledge in the post-liberal debate on peacebuilding. The following elements would seem to be relevant in Central Eurasia:

- Peace in the community is perceived as a state of social unity, well-being, and hierarchical authority. Ordering is often understood as conflict containment, which can be observed in everyday practices of avoidance, silencing, and secrecy.
- Actors and institutions of customary law or local solidarity networks can have influential roles rooted in generational respect for authority.
- Informality, relationality and social cohesion are preconditions for communal ordering. They can be intensified by joint work, mutual help, and local self-administration.

- The Soviet legacy still plays a major role in culture, practices, and institutions and is often interwoven with elements of patronal rule and authoritarian conflict management.
- Socio-economic precarity can influence local ordering, but coping and resilience grounded in customary worldviews can often be stronger than grievances.
- Spatial factors (urban/rural, population density, kinship size, etc.) matter.

The presentations and discussions demonstrated broad research gaps in the area of local ordering:

- *Conflict containment by avoidance* appears to be ambivalent. Forms of avoidance like silencing, coping, and resilience can be seen as elements of successful ordering; at the same time, however, they can conceal economic precarity and follow unwritten laws of power. More cross-regional comparative work on the implications and the extent of avoidance is needed.
- *Temporal factors* remain unclear and give rise to key questions. How do temporal factors affect local peace? Under what conditions is local ordering effective in the conflict cycle? What are the effects of social change?
- *Issues of power* in local ordering in general, and the role of the state in particular, are currently under-researched. How does the state manifest itself in local orders? Is it an integral part of patronal and/or post-Soviet culture? Is it an (in)formal actor, absent, or involved?
- *The normative ambivalence* of paternalistic customary ordering is likewise under-discussed. This includes gender markers, individual vs communitarian rights and values, rules of interaction (respect for uniformity versus diversity, authority versus participation, top-down versus bottom-up orientations), and views on social unity, elites, and the state.
- *The effects of mobility and trans-locality* and their repercussions for societal fragmentation and atomization are also under-researched themes. Questions arise regarding (informal) rules and the possibilities and limitations of navigation for ordering and peace in multiple social configurations (diaspora, social media, trade, migration).
- *Methodological challenges*. While the relevance of ethnographic explorations of local experiential perspectives on ordering and peace is undisputed, concepts of interdisciplinary (or better, transdisciplinary) research and of interregional collaborative knowledge production (issues of power, access, translation, decision-making, reflexivity, normative divides, exit strategies, etc.) have not been widely pursued.

2 On-site Workshop:

“Proposal Development for a Network Local Ordering and Peace”

Aims and objectives. This on-site workshop followed the aim of jointly preparing an application for a DSF research network. After the above described kick-off workshop in October 2020, thirteen network members met for five online meetings to discuss the state of research on ordering and peace, basic terminology and relevant scholarly articles. All members suggested options for network proposals and prepared a seed money proposal at the University of Copenhagen which was rejected.

Preparatory online-meetings. The first informal network meeting identified the state of research on interdisciplinarity and on knowledge production on local ordering. What had already become visible at the workshop in 2020 was confirmed: peace scholars still have to open up to culture, to ethnographic methodologies, to the role of local everyday practices and agency and to collaborative knowledge production. Peace research gaps persist on practices of conflict containment by local ordering (coping, resilience, avoidance), on interactions, normative ambivalences and different temporalities between local and international orderings, on experiential perspectives of multiple orderings and on cross-regional aspects of local ordering.

For the second and the third meeting every participant produced think pieces on two questions:

- What could be entry point(s) to ,the local‘? and
- How have you ex- or implicitly defined local ordering in our own work?

Early entry points to the local were social-anthropological, post-colonial and subalternity studies in the 1980s which disputed whether ,the local‘ has any value per se, whether it has a (silent) voice, whether it can talk back and whether it has agency. After the millenium, the discussion on the local was dominated by liberal views on localization and local ownership in peacebuilding. While the majority of IO-oriented scholars emphasized international-local interaction, critical peace scholars focused on everyday peace, local agency and experiential perspectives on intervention.

