

Article 1
On Nourishing Peace:
The Performativity of Activism through
the Nobel Peace Prize

Victoria Ann Newsom

Department of Communication Studies and Department of Liberal Studies
California State University, Los Angeles

and

Wenshu Lee

Department of Communication Studies, Loyola Marymount University

Abstract

The Nobel Peace Prize as a global media spectacle centered in Northern Europe is not without controversy. What we hope to accomplish in this essay is two fold: first, to advance the concept of "nourishing peace", which we define as a process that combines both negative peace and positive peace; and second, to use the theoretical framework woven from Turner's social drama, Conquergood's dialogical performance, and Appadurai's five scapes and global disjunctive flows to engage students in unpacking the Nobel Peace Prize critically, including the recent award of the prize to American President Barak Obama. Our critical analysis notes a few trends over the years of awarding Nobel Peace Prizes: awards framed traditionally from the point of negative peace often went to white men occupying positions of power in the West; and awards framed from the point of positive peace narrowly and nourishing peace broadly opened up more space for women and men of color and organizations that promoted human rights and well beings. The harbinger of this glaring elision in Nobel ideology is the missing Peace Laureate, Mahatma Gandhi. Gandhi was nominated five times but never

became a Laureate in his lifetime. Marking yet another trend, the recent award to President Obama was not for a "completed action", but rather for a future oriented nourishing peace, i.e., the publicly stated goal of nuclear disarmament and bringing about potentially a peaceful future. As teachers, we are encouraged to draw on Obama's "call to action" and use the Nobel Peace Prize as a means of inspiring obtainable local action, so that each "aha moment" in students' deep learning can become a turning point for critical consciousness and an impetus for meaningful peace activism both locally and globally.

Keywords: Nobel Peace Prize, nourishing peace, positive peace, negative peace, social drama, performative dialogue, five scapes, global disjunctive flows, Barack Obama, women Nobel Peace Laureates, Neda, peace movements, "aha moment" pedagogy, performative activism

In pursuit of nourishing peace

Peace is a term that one may associate with the end of military threats and active warfare, the end of political oppression, or the end of hunger, subjugation, and slavery. The recent awarding of President Obama's Nobel Peace Prize, as an example, reflects this increasingly complex understanding of peace in the contemporary global context. The desire for peace brings to mind, currently among other diverse situations, the domestic and global carnage of the George W. Bush era's "war on terror", the cyclical threat of nuclear weapons in North Korea, the popular uprisings during the presidential election in Iran, and the orphaned children of the blood diamond industry. Writing in Los Angeles, we as co-authors are mindful of our labor in the center of an empire in transition, an empire on its way to a twisted decline if the Obama administration fails to make

significant differences in American and global politics. In the aftermath of Bush political and economic disaster and the dawning of the Obama pragmatism, we ask: What would constitute an ethical and persuasive mode of advocacy for “peace” in the eyes of American youth living in one of the most diverse metropolises in the world, Los Angeles? How can we recognize which notions of peace may resonate with a youthful population in an urban environment? Are these notions of peace ones that resonate outside of local knowledge? Can peace itself be created both inside and outside of a local environment?

The Nobel Peace Prize and nourishing peace

Advocacy for peace as emanated from local impulses onto a global scale is best crystallized, in a pedagogical sense, through the Nobel Peace Prize. The awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize is a ritual moment performed on a global stage to recognize monumental work often spanning decades of “peace”. The ritual assumes noteworthiness around the globe, henceforth, a spectacular symbolic power, the granting of which singles out certain positive evolution and change in the humanity for praise while leaving other often equally meritorious acts unrecognized.

A closer examination of Nobel’s immense power of bestowal reveals that the politicized rhetoric of peace, in its early days, was often framed as negating forces in the trope of *anti*, e.g., anti-war, anti-terrorism, and anti-aggression. In other words, the Noble Prize has been awarded to a variety of performances of peace, including those statesmen who worked to end specific states of warfare, transformed acts that had grossly violated human rights, and cleared the ground to render future peace activism viable.

These tropes that negate, as powerful as they are, may fail to exert immediate local impact on a particular community because the performance of peace on a global scale as ritualized in the Nobel Peace Prize is often distant, in a time, space and cultural sense, from the lived experiences of individuals seeking

peace in their everyday lives. To utilize the Prize, then, to pedagogically engage a student population in peace advocacy in a college classroom and beyond presents a variety of challenges.

One such challenge was brought in front of us in a recent discussion with our students. The normative performances of peace substantiated by the Prize in its century of tradition are marginally relevant to our students' perceptions of peace and their perceptions of Peace Laureates themselves. The performativity of peace, for our students, involves a set of personally and locally legible values and needs, such as taking up internships for youth at non-profit organizations to reduce the involvement with gang activities and to seed the motivation to obtain college education for social justice. Obama's recent win, especially given its current media frame of "hope" and long-term efforts to avoid violence more closely connects with those student perceptions.¹ The links between the ritualized performance of the early Prizes centering on anti-tropes and our students' concrete and locally legible acts situated in a city and a nation that is fortunately uninfected by large-scale wars, though potentially existent and empowering, are yet to be drawn and made compelling. Finding examples that will reach our students, as in the case of Obama's win, is necessary if we wish to fully engage the students in peace activism. In other words, we are in search of the pedagogy of the "aha moments" which functions as an "instance of active engagement in meaning-making, creating a level of awareness that served as a new foundation from which continued experiences and understandings were built" (Landerman, Rasmussen, King, & Jiang, 2007, p. 288).

Fortunately, more recent performances of peace honored by the Nobel Prize in the past few decades, those that often have human rights associations or organizations as co-recipients, reflect a second meaning of peace, which echoes Trostle's definition (as cited in Sandy & Perkins, 2002, p. 5):

Peace is a state of well-being that is characterized by trust, compassion, and justice. In this state, we can be encouraged to explore as well as celebrate our diversity, and search for the good in each other without the concern for personal pain and sacrifice...It provides us a chance to look at ourselves and others as part of the human family, part of one world.²

It is this “turn” in the performances of peace as spelled out in the above quote, from a “negative peace” that seeks to end wars and battles to a “positive peace” that aims at the creation and sustaining of a state and an infrastructure of well-being, that we find a viable framework for the pedagogy of “aha moments”, one that our students can potentially relate to and use as basis for their own acts of critical social change. We call this turn as a process *nourishing peace*, combining both the negative peace and the positive peace. Nourishing peace is a peace process that often begins with the negating impulse as the dominant motivation, yet this process continues on without stopping when an end of war is declared, a peace process that extends into the post-war and post-conflict infrastructure building, a peace process that is long term and involves the everyday, a peace process that is about the rights of human beings to live unharmed as important as well and healthful, and peace that resonates with deep needs both locally and globally. In our classrooms, using the Nobel Prize as case studies of nourishing peace requires deep and ethnographic translation that deftly weaves the local and the global acts, and the negative and positive peace into a nourishing habitat for humanity’s well-being. Henceforth, we offer the thesis that the performance of peace that will most effectively reach our students and constitute an “aha” pedagogy lies in a nuanced rhetoric of *nourishing peace*.

