MUELLER-HIRTH, N. and RIOS OYOLA, S. (eds.) 2018. *Time and temporality in transitional and post-conflict societies*. Routledge advances in sociology, 244. Abingdon: Routledge [online]. Available from: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315208930

Time and temporality in transitional and post-conflict societies.

MUELLER-HIRTH, N. and RIOS OYOLA, S. (eds.)

2018

This file contains a single extract from the larger work. This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge/CRC Press in *Time and Temporality in Transitional and Post-Conflict Societies* on 22.03.2018, available online: http://www.routledge.com/9781315208930

OpenAIR @RGU

This document was downloaded from https://openair.rgu.ac.uk

CC BY NC

1. INTRODUCTION: TEMPORAL PERSPECTIVES ON TRANSITIONAL AND POST-CONFLICT SOCIETIES

Natascha Mueller-Hirth & Sandra Rios Oyola

After participating in large international comparative research projects on transitional justice in post-conflict societies, in addition to our own trajectories as researchers specialised on the South African and Colombian cases respectively, we found that reflection on time and temporality, although present in some works, was lacking as a systematic perspective in the fields of transitional justice and peacebuilding. This is surprising, given that time is a crucial dimension in the understanding of social transformation and is particularly relevant for addressing questions related to the legacies of violent pasts and the construction of peaceful futures. The idea for this book drew from Mueller-Hirth's (2017) article on *temporalities of victimhood* and was developed thanks to the generous response by the contributors to the volume. The backbone of the collection is our belief that by exploring how time is experienced, constructed and used by people and institutions, some central problems in post-conflict societies can be revealed and analysed in a unique way. The volume aims, empirically, to develop a deeper understanding of the role time plays in overcoming violent pasts and, theoretically, to contribute time-sensitive perspectives to the fields of transitional justice and peacebuilding.

Our argument is grounded in the sociology of time, which regards measurements of time and notions of temporality as defined by culture and society and examines how time is used to govern and to construct social meanings (Adam 1990; Adam 2004; Bergmann 1992; Elias 1993; Schwartz 1974; Zerubavel 1981; among others). There is no unique ontological manner

of registering time nor of perceiving it. In theories of time, a distinction is often made between social time and inner time (see Adam 2004 for an excellent overview). Social time is linear, measurable, predictable, as well as regular and uniform because, as Zerubavel (1981; 1985) claims, social events reflect particular dominant temporal expectations. By contrast, inner time is multiple and discontinuous; it is a cyclical time in which events reoccur and repeat themselves. Time typifications such as cyclical/circular vs. linear are also debated in the social sciences, particularly in anthropology where cyclical time is often imposed on traditional or small-scale societies and 'western time' characterised as linear, abstract and sequentially stretched. Munn (1992: 101) has been critical of these ways of typifying time and proposes alternatives such as the image of a leaf, which represents the growth of generations from the originating past and as such involves repetition, successiveness, and developmental components. Similarly, Adam (2004: 144 - 145) suggests that we think of temporal relations as 'clusters of temporal features', such as time frames, tempo, timing, sequence and patterns, whose relationships and relative importance are dynamic and contextually dependent.

While spatial metaphors, such as *moving forward* and *leaving the past behind*, help us to make sense of the *passing of time*, these metaphors are not universal. For example, scientists that rely on geological excavations tend to refer to the past in vertical terms, as that which is deep underground (Simonetti 2013). Understandings of time can follow multiple directions, and different notions of temporality may overlap or clash against each other. Despite the complexity and richness in the social study of time, Western normative and teleological notions of time associated with progress and linearity have predominantly influenced scholars and practitioners in the fields of transitional justice, reconciliation and peacebuilding.

Moreover, to recognise that there are non-linear, and potentially multiple, temporalities does not imply that these temporalities cannot be normative or dominant (Bastian 2014: 15). The social science knowledge on time also allows us to better understand its power effects, demonstrating that control over time is a medium of hierarchical power and governance. There are inequalities in how time is used and whose time is valued, and time plays an important role in social methods of inclusion and exclusion (Bastian 2014). Scholars of time have demonstrated a range of ways in which time becomes the object of social control and temporal power relations are shaped. For example, temporal power relations are gendered; women do more unpaid work and more caring work. Caring work in particular has a temporal logic – fluid, relational and cyclical – that can be contrasted with the linearity of market capitalism and male-dominated productive work (Bryson 2007), while the non-linear and unpredictable 'generativity of child bearing' is sometimes thought of as 'feminine time', or indeed 'feminine timelessness' (West-Pavlov 2013: 101-102). Women are most affected by the need to 'straddle multiple temporalities' (Everingham 2002, cited in Bryson 2007: 134). Representations of singlehood and marriage, and their associated temporal experiences of waiting, moreover are gendered (Lahad 2012). Temporality is also understood, and new temporal logics shaped, through sexuality and sexual difference (Halberstam 2005). Moreover, temporalities and temporal relations have been shown to operate through unemployment (Auyero 2012, Harms 2013), chronic illness (Charmaz 1991) and drug addiction (Reith 1999), to name but a few areas of research.

