

Chapter 1

Meditating on the Barricades: Concerns, Cautions, and Possibilities for Peace Education for Political Efficacy

Betty A. Reardon

Reflective and Conceptual Dimensions of Comprehensive/ Critical Peace Education

Some years ago, the late, revered peace researcher and distinguished economist, Kenneth Boulding, turned the maxim frequently used as a call to action on its head. “Don’t do something, just stand there!” I took this to mean that, even in times of crisis, reflection is a fundamental necessity to intelligent human action. Reflection in all its forms is a capacity at once essential and severely lacking in American education and politics; I have argued this position, a legacy from my work with Lawrence Metcalf, in previous publications. It is central to several of the essays in *Comprehensive Peace Education* particularly to the one identifying reflection as one of seven peacemaking capacities to be developed through peace education (Reardon, Chapter 5, 1988). Subsequent learning leads me toward further specifying and clarifying some of the pedagogical dimensions of comprehensive peace education as outlined in that work. It is the first on several more sets of reflections on what I perceive to be some political and pedagogical problems in present practices of “critical peace education.” (I see critical peace education as one of various more recent approaches to comprehensive peace education.)

I worry that these perceived problems may be detrimental to the role of dialogue as an approach to the politics of peace. Not the least of these preoccupations is that my own work and the way in which it and the work of others whose ideas have influenced me – or the ways in which these ideas have been interpreted – may well be in part responsible for what now concerns me. I also note that I refer to “perceived problems.” Not everyone will see the conditions that concern me as problematic.

B.A. Reardon (✉)
International Institute on Peace Education (IIPE), Adelphi University,
New York, NY, USA
e-mail: bar19@columbia.edu

But more to some of the points to be made here, I have come to find it ever more important to the values I seek to serve, to remind myself that I may be wrong, an attitude necessary to the capacity not just to listen but to fully hear the views of others, always harder to do when “we know we are right.” I share these worries because they have for me urgency, undiminished by my own and other’s continuing challenge to these and all arguments and assertions about peace education.

Since what follows is intended as an extension and clarification of my own previous work, the judgments are admittedly subjective. Some may read the conceptual distinctions proffered in this essay as a argument about angels on the head of pin, irrelevant distinctions between concepts widely understood – even sufficiently clear – in common peace education discourse. However, because the pedagogy I advocate involves organizing substance in conceptual frameworks, to me, these distinctions are both relevant and essential to the clarity of peace education subject matter and to the pedagogy that is my main concern. I offer them as examples of a process of the continued learning that I understand as constitutive to critical peace education, making it a dynamic, often exciting field of study.

I write not as a scholar or researcher, but as a teacher, an observer/practitioner, and a peace learner, what I have termed an “edu-learner” (1988). My interest is in continued learning for more relevant and effective teaching practice – the behaviors, interactions, and queries that comprise what we *actually do* in the classroom. The main sources of my learning have been the classroom and the students with whom I have pursued critical inquiries into the issues and substance of peace education, and “shop talk” with other peace educators. I am not a philosopher or ethicist, nor a political or critical theorist, and neither am I a lawyer nor a scholar of international relations. Those with expertise in these fields may rightfully challenge what my experience leads me to argue here, as I try to learn how to think and how to help other ordinary citizens learn how to think about the humanly untenable state of a violent world – and how we might become enabled to change it. I hope that I do not do them a disservice in the following reflections. In these pedagogical reflections, I hope that I have not too seriously misinterpreted the invaluable scholarship of these various fields from which much peace knowledge is derived.

One further admission of limitation is that most of my work has been done within an international network of peace educators with whom I have collaborated and share political views on peace, justice, and pedagogic preferences for inquiry and participatory approaches to peace learning. Herein, however, most of my observations stem from the contemporary American political culture and the pedagogical problems faced by American peace educators in responding to it.

Political Concerns: Efficacy in Establishing Cosmopolitan Norms

The political concerns which inform this essay and its pedagogical arguments arise from the present debased political culture in which civility and dignity have been deeply corroded by an acidic climate of contempt and absolutism, the antithesis

of that to which we aspire in the cosmopolitan vision. In this climate of contempt, authentic dialogue is impossible as public discourse is debased by distortions of politics and religion and the erosion of the constitutional separation of church and state, which is fundamental to the freedom of conscience and religious belief that is the bedrock of secular democracy. Nothing short of a profound change in political ethics will enable us to heal the diseased moral state of the society. Peace education should contribute toward this healing.

Starting from the long-held premise that peace education is education for responsible global citizenship, our task in general terms is educating toward political efficacy in the formation and pursuit of citizen action and public policy intended to move the world toward the achievement of a more just and less violent global order. Such citizen action calls for intention born of reflection, a considered decision, as stated in the Earth Charter, "...we must decide to live with a universal sense of responsibility....We are at once citizens of different nations and of one world..." (Earth Charter Commission 2002). In terms of current trends in the philosophic foundations of peace education, these goals might be summarized as cosmopolitanism, a worldview that emanates from thinking, acting as, and feeling ourselves to be global citizens. Cosmopolitanism is compatible with the premises of comprehensive peace education and the concept of a culture of peace that accommodates the political and pedagogic complexities inherent in so broad a concept as a culture of peace. The contribution of cosmopolitanism most relevant to peace education as an agent of healing is, in my view, that it best articulates the normative goals of our evolving field. "Cosmopolitans posit the existence of ethical values and principles that are universally applicable to all human beings, regardless of culture, ethnicity, religion or nationality. They maintain that our shared humanity carries with it a moral imperative to respect and care for the dignity of *every* human being..." (Snauwaert 2009, p. 1, original emphasis). I would summarize this as the vision of universal moral inclusion that inspires the normative goals of peace education, a vision in which all human beings are accorded respect of their fundamental human dignity.

These goals call for transformation of world views and identities as well as of the institutions and structures that manage our lives within which our world views and our identities are formed and manifest. A comprehensive goal of critical peace education would incorporate this purpose and could be designated as transformative political efficacy. Political efficacy of all types and at all levels of human social organization depends upon sound political thinking and political education that imparts to learners in a paraphrase of the Final Document of UNESCO'S World Congress on Disarmament Education (1980) "not *what* to think about [the politics of peace and justice] but *how* to think about [the politics of peace and justice]." Toward that goal, inquiry into obstacles and possibilities for transformation should form the core of peace pedagogy, so as to provide learning in how to think and to act for political efficacy in peace politics, a complex learning that requires pedagogies of multiple forms of reflective inquiry. It seems to me that the purpose of what is termed "critical peace education" is most effectively pursued through reflective inquiry.

I am convinced that lack of the reflective element in all public policy discussion – especially that which surrounds issues of peace, security, human rights, social justice, environmental sustainability, and the range of such hotly contested

issues – impedes constructive discourse, contributing to the problematic that I understand to underlie the organizing theme concept of this volume, difficult dialogues. The lack of reflection is especially evident in the failure to perceive and articulate some essential conceptual/normative distinctions, a failure that has become the basis of specious political controversies, producing even more intense conflicts and posing more obstacles to constructive social and political change. In the proposed clarifications of the blurring of two sets of key concepts addressed in this essay, moral/ethical and critical/ideological, I hope to deepen and to some degree challenge my own political thinking and pedagogical practice, as well as encourage colleagues to examine theirs. I perceive new facets and dimensions of politics and pedagogy not previously comprehended even in the concept of comprehensive peace education (Reardon 1988). I hope that focus on these facets and dimensions may help to form a basis for a critical inquiry into the present phase of the development of pedagogies of peace learning, notably the refinement and augmentation of more particular forms of reflection and processes of conceptual clarification to make our practice more politically effective.

Second only to reflective inquiry among the capacities for transformative political efficacy is conceptual clarity, essential to reflective thinking about any problematic and to conducting any public discourse, the effectiveness of which will depend upon common understanding of the terms employed to describe issues and proposals for their resolution. So, consideration is given to two particular instances of conceptual blurring (among a larger number thereof) that I believe impede peace learning, constructive public peace discourses, and the achievement of wider realms of moral inclusion. The two sets of concepts discussed later in this essay are especially relevant to the critical and ethical reflection essential to moral healing and political transformation.