The group also discussed basic terminology. Regarding possible definitions of local ordering, it became clear that, although many of us did not explicitly define or engage with local ordering as such, the discussion revealed a variety of concepts that relate to the local or local ordering. Local ordering can be understood as an everyday pre-political governmentality from below, a strategy for claiming rights as part of identity construction, a lens trying to capture an insider's and bottom-up perspective on social practices and the lived experience, an etic concept that is socially constructed by academia, the agency of communities engaged in everyday peace, and a rather scalar reference that can be political or power-oriented. A broad confusion of terminology was seen as a research gap to be addressed in the network. For reasons of clarity, the network members do not aim to bring the diverse terms too close together in the beginning, but rather to separate them, strengthen their understandings of 'local', 'order', 'everyday', 'peace', 'relationality', etc., and discuss distinctions and alternatives.

The fourth network meeting was devoted to deepening our knowledge by discussing two texts ("Doing 'being ordinary'" by Harvey Sacks [1970] and "Where is the local?" by Roger Mac Ginty [2015]). From Sacks, we drew the insights that doing "being ordinary" is a strategy to avoid tensions and one that serves social cohesion. People *are not* "ordinary" per se, but they *do* "being ordinary" – it is always performed. Furthermore, "being ordinary" is a situated concept, and we can speak about many parallel or overlapping "ordinaries" in a given locality. Power is an important factor which defines what "ordinary" means. Roger Mac Ginty points out how 'the local' is often heterogeneous and can be characterized by competing narratives, even within one space. Participants emphasized that 'the local' is a highly contested notion which raises questions about power, legitimacy and scale. In their view, Mac Ginty underestimates the influence of 'the global' on 'the local'. Here, space matters and 'the local' should not be disconnected from territory. From both texts we learnt that it is important to study the plurality of 'local(s)'.

Between the fourth and fifth meeting, network member Birgit Bräuchler, in close collaboration with the network, submitted a seed money proposal, "*TransPeace*: From local practice to public policy" at the Copenhagen Center for Public Policy, University of Copenhagen. The project sought to address concerns long recognized in peace and conflict studies about the disconnect between policymakers and local 'beneficiaries' of peace policy. *TransPeace* aimed at establishing more effective communica-

tion between conflict-affected communities and public policymakers by translating the practices of everyday peace into public policies. Thus, the proposed project could have filled a research gap in knowledge about how stakeholders at international, national and local levels collaborate, compete and negotiate in their pursuit of achieving peaceful transitions. An important premise was that local strategies need to be translated into local and global policymaking in order to achieve better and more just governance. For this reason, the project aimed to engage in ongoing exchanges of knowledge/expertise/skills and concerns, and to redirect our view from peace as a result to peace as a continuous process, with a primary focus on local agency. The planned network sought to establish a policy-oriented international network of peace scholars, practitioners and policymakers to translate multi-level peace strategies into applicable public policy. The proposal brought together four faculties at the University of Copenhagen, the Network Local Ordering and Peace, local organizations involved in the struggle for peace in selected (post-)conflict societies, and regional partner institutions involved in policymaking and peacebuilding. This grant application was unfortunately unsuccessful, however. The reviewers criticized that the proposal might be too ambitious in trying to do too much and covering too wide a geographical focus area.

Following this unfortunate decision on the seed money proposal, the network participants discussed a possible re-submission at the University of Copenhagen. At the fifth meeting the group rejected this option and decided to collect and discuss other funding options for scientific networks in Germany and beyond (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, DFG, EU Horizon Cost Actions, the Arts and Humanities Research Council, the British Academy, or faculty grants at the Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø or at the University of Aberdeen). Finally, the participants decided to submit an application to the DFG, and a sixth onsite meeting was devoted to jointly preparing a concept for this proposal at a workshop at the IFSH.

Results of the workshop. To prepare the workshop on 29-30 April (for programme see Annex), every network member contributed a think piece in advance. Discussions in Hamburg then focused on these

reflections, on DSF core criteria for a network proposal,¹ on the network concept and structure, and on topical issues of the planned proposal.