Notions of time and temporality play a crucial role in the study of post-conflict societies as well as in the transitional justice paradigm. Transitional justice aims to address wrongdoings of repressive predecessor regimes in order to combat denial and promote justice, accountability and transparency through strengthening the rule of law (Teitel 2003). More recently,

transitional justice mechanisms have also been used in established democracies such as Canada or Australia as a form of redress the unfair treatment of indigenous people through reparations and public apologies.

Transitional justice has been described as 'Janus-faced' in the sense that it contributes toward accountability measures that deal with the past as well as mechanisms that seek to assert stable futures.[1] In this regard, Teitel (1997: 2014) states that 'law is caught between the past and the future, between backward-looking and forward-looking, between retrospective and prospective'. Similarly, Hobbs argues that transitional justice is different from other forms of justice:

> The great significance of the field is its Janus-faced nature. While constitutional redemption is purely forward looking, transitional justice recognises that the past is always with us. In mediating the past, the present and the future, transitional justice understands that political commitment to a more just future can only be secured by acknowledgement of past wrongs and the promise of reparative action. (2016: 513).

The terms 'transitional' and 'post-conflict' have clear temporal referents. The promise of transformation is implicitly built upon a notion of progress, 'leaving the past behind' and 'moving toward democracy'. Following an implicit teleological temporality, the transitional justice discourse considers that a society goes from one stage of violence to another of democracy and peace. Transitional justice mechanisms such as trials, truth commissions and amnesties act as seals that control what is brought from the past, such as previously denied human rights abuse, as well as warranting the locking away of the past through amnesties,

vetting and trials. They seek to open the doors for future peaceful societies. This teleology is associated with a bias toward Western style democracies, in which the term 'transition' implies a 'change in a liberalizing direction' (Teitel 2000: 13). Transitional justice's teleological dimension has been criticised for not representing the empirical reality of transitional societies, nor the 'subjective perspective of members of a given transitional society' (Murphy 2017: 68; also see Hinton in this volume). Similarly, reconciliation is embedded in a discourse of progress, where societies are moving towards peace by healing broken relationships. In this volume (chapter 2), Valerie Rosoux explores some of the limitations of this temporal perspective for an understanding of reconciliation.

Moreover, this rhetoric requires a clear setting of boundaries between past and present, as well as future. Amid the chaos of lengthy conflicts, or conflicts that have risen out of chronic deprivation and inequality, setting such boundaries for the past or for the beginning of a conflict in the official discourse is a political act in itself. Definitions of the past are achieved through the implementation of temporal margins for truth commissions, as well as setting temporal limitations for defining who can be considered a victim. In the case of South Africa, but also among many Latin American cases, these temporalities established by the law leave victims of colonialism absent from the official narrative of transition and democratization, and 'longer temporalities and structural interpretations of the origins of armed conflict disappeared' from the official and public discourse (Castillejo-Cuellar 2014: 51). Indeed, we might argue that, by designating a country a 'post-conflict society', violence is relegated to the past and treated as a temporary episode rather than as an ongoing structural concern.

In the literature on peacebuilding, the concern for time has centred on the *timing* of efforts of resolution, which includes conceptions of 'ripeness': a situation in which 'substantive answers are fruitless until the moment is ripe' (Zartman 2000: 225; also see Rousoux, chapter 2). This approach focuses on models that can estimate the right moment to advance peace negotiations when other solutions are not achievable. Notions of timing have also been influenced by sequentialism, which highlights the necessity of considering the order of interventions in transitional societies in order to reach the desired effect of peaceful transitions. This perspective warns of 'the dangers of moving quickly toward elections in countries with little democratic history' (Carothers 2007: 15).

An important response to the hegemonic one-size-fits-all model of the liberal peace has been brought by the so-called 'local turn in peacebuilding', which instead emphasises the necessity of empowering local people as the primary authors of peacebuilding (see for example Mac Ginty & Oliver 2013). However, this literature has not explicitly engaged with temporal aspects of peacebuilding, and particularly with the significance of local temporalities that – as several of the contributors to this book demonstrate – shape understandings and practices of violence and peace. Although there has been an interest in issues of timing (Mac Ginty 2016), the lack of attention to specific local understandings of time in the peacebuilding literature seems a missed opportunity.

The time dimensions studied in this book

The contributors to this volume show that a progressive temporality does not necessarily apply to the transitional and post-conflict societies studied and highlight that violence and non-violence are not as easily demarcated. Past and present can seem continuous, rather than being separated clearly as violent/peaceful and democratic, because violence has not ceased or

because experiences of marginalization continue in the 'post'-conflict era. Violence and suffering are not necessarily temporary ruptures but, for many, conflict, violence and suffering are part of the social fabric (Vigh 2008). Moreover, people's lived experiences of time do not always conform to a linear temporality: for instance, victims' traumatic experiences can exist in plural temporalities, answering to the challenge of honouring the past while moving forward.