Pedagogic Concerns: Maintaining Authentic Open Inquiry

Three particularly focused forms of reflection are proposed here as pedagogical devices to accommodate the complexity of the issues involved in these conceptual areas and other instances of difficult dialogues. I hope to articulate, as clearly as I can, some growing concerns with a few of the characteristics of current practice in critical peace education that I see as owing somewhat to the blurring or conflation of concepts central to peace discourse and peace learning. Peace pedagogy is constantly evolving to meet ever changing needs of education for political efficacy in democratic societies, societies growing ever more contentious, torn by multiple competing, morally exclusive religious and political forms of fundamentalism. In my present view, there are some aspects of peace pedagogy that may themselves present obstacles to our goals, and their underlying social purposes of contributing to a political movement directed toward the necessary and desired transformative changes. There are several current practices that I perceive to limit the possibilities for educating toward a cosmopolitan ethic. These perceptions are significantly influenced by what I consider to be politically responsible and pedagogically ethical

peace education. In its comprehensive form, peace education accommodates – even demands – multiple approaches and perspectives.

The title of this essay – intended to capture the core of the reflection/action cycle at the core of peace learning – comes from a recent conversation with an educator activist who has often taken to the “barricades,” the forefront of nonviolent peace action, who takes as her professional responsibility the practice of critical peace education for political efficacy. Her teaching partner approaches the pedagogical task in a contemplative manner intended to cultivate qualities and practices of inner peace that she sees as the font of peaceful political behaviors, including organized nonviolent strategic action. Elements of both approaches are essential to transformative learning. However, there are few situations in which such teaching partnerships assure that peace education students are educated through a positive balance of these distinct but complementary approaches, each of which could be facilitated by one of the forms of reflection outlined – intended as complementary one to the other – and proposed in this essay.

In some cases, neither education for action nor education for reflective contemplation characterizes courses in peace studies or peace education. Rather, the learning objectives are still too often built upon traditional educational goals of subject matter mastery of the research and theories of the more widely published peace scholars – or the instructors’ interpretation thereof. Although the learning modes are likely to include instruction in methods of research and analysis, still we might recognize that when we focus primarily on predigested interpretations or catechetical study of the primary theorists, we may limit autonomous thinking. Certainly, students of peace should be guided toward the achievement of the substantive and skilling goals undertaken in the study of research conclusions and explanatory theories. However, even when the substance is the fruit of “critical peace research,” should we not also facilitate independent analysis and autonomous theory building among the learners? Most students, even at the beginning stages of political awareness, could benefit from such learning opportunities. Public political discourse would surely benefit if most citizens – not just those enjoying the advantage of academically oriented secondary or higher education – had such opportunities as are integral to the teaching of those who practice the educational philosophies of John Dewey and/or Lawrence Metcalf or Paulo Freire and more current critical educators including, Henri Giroux and all their respective disciples. The pedagogies suggested here are intended for the general citizenship, applied to the social education offered in secondary schools and to the preparation of those who teach in them. There are elements of these suggestions, however, that are adaptable to all levels and other subject areas.

One particularly discouraging consequence of the lack of such opportunities is an unfortunate tendency of too many peace education students to accept the political conclusions of the scholars they study to be the last word on the issues being addressed. While “the classics” of peace research may provide a critical view of politics, they will not, of themselves, offer experience in the practice of the independent critical thinking essential to responsible, effective political action. Only at the doctoral level is there much encouragement of student pursuit of new knowledge, alternative critiques or forms of analysis, all of which comprise fundamental

elements of education for political efficacy but should be included in general citizenship education in all venues and all forms. Little of the prepackaged peace knowledge we have has yet to prove adequate to movements for political change. All that we know and all that we think we know about peace should be open to continual critical review and assessment as a standard practice of our pedagogy – at all levels and in all spheres of peace education. So, we too should be preparing students to make their own contributions to our store of peace knowledge, so as to deepen understanding of the problems and possibilities for change, and to strengthen the commitment to action that comes from direct, critically reflective involvement with the issues being addressed.

There is still another factor of concern regarding the lack of reflective teaching in our schools. Not only does it prevent the development of thoughtful decision making among the general electorate; it also serves as an additional division that is rending the political fabric of this and other societies by generating mutual contempt between the “ordinary folk” and the “intellectuals.” The moral chasms dividing society rent by lack of reflection are deepened by lack of respect that pervades the political culture.

Most of all, we need to be keenly cautious of letting the strength of our own convictions and adherence to particular political interpretations creep into what and how we teach. We need to avoid privileging views congenial to our own over the multiple alternatives that authentic, open inquiry requires us to present as objectively – note I do not say neutrally – as we can. Even the slightest appearance of bias or lack of objectivity is used by those who oppose our field, claiming that we are teaching *what* to think, while we believe we are teaching *how* to think about the issues at hand. This, sometimes seemingly unconscious, privileging of our own views contributes to *politicization* of peace education, by which I mean placing the positions presented to students on the continuum of contemporary partisan politics, ideologies, and political theories without the broader context of a wider range of alternatives which may lay outside the continuum. Absent fully open inquiry, evaluative assertions can function as bias. Exclusion of multiple alternatives lays us open to opposition from those who themselves have little understanding of the distinctions between education and indoctrination. So, we and our students fall into the very politics that makes the dialogues we want to encourage so difficult. Objectivity calls for the widest possible inclusion and a broad range of practices in critical inquiry and multiple forms of reflective thinking. It does not require neutrality, but it does require that the values proposed as criteria for making judgments be openly presented and thoroughly examined.

Reflecting Our Way to the Barricades: Multiple Modes of Reflective Inquiry Relevant to the Political Efficacy of Peace Learning

The point of fully open inquiry is not to avoid these difficult dialogues, for such would delay action for change. Rather, it is to become more intentional in assuring that both the debates and the actions and policies they may determine are thoroughly

explored, soundly reasoned, ethically assessed, and thereby more likely to be socially constructive. Here, I find the practical wisdom of Kenneth Boulding's precept – interpreted as an injunction to reflect before action – enjoining peace educators to be more focused on the pedagogical responsibilities to instruct learners in the habits and skills of reflection, a learning objective that involves learning by doing. The practice of reflection should be integral to all approaches to citizenship education and to all forms of critical and comprehensive peace education. Reflection is the realm of thinking most appropriate to critical inquiry. It is the intellectual space in which the “critical” comes to bear. It is also that space where the practical, the normative, and the human may be illuminated.

A reflective pedagogic process is initiated by the questions and queries provoked by the problematic of the topic or issue being addressed. The questions are formulated so as to encourage deeper modes of thought than the kind of recall that is characteristic of a curriculum designed primarily for mastery of content rather than a critical analysis of it. Reflection is well suited to peace learning as its subjective element is conducive to the ongoing developmental nature of comprehensive peace education. All peace learning at whatever academic level in whatever learning setting should be directed toward developing a range of reflective capacities relevant to political efficacy. Development of such capacities requires independent individual and group practice of reflection. Through years of practice, I have come to conceptualize three – I assume there are more practiced by others – forms of reflective thinking in which to frame an inquiry focused on the particular nature of the peace problematic in question. All three are informed by the foundational capacities of clear conceptualization and the sound reasoning which of itself can be developed through posing questions suitable to the developmental level of the learners so as to encourage its becoming a habitually used skill. Reasoning capacities, like other skills, can be honed through continued practice that serves to reinforce the habit of reflective thinking. Through years of posing questions of inquiry, I have employed several kinds of queries to enable students to achieve a better comprehension of subject matter by processing it through reflective thought. The queries are also designed to develop autonomous critical thinking. Particular types of queries have been used to introduce the primary forms of reflection I have used – without necessarily designating them as such: critical/analytic, moral/ethical, and contemplative/ruminative. The three are, of course, not necessarily distinct one from the other and may operate separately, simultaneously, or in sequence. However, each may be more suited than the other two to inquiries into particular issues or problems, and the greater the clarity and intentionality with which we facilitate the practice of these forms, the more likely we are to educate for the reflective thinking most conducive to political efficacy. Here, too, conceptual clarity is needed. What follows in descriptions of the three forms attempts to provide peace educators with somewhat more refined notions of reflection than I may have presented in previous work.

Reflective thinking, as I understand it, is as defined and advocated by Lawrence Metcalf in his book with Maurice Hunt (Hunt and Metcalf 1958) as influenced by Dewey's thinking on education for democracy (1933). “Reflective thought... grounded in tested belief... [While it is not inconsistent with scientific method, it also]... uses criteria other than scientific ones...” (p. 67). Hunt and Metcalf also

presage the holistic forms of thought currently advocated by peace education. "Reflective thought ... includes every relevant aspect of the mental and physical environment in which ... thought occurs ... General ideas or principles are prominent among the resources applied to any act of reflection..." (p. 280).