In order to investigate the performance of peace, and how this can be utilized as an effective pedagogical tool, we are led to theories of performativity and performative pedagogy. However, inspired by the metamorphoses of British cultural studies in the non-U.S. academic world, we choose to enact cultural

performances as radically unleashed deep work in the trenches, and refuse to perform the irony of highbrow performativity scholarship. By this we mean performativity has the potential rather than the guarantee of subversion and social change. Theorists of performativity seem to be mindful of this non-guarantee, yet the way the theory of performativity has been preached and circulated seems to posture the certainty of subversion. The pervasive abstract language and its occasional inductive focus are rarely close to the everyday folks, wherein lies the performative irony: the iterative meta-discourse of uncertainty soars ever higher into the certain sky of theory, leaving behind the sufferings of the everyday. Drag, after all, is quite a different hailing than torture, hunger and infectious disease. As an alternative, we migrate into and linger in the space traveled by global theorists, like Victor Turner, Dwight Conquergood, Arjun Appadurai, Starhawk, Susan Okin, Anna Deavere Smith, Paulo Freire, and Henry Giroux. We want to live in and be inspired by their arch-cases focusing on those who are disenfranchised in the global rush for deep mobility, including the global poor and the dispossessed mass, a space we loosely term as “a basic framework for performative activism”.

Performance theory tells us that personal identity is constructed both by the individual and by communal and social processes. It is never the performer alone that constructs her or his identity; instead we believe that performance is iterated and reiterated by both performer and community-audience. In the case of peace activism, the performance of an activist, we believe, responds both to individual and local needs. The circuits of knowledge of a local community, out of which the performance finds critical nourishment, dialectically because of its framing power, may limit the performer and the performance itself. Performative social action and subversion, then, must arise from such dialectical processes, and their ensuing ethical choices become negotiated as a performer and her audiences struggle for higher meanings.

Turner (1974) examines political activism and its agents of change through what he calls "social drama." A social drama arises from a disruption to social order and the creation of a "breach". In a more drastic situation, a "crisis" in a cultural tradition may result in a "redressive action". Aspects of a redressive action, Turner further argues, may be rejected or incorporated, in different degrees, into existing cultural norms. Students will relate to Turner's concept because it is concrete and interesting enough to invoke storytelling, a form of cultural performance. They can tell stories about different kinds of social drama in the conflicts that arise between, for example, friends, family members, generations, and social classes. They may also compare different types of narration to instigate potential "aha moments" of the "perspectives" chosen, consciously or unconsciously for the telling. It is here, in the performative narration of breach and crisis and the awareness of the perspectives taken to narrate, that our thesis of nourishing peace bears the potential resonance with students' habitat. And we, as teachers, can encourage such resonance by inviting our students to perform social drama, bringing them to examples that reach into their own locales, and asking them to help find the link between one's perspective taken and potential redressive actions that will be persuasive and ultimately accepted, by the public, as solutions.

For Turner the liminal qualities of social drama, in the narration of which may create a moment "betwixt and between" (1967, p. 1) the "successive participations in social milieu" (1972, p. 52) that allow revolutionary activity and challenge normative cultural performances. This process is itself performative. The resulting performance, which involves the choices of what to narrate and what perspectives used to narrate, creates the impetus for change by opening the liminal space, a zone of what once was and could have been, for informed and impassioned advocacy. For example, the U.S. housing crisis and subsequent economic downturn in 2008 into the present, when a more realistic rate of unemployment and underemployment in the U.S. stands at 17.5% (Leonhardt, 2009, November 6), provide an opening for social change because

there is now a glaring need that impels better and more responsible economic practices and financial policies. Students' narration of this financial social drama and the perspective chosen for that narration be it from the bankers' view for deregulation, a policy maker's view for regulation, or a home owner's view for assistance in foreclosure proceedings, are performed for local and national audiences. If the audience comes to agree on the impetus and solution, an adequate redressive action may well become a focus for organizing, e.g., economic responsibility becomes reinforced at all levels, from increased personal savings, to accurately documented loan processes, to financial institutions' verifiable information in derivatives to assist savers' and investors' choices.

However, change itself is not guaranteed. It is highly dependent on the enacted performance to reconstruct the audience's memory of local knowledge so that arguments for the promoted redressive action are deemed plausible and, ultimately, persuasive. For us to effectively teach students to envision and enact such change, we must thicken their rhetorical competence and ethical commitment to help translate their performance to meet a more holistic definition of peace. We can use selective case studies of Peace Prize Laureates as a pedagogical tool to illustrate for our students the narrative choices in the retelling of a social drama and in redressive alternatives for peace and activism. To do so, we may further cover Turner's ideals of performance ethnography, Boal's theatre of the oppressed, Boje's focus on interpretive ethnographic storytelling, and Conquergood's dialogical performance to teach our students. As an example, we note what Conquergood (2007) offered in the midst of othering and ideological difference: taking a stance of "both/and" or "yes/but" instead of "either/or" (p. 66) through a genuine and respectful conversation. As Conquergood states, "one cannot build a friendship without beginning a conversation" (p. 67). Through such a process, two distinct voices interact via different ideas, symbols, and values. Each voice in the conversation is able to explore and modify its own locality in reference to the other. In addition, the reflexivity that emerges from such

dialogical performance may “enable people to take stock of their situation and through this self-knowledge to cope better (Conquergood, 1988, p. 180).