Conceptualizations of local ordering. Most network members elaborated on possible conceptualizations of local ordering. Christine Smith-Simonsen is concerned with not arriving at a definition of ‘the local’ as ‘the other’ or ‘the south’, and with defining the research problem as a ‘lack of local order’. In her view, this would replicate the liberal peace tendency to frame ‘them’ as the problem to which ‘we’ will find a solution. For Smith-Simonsen, it is important that ‘the local’ be everywhere, that it encompass both ‘us’ and ‘them’. Birgit Bräuchler holds the view that the local is an essential given or something homogenous, rather a lens to look through.² At the same time, the local only exists through its embedding in broader contexts. However, it needs to be understood in its own right and using its own terminology. For our discourse on local ordering and peace, this understanding requires an analysis of what key concepts such as conflict, justice, security, reconciliation or peace actually mean in local contexts, and how to translate between the different spheres. Diverging conceptualizations of the local require different means and methods for researching them, a fact which clearly calls for a multidisciplinary approach. For Gearoid Millar, examining the local and the everyday and how they constitute peaceful relations in specific settings is much needed. For him, as for Bräuchler, is important to incorporate some analysis of the context of that local and the relationship of orderings across scales. This should go further than earlier efforts in the peacebuilding literature on hybridity, friction and now complex peace systems.

Ruben Schneider focuses on global-local processes of cultural co-production underlying international interventions and the everyday manifestations and intersections of various modes of power. For him, local ordering is never ‘free’ from the dominant games of truth and power but always a relational form of governance that is affected by context and variably intersecting scales. Therefore, it is important to analyse both local conceptions of peace and ordering and similarities/differences between strategies

¹ DSF core criteria are: Quality of project design, professional qualification of the project team, potential for knowledge transfer. Additional criteria are national and international cooperation, interdisciplinarity and diversity, support for young scientists.

² “The local is diverse and heterogeneous and locality is a culturally constructed and relational concept. It can imply both a physically demarcated space as well as clusters of interactions and fields of relations that involve the local, the global and other spheres. Hence, the local can be a village, a regional trade network or an international organisation.” (Birgit Bräuchler 2022, Think piece, internal manuscript)

across contexts. Vadim Romashov, on the other hand, stresses that the local is community within a locus that possesses agency in shaping everyday peace. He wants to focus on grassroots community relations, rejects the confusing notion of 'local' and prefers to carefully engage with 'the communal'. Furthermore, he suggests considering horizontal 'local-local' interactions in addition to vertical 'local-international' dimensions of interaction. Finally, Romashov wants to study how the trans-locality of communal peace(s) can be supported in order to increase their autonomy and independence from interventionism from the outside, both national and international. Philipp Lottholz prefers to avoid an exclusive perspective and analytical focus on 'the local' as such. He emphasizes a lack of knowledge about how stakeholders at different levels collaborate, compete and/or negotiate in their pursuit of achieving (peace) transitions, as I((N)G)Os actually do a lot of research and make efforts to improve their work. This points to the relevance of the 'organisational learning' aspect of peacebuilding actors.

In light of these controversies, Karolina Kluczevska identifies two camps within our group: the anthropological one interested in broadly-conceived local agency in its own right, and the political science one which approaches the local as a scalar concept and an entry point for exploring local-international interactions. As a consequence, and following Millar (2014), Kluczevska distinguishes various aspects of local ordering (norms, practices, actors/institutions, issues of power), effects on conflict and peace (avoidance, silencing, accommodating, etc.), and aspects of diversity and fragmentation. Other important aspects include intersections of local ordering across scales and with mobility and political economy. Florian Kühn argues for an understanding of 'ordering' as interface, overlap or practices mixing in the production of ambiguities about structures and the norms governing them. For him, ordering is the practices where international, national (e.g. state supported) and local rules clash, align, are made use of or are resisted, constantly producing slightly nuanced, sometimes radically new ways of doing things. In this context, Esther Meininghaus stresses a focus on local-level peace negotiations at the intersection of local, national, regional and international policies/relationships. She recommends including research questions from a highly critical perspective that are open to exploring how the understanding of peace itself and its value/feasibility is contested. Central to this approach would be the question of to what extent local communities may reject, welcome or want to affect the possibility of external involvement in local negotiations for peace.