The concept as I present it here refers to thinking that brings to bear – as fully and objectively as possible – all substance available and relevant to the consideration of an issue or problem. As noted earlier, by "objective," I do not mean "neutral" or without normative and/or value considerations. Reflection in itself is a value, and reasoned reflection in regard to public issues is directed toward taking a position on an issue or advocating a strategy or policy for addressing the problem upon which the reflection is focused. The values and norms themselves, the "tested beliefs" integral to the process of reflection, are subject to assessment and values testing that makes us conscious of the values at play so that they are less likely to function as an unacknowledged screen by which evidence that may appear to contradict the validity of the assessor's values might be excluded from consideration. Such is the case when assessments are made from an ideological base or a fixed belief system (a point I will deal with below in discussion of the conceptual blurring of critical and ideological morality and ethics). Reasoned reflection, observing and assessing evidence in light of pragmatic as well as normative criteria, is the starting point of reflective inquiry and the minimal essential of critical inquiry, the first and more widely used of the three forms of reflective inquiry.

Critical/analytic reflection is the core reflective process of critical peace education. It is also this form that peace educators associate with Paulo Freire and his theoretical heirs (Darter et al. 2003), as examination, analysis, and reasoned assessment of evidence in whatever form or through whatever process it has been gathered, that is, research, observation, experience, etc. As a sphere of peace learning, it is practiced within a framework of fully open inquiry that seeks to explore all possibilities and propositions involved in the focus subject of the inquiry.

Critical/analytic reflection is more directly political than the other two as its primary inquiry is most often into the nature, functions, and distribution of power, the political institutions and social structures through which it is mediated and the consequences of these circumstances to human lives and relationships. In my own work, this form of reflection has centered mainly on the problematic of gender and alternative security systems, inquiries in which issues of institutionalized power are the core problematic. In all such inquiries, the question of whose interests are served have to be confronted as the relevant institutions are subject to analysis of the locus and function of power and assessment of the human consequences of their uses of power. Reflections focus on both the diagnosis of the dysfunctional in existing institutions and prescriptions for changes in social and political structures, intentionally designed to fulfill core peace values. Raising the institutional questions should, in my opinion, form one of the main tasks of critical/analytic inquiry in all forms of peace education.

In assessing positions and proposals in both the politics of security policy and the power relations between men and women, in any vigorously contested political/social issues, the subjective values, norms, and ethical principles espoused by the

assessor play a key role in the process, as is the case in nearly all political analysis. This role requires that the individuals and the groups involved in any process of critical/analytic reflection be clear about the themes, values, and processes involved – clear in the conceptual sense and in the sense of transparency – for the sake of political efficacy and ethical integrity. Both well-documented substantive knowledge and values awareness are essential.¹ If the conclusions of critical analysis are to be ethically defended and politically efficacious, the values applied must be acknowledged and publicly stated. The efficacy of critical conclusions is largely determined by public understanding and acceptance of the analysis, the evident validity of the data upon which it is based, and the value frame in which they are articulated. Conclusions of any transformative reflection process should also involve consideration of potential political consequences – both short- and long-range consequences – of acting on the conclusions to contribute to constructive change. As noted, the process of critical reflection focuses the diagnosis of the problems being explored by the inquiry. Why is this condition a problem? What differences in perspective or values may be at issue? What are the manifestations of the problem? What political, economic and/or social norms or cultural values are ignored or violated, and what causes can we discern? How conducive to peaceful and just outcomes are these norms and values? Is there need for normative and or value change? What remedial political and economic efforts and/or social actions might be taken? Transformative reflective inquiry should address possibilities for practically achievable and normatively acceptable solutions. Among the queries to be addressed in critical analytic reflection on each proposed solution are the following: Is it necessary? Is it fair? Is it feasible? Will it work? Is it sustainable? Is it desirable in light of the values brought to the critical assessment? Pursuing the values questions in many cases will open a moral/ethical inquiry.

Moral/ethical reflection addresses questions of fairness and moral inclusion with queries focused on issues of the goodness, distribution of advantage and harm, questions of justice, as well as potential detriments and benefits of political, social, and economic relationships and their effects upon the quality of human life and the health of the biosphere. Transformative moral/ethical reflection – directed toward reducing violence and enhancing justice – is guided by normative principles consistent with the values designated as the indicators of what is considered to be socially good and humanly enhancing. These norms arise from the deepest cultural values of a society and its dominant philosophic and religious beliefs, and the not always “self-evident truths” that form the foundation of the social contract that informs the laws that govern the society and the relationships among its peoples. The normative order of even secular societies can trace some of its roots to the religious beliefs and institutions formative to most world cultures. Theologically, the moral codes of the world’s great religions may have been intended to apply to all, but in

¹ A common critique of peace education asserts that it is lacking in substance and inculcates predetermined positions rather than cultivating autonomously derived values, the latter which is in fact a primary purpose of peace learning.

practice – especially in these times – these codes have come to serve the cause of moral exclusion and considerable violence. These moral contentions as a focus of transformative moral/ethical reflection present a challenge to peace learning that may best be met through a secular cosmopolitan social contract.

As the *Declaration of Independence* articulates the “self-evident truths” of the American social contract, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights has come to be considered the self-evident truths of global society. The Declaration serves as the first phase in the evolution of cosmopolitan ethical and legal norms. In just societies, the laws assure that all in the society have access to the goods that manifest the self-evident truths. The global human rights movement and much of what informs peace education – consistent with the cosmopolitan ethic – is directed toward learning that will enable and motivate societies to provide access to as much of the goods of the Earth to as many of the world’s people as possible. The principles of the Declaration, along with other such secular ethics, might well serve as reasoning guides and assessment criteria for exercises in ethical reflection that should be undertaken in peace learning. The very title of the Declaration suggests the recognition of some fundamental universal values as basic norms of human and social relations.²

Just as I hold that the primary inquiry of critical/analytic reflection should be directed toward transforming the international political system from militarized patriarchy to a nonviolent order dedicated to the achievement universal moral inclusion, I believe that the core focus of ethical reflection should be to transform the divisiveness of moral exclusion toward universal moral inclusion. The core of this inquiry should focus on transcending the objectification of persons that now operates at every level of human relationships from child abuse, to sexual exploitation, to domestic violence, to strategic torture, to the demeaning of human dignity throughout popular entertainment, and to racism and genocide. With the concept of universal moral inclusion in mind, inquiry into ethical dimensions and consequences would raise such questions as the following: What ethical principles should we bring to consideration of this problem or proposal? What ethical issues might be raised by the problem or in the enactment of this proposal? Are the potential outcomes of the proposals likely to be just? Who will benefit and how? Who might be harmed and how? Are the potential distribution of benefits and harms fair and just to all human identities and respectful of universal human dignity? How might the harms be avoided and benefits more widely distributed? Are there existing norms and standards that might help in finding constructive responses to the ethical queries raised by this problem, issue, or proposal? As in other inquiries, the responses to

²The “universalism” of the Declaration is asserted by some to be a Western masculinist construct that is not applicable to all world cultures. This assertion is contested by the global human rights movement, representing all world cultures, who claim that the standards are adaptable to various cultures. What is universal is not the mode of application, but rather the fundamental principles. Perhaps most contended are the standards that uphold gender equality and the human rights of children, both of which are seen as challenges to widely accepted patriarchal norms.

such queries as these are likely to lead to further and more specific inquiry that could extend the reflection to the critical/analytic and – as the inquiry deepens – to contemplative/ruminative reflection.

Contemplative/ruminative reflection is a process consistent with the breadth of thought inspired by a cosmopolitan view. It is a wider sphere of reflection, which facilitates perception of the full scope of the complex systemic, dynamic interrelationships comprising our natural and humanly constructed environments. It makes space for affect and intuition, as ways of apprehending aspects of a problematic that require sensitivity to the seldom considered psychological and emotional elements of a problematic. It is through deeper thought that persons gain levels of self-awareness which further develop capacities to lead not only humanly fulfilling lives, but even more to the point, to live personally, socially, and politically so as to be agents of social and political transformation, and to commit to an active struggle or movement for transformative change. Agency manifest by participation in some of the multiple movements striving toward global transformation is for many aspiring global citizens, a significant dimension of a meaningful life.

Taking up such participation is one point of this form of reflection which I refer to also as *ruminative* to connote the aspect of “mulling over” that is the essential process of contemplative/ruminative reflection, a process suited to considering where and how one applies political and social agency, and where one stands on crucial public issues. Rumination is thinking things through more deeply and fully than the habitual superficial thinking that produces too much of our public discourse that has become little more than vituperative exchanges of sound bites, reducing political arguments to ethically stunted superficiality and politically dysfunctional simplicity. Such discourse has turned American politics into a zero sum game in which the contender seeks only to win, to gain power for their respective groups’ having power, not to use it for the common good. Here is another challenge to critical peace education.