Thus, through combining these techniques recommended by Turner and Conquergood we can utilize a cultural performance as a means of opening conversations to discuss injustice as well as substantive well-being. Turner’s change agents, if reframed as Conquergood’s conversational partners for critical awareness and effective coping, become intelligible communicators our students may strive to become. They may morph from erasure and silence into visibility through the performance of dialogues on perspectival narration of personal/social crisis. As teachers, we can invite our students into a conversation and they can invite each other into the process of social change. The conversation must then itself be framed as a project of locality, and then these conversations must be expanded to discussions between localities, and the varying needs and values associated with these different localities. In this way, we can ask our students to investigate what conversations about “nourishing peace” are needed in their neighborhoods and experience to end transgressions and sustain long term well-being, and how those conversations can be broadened to a larger, global discussion. For this discussion, we next turn to the work of Arjun Appadurai.

Arjun Appadurai conceives of globalization as “disjunctive cultural flows” in a world the more affluent and learned part of which has been transformed by what we call “deep mobility”. Let us explain further. Based on Appadurai’s (1990) classic essay on global cultural economy, modern technologies of transportation have made it easier and more affordable to move people en masse between locations that are worlds apart, a feat impossible to imagine before the 20th century. Here we mainly talk about *transnational bodily mobility* through the invention of bicycles, steamships, trains, cars, and airplanes. Modern technologies of information have also made it easier and more affordable to move ideas and propagate feelings en masse between locations that are worlds apart. Here we talk about *transnational virtual mobility* through the invention of

telephone and cell phone, gramophone and stereo, camera, radio, film, television, video, CD, DVD, and the Internet. The current trend seems to develop from public, formal, fixed, heavy and expensive technologies to ones that are versatile in a public, private/informal and self-selectively anonymous sense, and increasingly mobile, light, portable, simultaneous, and affordable. Because of the potential deep mobility through technologies of transportation and information, an ideal 21st century human being is a fluid and often self-styled rootless individual, one who can control one's own physical movement and information movement, with ever increasing amount of freedom, speed, ease, convenience, and the choice to break free from time, place, convention and decorum. Yet ironically there exists a cosmic paradox associated with the deep mobility's monumental mooring and unmooring. Namely, our ideal human being's desire to see, to understand, to connect, and to chat with others, is transformed into a craving for a ravenous belonging in autonomy and unrootedness.

Paradox aside, the coupling of the transnational bodily and virtual mobility, thus, creates what we mean by *deep mobility*. But human beings have different capacities to access this deep mobility. American college students possess deeper mobility than those who are poverty stricken and variously labeled as slum dwellers, camp refugees, and trafficked victims, many of whom, the often called transnational entrapped and immobile, were empowered and transformed by and/or with some of the Peace Laureates we shall teach.

Conceptually to grasp the complexity of globalization and the global cultural economy, Appadurai (1990) suggests a framework that is not based on "existing center-periphery models" but on "certain fundamental disjunctures between economy, culture and politics which we have only begun to theorize" (p. 6). Specifically he proposed the following "five dimensions of global cultural flow", including ethnoscaples, mediascaples, finanscaples, technoscaples, and ideoscaples. These five dimensions, like Legos, are the building blocks of heavily imagined worlds. They are also "deeply perspectival constructs" affected by "the

historical, linguistic and political situatedness of different sorts of actors: nation-states, multinationals, diasporic communities, as well as sub-national groupings and movements (whether religious, political or economic), and even intimate face-to-face groups, such as villages, neighborhoods and families” (p. 7). Their common suffix, *scape*, also points to “the fluid, irregular shapes of these landscapes, shapes which characterize international capital as deeply as they do international clothing styles” (p. 7).

The level of communication technology in contemporary cultures and the borders of the local are simultaneously shifting and expanding. The definitions of positive and negative peace are moving with the ever changing cultural context, as ideals of peace that were discouraged by recent political rhetorics, such as disarmament, once again become a priority in post-Bush society. Our students, who with their digital awareness often address these scapes, albeit sometimes unknowingly, hold the skill set needed to reshape current conditions through reshaping these communicative constructs. As teachers of peace our job is to encourage peace activism through whatever means or scopes are available for our students. What Appadurai (1990) offers our students is a basic theory of global cultural flows that sensitizes their analytic reach into five fractal and overlapping dimensions on people (*ethoscape*), machinery (*techoscape*), money (*finascape*), images (*mediascape*) and ideas (*ideoscape*). Using it to approach the Nobel Peace prizes as case studies, our students are then given a tool to competently offer “a decent global analysis” (p. 21) of nourishing peace and peace building.

Nobel and the global performance of peace

How can we translate the global performance of peace through the Nobel Peace Prize into a meaningful embodiment relevant to the lived experiences of our students in Los Angeles? We propose to begin by understanding how the Prize itself is constructed and enacted to global audiences. While the more recent Nobel Peace Laureates perform various types of *nourishing peace* discussed

earlier in this essay, the century long history of the prize reflects a more traditional performance of peace through the use of anti-tropes, e.g., anti-war peace.

The Nobel Peace Prize as a global spectacle centered in Northern Europe is not without controversy. Each year bestowed in the presence of the King of Sweden in Oslo at the City Hall, the Prize itself consists of a diploma, a medal, and a monetary award. The award ceremony is followed by a concert, the next day, broadcast to more than 150 countries, and often includes celebrity participation. The ritualized nature of the event reinforces the Western and Eurocentric values held by Alfred Nobel himself. These performative elements, embodied in the ritual process, serve to create and maintain the global reputation of Laureates and to reinforce the value of the prize as a global symbol, a trademark for peace. Though we endorse the aims of peace as embodied by these Laureates, we think it is critical for our students to understand that the Nobel rituals are heavily hegemonic, exercising its power of bestowal in the global disjunctive flows of people, machinery, money, media and ideas. In helping students to map their lives onto various elements of the Prize, which are often deterritorialized, we hope to encourage them to create ultimately their own performative tools for nourishing peace. In other words, while students will understand the significance of the prize intellectually, the connection for them to act on this level in their daily lives involves critical unpacking and deep learning. What we hope to accomplish is to use the basic framework woven from the ideas offered by Turner, Conquergood and Appadurai to engage the students so that each “aha moment” becomes students’ pedagogical turning point for “continued, sustained learning opportunities resulting in the acquisition of critical consciousness” (Landreman et al., 2007, p. 293).