For Ketevan Gurchiani, it could be very interesting to learn more about peace practices in groups with great diversity and fragmentation where, in theory, there is a potential for conflict, but where local practices allow for peaceful coexistence. Here, Lisa M. Sarida Lippert is sceptical and warns of "the danger of a single story" (Adichie 2009). She emphasizes that the local presents itself as an arena of diffusion, of exchange and of change. For her, it is more important to ask how to grasp a multiplicity of 'local's', and how local is local enough to speak of 'the local'? For Regina Heller, there are different understandings and ways of producing peace in different settings and contexts. These are embedded in social and collective beliefs and practices as normative-ethical experiences. Moreover, she emphasizes that there is neither an abstract notion of peace (such as positive or negative peace) nor a single definition of or pathway to peace (e.g., in liberal peace). Peace is a very concrete embodiment of social practices, and local peace means that it can be found "somewhere" (as opposed to a tiered understanding of local, as in "local/regional/global"). In this respect, Anna Kreikemeyer points to a peace research gap in local understandings and everyday practices of peace. She stresses the need for interdisciplinary approaches and inter-regional collaborative knowledge production in the study of local peace formation.

Discussions on network concept, structure and topical issues. The participants emphasized that the proposal should be focused and clear regarding why what we do is new, needed, what it will produce, and how the network will accomplish it. Most network members agreed that the network concept should include four main goals: (1) reach conceptual clarity by engaging with each other's work and developing some common language; (2) produce a Forum, a Special Issue, various knowledge transfer products and a larger research proposal; (3) work in sub-groups responsible for the different outputs, and (4) organize three network meetings over 24 months to advance the network agenda. Finally, the participants also discussed the overarching title and the planned budget.

In the discussion on topical issues, there was unanimity that the network is primarily interested in peace rather than peacebuilding (as a framing concept). Debates focused on

- problems of interdisciplinary conceptual advances. Here, questions arose on how to integrate the scalar and the everyday "camps", but also on the question of whether we have such "camps" in our group at all.

- inter-local ordering, namely confrontations and intersections of different orderings, and how they converge and/or transform. Here, questions arose on inter-local meanings, on how local ordering responds to international interventions, on the (non-)inclusion of international bodies and on how (translocal) communities deal with internal and external diversities. Other questions problematized the focus on people, not just NGOs as local actors, the role of individual levels and practices and on the spectrum of locally-led initiatives.
- problems of othering resulting from intersections of orderings across scales. Questions arose on how to conceptualize and deconstruct othering, which has both negative (exoticizing, portraying someone/something as a threat) and positive connotations (romanticizing). Here, some participants decided to approach othering as an epistemic practice, a way of positioning oneself and a way of learning and making sense of the other.
- questions of bridging different orderings. Here, questions arose on interphases and translators: What kind of brokers/facilitators emerge in interphases, and how do they assist or hinder processes? Which practices hinder, foster or transcend conflicts? To what extent or in what way can institutions or actors better coordinate/cooperate to create more locally-owned order/systems/infrastructures? What is the role of collaborative knowledge production and organizational learning?

All network members emphasized the need to understand complex social practices and to be aware of intellectual and research risks. As a result, the rationale of the network proposal should be framed (1) around the two perspectives– the scalar and the everyday – which exist in the group, (2) a productive approach to diversity and (3) ways to bridge these aspects.

[Further academic activities by network members.](#) Between November 2021 and September 2022 network members organized panels at international academic conferences, seminars for academic teaching and an event series. The following events took place:

- *Conference:* Australian Anthropological Studies (ASS) online conference, 24 November to 2 December 2021
Panel: What does it take to get there? Local peace strategies and international public policy, organized by Birgit Bräuchler

Paper: “How Could International Organizations Open up to Local Peace Processes? The Case of Everyday Co-operation of Armenians and Azerbaijanis in a Borderland of Georgia” by Anna Kreikemeyer and Vadim Romashov

- *Seminar:* Everyday Lives Between Conflict and Peace: Communal Ordering and Mundane Peace in post-Soviet Eurasia at Tampere University, 15 March – 20 April (2022), organized by Vadim Romashov

Lectures:

- Everyday Peace and Community, by Vadim Romashov
 - Studying local ordering and peace in Central Eurasia, by Anna Kreikemeyer
 - Conflict management from the ground up in Tajikistan, by Karolina Kluczewska
 - Armenian-Azerbaijani rural communities in Georgia: Living together with difference, by Vadim Romashov
 - Everyday life in multi-ethnic urban settings of Tbilisi, by Ketevan Gurchiani
- *Event series:* Collaborative learning for peace: A knowledge and experience exchange (online) Organized by Anna Kreikemeyer and Philipp Lottholz in consultation with Christine Smith-Simonsen, Karolina Kluczewska, Gearoid Millar and Salehin Mohammad

Lectures:

- Pieces of peaces, as a part of politics in Sudan: Who’s time, processes, and mental schemes are being privileged? by Megan Greeley on 2 Feb 2022
 - The ‘local’ turn, ‘hybridity’ and ‘friction’ in refugee governance: An ethnography of Refugee-Led Organizations (RLOs) in the Rohingya refugees camps in Bangladesh, by Salehin Mohammad on 13 April 2022.
- *Conference:* Annual conference of the British International Studies Association (BISA), Newcastle, 15-17 June 2022

Panel: From order to peace? Debating (and comparing) local ordering across Eurasia, organized by Philipp Lottholz

Papers:

- “Limitations of the local turn: local versus International Organisations' ordering” by Karolina Kluczevska and Anna Kreikemeyer
 - “How can international organizations open up to local peace processes? The case of everyday cooperation of Armenians and Azerbaijanis in a borderland of Georgia” (revised version of AAS paper) by Anna Kreikemeyer and Vadim Romashov
 - “Reclaiming security and infrastructures: The emergence, circulation and discontents of ‘Safe City’ projects” by Philipp Lottholz and Amina Nolte
- *Conference:* European International Studies Association (EISA) Pan-European Conference on International Relations (PEC), Athens, September 2022

Panel: Reconsidering the 'Local' Beyond Binary Thought, co-organized by Lisa S. Lippert

3 Exploitation of Results

Parallel to building up the academic network and preparing the two workshops, Anna Kreikemeyer was active in publication and knowledge transfer and in conducting further research.

Publications

- *Prospects for Peace Research in Central Asia. Between Discourses of Danger, Normative Divides and Global Challenges.* Osnabrück: Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung 2017. <https://bundesstiftung-friedensforschung.de/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/TB_Kreikemeyer.pdf>.
- “Hybridity revisited. Zum Stellenwert von Hybriditätsperspektiven in der Friedensforschung”. *Zeitschrift für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung* 7/2018(2): 287-315.
- “Everyday Peace” in Jabbor Rasulov, Tajikistan: Local Social Order and Possibilities for a Local Turn in Peace Building. In: *Interrogating Illiberal Peace in Eurasia*, edited by C. Owen et al., 122-141. London: Rowman & Littlefield 2018 (with Khushbakt Hojiev).

- “Studying Peace in and with Central Eurasia. Starting from Local and Trans-local Perspectives”, *Special issue of the Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 14/2020(4): 465-482 (Introduction by Anna Kreikemeyer and five contributions by Arthur Atanesyan, Hafiz Boboyorov, Aksana Ismailbekova/Nick Megoran, Karolina Kluczevska and Anna Kreikemeyer).
- “Peace Formation from the Ground up. Lessons from Everyday Collaboration between Armenians and Azerbaijanis at the Sadakhlo Bazaar in Georgia” (working title, application for a special issue article, with Sevil Huseynova and Vadim Romashov).

Knowledge transfer

- Advancing Peacebuilding from the Ground up. *Policy Brief* 4/2021. Hamburg: IFSH (with Karolina Kluczevska).
- Frieden von unten, Frankfurter Rundschau. 26 September 2021.

Research proposals

- On 29 October 2020, Anna Kreikemeyer submitted a proposal to the DSF for a standard research project on the topic “*Local Capacities for Peace in Central Eurasia: An Ethnographic Study of Ordering in Customary and Illiberal Contexts*” (rejected)
- On 27 April 2022, Kreikemeyer resubmitted a proposal to the DSF for a profile project on “Local Peace in Central Eurasia: Studying Peace Formation in Customary and Patronal Contexts”
- In October 2022, Kreikemeyer will submit a proposal to DSF for a network project on “Local Ordering and Peace: Unpacking Dynamics across Scales (LOPUDAS)”.