This collection aims to problematise, through empirical research in a range of contexts, a straightforward, taken-for-granted notion of time in transitional justice and peacebuilding. We have identified several key themes that can be made visible through the lens of time and temporality, which appear and sometimes overlap across the sections and chapters of this volume:

(1) tensions, clashes, and negotiations between different temporalities in the context of transitional justice and victims' and perpetrators' experiences of lived time;

(2) how these different temporalities produce an unequal distribution of power in post-conflict settings, leading to the socio-temporal marginalisation of some in society and to repercussions for processes of reconciliation, reparations and change;

(3) the effects of social acceleration on transitional and post-conflict societies; and

(4) how collective memorialization becomes a vehicle to transmit memories of the past through the lenses of the present.

This introduction now develops these four key themes and then outlines the structure of the book and the contributions that comprise the volume.

Multiple temporalities

A number of contributors found a distinction between temporalities shaped by institutions such as those in charge of reparations, trials and truth commissions, and the temporalities corresponding to the lived experiences of people affected by violence. In the Argentinian context (van Roekel, chapter 5 in this volume), victims' histories of the last dictatorship and its aftermath were a 'collective jumble of significant personal episodes that did not follow an established chronological thread of events'; conversely, for military officers, by institutionalising and materialising violence, time was an 'orderly and fixed business' with emphasis on the future. In communities in post-war Mozambique (Igreja, chapter 6), embodied accountability, such as the intrusion of spirits of the dead, pursues liability for serious violations committed over an indeterminate time span and irrespective of the passage of time. These embodied accountability practices can be contrasted with the temporality of global accountability projects, as encapsulated in transitional justice, which involve predetermined time frames and a clear division between past and present.

Importantly, these contributions demonstrate alternative conceptions of time that are used to engage, cope and survive the long-term effects of atrocity and other forms of human rights violations. They highlight that local workings of time shape practices of remembering, reconstruction and accountability. However, although it is crucial for our understanding of societies emerging from conflict and authoritarianism to recognise the existence of these different temporalities, this recognition can have disempowering effects for marginalised people, given the hierarchies and power differentials in the uses and understandings of time.

The idea of the disempowering effect of the notion that certain groups belong to different temporalities is not new. Johannes Fabian (1983: 1), in his analysis of the uses of time in anthropology, exposed that certain time discourses are employed in the description of the

'other' and function to create distance in a seemingly neutral manner or in describing certain groups as archaic, tribal or primitive. The 'temporalizing of difference' can involve the labelling of 'other' people, cultures and societies as belonging to the past, which gives rise to associated claims about their irrationality, underdevelopment, rituals, religiosity, and so on (Helliwell and Hindess 2005).

Time and unequal power relations

We can observe this link between time and power in relation to victims/survivors in post-conflict societies, who, after a certain amount of time has passed, are often portrayed as anachronistic, as belonging to a different time, being unwilling to 'move on' into the democratic era, or failing to conform to the dominant post-conflict temporality. Victims/ survivors, but also other groups in society, can feel 'lost in transition' (Pedersen & H∅jer 2008) or 'out of sync' with the rest of society (Mueller-Hirth 2017: 200). Societal pressure to forget the past or to forgive can result in a denial of their rhythm of possible reconciliation in favour of political reconciliation demanded from governments facing vulnerable transitions, as is explored by Rios Oyola in relation to Colombia and by Benda with regards to Rwanda in this volume (chapters 4 and 8, respectively). Benda explores the different versions of future and past used by policy makers in post-genocide Rwanda. Rios Oyola investigates how the temporality of political peace processes influences the temporality of social peace processes, analysing this relationship in terms of social acceleration. Social and political expectations about the timing, duration and pace of people's victimhood and their willingness to forgive, which reflect linear 'transitional justice time' (Hinton, this volume) and its notions of the past, present and future, lead to the socio-temporal marginalization of people's lived experiences.

An exercise of power through the politics of time can also be observed in the delays and waiting

times that people experience in post-conflict societies, for example in relation to reparations, victim support, recognition, or socio-economic change. The distribution of waiting time is connected with the distribution of power: to be kept waiting is a social assertion that one's time and social worth are less valuable (Schwartz 1974; Bourdieu 2010). Because waiting is bound up with social status and power, it is often designated to the poor and the powerless (Harms 2013; Auyero 2012), and indeed exacerbates inequalities (Reid 2013). Waiting, as analysed by Mueller-Hirth in chapter 7 of this volume, is a time-based problem that reveals the complexities and inequalities of reparations and change in South Africa more than two decades after the end of Apartheid.

The effects of acceleration

Part of the inequalities that the authors observe stem from a temporal conflict between social acceleration and the specific demands of transitional and post-conflict societies. Social acceleration has characterised the development of modernity, although the emergence of a technologically-driven neoliberalism and the increasing networking of societies has more recently led to increasing time scarcity and the 'shrinking of the present' (Rosa 2003, Rosa & Scheuerman 2009). Rosa (2003) distinguishes three categories of acceleration: technological acceleration, the acceleration of social change and the acceleration of the pace of life. We argue that acceleration throws up particular issues for transitional and post-conflict societies.