The Prize was first developed in an era of increased armament and sudden rise of military regimes in Europe. Not surprisingly, it was created to encourage peace activism through anti-war efforts. Framed in this politicized context, it is not

difficult to understand why debates over whether Human Rights activism qualifies for the Prize or deviates too much from anti-war peace are among the earliest and longest-lasting discussions attributed to the ritual itself.

The Eurocentric tendencies of the Prize are, at least in part, a result of the composition of the selection committee members by the Parliament of Norway, as mandated by Alfred Nobel's will (Abrams, 2001). Nobel himself intended the Prize to be for Swedish activists, among others, though this has actually happened only twice. Nobel's (1895/2009) description of the ideal recipient in his will outlines a specific type or standard for peace. The ideal recipient, he states, is

the person who shall have done the most or the best work for fraternity between nations, for the abolition or reduction of standing armies and for the holding and promotion of peace congresses.

This description of peace represents what peace scholars refer to as *negative peace* or *peacekeeping* wherein peace is achieved through the removal of the state of war or unrest (Galtung, 1967, 1985; King, 1964). This is the type of peace effort Nobel himself recognized and wanted to honor, and is generally performed by the statesmen and political leaders whom Nobel expected the Prize to engage. This anti-war style of negative peace or peacekeeping is contrasted to a positive peace or peace-building/peace-making approach where programs, institutions, and other efforts are made by individuals and political entities to create a condition or infrastructure which encourages peace, rather than attempt to remove a condition that makes peace a challenge (Galtung, 1967, 1985; Hulme & Goodhand, 1999; Harris, 2004; King, 1964). Nobel's intended focus for the peace prize was on grand achievements in disarmament, however Nobel's statement that the prize should go to "the best work for fraternity between nations" is used to justify the award given for positive peace and Human Rights efforts in the later years (Abrams, 2001).

Negative peace or peacekeeping, and the performance associated with this process as specifically outlined by Nobel in his will, requires that the performers have access to a global stage, who are usually, though not restricted to, the leaders of warring factions or the governing bodies of those nations involved in violent conflict. Men, primarily Western European or American Statesmen with recognized political status are the people most likely to play such a grand role in a celebrated master narrative of peace-keeping. It is no surprise then that, more often than not, women and men of color were left out as the recipients of the Prize throughout the majority of its existence. In other words, they were “unfit” for the auditioning, and henceforth, the granting of a role in such a drama.

As the paradigm shifted to include positive peace, the Prize more readily recognized relief organizations rather than individual Laureates, especially in its early history. Further, positive peace efforts often take a lifetime of work or an extended series of efforts before they begin to be recognized. Positive efforts are often focused on issues of health and wellbeing, and the holistic status of people’s lived experiences. Neither quick nor easily recognized, such efforts are often incremental and collective. These efforts also most often build from local efforts up to a global scale. Therefore, these efforts are rarely sensational enough to bring to the awareness of a global audience, particularly before the digital communications revolution, as opposed to negative peace efforts which can occur during a spectacular singular event or highly recognized series of events. Historically speaking, therefore, and in accordance with the official definition, positive peace efforts, especially by individuals rather than organizations, did not fit squarely within *the* historical framework of the Prize. Among the most obvious examples was the “Missing Laureate”, Mahatma Gandhi (Tønnesson, 1999, December 1). His life-long commitment to the non-violent end of British colonization was performed more in accordance with those tropes associated with positive than negative peace. Gandhi was nominated five times for the award in 1937, 1938, 1939, 1947, and 1948. Regrettably, Gandhi never won, though in 1948, the year he passed away, no award was made.

Women leaders in the peace movement also have a distinct history of being overlooked for the Prize—a trend developed in the earliest years of the award. This tendency is rooted in both the patriarchal norms of the era in which the award began, and the nature of peace efforts typically championed by women, e.g., the non-spectacular grassroots and local peace-building work. To note, among the 120 peace prize laureates (97 times to individuals and 23 times to organizations) only 12 were women (see Appendix A).

The first woman presented with the award did not recognize positive peace-building efforts as an acceptable form of peace activism. An intimate friend of the Nobel family, Bertha Von Suttner was a negative-peace activist working to eliminate violence and asking people to “lay down [their] arms”. Nobel himself wanted Von Suttner to receive the award, but it took five years of the award being presented before she was honored with the Prize in 1905.

This is not to say that efforts toward positive peace uniformly went unrecognized by the Prize selection committee. The very first Peace Prize in 1901 was split between negative peace activist Frederic Passy of the Peace Movement and positive peace activist and the International Red Cross Founder Henri Dumont (Abrams, 1994). Von Suttner, among others, protested Dumont’s award, claiming Nobel himself intended the award for disarmament efforts (Abrams, 2001). Organizations working to aid refugees were awarded the Prize in 1938, 1954, and 1981 (Abrams, 1994). In 1947 a religious order in the US and the UK, the Quakers, won the Prize for their humanitarian relief efforts (Nobel Foundation, 1947/2009). Another organization, United Nations Children’s Fund [UNICEF], won in 1965 aiding children suffering from hunger and disease (Nobel Foundation, 1965/2009), and Amnesty International won in 1977 (Odelberg, 1978). Individuals who won the Prize for their humanitarian efforts in the first half of the twentieth century were far fewer. One notable humanitarian Laureate was Albert Schweitzer who won in 1952 for his work with lepers in West Africa (Lewer, 1992).

The distinction between these positive and negative performances of peace, and which styles of peace were honored, reflects the ideological understanding of peace as well as the political motivations of world leaders at the time during which these performances were recognized. By the 1960s these values were shifting, and positive peace performances became more prominently recognized, in part because of the increasing number of civil rights and student movements around the globe, and in part because of the lack of large scale and sensational violence associated with the Cold War. In 1970 the Prize was given to the first and only person to receive the award for food production and preventing hunger during the Twentieth Century, Norman Borlaug (Hesser, 2006). Having passed away in September 2009, Borlaug's work is a significant example of positive peace-building not only because it created new solutions for one of the conditions leading to a lack of peace but also because Borlaug focused on changing agricultural production methods for individual farmers and local farming communities. Through these examples, we begin to see that the performance of peace, as recognized by the Nobel selection committee, slowly takes on the characteristics of local activisms and long-term social change in capacity and infrastructure building, rendering people or peoples less vulnerable to war, violence, displacement, degradation, hunger and illness.