Contemplative/ruminative reflection may be at some distance from what Metcalf advocated. It is a process in which reason and tested truths are complemented by the exercise of what Lawrence Kohlberg (1984) had come to designate as the sixth stage of the development of moral reasoning, involving concepts of universal justice, a stage few of us have reached. I would attribute this paucity of achievers of higher levels of moral reasoning in no small part to lack of opportunity or encouragement to engage in the processes of deeply reflective thinking essential to the ethical quality of practical political action toward widening realms of moral inclusion in a diverse and complicated world.

The pedagogic uses of contemplative/ruminative reflection are well suited to education for cosmopolitanism. I have previously argued that we need to make more room for silence in our classes. Not only for those times when students may be at work on individual learning tasks, or some of those points in the consideration of various very painful realities comprised by the problematic central to peace learning where speech is halted, or more personal reflection is called for, but also for times when silent thought is the richest realm for internalizing learning and integrating it into the individual and social self. Perhaps daydreaming might be encouraged from time to time rather than denounced as failure to pay attention. The introduction of

something as simple as “quiet time” to allow for the silence necessary to contemplative reflection, that silence in which it is legitimate to suggest that students reflect on how they “feel” about the topic of reflection as distinct from – but a complement to – what they “think” about it, to intentionally call forth affective responses to material that has been cognitively considered. Learners might explore some of the unexamined notions that produce those feelings as a step toward analyzing their own values and achieving the kind of self-awareness referred to above.

Contemplation provides the opportunity to develop a capacity for empathy without which the development of concern for justice is very likely. I would define empathy as a capacity to understand/appreciate the feelings and circumstances of others, even in the absence of similar experiences. It is that which enables those free and not in need to feel solidarity with and responsibility to act on behalf of the deprived and oppressed. Critical/analytic reflection calls for inquiry into political, economic, and social effects on all who would fall within the realm of a policy proposal. Moral/ethical reflection calls for assessment of the elements of justice and moral inclusion at play in a problem under study. Contemplative/ruminative reflection might inquire into how others may feel and the human experiences they might endure as consequence of the personal or political action being contemplated, inviting those in reflection to consider more deeply the experiences and suffering of those who are affected by what they themselves do and how they live and by the policies of their country.

Powers of the imagination are given play in contemplative reflections which is the most fertile ground for the cultivation of human creative thought, the source of the sorely needed alternatives to present political and social orders. Without acts of creative imagination, the alternative structures and institutions manifesting transformative change cannot be conceived. Contemplation encourages speculation on “what might be” and the envisioning of a transformed global society that inspires and motivates transformative action (Lederach 2005).

Contemplative/ruminative reflection is a realm of thought that manifests the holism that many peace educators advocate as the learning framework for the subject matter of the peace problematic. It certainly should be considered within the pedagogic practice of holists. Holism, a comprehensive and integrated approach to an inquiry, is advocated as an antidote to the reductionism and fragmentation that obscures the essential interrelationships among the multiple components of the problematic. In a similar vein, it offers the thinking space for the integration of learning from different times and different sources. Integration is a significant aspect of all learning, but it is an essential aspect of cosmopolitan peace learning. A cosmopolitan view requires not only seeing the world as a whole, but fully perceiving its complexity and diversity. Integration is a kind of intellectual management skill that enables learners to become ecological/cosmopolitan thinkers.

No form of reflection can more deeply enrich the common learning and nurture the human spirit more than contemplation; not ignoring the difficulties and dilemmas of pedagogical practice of contemplative/ruminative reflection, but rather attending to the caution to distinguish this reasoning of the heart from the profession and practice of religion and spirituality, contemplative reflection can provide learning experiences

that could serve in all classrooms to inspire and strengthen the capacities of learners to live, act, and view the world as global citizens. Among the types of queries³ which might provoke the creative and empathetic thinking to be developed through contemplative/ruminative reflection are: How might you/I/we describe a global society in which moral inclusion is the norm? What new or significantly changed institutions would make such a society possible? What are the major obstacles to universal moral inclusion in the present world system? (In this inquiry, moral inclusion includes the Earth.) How do the people of our society and other societies experience these obstacles? Who suffers and how do they suffer from the consequences of these obstacles? What are our personal and political relationships to those obstacles? In what ways might we change our own behaviors, relationships, and lifestyles to overcome our complicity in any form of moral exclusion? What alternative institutions might assure wider realms of moral inclusion? How might we make a particular and personal contribution to changing the structures and institutions that manifest moral inclusion? What kinds of political action might we imagine to bring about the establishment of the necessary institutions? What would we need to learn to be capable of such change and such action? Can you envision a history of how the transformation might have come about? Learning queries should be central to all forms of reflective inquiry, as it is from the responses to these questions that a common learning agenda for peace education might be derived.

Caution with Regard to Religious and Spiritual Practice

As the other two forms of reflective inquiry call for objective outward-looking thinking, contemplation/rumination invites learners to think inwardly and subjectively, propelled not only by reasoning, but also by an inward looking gaze on the self, the individual self, and the self in relation to others and to the larger living system, the biosphere that is the source of our individual lives. It is a deepening of what I previously termed *ecological consciousness*, that is, thinking broadly and deeply in living systems terms (Reardon in Nordland, 1994, p. 21). Contemplation as reflective inquiry is akin to – but not synonymous with – the spiritual practice of meditation and the religious practice of meditative or contemplative prayer. While these practices are significant and to be encouraged in the personal and spiritual development of peacemakers, I do not believe them to be appropriate to secular public education about public issues. Educators in the public realm should respect the spiritual natures of students, but not involve themselves directly in their spiritual/religious development. The principle of the separation of church and state obliges us to leave the guid-

³In the practice of inquiry, I make a functional distinction between questions and queries. *Questions* are interrogations for which there are definite – usually discrete – *answers*. *Queries* are those that can provoke multiple *responses*, making possible the exploration of different perspectives and various possibilities, a pedagogic process consistent with moral inclusion.

ance of that development to the constitutionally appropriate agents. Although respecting very much the work of Arthur Zajonc on contemplative inquiry (2008) and the Waldorf/Steiner spiritual approach to education, I do not seek to adapt them directly to reflective inquiry. I do, however, hold that contemplative reflection is an important form of the deep thinking without which neither personal nor social transformation is possible. It does provide an introduction to a mode of reflective thinking out of which spiritual and religious development might grow in experiences outside public citizenship education that – given the materialistic, antagonistic nature of contemporary culture and politics – should respond more directly to the need for transformational learning for the public and political realms.

While there is growing common understanding of what might comprise social and political transformation, self-transformation in the secular sense of critical and ethical agency – as I refer to it here – has not been widely considered in the discourse of peace education. Such transformation involves coming to a realization of how we are formed by the institutions and relationships in which we live our personal and social lives. It leads to understanding that through a process of intentional learning we can become capable of changing personal relationships and gain awareness of our own possibilities for agency directed toward changing institutions. Thus, I deem it very important not to jeopardize the possibility of all learners experiencing opportunities to engage in contemplative/ruminative reflection in their general education by not clearly separating it from religious and spiritual education and practice.

Nonetheless, while the contemplative/ruminative reflection I advocate here is not a spiritual practice, I do believe that teaching *about* particular religious and spiritual beliefs and practices – not teaching adherence to the beliefs and practices – has a place in peace education subject matter as a dimension of multicultural education. Multicultural education is an essential substantive component of a curriculum to educate toward understanding of the world, comprehending as much of its diversity as can be communicated in formal public education. Consistent with my position on the limits of spiritual practices in the application of contemplative reflection in secular education, I am opposed to introducing religious practice as such and certainly to the advancing or imposing of religious beliefs and perspectives within the public schools, as has been the cause of curricular controversies in several states of the USA recently. These controversies are cases in point to illustrate the problems of lack of conceptual clarity in political and pedagogical thinking and practice. Their consequences also strengthen the arguments for pedagogies of reflective inquiry and have led to my critical stance on the blurring of morals and ethics as discussed below.

Significant Distinctions: Reflective Inquiry into Conceptual Clarifications

Difficulties and dilemmas abound throughout all practices of critical thinking and reflective inquiry. Not the least of these is the pedagogic challenge of formulating cogent queries as the foundation of the structure of an inquiry and within which to

frame difficult dialogues toward wider and more open discussions. It is in difficult dialogues – involving not only those who hold different world views, values, and philosophical premises but also those with whom we share similar political inclinations yet differ profoundly over political instruments and methods – that the assumptions and purposes of critical reflective inquiry are tested. Educators applying any of the queries posed above in relation to each of the three forms of reflective inquiry are likely – or at least it is hoped so – to elicit a variety of responses. Absent a commonly accepted inquiry agenda, differences may even become so difficult as to prevent any dialogue. In these cases, questions of clarifications of concerns and meanings are essential to opening the communication process. Words may be understood to connote different concepts and carry different value valences, trapping us in what can become seemingly intractable conflicts. Dialogue – the avowed preferred mode of peace seekers – is often thwarted by the very language with which dialogue is to be conducted. The terminology itself sometimes encourages rather than dissipates conflict and difference.