In general terms, the pace of economic and social change in 'acceleration societies' (Rosa 2003) involves a very different temporal logic than the logic underlying victim support and reparations policies, which are often aimed at redressing the legacies of many years of violence and discrimination. Virilio (1997) has claimed that we live in a 'dictatorship of speed'; the necessity of speed is held up as a virtue and is associated with vitality and vigour (Tomlinson

2007). Conversely, patience, something that is often asked of people in transitional and post-conflict societies, is a cultural value that arguably loses its significance with the development of modernity and the compression of time. We contend here that there are conflicts between the demands of acceleration societies and the patience that is required in post-conflict societies in order to achieve redistribution, redress and social reconstruction. Acceleration, and its associated virtue of speed, provides a temporal frame for social expectations on victims to move on and for transitional justice processes to wrap up quickly. For example, conflicts between different time cultures have been documented in Germany after reunification, when West German depictions of East German culture portrayed it as too slow and always being 'behind in time' (Rau 2002).

Moreover, acceleration is relevant to the concerns of this volume in that political apologies and other political processes can act as an accelerators for reconciliation efforts, without important historical, social and economic issues necessarily having been addressed (also see Rosoux's chapter on the tempo of reconciliation, this volume). Political apologies can be understood as 'prime examples of deliberate attempts to intervene in shared understandings of political community and its temporality' (Bastian 2013: 3). Rios Oyola's chapter (this volume) seeks to understand to what extent the Colombian peace plebiscite and the FARC's public apologies work as fuel for accelerating the social peace process in order to overcome desynchronization with the political peace process. The challenges emerging from this desynchronization echo the pressures on victims in relation to forgiveness, as already outlined above (2).

Memorialisation

Transitional justice discourse holds the promise of remembering as a way to 'never again' perpetrate the types of atrocities that occurred in the past. Memories, as acts of representations,

allow individuals to locate themselves in time and distinguish themselves from the past (Feindt et al. 2014: 28). The impact of memory in transitional and post-conflict societies is found in the framework of a *politics of regret*; the politics adopted by post-conflict countries through attempts to retrospective justice and redressing past wrongs (Olick 2007). The foundation of the idea that collective memory offers a strong relationship between the past and the present relies on the notion that societies are capable of learning lessons from the past, and that proper narratives of social memory can help to prevent societies from romanticising past violence. Politics of memory are intended to work as careful warnings against the temptation of nostalgia by recognizing the unjust harms suffered by victims but they also 'propagate new interpretative narratives about the "what happened" to legitimate a new political dispensation and develop a new vision of the future for the polity' (de Brito 2010: 360, also see Iecker de Almeida, chapter 9).

Just like there is no present without past there is also no past without present, as Iecker de Almeida demonstrates when she writes about acts of *undoing the past* in post-authoritarian Brazil: 'undoing is the attempt to make it seem *as if* the past had never happened by creating different timelines which allow the adoption of an alternative future' (chapter 9, this volume). Both official policies of memorialization and spontaneous grassroots memorialization are influenced by present events and present emotions but 'the past is [also] re-evaluated in light of the future' (Assman 2013: 55). Current collective emotions act as gateways of memories of the past; they help to create representations of the past according to the interests of the present, following Koselleck's claim that 'the present past is saturated with personal memories and emotions through which the living are involved in it and bound up in it' (Assman 2013: 48). It is possible that current social emotions influenced by a human rights discourse could help to

shape narratives of social memory that allow understanding the past as lessons for the future and preventing the repetition of violence.

The mere recollection of the past is not sufficient warranty for such events to not be repeated. The power of remembering in order for such kind of atrocities to not happen 'never again!' should be based on a clear peacebuilding agenda, since today's victims, justified by their memories, can become tomorrow's perpetrators. Mamdani (2002: 17) illustrates this point in the case of the Rwandan genocide: 'How many perpetrators were victims of yesteryears? What happens when yesterday's victims act out of a determination that they must never again be victimised*, never again*?' Volkan's (1997; 2004) notion of chosen traumas – shared mental representations of a massive trauma experienced by a group's ancestors that are reactivated and sometimes exaggerated – also emphasises how past violations can drive present-day social movements and political mobilisations. Memory representations can lead to a 'time collapse', where ideas and feelings connected with the past are folded in with those of a current conflict: 'under the influence of a time collapse, people may intellectually separate the past event from the present one, but emotionally the two events are merged' (Volkan 1997: 35).

It is important to note however that, just as there is no linear narrative of violence, there is no linear teleological transmission of memories of violence (Shaw 2010). While some memories of violence can cohere into approved forms, other forms of memory are embodied, ritual, non- or poly-discursive (Berliner 2010; Pichler 2010). Rothberg (2009: 13-14) introduces the concept of multi-directional memory in order to highlight how memories are subject to competition, negotiation, and overlapping led by social and political forces. Gandolfo, in chapter 10, considers ruins in Palestine/Israel as examples of embodied memory and resistance. She explores how walking through ruins represents the visitor's negotiation with

'pluritemporalities' – different interpretations of collective and subjective time. Gandolfo shows the ruins she studied as an example of sites that allow memory practices to be revisited, redefined, and relocated through ongoing processes of memory work, such as cultural activism and heritage movements. The notion of a clear division between past and present then needs to be challenged:

> Many of the salient phenomena in international and domestic politics of the last decades - reparation politics, the outing of official apologies, the creation of truth commissions, historical commissions and commissions of historical reconciliation, etc. - revolve around a growing conviction that the once commonsensical idea of a past automatically distancing itself from the present is fundamentally problematic, and that the belief that the past is superseded by every new present has been more a wish than an experiential reality (Lorenz and Bevernage 2013: 16).