Women, too, become more recognized as this process continues. Most of the earliest women Laureates were recognized for negative peace performances, particularly their disarmament work. Then, in 1979, Mother Teresa was recognized for her lifetime of work in Calcutta. A political leader in her own country, Aung San Suu Kyi, the next woman Laureate to perform positive peace, was recognized in 1991 for her "non-violent struggle for democracy and human rights" in Burma or the Union of Myanmar. She continues to be the exiled elected president living under house arrest for 14 of the past 19 years (Fuller, 2009, October 9). In the official descriptions of her Nobel speech, her performative struggle is compared to that of Gandhi. Again, this focus of positive peace performances revolves around the ideal of non-violent action and thereby

simultaneously reflects negative peace ideals. The merging of these, in the case of Aung San Suu Kyi, as well as in the case of Dr. King, Jr., illustrates the goal of positive maintenance of peace and non-violence. These examples in particular illustrate that both positive and negative peace are necessary to encourage the budding of, what we argue here as a more lasting and, therefore, desirable form of peace, nourishing peace.

In more recent years the distinctions between negative and positive peace performances have become less viable, as wars have become more recognizably local and transnational, and as efforts toward positive peace have become dependent on the success of negative peace and vice versa. It is here that we begin to recognize the emerging pattern of *nourishing peace*, which requires both a removal of violence and an increase in institutions and resources in order to generate a more lasting state of substantive well-being. Positive peace itself is a type of nourishing peace when combined with the anti-tropes of negative peace, and with the anti-tropes associated with Human Rights efforts such as anti-violence, anti-child-and-sex trafficking, and anti-slavery. Significantly, Human Rights efforts as peace efforts are directly linked, in Prize rhetoric, to non-violent action, therefore echoing negative-peace idealism while recognizing positive-peace performances, and thereby illustrating what we call nourishing peace.

Like that of positive peace, the goal of nourishing peace is to create long-term and lasting peace. Human rights efforts also exemplify this goal. In particular, the Nobel committee's official recognition of Human Rights activism as an effort toward peace, beginning in 1960, provided a greater viability for individuals to win the prize through what we view as nourishing peace efforts. The first to win for Human Rights work was Albert Lutuli (1961/2009) in 1960 for his non-violent anti-apartheid work in South Africa. He would be the first of several Laureates recognized for this goal, including Desmond Tutu in 1984 and Nelson Mandela in 1993. Soon after Lutuli, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was recognized

in 1964 for his non-violent efforts to challenge and change the lived inequality of African Americans. On the official Nobel Prize website, King's win is discussed, not in terms of a particular action to bring peace to a situation but in terms of a series of efforts that avoided violence and seeded nonviolent change.³ King's own acceptance speech (1964/2009) highlights how his efforts focus on positive peace-building:

We must concentrate not merely on the negative expulsion of war, but on the positive affirmation of peace.... Somehow we must transform the dynamics of the world power struggle from the negative nuclear arms race which no one can win to a positive contest to harness man's creative genius for the purpose of making peace and prosperity a reality for all of the nations of the world.
(para. 33)

The focus on non-violence would not be the only positive peace efforts awarded to individuals, but it remains one of the Prize's most visible and recognized signifiers.

From the 60's through today, the ideal for peace as disarmament promoted most aggressively by Nobel himself became less of a focus of the award. There are a number of factors that contribute to this welcomed shift, including the nuclear arms race during the Cold War, fears of the Domino Effect, the growth of the weapons and defense industries which is often termed as the military-industrial complex, and the increased naturalization in the rhetorics of defense. This pattern continues after the Cold War and morphs into the rhetoric of the new War on Terror. As global authorities were firmly vested in the arms race, and the global economy became focused on the defense industries, performances of positive peace became more urgent and fortunately encouraged into greater acceptance by the Prize. Ironically, with the War on Terror and the new focus on economic globalization, particular global concerns have started to become more

recognized and discussed in the media that highlight the need for disarmament and the end of violence in war-torn areas of the world. In particular, as international terrorism has become associated with genocides, weapons and human trafficking, work in the arena of Human Rights has returned, in part, to an anti-war focus.

These new performances of nourishing peace are often rooted in the positive peace associated with local needs while simultaneously reflecting more widespread anti-war and anti-violence goals. This is reflected, for example, in how Guatemalan activist and the 1992 Laureate, Rigoberta Menchú Tum, performs peace on the global stage. Tum is recognized as an activist for Human Rights for Mayan Indians and other indigenous peoples, particularly those civilians who are victims of the violence and trafficking associated with guerrilla tactics utilized in many recent civil wars. During one of the military coups in Guatemala, it is estimated that at least 70,000 civilians “disappeared,” most likely either killed or sold into slavery. Tum’s work, and more importantly, her powerful testimonial (Beverley, 2008) to bring events like this to the attention of the world highlighting, in her own words from her Nobel lecture (1992/2009), “the struggle for peace, for Human Rights and for the rights of the indigenous people, who, for 500 years, have been split, fragmented, as well as the victims of genocides, repression and discrimination” (para. 2). The shift in understanding peace as both welfare and disarmament is further illustrated by a particularly poignant episode in Tum’s career. As discussed during Tum’s Nobel ceremony, after her nomination, the very man who killed her mother during one of the violent episodes in her country’s long revolution congratulated Tum on being a Nobel nominee.

More recent performances of nourishing peace by women Laureates include women and children’s rights activist Shirin Ebadi (2003) of Iran and Wangari Muta Maathai (2004) of Kenya for her visionary work on tree planting with women groups, the Green Belt Movement and a Pan African Green Belt Network, and

other ecologically sustainable development. These recent performances of nourishing peace are significant not only because these women perform their work in both peace-building and peace-making, but also because they perform these as women of color not located in the hegemonic West. This shift in recognition for how women perform peace is significant when we note that, with the exception of Mother Teresa, all of the White American and European women Laureates seemingly received the award for performing negative-peace. However, a more longitudinal review of their respective accomplishment leads to the observation that, at one point or another, they were involved with substantive positive peace building efforts. For, example, Jane Addams's prominent work in civic responsibility, women's suffrage and social justice in the greater Chicago area, and Alva Myrdal's work on social welfare and housing and school problems. This pattern is also evident when observing the performances of recent male Laureates, who with a few notable exceptions such as Jimmy Carter and Al Gore who were recognized for their performances of positive peace, are increasingly men of color and non-Western architects of nourishing peace. Because these Laureates are focused on the well-being of people in an era of global disease, a recognized resurgence of global slavery, and in an era where the "War on Terror" has created, for many, a new level of paranoia and destitute, these are also the performers most able to resonate with our students in their daily lives.