In spite of several decades of the advocacy and practice of holism by peace educators, there is still – even in peace education practice – a tendency to think in terms of dualisms when conceptualizing positions in a controversy. Oppositional and adversarial positions are not infrequently taken to “defend” peace. Winning – not resolution – becomes the objective of academic as well as political discussions. Clarification of issues is jettisoned in favor of disproving others’ arguments. Debate to assert truth from one perspective prevails over dialogue in search of a common truth, accommodating multiple perspectives. Although academic debate as such has sometimes proven a useful tool in the advancement of scholarship, it is not the most useful style of discourse toward the transformation of the adversarial nature of communication that characterizes the mainstream politics of the cultures of violence. Adversarial discourse is integral to the deeply fragmented, competitive world as seen from the dominant realist view that stands in opposition to cosmopolitanism. Separating oneself from the positions of adversaries is more important than communicating with them. In spite of an insistence on the need for civility in professional and public discourse, peace educators (and even some human rights educators) are not totally free of the fault of denigration rather than reasoned refutation – part of the process I have referred to as civil disputation (Reardon 2001) – of ideas and positions in contention with our own, and of the persons who hold them. Contentious dialogues, while necessary to political change, are the most difficult and most in need of conceptual clarity and civility in the search for common truth and efforts to liberate the common humanity within which lies our greatest hope for peace. Sadly, the possibility of deriving a common truth and a socially constructive resolution of publicly debated issues is often lost in relentless striving to win, to “come out ahead” of our interlocutors rather than “come together” with them. Peace education should attend to this serious obstacle to a civil and just peace.

Toward this end, I have given thought to various conceptual blurrings, the clarification of which is essential to the conduct of difficult dialogues and the pedagogic practice of reflective inquiry. It is important in reflective inquiry to make distinctions without setting up dualisms and privileging one concept over another. In the discussion below, I do not intend to contrast the concepts in each set, or to

suggest one to be intrinsically better than the concept with which it is paired here. My purpose is to make distinctions toward greater clarity and integrity of reflective inquiry as peace education. Two blurred pairs, critical/ideological and morality/ethics, seem to me to be particularly relevant to the pedagogical practice of reflective inquiry argued here to be an appropriate and effective pedagogy of peace learning for political efficacy. Both pairs affect public discourse on many “hot button issues” related to peace among them: international and global security, climate change and the environmental crisis, human rights and social justice, gender and human diversity, and violence and nonviolence. Preparing citizens to push these buttons without burning their political thinking fingers is a task of education for political efficacy. Preparing them to do so in a manner consistent with the values of a culture of peace and/or cosmopolitanism is a particular task of peace education. The heat of these buttons is in no small measure due to the blurred conceptual distinctions between some of the core notions that are fundamental to peace theories and to the cultural characteristics of common political discourse outlined above. The exigencies of peace education call us to address a seriously unattended need to clarify conceptual contradictions and complementarities, as well as strategic and political differences. Two that I identify as most relevant to a pedagogy of reflective inquiry are addressed here.

Critical and Ideological: Toward Truly Open Inquiry

Over the past decade, various forms of “critical pedagogy” have become the preferred methodology of growing numbers of peace educators in various countries. On its face, critical pedagogy is a highly appropriate – some argue the most appropriate, or even the only suitable – methodology for peace education. I have rather recently argued something that might be so construed (Reardon 2010). Critical pedagogy is rooted in the essential political nature of peace education, taking its inspiration from the “Frankfurt School” of critical philosophy, the gospel according to Habermas and his followers (Darter et al. 2003). Intended to inspire a politics of emancipation, this philosophy has been adapted to devising an emancipatory education, framed somewhat more in the actual politics of inequality than is the awareness process of *conscientization* advocated by Freire. My concern is not with the fundamental philosophy, but with some of the educational practice that carries its banner that seems to conflate “critical” with “oppositional,” not infrequently on ideological grounds. The practice of concern seems sometimes to ignore the mission of a critical theory of education as described by Henry Giroux who refers to “...self conscious critiques and to the need to develop a discourse of social transformation and emancipation that does not cling dogmatically to its own doctrinal assumptions” (Giroux, in Darter, 2003, p. 27).

While I am of the opinion that effective peace education is political education, that is, education for responsible and effective political participation, I also hold that peace education should not be “politicized” by privileging any particular political bias or ideology, even the emancipatory gospel of the prophets of Frankfurt or any

number of equally revered peace theorists. Such political privileging compromises the integrity of the critical inquiry, which is the essence of responsible peace education. Likewise, shaping public school curriculum to conform to particular religious beliefs compromises such inquiry. I fully accept the validity of Freire's claim that no education is neutral. All education carries and communicates values that in public education must be as openly acknowledged as religious values are reverently avowed in religion-based education. The acknowledged values that infuse the goals and objectives of peace education are best pursued in a truly open inquiry, one not bound to a particular place on the left-right continuum of the organized politics of the present system and one that does not privilege any of the political philosophies that underlie the continuum. Such philosophies might well be the subject matter of peace education if subject to the challenge of authentic inquiry, but not presented as the ultimate explanation for the problematic of peace. The conflation of critical pedagogy with education from the perspective of the left contradicts what I would take to be the purpose of critical pedagogy, discerning as clearly and objectively as possible how the present social order obstructs the achievement of a just peace, analyzing the obstructive social and political institutions and raising awareness about the modes of thinking that maintain them. Various philosophies and peace theories might be explored for their possibilities to shed light on causality and to point toward a way out of the problematic. The inquiry into each would entertain the question, "What light does this theory shed on our quest for a politically effective response to this particular peace problem?" rather than, "Is this theory the answer?" All must be fully open to challenge by students as well as their instructors. (I need to continuously remind myself of this imperative in explicating some of my own interpretation of the pivotal role of gender in the peace problematic.) All involved in the inquiry should be encouraged to form their own theories to be subject to the same assessment.

Challenging the notion of a "pedagogy of the left" as antithetical to open inquiry is in no way intended to deny the fundamental structural injustices and institutions of violence the left rightly opposes. Rather it is intended to open, broaden, and deepen the peace inquiry so that it might produce a wider range of thinking about more effective strategies for change. Such strategies, I believe, cannot be derived from an inquiry that begins with the assumption of the validity of the perspectives and analyses of the left any more than it can from the assumptions of the right or the "establishment" that colors much public education. If inquiry reveals either of the latter two to bear significant responsibility for the problems, it can be challenged more effectively within a framework that has taken its own assumptions and assertion fully into account, as is suggested by the Giroux quotation above. The inquiries undertaken by peace education should extend beyond and beneath contemporary, specific issues of war and peace, the strategies for achieving one policy change or eliminating one weapons system or implementing one political philosophy. It is not that these issues are irrelevant, but that they are insufficient. In the pursuit of the learning necessary for progress toward authentic global security and universal human dignity, peace education must favor no particular position in the contemporary range of the main political camps and must challenge the very systems and structures

that produce both the problems of study and the political camps. This is not just because virtually all political positions and structures are morally, ethically, and even politically bankrupt, as well as blind to the deeper roots of the problematic (such as, I would argue, patriarchy), but because virtually none of these positions or structures shows reasonable possibility of providing a basis or framework for deep and fundamental change. To be truly radical is getting to the deepest roots of the core political problem, the worldviews and fundamental belief systems that are yet to be fully examined in most educational practice much less challenged by our political actions, largely confined to the system as it is constructed.

Our own practices of critical pedagogy should not be exempt from challenge. For a number of practitioners and their students, it appears to have become an ideology rather than a methodology. Critical pedagogy as an ideology contradicts the pedagogical principles and fundamental philosophy of peace learning that learners themselves should determine their own positions on public issues and bring a critical eye to every interpretation and assertion. In spite of efforts to bring a truly critical perspective to all aspects of education, too many students still read texts of critical pedagogy – and of peace research – as scripture, accepting it as the final word from an ultimate authority that requires their lip service if not their practice. Too often, the pedagogy is “taught” in the usual traditional manner of read, review, revere, and remember enough to quote on the exam and to season conversations with other students and teachers. The full extent of the transformative Freirean cycle is rarely pursued in our classes, most lamentably not even in most peace education classes. Nor do many educators provide consideration of the ongoing learning of the theorists themselves that makes such challenge of even the most value consistent and promising practices an enriching learning experience. Not long ago, a Freirean colleague and I were dismayed to hear a young peace educator say, “You can never dialogue with an oppressor,” inferring as well that it was pointless to attempt reasoned discussion with any whose political position is deemed outside the realm of the reason established by the basic *orthodox* critique, thus was dismissed the promise of facing the challenge of difficult dialogues and a large part of the hope for nonviolently realized transformative change. So, too, did we clearly see how deep the need is for fully open, critical, and reasoned reflection in all of our peace education practice, particularly in instances where resistance to injustice must be planned and undertaken. Had all African-American activists for justice in mid-twentieth century perceived as an unreachable oppressor Ku Klux Klan member, Robert Byrd, we would have lost the ardent civil rights advocate that Senator became.