From this perspective, past, present and future are less part of a linear continuity but overlap, revolve in circularities and can influence each other. The challenge to describe, define and understand these multiple temporalities is one that we have encountered in this book.

The relevance of this volume

We agree with Barbara Adam who writes that we need 'time literate social theory' (2003). In this vein, we want to advance time-literate thinking about the issues that affect transitional and post-conflict societies. The contributors to this book all seek to develop a deeper understanding of how time is experienced and constructed in transitional and post-conflict societies through different uses and understandings of temporal categories and concepts. Research in the areas of transitional justice and peacebuilding has rarely systematically considered these issues.

However, as Munn noted, the problem of time is the difficulty of 'find[ing] a meta-language to conceptualise something so ordinary and apparently transparent in everyday life' (Munn 1992: 116). How can we take time more explicitly into account when we study transitions and post-conflict societies, and how can temporal analyses provide insights into their social and political dynamics? In this regard, this volume links social theories of time to empirical research from a wide geographical range of case studies. The different conceptions of time and temporality used in this volume do not attempt to provide a unified theory of time in transitional societies; rather, the authors present temporal analyses of some of the key dynamics of transitional and post-conflict societies, such as victimhood, reconciliation, forgiveness, collective memory building, intergenerational transmission and reparations.

Therefore, while this book develops a novel theoretical approach to studying transitional and post-conflict societies, its key objective is to enhance our understanding of the challenges these societies face after the ending of mass violence. To engage with dimensions of time and temporality allows researchers, policy makers and practitioners to problematise the discourse, implementation, and long-term consequences of transitional justice in ways that have not been observed before. Different perceptions of time and temporality have many significant impacts for the operationalization of policies aimed to transform the aftermath of conflict. For example, institutions that rely on the reporting of instances of violence and conflict in order to develop future-oriented policies rely on the accuracy of reports that are based on Western notions of time that often do not reflect local understandings of conflict and temporality (Igreja 2012, McLeod 2013) or the consequences of living amid chronic and acute violence (Read and Mac Ginty 2017). The 'politics of waiting', as they play out in relation to victim support policies, can shape people's engagement with the state and former enemies in the post-conflict

settlement.

The research in this volume demonstrates that 'transitional justice time' is not neutral and that temporal modes produce particular power relations in transitional and post-conflict settings. A notion of linear time, if left unchallenged, might be decisive in narratives about societies 'moving forward' without recognizing the multiple temporalities that exist in relation to traumatic or violent experiences and that can account for how people's conceptions of justice and healing change dynamically (Igreja 2012). Moreover, we believe that developing a deeper understanding of the role time plays in overcoming violent pasts and the challenges, many of them long-term, that are faced in post-conflict societies can bring us closer to the lived reality of peacebuilding and transitional justice and to the people who are most affected by them. Conflicts are often triggered by the 'historical accumulation of separate and unresolved violent conflicts' (Igreja 2012: 4) or 'chosen traumas' (Volkan 2004), as discussed above, that can lead to renewed cycles of violence. These cycles are in no manner unescapable, and an appropriate understanding of how time is perceived, constructed and lived in transitional and post-conflict societies can help to address and prevent ritualised violence and the repetition or re-enactment of traumatic memories. We hope that this new understanding goes some way towards better grasping the conditions for establishing sustainable peace.

As such, our objectives in this volume are both practical and theoretical: this book not only intends to make a case for the need to theoretically engage with the category of time, but we also hope that, in its empirical contributions, it can highlight some neglected dimensions that are crucial for building sustainable peace. Similarly, our focus on temporalities and temporal domination does not imply that we neglect other dimensions of power, marginalisation and exclusion. On the contrary, one of our concerns in this volume is to pay closer attention to

taken-for-granted aspects of transitions and less noticeable forms of power, and to become alert to how socio-temporal marginalisation contributes to the exercise of power.

Structure of the book

This book presents original research from nine transitional or post-conflict settings, including Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Rwanda, Cambodia, Mozambique, Palestine/Israel, and South Africa. The authors have used different approaches, methodologies and conceptualisations in analysing aspects of time and temporality. Their research is based on interviews, participant observations, document analysis and historical analysis, among other methods, and is often ethnographic in approach. Together, the authors demonstrate that temporal analyses can provide new and important insights into the social and political dynamics of societies after the end of violence. Although the collection provides an ambitious geographical scope, its purpose is to explore and problematise the role of time and temporality in post-conflict and transitional societies, rather than providing exhaustive description of cases or cross-comparative analysis.