The pedagogy of nourishing peace as performative activism

This past summer protesters in Iran made their voices heard around the world using the same communication technologies, particularly via social networking Internet sites that our students regularly use in their daily lives. By posting YouTube and Facebook videos, by reporting the conditions of Iranian election protesters via Twitter and blogs, the young people and activists in Iran gained support and media attention that the Iranian government itself worked diligently to shut down. Support for Iranian protestors continued to grow online, as these social networking sites and other websites became spaces for the exchange of

information and the organization of protests. The major news media, further, used the digital communication that was provided by protestors as their own primary sources for understanding the conflict in Iran, as they were prohibited from using more traditional media means after the elections. This type of communication is activism that illustrates the need for human rights in a local space—activism that speaks of the abuses of government-sponsored violence.

This is activism that echoes the way that our students, a majority of whom grew up as part of the millennial generation, communicate on a daily basis. The fact that these local communications were performed on a global stage to global audiences, an embodiment of their deep mobility, emphasizes how individuals can function in what has been associated with powerful statesmen and leaders: negative peace. Further, this communication moment, enabled by the relatively privileged access to deep mobility, illustrates that individuals need to reconcile their tools as opportunities to also create nourishing peace of the sort that can be shared and spread to other localities. This form of activism suits our students in their abilities and capacities for peace, among other social change goals. Because of its familiarity, ease of use, and accessibility, the visibility of this form of activism in Iran may play a significant role in educating our students on performances of nourishing peace in the Nobel process of recognition. This, in turn, reflects the breach and crisis in our student's own understanding of peace activism that can resonate with a broader audience's understanding of peace.

Here we return to the performative pedagogies built on the work of Turner, Conquergood, and Appuradai. Appuradai's tropes are clearly represented by the situation in Iran. In particular, the case of Neda Agha-Soltan, the 26-year-old woman shot to death in the protests erupted into the social conscience of the global stage as a human story that illustrated the need for peace as it was used to contest the corrupted presidential election in June 2009. Her blue jeans and black top which the global youth could identify with effortlessly were tragically contrasted with her beautiful yet blood drenched face and the frenzy a few male

protestors went through to try to save her. The death of a young innocent non-violent woman provides a breach that demands a drama for redressive action. Coverage of the global recognition of Neda's death in *The New York Times* (2009, June 22) provides a good starting point for the use of Appadurai's five scapes to craft a nuanced global analysis. The narrative of how the video made its way into YouTube and CNN was fascinating:

Shortly after Ms. Agha-Soltan died, the man whose 40-second video of her death has ricocheted around the world made a somber calculation in what has become the cat-and-mouse game of evading Iran's censors. He knew that the government had been blocking Web sites like YouTube and Facebook. Trying to send the video there could have exposed him and his family.

Instead, he e-mailed the two-megabyte video to a nearby friend, who quickly forwarded it to the *Voice of America*, the newspaper *The Guardian* in London and five online friends in Europe, with a message that read, "Please let the world know." It was one of those friends, an Iranian expatriate in the Netherlands, who posted it on Facebook, weeping as he did so, he recalled.

Copies of the video, as well as a shorter one shot by another witness, spread almost instantly to YouTube and were televised within hours by CNN. Despite a prolonged effort by Iran's government to keep a media lid on the violent events unfolding on the streets, Ms. Agha-Soltan was transformed on the Web from a nameless victim into an icon of the Iranian protest movement.
(para. 5-8)

The complex technoscape (e.g., cellphones, computers, television sets) and mediascape (through the disjunctive flows from emails to print and electronic media outlets and social networking sites, carrying the video onto safer global

shores) featured a complex ethnoscape (including an unsung hero, the nameless Iranian man who shot and emailed the 40-second video, an Iranian expatriate in the Netherlands, and many media workers in England and elsewhere who were involved in the circulation of Neda). Combined together, these scapes also made the ideoscape, the ideas for freedom, democracy, fair election, martyrdom, state censorship, the Iranian protest movement, and a desire for basic human rights legible for the global youth.

Students are likely to relate to the performance of peace illustrated by the protesters such as Neda because the conversational moment between these protesters and our students is both recent and direct. However, students are less likely to associate themselves with Nobel Laureates. The performance of peace that students associate with Nobel Laureates, and therefore the Prize itself, can be an important starting point to engendering student peace activism. Then we can look to other moments, such as the case of Neda, through which to build the connections between Nobel and our student's lives and actions.

Another propitious "aha moment" in peace is the recent award of the prize to American President Obama. Obama's performance of peace is particularly useful as a case study for students because of its framing, by the White House and global media, as a "call to action" (NBC News, 2009, May 9; CBS/AP, 2009, May 9). Obama's win is not for a completed action, but rather for the publicly stated goal of nuclear disarmament and bringing about a potentially peaceful future. Significantly, the Nobel committee is cited as choosing Obama in order to help promote his goals: "to build momentum behind Obama's initiatives to reduce nuclear arms, ease tensions with the Muslim world and stress diplomacy and cooperation rather than unilateralism" (NBC News, 2009, May 9, para. 2). Obama's win, therefore, indicates a peace process that is only beginning, yet one which will encourage disarmament in congruence with health, social welfare, and other necessary implementations. It is significant that this futuristic goal reflects both the anti-tropes of negative peace and, because of the long-term goal

elements implied, the lasting tropes of positive peace. Thus, Obama's Nobel performance is that of *nourishing peace*.

Just days after Obama's win, the media reports debate over why Obama won the Prize, the first sitting United States President to do so since Woodrow Wilson's win for promoting the forerunner to the United Nations. Conservative Fox News and other similar voices suggest strong challenges to the win, citing that Obama has not accomplished a single act deserving the Prize. However, Nobel Prize committee members stress that they sought to recognize Obama's push for change in the overall focus of global power, echoing the awarding of the prize to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The performance here, unlike in the case of Neda Agha-Soltan, derives in part from the hegemonic traditions of media and power. Nobel and the Nobel performance in the case of Obama provides the moment of crisis required of Social Drama, as it illustrates the abrupt change from Bush-era policy and values and the worldviews of other nations toward the U.S. Ironically, conservative and liberal media voices both suggest that it is Obama's post-Bush approach, rejecting the outright war and military build-up of the former President, that is really being honored. CNN's Steve Clemmons (2009) explains, "They want a world where America is benign and positive, and where other leaders help in supporting the struggles of their people for better lives rather than securing themselves through crude power" (para. 3). The resulting ideoscape makes legible for global youth similar values to those illustrated in the Iranian protest movement: freedom, democracy, fairly elected officials, media censorship (though this time represented by Fox News and other conservative media in conflict with the state and the Nobel committee), and the desire for basic human rights.