The caution that such situations leads me to is not only that peace educators should be as self-monitoring and self-aware as we can, but also that we must practice what we teach, perhaps biting our tongues from time to time. Often, we need to maintain our own reflective silence in the face of ideas we would prefer not to hear expressed in our classes, taking time to formulate a responding question that might keep the inquiry open, even in minds that to us may appear closed. Critical inquiry is a methodology that avoids direct answers – other than to questions of fact or clarification – in favor of responses that keep the reflective learning possibilities open. In peace education, critical pedagogy should comprise a methodology of

provocative questioning rather than one of soliciting answers influenced by political ideology. Predetermined answers are the stuff of fundamentalism. Fundamentalism – which I take to be the claim to possess an unchallengeable truth – in all its forms, ideological as well as religious is the antithesis of reflective critical thinking. So, too, in its negation of the views of others, it contradicts a core principle of cosmopolitanism, a world view that respects the other, takes interest in multiple views, celebrates diversity, and manifests the widest possible range of moral inclusion.

While few of us aspire to turn out classes full of Thurgood Marshals, we might strive toward nurturing the capacities for open-mindedness, tolerance, and respect that characterized his personality and his roles as groundbreaking civil rights lawyer and revered Supreme Court Justice:

To the end Marshal believed in the humanness of those who opposed him – a largeness of spirit that allowed him not only to build coalitions on the court but to sit in smoky back rooms playing poker with some of the worst segregationist of the century. Never did he take the view that another human being, no matter how morally bankrupt, was beneath him. (Carter 2010)

In short, Thurgood Marshall was a politically efficacious cosmopolitan, a model of citizenship whose life and work are an example of the possibilities that are opened when critical politics practiced as ideology is trumped by ethics.

Morality and Ethics: Pursuing a Wider Scope of Justice and Moral Inclusion

The fundamental purpose of Marshal's public life was consistent with that of Martin Luther King, holding American society accountable for the fulfillment of its foundational political value, recognition, and realization of human equality. Although King's public work was initiated in the Southern Christian churches that germinated the civil rights movement, his political audience was the larger American secular society. His initiatives were primarily inspired by the religious morality of his Christian faith, while Marshal's inspiration was in the ethical principles of the U.S. Constitution. Both strove toward widening the American scope of moral inclusion by seeking the assurance of social justice through law. Both worked for moral goals, articulated as social justice through the exercise of the secular ethics imbedded in Constitutional law, the encoding of the "self-evident truths." While their efforts did not achieve the transformation of American society that King envisioned and articulated, they achieved the legal goals that to this day offer the basic tools for constructing a racially just society, demonstrating the uses of law as a politically efficacious instrument of nonviolent social change. In their common struggle, we see that morality and ethics complemented and reinforced each other without compromising the constitutional separation of church and state, the foundation of American secular civil society from which both sought support. This core principle of the American political system is now subject to compromise by the fundamentalisms that impede reasonable and civil public discourse, as it seeks to narrow to closing the open

inquiry so essential to a democratic society, and the *sine qua non* of reflective peace learning. Much of the assault on the separation of church and state by American religious and political fundamentalists is framed in the language of morality, which to all practical purposes rationalizes the moral exclusion that characterizes most forms of fundamentalism in this wide and diverse world. I find it both morally and ethically acceptable for religious conviction to motivate persons to political action as was the case of Dr. King and his followers, but it is neither morally nor ethically acceptable to infuse religious convictions into politics. To educate for the transformative change that has inspired so much of the peace education movement, we need to clearly distinguish between religious morality and secular ethics, so as to educate for the essential capacities of ethical reasoning without which political efficacy in the cause of social justice is not likely to be achieved. My argument about the inappropriateness of religious belief and practice in public education arises from the consequences that the blurring of morals and ethics have on public education.

It is widely agreed among peace educators – as argued by King and Marshall – that transformational change toward greater degrees of justice requires that societies develop stronger commitment to the norms that uphold principles of justice and non-violence. These norms are manifest in the practice of moral and ethical principles and the social values that derive from them. Social values are vigorously contested in the present climate. Conflicting moral claims are advanced by the whole range of political positions in the USA from Tea Partiers through various degrees of conservatism, centrism, and liberalism to the radicalism of the right and left. The contestation – conducted largely outside the realms of reason and civility – comprises mutual charges from short-sighted self-interest to irresponsibility, to immorality and dishonesty, and even to outright stupidity. There are similar political conflicts in other countries. No situation poses greater difficulties to dialogue as an instrument of political accord.

Dialogue, a means to political accord favored by many advocates of nonviolence, requires skills of communication, civility, and common conceptual language. Lack of the skills of ethical reasoning, little respect for the other that makes for civility, and contempt for the morality of the other stands in the way of defining mutually acceptable common norms, so moral exclusion prevails as a seemingly impenetrable barrier to constructive dialogue. As peace educators, we are called to work toward the development of the skills and the cultivation of civil communication styles based on respect for the other so as to widen the realms of moral inclusion. Widening realms of moral inclusion is a means to increase the political relevance of nonviolence, essential because it is through nonviolent political action that truly transformative change can be wrought (Lederach 2003). Striving toward the conditions under which we can negotiate the common norms that could lead to wider realms of moral inclusion among peoples of many belief systems, we are faced with the obstacle of irresolvable, conflicting moral claims. Clarifying the politically relevant functional distinctions between morality and ethics as they affect public issues in secular, democratic societies is one means to open the possibilities for peace education to transcend this obstacle.⁴

⁴ Some religious educators have addressed the issue of ethics education as a means to promote interreligious understanding (Interfaith Council on Ethics Education for Children 2008)

Reflective inquiry as a pedagogy for widening realms of moral inclusion would introduce publicly accepted ethical norms such as the international standards upholding universal human rights into the exploration and assessment of contentious public issues. Among the relevant factors considered should be both the social and human values espoused by the culture and the international norms. The potential consequences of the contending positions on the issues in question would also be assessed. Reflection on which of the contending values are most likely to lead toward policies with just and equitable outcomes would comprise a significant portion of such assessment. A primary query of the values clarification process would be, "Do the values in contention derive from moral precepts or ethical principles or some combination thereof? What are the sources of the precepts and principles?" Given this clarification, the inquiry could move to exploring possibilities for commonly accepted ethical principles to help resolve the contentions. Further questions might include, "Could some of the existing international norms facilitate a resolution of the contention? Are there other secular ethical principles that might help toward that end? Might we work toward the articulation of some common ethical principle under which we could move forward to remedial action?"

Morality and moral standards – that I would define as concepts of behavioral right and wrong – tend to be articulated as precepts, simply stated, straightforward injunctions regarding behavior, such as the Golden Rule and the Ten Commandments. Moral precepts derive mainly from moral authorities, most often religious authority, but also from philosophical, ideological, and professional sources such as articulated in the Hippocratic Oath, enjoining physician to do no harm – an oath that might well be taken by educators.

Ethics – that I would define as concepts of personal and social good – are articulated as principles that primarily derive from philosophical inquiry into goodness, truth, justice, and responsibility. Some philosophers have been as revered as have religious prophets and have in some instances had as significant an influence on how societies are organized. Religious prophets and political philosophers have also preached similar truths, each in his/her way seeking to teach human beings how to live personally meaningful and socially responsible lives. (A Russian friend and I, comparing notes on formative values, discovered that some values I had been taught as those of a "good Christian" she had learned as the attributes of a "good Communist." While we agreed that both sets of values were socially constructive, we also observed that we were certainly never encouraged to question them or the religious or political authorities that preached them.) Most moral authorities expect reverence from their respective adherents and, to understate this, usually discourage open challenges. The fundamental moral question asked within a framework of religious morality is, "In this kind of case, what does the prophet/scripture teach us to do?"