The volume is divided into three sections. The sections have emerged from, and reflect, the empirical cases the contributors produced. The four substantial themes that we developed earlier – multiple temporalities, time and power, acceleration and memorialisation – cut across these sections. Part I, *Questioning Transitional Justice Time*, establishes that transitions, transitional justice institutions and processes have particular dominant time orientations that are associated with truth claims. In chapter 2, Valerie Rosoux provides an opening conceptual reflection on the necessity of considering time in post-conflict negotiations and reconciliation, introducing many of the issues that subsequent chapters unpack. Rousoux criticises the idea of the 'ripeness' of a conflict by stimulating a comparative analysis between different cases,

including the Franco-German, Franco-Algerian, Rwandan and South African conflicts. She demonstrates how differences in tempo and timing can challenge enthusiastic, but premature, calls for reconciliation. Reconciliation emerges as an open-ended and non-linear process that needs to deal with the transgenerational transmission of guilt and victimisation, as well as with individual and collective approaches to remembering and forgetting. Chapter 3, by Alexander Hinton, draws on ethnographic research on the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia. This so-called Khmer Rouge Tribunal, a hybrid tribunal with an outreach mandate, is an example for growing awareness of the gap between abstract justice and the understandings and experiences of post-conflict populations. Through analysing the journey of Uncle San and Aunty Yan, characters in a widely used Tribunal outreach graphic booklet, Hinton argues that a particular conception of time – 'transitional justice time' – is manifest in its narrative. Transitional justice time is premised upon a particular conception of teleological transformation and idealised liberal democratic being that serves to erase historical complexities and masks, and even effaces, local understandings, including Buddhist temporalities prevalent in Cambodia. In Chapter 4, Rios Oyola analyses how the urgency of the political peace process in Colombia is subjected to deadlines that reflect the vulnerability of the agreement, political interests and the pressure of the international community. This urgency is transmitted to the social peace process, understood as the process of societal healing conducted by civil society (Brewer 2013). Her chapter does not only highlight the existence of different temporalities between the social and the political peace process, but studies how the latter tries to influence the former through social acceleration devices such as the peace plebiscite and public apologies.

This second part of the book, *Co-existing and conflicting temporalities,* attends to victims' and perpetrators' experiences of lived time, which are often at odds with those of 'transitional

justice time' as examined in Part I. Eva van Roekel studies, from an anthropological perspective, the relationships between time and violence in Argentina in chapter 5. Her data, emerging from conversations with victims and perpetrators, show how different and dynamic forms of time-as-lived and valuations of violence co-exist and produce diverse understandings of local transitional justice trajectories. She argues that we should rethink transitional justice processes by analysing the specific nature of how communities and individuals conceive the relationship between violence and time: far from being linear movements away from violence and suffering, transitional justice processes can exist as an ongoing re-enactment of the violence and suffering and a moral practice to keep it in the present. Victor Igreja, in chapter 6, similarly addresses the contrast between the temporality of local practices of accountability and of forms of global accountability that are part of the transitional justice repertoire. Drawing on ethnographic research and the case of a family in a community in conflict in Mozambique, he shows that liability and justice remain intrinsically linked to embodied processes that transcend time and individual selves. Consequently, addressing injustice does not necessarily involve conflict resolution such as it would be upheld by institutions, but rather an embodied accountability across generations. His research suggests that negotiations over temporalities of wrongdoing, instead of stricter periodization of gross human rights violations, are instrumental for averting new cycles of vengeful violence. Chapter 7 moves from questions of accountability to concerns about the timing of reparations and recognition. Mueller-Hirth examines the experiences and effects of waiting for victim support and social change among those affected by Apartheid-era human rights violations, twenty years after the democratic transition. She employs the notion of 'fixed liminality' to show that waiting for delayed payments of reparations, and for change more broadly, has left some victims/ survivors in a permanent in-between state and unable to move on from their victimhood. Her contribution demonstrates that delays and waiting are strategies of power that contribute to the socio-

temporal marginalisation of particular groups in post-conflict societies, making the timing of reparations a crucial issue.

The third part of the book, *Intergenerational transmission and Memorialisation*, is concerned with the relationships of time with memory in relation to how pasts, presents and futures are understood and mobilised. Richard Benda explores important issues around the intergenerational transmission of trauma, guilt and responsibility in his chapter on the 'children of killers' in post-genocide Rwanda. Drawing on participatory research with Youth Connekt Dialogue (YCD) – essentially *intragenerational* dialogues that deal with the *intergenerational* transmission of trauma and guilt – he shows that the government's claims to be the sole custodian of the social organisation of time is contested both by victims and by children of perpetrators. Through the metaphors of 'rear-view mirror' versus 'windshield' temporalities, shared intergenerational time senses and a subaltern temporality could be expressed. He shows that, by applying a time-focused approach to YCD, we can gain a better understanding of how plural, competing and complementary temporalities interact in the transitional timeline, to reorder the past and shape the future, and critique the government's temporal expectations for national reconstruction and reconciliation. In chapter 9, Gisele Iecker De Almeida critically analyses the philosophy of history that underlies the processes of re-memorialisation of Brazil's most recent dictatorial period. By analysing the reparation and truth seeking programmes and recent state efforts at memorialisation and renaming, she traces the ways in which the Brazilian state has sought to 'undo the past' by reshaping how it is perceived in the present in line with a more desirable future and new narrative of the nation. Moving on from the previous chapter's concern with a state's efforts to shape memory to a study of restoration as a form of activism, Luisa Gandolfo, in chapter 10, considers the depopulated West Bank towns of Kufr Bir'im and Iqrit. She explores the ways in which restoration of these sites provides a point of

