

# Review of: "Reflections on Bordering, Micropolitics and Everyday Life in Peacebuilding Processes: Revisiting the Lingering Legacy of the 1949 Armistice Agreements"

Azmat Khan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ohio University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This is a very interesting article, compelling making a case for an alternative/defractive (micro) approach to peace building. This is important because past and current approaches tend to privilege large scale, macro approaches (and elite voices) to conflict resolution, overlooking the voices/people that are most directly affected by it. Now that the conflict has flared up yet again, and more forcefully, this articles seems to make a good contrition to the existing literature on the Israel-Palestine conflict.

I have a few suggestions.

On the concept of "assemblage," Jasbir Puar's book might be helpful. One chapter specifically zooms in on how Palestinians navigate their daily lives through the check posts.

Puar, J. K. (2017). *The Right to Maim: Debility, Capacity, Disability*. Duke University Press.

This article on the micro stealing of the Palestinians' time might also be interesting. Peteet, J. (2008). Stealing Time. *Middle East Report 248* (Fall 2008). <https://merip.org/2008/09/stealing-time/>

In the following three excerpts, I felt that the authors are privileging the macro discourses which would be against their theoretical commitment in this article (to privilege and center micro politics, and grant agency to local, everyday voices/agents)

"The sharply contrasting perceptions of the role that the Armistice Agreements should play in the peace process today are complicating the search for possible peace solutions for the region."

"...many observers in Syria and Lebanon perceive the shunting aside of the original Agreements as a strategy *otdivide et impera*, rather than an effort to build on Bunche's original effort to construct and consolidate a comprehensive long-lasting peace in the Middle East."

"...but instead from the constant questioning of such proposals by analysts, officials, and residents." Only the questioning of the macro pacts, in my opinion, still reproduces/recenters the macro discourses. I think giving more scholarly space to local voices serve the epistemological promise the authors are making.

On more thing:

“...how the discourses of war become part of identities and landscapes and thereby shape the thinking and imagined possibilities, that is, the everyday lives of those they touch.” Can we also ask the vice versa, i.e., how/whether local micro practices of space making, living, storying, and remembering also shape macro narratives? If not, why not?

Finally, one typo.

opening one’s political “yes” (I guess “eyes”

I hope my suggestions somehow help the further refinement of this article.