Within a framework of secular ethics it is more likely to be, "What is the fair or just thing to do?" (I do not argue that the responses to the two questions might not very well be convergent.) Ethics and ethical standards are principles, such as the "categorical imperative," and guides that may be simply stated, but are likely to be more complex than straightforward in application, subject to ongoing examination,

assessing consequences as in thinking of the potential human rights effects on all concerned by the proposed action or policy. An illustrative ethical parable often invoked by environmentalists is the “tragedy of the commons.” Morality may be best taught by example, but it appears that today more often it is by inculcation and reiteration, internalized through monitored behavioral application. (Again, I do not claim that people of faith never wrestle with moral issues. On the contrary, those who bring a reflective approach to religious morality, do a good deal of it. But those are not the forces whose moral certainty is infecting politics.) Ethics is learned through reflection and application of principled reasoning to position taking in problematic situations. Ethical reflection is a medium for the development of the kind of moral reasoning that is appropriate to public action toward transformative change.

Moral codes, derived from religious belief, conditioned by centuries of morally exclusive cultural practice, often rationalized by selective reading of scripture – viz., slavery, war, colonialism, and the oppression of women – are a strong factor in the debased public discourse of contemporary politics as described above. These codes are not put forward for reflective review, but rather as unchallengeable truth to be brought to bear on the issue at hand. As such, their respective standards are not appropriate to the assessment of public controversies through the kind of reflective inquiry I advocate as pedagogy for peace education. While many religions adhere to some version of the Golden Rule, they tend to vary in the actual behaviors that are permitted and prohibited within the religions’ interpretation of the rule and to whom it applies in their readings of their respective scriptures. From this variation arises so great a number of our contemporary crises and conflicts that peace education has begun to include the subject of religious belief, some of it with special reference to beliefs about peace and justice. This inclusion as subject matter, not as the basis of judgment making on public issues, as I have observed above, is reasonable and, I believe, in these historic times, necessary. There seem to be two assumptions that produced the inclusion of religion as a subject in secular peace education programs. The first and most widely held – what I call the empathy assumption – is that such education can produce interreligious understanding and thereby reduce religious conflict. The second – the political pragmatism assumption – is that religious beliefs have as profound an effect on world views and interrelationships among peoples of different religions and ethnicities as do political ideologies and power positions of nations and peoples, and so they are an important factor in communication and establishing less conflicted relationships. However, neither of these approaches assures reflective challenging of the moral absolutes that so often prevent conflicting parties from considering dialogue as a means to change relationships, the means toward which we seek to educate.

In peace education, as in the wider realm of public affairs, moral precepts and ethical principles need not be mutually exclusive. But neither are they functionally equivalent in conducting reasoned, reflective public discourse, especially not so in the process of education for political participation. As learning to make soundly and fully reasoned normative choices in the planning and projection of political strategy is limited within an exclusionary political or ideological framework, so too the introduction of morality may muddy the waters of reasoned

reflective inquiry. In spite of the fact that political realism, the dominant mode of thought in contemporary international affairs rejects morality as a practical factor applicable to international relations, some of the major contentious issues of contemporary world politics are couched in terms of morality. The preemptive war in Iraq, the US president informed us, was “a crusade.” Moral, even theological persuasions were put forward to gain support from other Western nations.⁵ Yet, subsequently (or consequently) some argued, the United States has lost the moral high ground (as if it had ever held it), in implementing its national security policies, the most egregious example, perhaps being the resort to torture.⁶ One religiously based group publicly opposing torture regularly asserts that “Torture is a moral issue.” And within the frame of my own religious convictions, I would agree with the assertion. But more relevant to the public discussion, within the frame of the responsibilities of citizenship, is that it is a legal issue and a gross violation of the international standards of secular ethics articulated in the International Convention on Torture and of the generations of Western political thought and practice that have denounced “cruel and degrading treatment” (Reardon 2008). These international standards and democratic norms are integral to the subject matter of peace education, providing a framework for inquiry into value contentions that is consistent with its political purposes.

While we may publicly affirm and bear witness to what we believe on religious grounds to be immoral public policies, in the arenas of secular public discourse and education, we need to find the secular ethical equivalents of those religious values, which may be relevant to the issue – but not necessarily disregard their effects on contentious issues. Given the constitutional separation of church and state, at least in the United States, religious belief should not be the basis of public policy making. All of these cautions apply equally to the teaching situation. Peace educators who hope to prepare learners for reflectively reasoned participation in contentious public discourse would do well to consider introducing the secular ethics of the relevant international standards, including human rights covenants and the Nuremberg Principles, negotiated within a discourse of diversity, but grounded in the common purpose of building a peaceful global community. Such standards serve in the present strivings for justice as instruments of moral inclusion and cosmopolitan values.

Tempting as it may be for peace educators to use only the moral frames now current in the public space, the better route to reasoned reflection is the secular ethics suited to contentious political discourse in our diverse world society. Preparing learners for participation in the secular sphere should involve them in practice of reflective reasoning through the application of ethical principles such as those articulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Nuremberg Principles, and The Earth Charter, all of which echo both the Categorical Imperative and the Golden Rule. It would serve effective political communication to assure, as well, that the moral

⁵ Jacques Chirac, former Premier of France in his memoir (2009) recounts such attempts at persuasion.

⁶ In a discussion of *Decision Points* (2010) George W. Bush justified water boarding.

and religiously based equivalents of the standards are also explored, as in the previous reference to study of spiritual beliefs as a component of multicultural education. Preparation for global citizenship might include study of various values perspectives and languages so as to improve possibilities for effective communication among those who hold different beliefs and worldviews.

The morality which stems from respect for the human person that inspired the Golden Rule and is stated as a specific set of social principles in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights may be subject to question regarding application in particular public situations, but its significance to the common life of society derives in large part from the acceptance of the secular moral authority of the world community. The United Nation, as politically weak, legally flawed – the most powerful member states would have it so – and in some instances as mistaken and corrupt as other institutions that have been regarded as moral authorities, has served this purpose for the world community since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Nuremberg Principles, and the promulgation of the treaties drafted to encode the core principles of the declaration into international law. At the world level, as at other levels of the global order, that which has been articulated as public morality, is socially responsible, humane behavior guided by internationally recognized norms that when egregiously violated cause the social shock often referred to as “moral outrage.” Some of these violations are identified as “crimes against humanity” – all people are humanly diminished by such acts – subject to prohibition and prosecution by law. The behavioral equivalents of these secular moral norms are ethical principles that may be taught by example, so as to become the habit of just relationships, fairness, and equity guiding daily communal life. They may be modeled in classrooms, organizations, and communities, at all levels up to the community of nations. These are such principles and values as lend themselves to the kind of reflective examination most suited to peace education. They are open to continual assessment and challenge as should be the application of all ethical standards, public policies, and acts of states. The right to challenge authority claimed by those who made the revolutions that gave birth to Western democracies was reflected in the Nuremberg Principles that established challenge of illegal orders to be both an individual right and a legal responsibility. The Nuremberg case that produced this ethical principle demonstrates a process of critical reflection and challenge that provides rich material for peace education as reflective inquiry. Further, it highlights a major objective of peace education and the capacity and motivation to challenge the unethical and to resist the unjust. This is one of the presumptions of human rights learning (Reardon 2010) as an approach to peace education that also advocates the international standards of human rights as the core substance of global citizenship education.

What is especially important in the Nuremberg case is that it is an example of a consequence of the exercise of a public “moral conscience,” clearly illustrating that the criminal actions in question are actions taken in public, with public consequences, to be publicly scrutinized. Such is not the case with other hotly debated moral standards in which religious customs and norms collide with secular norms, some falling into the realm of personal morality or specific religious practices that

do not really affect the well-being of the larger society, such as the headscarves controversies in French and Turkish secular public schools, an example of Islamophobia. Female students, who choose to wear headscarves out of personal belief without attempting to proselytize, are not a threat to the well-being or the freedom of, or from religion in secular society. Neither are they detrimental to those who wear them – as is agreed by many in the human rights movement – as is the case with some religious practices so harmful to health and well-being of women that they are prohibited by civil law: that is, polygamy, child marriage, and genital cutting. Nor do non-proselytizing, nonharmful personal practices represent an obstacle to the education of others in the public schools. Indeed, they may well constitute education in and for diversity, an essential component for the development of an attitude of moral inclusion, accepting the humanity and acknowledging the dignity and right to fair treatment of all, an avowed goal of peace education.

Such issues of personal practice and belief can divert public attention from concern about responsibility to fulfill the right to education as well as the principle of freedom of religion. The challenge to prohibition of this type of religious practice that is personal and not harmful to self or others is just as much a manifestation of ethical behavior as resistance to the above-mentioned harmful practices. Peace education should be providing learners with opportunities for critical and ethical reflection on such distinctions so that they might discern what is just and fair, and to define and articulate the relevant, underlying ethical principle or principles. Establishing distinctions between religious intolerance and legitimate secularism within a framework of human rights provides an opportunity to explore the relevance of human rights to the just and tolerant society that is implied in cosmopolitanism as a philosophic basis of peace education as advocated by Dale Snauwaert (2009).