memorialisation, healing and communal commemoration, as well as a mechanism of resistance and cultural activivism. In doing so, she counters Halbwachs' idea that history is a 'dead memory' by positing that an 'organic' relation is sustained through the presence of subsequent generations who keep history alive through formal and informal commemorations and celebrations. By engaging with the notion of pluritemporality, her chapter considers the position of the sites as material mnemonics, physically present, yet absent from the state discourse. As Palestinians and Israelis ascribe alternative names and histories to the sites, the locations become not just heterotopic counter-sites, but also heterochronic as certain epochs are selected and others discarded in the retelling of a site's past.

Notes

1 Crawford (2015: 475) presents a similar claim for restorative justice 'simultaneously look[ing] backwards and forward across time'

References

Adam, Barbara. 1990. *Time and social theory*. Cambridge: Polity.

Adam, Barbara. 2003. Reflexive modernization temporalized. *Theory, Culture & Society* 20 (2): 59-78.

Adam, Barbara. 2004. *Time*. Cambridge: Polity.

Assman, Aleida. 2013. Transformations of the Modern Time Regime. In: Lorenz, Chris and Bevernage, Berber (eds.) *Breaking up Time. Negotiating the Borders between Present, Past and Future.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Pp. 39-56.

Auyero, Javier. 2012. Patients of the State: The Politics of Waiting in Argentina. Durham: Duke University Press.

Barahona de Brito, Alexandra. 2010. Transitional Justice and Memory: Exploring Perspectives. *South European Society and Politics* 15 (3): 359–76.

Bastian, Michelle. 2013. Political apologies and the question of a 'shared time' in the Australian context. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 30 (5): 94-121.

Bastian, Michelle. 2014. Time and community: A scoping study. *Time & Society*. 23(2): 137-166.

Bergmann, Werner. 1992. The problem of time in sociology: An overview of the literature on the state of theory and research on the Sociology of Time, 1900-82. *Time & Society*, 1(1): 81-134.

Berliner, David. 2010. Memories of Initiation Violence: Remembered Pain and Religious Transmission among the Bulongic (Guinea, Conakry). In Argenti, Nicolas and Schramm, Katherina, eds. *Remembering Violence. Anthropological Perspectives on Intergenerational Transmission*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2000. *Pascalian meditations.* Stanford: University Press.

Brewer, John. 2013. "Sociology and Peacebuilding." In *Routledge Handbook of Peacebuilding*, edited by Roger Mac Ginty, 159–70. Routledge Handbooks. London: Routledge.

Bryson, Valerie. 2007. *Gender and the Politics of Time. Feminist theory and contemporary debates*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Carothers, Thomas. 2007. The Sequencing Fallacy. *Journal of Democracy*, 18(1): 12-27.

Charmaz, Kathy. 1991. *Good days, bad days: The self in chronic illness and time*. Rutgers University Press.

Crawford, Adam. 2015. Temporality in restorative justice: on time, timing and time-consciousness. *Theoretical Criminology: an International Journal.* 19 (4): 470-490.

Castillejo-Cuellar, Alejandro. 2014. Historical Injuries, Temporality and the Law: Articulations of a Violent Past in Two Transitional Scenarios. *Law Critique* 25:47–66.

Elias, Norbert. 1993. *Time. An Essay*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Fabian, Johannes. 1983. *Time and the Other: How anthropology makes its object*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Feindt, Gregor, Félix Krawatzek, Daniela Mehler, Friedemann Pestel, and Rieke Trimçev. 2014. Entangled Memory: Toward a Third Wave in Memory Studies. *History and Theory* 53 (1): 24–44.

Halberstam, Judith. 2005. *In a queer time and place: Transgender bodies, subcultural lives.* London: NYU Press.

Harms, Erik. 2013. Eviction time in the new Saigon: Temporalities of Displacement in the Rubble of Development. *Cultural Anthropology* 28(2):344-68.

Helliwell, Christine and Hindess, Barry. 2005. The temporalizing of difference. *Ethnicities*, 5(3), 414-418.

Hobbs, Harry. 2016. Locating The Logic Of Transitional Justice In Liberal Democracies: Native Title In Australia. *UNSW Law Journal* 39(2): 512-552.

Igreja, Victor. 2012. Multiple Temporalities in Indigenous Justice and Healing Practices in Mozambique. The International Journal of Transitional Justice. 6(3): 1–19.