Obama's own discussion of his win can be used as a tool for teaching students peace activism. At a news conference, Obama stated, "Let me be clear, I do not view it as a recognition of my own accomplishments, but rather as an affirmation of American leadership on behalf of aspirations held by people in all nations"

(CBS/AP, 2009, May 9, para. 6). Obama's claim that the award is a "call to action" for others inspires peace activism and reinforces that such goals reflect the ends desired by many peoples in many localities. He promotes performative activism that inspires our students, and is made meaningful and viable for multiple peoples' intrinsic needs.

In teaching our students *nourishing peace*, the parallels between the ideal explained by CNN's Clemmons and the necessities of human rights that touch their own lives need to be illustrated. The performance here is nourishing peace: to negate forces of violent oppression and the immediate elimination of unbearable violations and to simultaneously create forces and infrastructures which can ensure the presence of basic human entitlements such as health, safety, education, food, water, and dignity. These are the very needs that are echoed in our students' local communities, as well as in local cultures across the globe. With our guidance, and examples like Obama's Nobel and Neda Agha-Soltan's death, our students will be more likely to draw critical though often unnoticeable connections between nuclear disarmament and health care plans, civil action and equitable access to clean and drinkable water as types of peace and human rights efforts, and then to connect those efforts to local peace and human rights work here in Los Angeles, and in students' other localities.

The end goal: Engaging students in Nobel

The Nobel Peace Prize is situated as a lofty goal, something out of the reach of most people, including our students. The road to the Prize, though many of us will be persuaded to walk, can be materialized only by the few. To focus on the winning of the Prize as a personal goal seems to devalue the award itself. Yet the importance of the award resonates, and while students can only name a few Laureates, in class discussion and surveys they generally respond favorably to the ideal of the Prize.

Partly, this preference exists because of the few Laureates cited most often by students themselves: The Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King, Jr., Mother Theresa, the Dalai Lama, Al Gore, and, in recent conversations, Barack Obama. These Laureates are people for whom students express respect, particularly in relation to why they were awarded the prize. Significantly, Mahatma Gandhi is also listed by a large number of students as a Prize Laureate, though he never actually won. The examples of these relatively recent Laureates (and Gandhi) are not limited to the White, Western men in seats of political power traditionally recognized with the Prize, and Gore himself won after tenure in his public office ended. Instead these examples represent primarily persons who reflect many of the ideals we associate with a performance of nourishing peace. These are narratives that represent the storytelling moments promoted by Turner to which students can relate. These are also narratives that, once told critically, through the lens of global disjunctive flows and deep mobility, can become “aha moments” in our pedagogies for student peace activism.

Nourishing peace is further reflected in human rights narratives that our students also recognize, in news media discussions and from popular culture interpretations. Blood diamonds, Invisible Children, and Human Sex Trafficking are all issues students bring up in class discussion and public speaking exercises, and connections between the Nobel Peace Prize and these human rights issues encourage more of the necessary “aha moments” in our pedagogies. Students’ awareness of Laureates and their work is evidence of this “aha” potential. Along with the Nobel Laureates listed above, our students also commonly cite Nelson Mandela, Desmond Tutu, and Aung San Suu Kyi as Laureates, though at a lower frequency. These examples distinctly represent performative human rights activism as nourishing peace; as these Laureates seek both the end of warfare and political aggression, and an increase in resources and safety for oppressed peoples. To further investigate how students frame the Prize, we can ask our students to “nominate” people to the Nobel

Committee, and “nominate” people for the award. We may also ask them to suggest projects that will, in their view, be Nobel worthy.

Deepening the discussion, we can ask students to compare public actions as acts of peace. For example, Clinton’s act of saving two Asian-American women journalists in North Korea can be contrasted with Neda’s death in Iran. The controversy over Obama’s win is another example for debate in our classes. For our students, who is the more worthy of the Nobel Peace Prize? What forms of peace did each embody? This assignment may enhance the pedagogical power of the Prize for our students. Then, we can ask them what local activities can be done that would reflect similar forms of peace, or similar action. We can also suggest that they look for other forms of peace action in local projects, including their own.

Ultimately, and in conjunction with the goals of performative pedagogy as we claim it, we should be teaching through examples and encouraging projects that utilize the technologies that students use. We should draw on Obama’s “call to action” and use Nobel Prize as a means of inspiring obtainable local action, even if the Prize is less often awarded to those who do not eventually claim the global stage. We should be mindful in not simply using paper and analyses of peace and peace activism as they exist elsewhere, but encouraging that students start doing things that will generate nourishing peace exemplars.

Notes

¹ This article was begun months before reports of President Obama’s 2009 Nobel Peace Prize. Obama’s performance of peace, however, reflects, for us, the type of peace to which our students respond in classroom discussion, and represents the types of peace-building and peace-keeping efforts in which our students choose to participate.

² Trostle's definition of peace is cited in "The Nature of Peace and its Implications for Peace Education" by Leo R. Sandy and Ray Perkins, Jr. (2002, p. 5). In this study, Sandy, a veteran of the U.S. Navy and an active member of Veterans for Peace, engaged in dialogue with "fellow veterans to explore the nature of peace and, based on their own experiences of war, to provide a satisfactory account that could serve as a guide for all peace-makers who seek a world without war" (p. 1). The study draws on that dialogue with fellow veterans (such as Trostle) who served in the military between World War II and the Vietnam War and who are members of Veterans for Peace (2009), a nongovernmental organization of "veterans working together for peace and justice through nonviolence" (p. 1).

³ Obama's 2009 Nobel Prize is described in a similar fashion: less about a single event he accomplished than about the efforts undertaken to ensure a wide-ranging peace.