The fully open reflective inquiry that I argue here to be the most appropriate means through which peace learning becomes preparation for political efficacy cannot be pursued in schools intolerant of diversity; nor where science curricula are censored, as in some American schools, because certain subject matter contradicts scriptural interpretations of particular religious faiths; nor where classical works of literature are withdrawn from public school because they challenge the beliefs of, or are morally offensive to some who seek to impose their own moral standards on others; nor in schools that would banish multicultural studies because they “undermine American values.” Public schools are to serve the entire public. What we have called academic freedom in universities is in secondary schools opportunity to engage in critical and ethical reflection on issues that affect students’ lives and the quality of the societies in which they live.

Education in a democratic secular society should neither limit legitimate personal freedoms of students nor freedom of inquiry into all knowledge available to the society. If we claim to defend such rights by our military interventions abroad, is it morally or ethically defensible to tolerate their violation in our own communities? Indeed, these issues of personal values and public ethics might well be the stuff of classroom discussion. But even more significant to my argument is that such controversies are indicators of the dysfunctional and antidemocratic consequences of multiple religious moralities in contention with public norms of tolerance in a secular society.

The point I see as relevant to peace education is that the conflation of ethical principles and standards as synonymous with, or functionally equivalent, to moral precepts confuses the normative discourses to which the field is committed. Arguing that the two derive from different sources and function differently toward social purposes that in our current political and cultural conditions do not, fully coincide, I assert that it is important to distinguish between the two in a pedagogy of reflective inquiry. While, both may have a place in peace education as practiced in all its varieties, religious differences have become so politicized that the blurring of these two concepts compounds the difficulties of dialogues on the most crucial political and normative issues of our times. Religious positions are faith based. It is neither effective nor politically constructive to debate them in a public secular setting. Ethics are principles applied through reasoning. Such reasoning is essential to democracy and to the practice of critical peace education. When public attention should be given to the ethical implications of torture, the structures of poverty, the broad scale violation of human rights, the oppression of women, focusing on questions made contentious by competing religious values and religiously motivated attempts to dictate public policy, capacities for ethical reflection remain stunted, and justice is frustrated.

Above all, ethical reflection in the service of peace should be guided by the fundamental principle of nonviolence: to avoid, reduce, and assess the possibilities for the elimination of all forms of unnecessary harm.

Reflective Inquiry as a Pedagogy of Cosmopolitanism

The pedagogies and concerns outlined in this essay, in my present view, are the core of the challenges to and possibilities for contemporary comprehensive critical peace education. Both the challenges and the possibilities of the developments of the next few years of our field's evolution are to be found in the growing interest in cosmopolitanism as framework and purpose of peace education. As a philosophy of educational purpose, cosmopolitanism provides a values framework conducive to the development of political efficacy in the struggle to achieve universal moral inclusion. I have tried to make the case that reflective inquiry is a pedagogy especially well suited to this purpose and to confronting the present problems of the field as I perceive them. I offer the following to sum up that case.

In brief, my preference for the use of ethical principles in peace education derives from current trends in American society toward rejection of diversity and lack of tolerance, civility, and reasoned discourse in the public space. My suspicion of the ideological bias in some practice of critical pedagogy stems from similar concerns and the limitations forthcoming from insufficient consideration of multiple alternatives. These concerns lead to the pedagogical argument I have put forward here that fully open inquiry is essential to the all the forms of reflection integral to peace learning. The conclusions of critical inquiry undertaken in the frame of prior ideological assumptions is as compromised as are ethical positions on public issues taken solely on the basis of religious morality. Responding to these concerns, I suggest

that the fully open inquiry of critical peace education would engage learners in at least the three forms of reflection outlined in this essay or alternatives that would provide similar reflective inquiry.

As noted, no one form or set of reflective skills is totally distinct nor separate from the others, but each may be emphasized when it has special relevance to a problematic and the nature of the inquiry and the learning objectives sought. Critical reflection on the inequities of access to power as structural obstacles to justice is the initial foundational inquiry of peace education that seeks to inspire and to prepare students to work to transform the unjust and violent conditions of the present world order. The reflective skills, relevant to learning toward the capacities of tolerance and appreciation of diversity, that characterize the cosmopolitan view are primarily those of ethical reasoning as is consistent with the philosophy of what I believe Metcalf and Hunt were advocating as reflective teaching for democratic citizenship. Contemplative reflection is at the heart of transformative learning and to releasing the creative imagination to envision the behavioral and institutional alternatives to violence to which peace education aspires.

The Freirean principle imbedded in critical/analytic reflection on political structures and processes is relevant and essential to inquiries into the problematics of disarmament and security, human rights violations, environmental destruction, and into the development of political and economic institutions to sustain a peaceful, just and democratic international order. Critical reflection on political issues raises questions of the causality of a particular problematic and calls for the assessment of the political and economic feasibility of proposed solutions that produce the political understanding from which political efficacy derives. Consideration of ethical principles deepens and extends the inquiry into areas of: equity, fairness, and desirability. Ethical reflection contributes to a sense of justice, a capacity enabling learners to confront contentious political issues within a framework of reason and respect for the other; even – perhaps especially – in confronting positions, they find politically wrong and ethically unacceptable. Contemplative reflection offers a more profound realm of learning in political interpretation resulting from critical and ethical thinking that can be integrated into the learner's sense of human and social meaning, including his/her relationship to larger realms of human experience. Contemplative reflection is the realm wherein commitments of the self to social purposes are formed.

We need not require learners to throw passionate commitment to a particular position or cause out the window of inquiry framed by reflective reasoning. Rather, we need to make responsible efforts to assure that commitment is clarified and strengthened through a process of authentic reflective inquiry. Difficult dialogues should be approached with open minds, not empty heads or vacant hearts. Informed, reasoning heads and sensitive, compassionate hearts provide the capacity and the willingness to challenge and question the structures and politics of moral exclusion, to argue constructively with civility and to act effectively toward moral inclusion. Sensitive, compassionate hearts are cultivated in the terrain of contemplative reflection, the profound thinking in which the human consequences, or the effects of our propositions and actions on well-being and spiritual vitality, are pondered in

that chamber of thought. It is in this chamber where the fruits of the intellect are plumbed for meaning and fulfillment – the two most fundamental purposes of authentic education – as the foundations upon which to build the transformative political efficacy through which universal moral inclusion, the vision of cosmopolitanism may be realized.

With commitment to purpose, clarity of concepts, and deeply reflected positions, we and our students should be well equipped to take to the pedagogical and political barricades of critical peace education.

References

- Bush, G. W. (2010). *Decision points*. New York: Crown.
- Carter, S. L. (2010, May 16). A bench of rivals. *The New York Times, Week in Review Opinion Pages*, p.12.
- Chirac, J. (2009). *Every step should be a goal*. Bordeaux: Mollat.
- Darter, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. (Eds.). (2003). *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York/London: Routledge-Falmer, Passim.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. Boston: Heath.
- Earth Charter Commission. (2002). *The Earth Charter*. <http://www.earthcharterinaction.org>
- Giroux, H. (2003). Critical theory and educational practice. In A. Darter et al. (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy reader*. New York/London: Routledge-Falmer.
- Hunt, M., & Metcalf, L. (1958). *Teaching high school social studies* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Interfaith Council on Ethics Education for Children. (2008). *Learning to live together*. Geneva: Arigatou Foundation.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lederach, J. P. (2003). *The little book of conflict transformation*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.
- Lederach, J. P. (2005). *The moral imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nordstrom, E., & Reardon, B. A. (Eds.). (1994). *Learning peace: The promise of ecological and cooperative education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Reardon, B. A. (1988). *Comprehensive peace education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Reardon, B. A. (2001). *Education for a culture of peace in a gender perspective*. Paris: UNESCO Press.
- Reardon, B. A. (2008). The eradication of torture: The imperatives of gender and education. *New York Law Review*, 11(2, Summer 2008), 265.
- Reardon, B. A. (2010). *Human rights learning as the pedagogy and politics of peace*. San Juan: UNESCO Chair in Peace Education, University of Puerto Rico.
- Snauwaert, D. (2009, Fall). The ethics and ontology of cosmopolitanism. *Current Issues in Comparative Education* 12(1). ISSN 1523–1615. <http://www.tc.edu/cice>
- UNESCO. (1980). *Final document of the world congress on disarmament education*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Zajonc, A. (2008). *Meditation as contemplative inquiry*. New York: Lindisfarne Books.