Lahad, Kinneret. 2012. Singlehood, Waiting, and the Sociology of Time. *Sociological Forum* 27: 1: 163-186.

Mac Ginty, Roger. 2016. "Political versus Sociological Time: The Fraught World of Timelines and Deadlines." In *Building Sustainable Peace: Timing and Sequencing of Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Peacebuilding*, edited by Arnim Langer and Graham K. Brown, 15–31. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mac Ginty, Roger & Oliver P Richmond. 2013. The Local Turn in Peace Building: a critical agenda for peace. *Third World Quarterly* 34 (5): 763-78

Mamdani, Mahmood. 2002. Making Sense of Political Violence in Postcolonial Africa. *Identity, Culture and Politics* 3 (2): 1–24.

McLeod, Laura. 2013. Back to the future: Temporality and gender security narratives in Serbia. *Security Dialogue*, 44(2), 165-181.

Mueller-Hirth, Natascha. 2017. Temporalities of Victimhood: Time in the Study of Postconflict Societies. *Sociological Forum*, 32 (1), 186-206.

Munn, Nancy D. 1992. The cultural anthropology of time: A critical essay. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 21(1), 93-123.

Murphy, Colleen. 2017. *The Conceptual Foundations of Transitional Justice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olick, Jeffrey K. 2007. *The Politics of Regret: On Collective Memory and Historical Responsibility*. Routledge.

Pedersen, Morten Axel & H∅jer, Lars. 2008. Lost in transition: fuzzy property and leaky selves in Ulaanbaatar. *Ethnos*, 73(1), 73-96.

Pichler, Adelheid. 2010. Memories of Slavery. Narrating History in Ritual. In Argenti, Nicolas and Schramm, Katherina, eds. *Remembering Violence. Anthropological Perspectives on Intergenerational Transmission*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Rau, H. (2002). Time Divided – Time United?: Temporal aspects of German unification. *Time & Society*, 11(2-3), 271-294.

Read, Roisin & Mac Ginty, Roger. 2017. The Temporal Dimension in Accounts of Violent Conflict: A Case Study from Darfur. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 1-19.

Reid, Megan. 2013. Social Policy, "Deservingness," and Sociotemporal Marginalization: Katrina Survivors and FEMA. *Sociological Forum* 28: 4: 742-763.

Reith, Gerda. 1999. In search of lost time: Recall, projection and the phenomenology of addiction. *Time & Society* 8 (1): 99-117.

Rios Oyola, Sandra Milena. 2015. *Religion, Social Memory, and Conflict: The Massacre of Bojayá in Colombia*. Palgrave Studies in Compromise after Conflict. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rosa Hartmut. 2003. Social Acceleration: Ethical and Political Consequences of a Desynchronized High–Speed Society. *Constellations* 10: 1: 3-33.

Rosa, Hartmut and William E. Scheuerman: 2009. Introduction. In: Hartmut Rosa and William E. Scheuerman (eds) *High-Speed Society: Social Acceleration, Power and Modernity*. Pennsylvania State University Press.

Rothberg, Michael. 2009. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Shaw, Rosalind. 2010. Afterword: Violence and the generation of memory. In Argenti, Nicolas and Schramm, Katherina, eds. *Remembering Violence. Anthropological Perspectives on Intergenerational Transmission*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Schwartz, Barry. 1974. Waiting, exchange, and power: The distribution of time in social systems. *American Journal of Sociology* 79: 4: 841-870.

Simonetti, C. 2013. With the past under your feet: on the development of time concepts in archaeology. *Anuário Antropológico* 39 (2): 283-313.

Teitel, R. 1997. Transitional Jurisprudence: The Role of Law in Political Transformation. *Yale Law Journal* 106: 2010-2080.

Teitel, R. 2000. *Transitional Justice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Teitel, R. 2003. Transitional Justice Genealogy. *Harvard Human Rights Journal* 16, Spring: 69-94.

Tomlinson, John. 2007. *The culture of speed: The coming of immediacy*. London: Sage.

Vigh, H. (2008). Crisis and chronicity: Anthropological perspectives on continuous conflict and decline. *Ethnos*, 73(1), 5-24.

Virilio, Paul. 1997. *Open Sky*. London: Verso

Volkan, Vamik. 1997. *Bloodlines. From ethnic pride to ethnic terrorism*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Volkan, Vamik. 2004. "Chosen trauma, the political ideology of entitlement and violence. Paper presented at Berlin Meeting, 10 June 2004." Retrieved 2 September 2014 (http://vamikvolkan.com/Chosen-Trauma,-the-Political-Ideology-of-Entitlement-and-Violence.php).

West-Pavlov, Russell. 2012. *Temporalities*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Zartman, I. William. 2000. Ripeness: The hurting stalemate and beyond. In Stern, Paul and Druckman, Daniel (eds.) *International conflict resolution after the Cold War*. Washington: National Academy Press.

Zerubavel, Eviatar. 1981. *Hidden Rhythms: Schedules and Calendars in Social Life*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Zerubavel, Eviatar. 1985. *The Seven Day Circle*. New York: FreWe Press／Macmillan.