References

Abrams, I. (1994). Where there's a will: The struggle over Alfred Nobel's testament. Retrieved from <http://www.irwinabrams.com/articles/will.html>

Abrams, I. (2001). *The Nobel Peace Prize and the Laureates: An illustrated biographical history, 1901-2001*. Nantucket, MA: Science History Publications.

Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Public Culture*, 2(2), 1-24.

Beverley, J. (2008). *Testimonio*, subalternity, and narrative authority. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (3rd ed.), (pp. 257-270). London, England: Sage.

CBS/AP. (2009, May 9). Obama: Nobel Prize a “call to action”. CBS News/AP. Retrieved from <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/10/09/politics/main5374237.shtml>

Clemmons, S. (2009, October 9). Commentary: Obama’s unclenched fist won the Prize. CNN Politics. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/10/09/clemons.obama.peace.world/index.html?iref=newssearch>

Conquergood, D. (1988). Health theatre in a Hmong refugee camp: Performance, communication, and culture. *TDR: Journal of Performance Studies*, 32(3), 174-208.

Conquergood, D. (2007). Performing as a moral act: Ethical dimensions of the ethnography of performance. In P. Kuypers & G. Robertson (Eds.), *The community performance reader* (pp. 62-75). New York, NY: Routledge.

Fuller, T. (2009, October 9). Burmese dissident meets with foreign envoys. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/10/world/asia/10myanmar.html?_r=1&scp=1&sq=aung%20san%20suu%20kyi&st=cse

Galtung, J. (1985). Twenty-five years of peace research: Ten challenges and some responses. *Journal of Peace Research*, 22(2), 141-158.

Galtung, J. (1967). Two approaches to disarmament: The legalist and the structuralist. *Journal of Peace Research*, 4(2), 161-195.

Harris, I. (2004). Peace education theory. *Journal of Peace Education* 1(1), 5-20.

Hesser, L. (2006). *The man who fed the world: Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Norman Borlaug and his battle to end world hunger*. Dallas, TX: Durban House.

Hulme, D., & Goodhand, J. (1999). From wars to complex political emergencies: Understanding conflict and peacebuilding in the New World Order. *Third World Quarterly*, 20(1), 13-26.

King, M. L., Jr. (1964/2009). The Nobel Peace Prize 1964 Nobel Lecture, December 11, 1964. The Nobel Foundation. Retrieved from http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/1964/king-lecture.html

Landreman, L. M., Rasmussen, C. J., King, P. M., & Jiang, C. X. (2007). A phenomenological study of the development of university educators' critical consciousness. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(3), 275-296.

Loenhardt, D. (2009, November 6). Broader U.S. unemployment measure stands at 17.5%. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2009/11/07/business/economy/07econ.html?_r=1&hp

Lewer, N. (1992). *Physicians and the peace movement*. London, England: Routledge.

Lutuli, A. (1961/2009). The Nobel Peace Prize 1960 Nobel Lecture. December 11, 1961. The Nobel Foundation. Retrieved from http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/1960/lutuli-lecture.html

NBC News. (October 9, 2009). Obama: Nobel Peace Prize a 'call to action'. NBC News. Retrieved from http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/33237202/ns/politics-white_house/

Nobel, A. B. (1895/2009). Full text of Alfred Nobel's Will. The Nobel Foundation. Retrieved from http://nobelprize.org/alfred_nobel/will/will-full.html

Nobel Foundation. (1947/2009). Quakers and Peace. American Friends Service Committee, The Nobel Peace Prize 1947 Nobel Lecture, December 12, 1947. The Nobel Foundation. Retrieved from

http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/1947/friends-committee-lecture.html

Nobel Foundation. (1965/2009). The Nobel Peace Prize 1965. The Nobel Foundation. Retrieved from http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/1965/

Odelberg, W. (Ed.) (1978). *Les Prix Nobel* [The Nobel Prizes] 1977. Stockholm, Sweden: Nobel Foundation.

New York Times. (2009, June 22). *Times* topics: Neda Agha-Soltan. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/people/s/neda_gha_soltan/index.html?scp=1-spot&sq=Neda&st=cse

Sandy, L. R., & Perkins, R. (2002). The nature of peace and its implications for peace education. *OJPCR: The Online Journal of Peace and Conflict Resolution*, 4(2), 1-8. Retrieved from http://www.trinstitute.org/ojpcr/4_2natp.pdf

Tønnesson, Ø. (1999, December 1). Mahatma Gandhi, the Missing Laureate. The Nobel Foundation. Retrieved from http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/articles/gandhi/

Turner, V. (1974). *Dramas, fields, and metaphors: Symbolic action in human society*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Turner, V. (1967). *The forest of symbols*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Appendix A:

The 12 Women Nobel Peace Laureates

1905 - Bertha von Suttner

1931 - Jane Addams

1946 - Emily Greene Balch

1976 - Betty Williams

1976 - Mairead Corrigan

1979 - Mother Teresa

1982 - Alva Myrdal

1991 - Aung San Suu Kyi

1992 - Rigoberta Menchú Tum

1997 - Jody Williams

2003 - Shirin Ebadi

2004 - Wangari Maathai

About the authors

Dr. Victoria Newsom's research centers on the negotiation of power, gender, and identity in performative and communication contexts. Her current projects include work in media activism, peace studies, postcolonial feminism(s), and performative pedagogies. Victoria is an active researcher with book chapters and articles in *Communication Yearbook*, *Femspec*, and *Feminist Media*

Studies. Victoria's current research and activist interests lay in the preservation of human rights and human dignity. Dr. Newsom is an instructor in the Department of Communication Studies and Department of Liberal Studies at California State University, Los Angeles. She serves as faculty advisor to two student Human Rights organizations Los Angeles, and is developing a nonprofit foundation for Human Rights and Media Activism. She can be reached at Victoria@victorianewsom.net

Dr. Wenshu Lee (Ph.D., the University of Southern California) is Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at Loyola Marymount University. She teaches qualitative research methods, critical intercultural communication, and critical organizational communication. Her current research focuses on transnational womanism and feminism in theorizing social justice, deep codes in intercultural interactions, transformative pedagogy, and the trope of “health” for human rights and global equity. Her work appears in the journals of communication studies (e.g., *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *Howard Journal of Communications*), interdisciplinary journals (e.g., *Journal of Homosexuality*, *Industrial Marketing Management*), and various scholarly anthologies on rhetoric, social justice, and the human condition.