

Conjectures on peace education and Gandhian studies: method, institutional development and globalization

Monisha Bajaj*

Department of International and Transcultural Studies, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, USA

(Received 23 November 2008; final version received 30 April 2009)

This article examines the similarities and differences of the fields of Gandhian studies and peace education through an exploration of their content, institutional development, and globalization since the mid-twentieth century. The methods utilized include document review of syllabi and course descriptions in Gandhian studies and peace education, as well as interviews with individuals involved in both fields. Through an examination of the history, emergence and core concepts in each field, this article argues that both fields have the potential to offer each other important lessons based in their own unique trajectories. Specifically, it was found that educational movements, and structural analyses of power and inequality that are often integral to them, in the global South can inform peace education by diversifying the voices deemed canonical in the field. Similarly, Gandhian studies, in responding to the unique dilemma of expanding resources and institutionalization amidst *decreasing* student demand, may do well to broaden its foci and further integrate contemporary social issues related to peace and social justice.

Keywords: Gandhian studies; peace education; globalization; education in the global South

Introduction

My plan to impart primary education... is thus conceived as the spearhead of a silent social revolution fraught with the most far-reaching consequences. It will provide a healthy and moral basis of relationship between the city and the village and thus go a long way towards eradicating some of the worst evils of the present social insecurity and poisoned relationship between the classes. It will check the progressive decay of our villages and lay the foundation of a juster [sic] social order in which there is no unnatural division between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' and everybody is assured of a living wage and the right to freedom. (Mahatma Gandhi, 9 October 1937)

Thousands of books and articles have been written on Mohandas 'Mahatma'¹ Gandhi since his death in 1948 at the hands of Hindu extremists in India. In fact, his work has been so influential that, over the last 60 years, Gandhian studies has emerged as a disciplinary field, encompassing a wide range of scholarship, including broad-based analyses of material inequalities and the specific character of India's experience with globalization to examinations of the role of social and collective action towards peace

*Email: bajaj@tc.edu

(Prasad 1998). Scholars in the field of peace education have also drawn from Gandhi's work, highlighting its relevance for Indian education in particular (Prasad 1998; Harris 2004; Fields 2006).

The field of peace education evolved, most directly, out of the call for 'peace research, peace action and peace education' by seminal peace studies scholars who saw education as an integral component for the dismantling of structures of violence and the promotion of peace (Galtung 1973, 317). In the 1980s, scholars discussed peace education as a remedy to the impact of direct violence and the threat of nuclear proliferation on society (Reardon 1985; Harris 2004). Special attention was paid to sexism and militarism as manifestations of violence (Brock-Utne 1985; Reardon 1985).

Gandhian studies is sometimes considered a localized variant of peace education (Harris 2004). In this article, however, I argue for an examination of Gandhian studies in its own right because its development and emergence out of the post-colonial history of a large nation in the global South can offer peace education productive analytic models for rethinking the possibilities, conditions, and nature of comprehensive peace. Conversely, peace education can help Gandhian studies integrate an examination of physical and material forms of violence and continue its evolution into a more generalized, inter-disciplinary and holistic inquiry into the conditions and possibilities for nonviolence and social justice (as opposed to the repeated examination of the life, struggle, and values of one individual man, albeit a man of great historical significance); such a move may also reverse the trend of decreasing student demand (despite expanding course offerings) in Gandhian studies in certain Indian universities (Kappan 2007). This article analyzes the a/symmetries of Gandhian studies and peace education through an exploration of their methods, institutional development, and globalization since the mid-twentieth century and argues that both fields have the potential to offer each other important lessons based on their own unique trajectories.

Overview

The information presented in this article was collected from July 2007 to June 2008 in India and the US, drawing on primary and secondary sources. The methods utilized for gathering information were document review, archival investigation, and informal interviews carried out in person and over the phone. Representative themes that were found across materials gathered were coded and analyzed for presentation. The research inquiry explored the emergence and current state of Gandhian studies in Indian universities and the ways in which this discipline could (and could not) be read productively alongside the field of global peace education, through a comparison with peace education programs at universities primarily in Europe and North America since these are where such courses are primarily offered.

Peace education and India

Peace education is the transmission of knowledge about the requirements of, the obstacles to and the possibilities for achieving and maintaining peace, training in skills for interpreting the knowledge, and the development of reflective and participatory capacities for applying the knowledge to overcoming problems and achieving possibilities. (Reardon 2000, 399)

The field of peace education, originating in the post-World War II period, seeks to address direct, structural and cultural forms of violence through the transformation of educational content, structure and pedagogy (Galtung 1969, 2009; Reardon 2000; Harris 2004). Though the field originally focused on the elimination of direct violence, emphasizing nuclear disarmament and countering militarism (Reardon 1985; Haavelsrud 1996), one of the core goals of peace education has also become the elimination of cultural and structural violence, which are rooted in social inequalities that limit access to resources and opportunities for individuals and groups, and may be embedded in longstanding cultural practices, attitudes or patterns (Galtung 2009). It is important to note that peace education is far from an institutionalized discipline, with courses being offered in some schools of education, and ‘there is not one standard field but a variety of sub-fields loosely held together by a few common purposes’ (Reardon 2000, 398). Nonetheless, the topics included in peace education courses, programs and literature regularly include developing the capacity to promote social change vis-à-vis gender equity, cultural pluralism and sustainable development, among others (see Table 1).

While peace education has developed conceptual tools to examine material and structural forms of violence as seen in Table 1, much scholarship and documentation emphasizes that peace (and concomitantly, peace education) begins in the ‘minds of men’ – as noted in the preamble to UNESCO’s constitution – and involves personal, rather than necessarily collective, action towards peace (Mayor 1995; Schwebel 2001). It thus becomes important to understand some of the philosophical underpinnings of peace education to understand its theoretical orientations.

The works of educational scholars, and discussions of these educationists and their core contributions to pedagogy and/or practice, make up a significant part of the scholarship in peace education. Important examples include Maria Montessori’s child-centered learning (Duckworth 2008), John Dewey’s democratic education (Howlett 1982; Page 2004; Reardon 1988; Stomfay-Stitz 1993) and increasingly, Paulo Freire’s education for critical consciousness (Ardizzone 2003; Bartlett 2008; Burns and Aspelagh 1983; Harris 2004; Synott 2005). In all of the theories mentioned, there is a strong argument for community engagement to be an integral component of education and for schooling to lay the groundwork for future social action and responsibility. However, the social movements towards equity and justice inspired by Gandhi, and his belief in education for self-reliance and moral development have, with a few exceptions (Allen 2007; Brantmeier 2007; Prasad 1998; Fields 2006), been largely absent from peace education scholarship.²

While Montessori and Dewey importantly call for reflective individual analysis in order to determine one’s potential to influence society in the future, Gandhi, perhaps due to the differentiated social circumstances, conceptualizes the child/learner as

Table 1. Foundational concepts in peace education.

Values	Capacities
Gender equality	Gender sensitivity
Cultural diversity	Multicultural proficiency
Social responsibility	Global agency/engagement
Social responsibility	Conflict competence
Environmental sustainability	Ecological awareness

Source: Reardon (2001).

already deeply involved in society and connected to communities, in a similar way to Freire. This argument suggests that education must offer learners the opportunity to cultivate an understanding of social dynamics and resist pressures – be they post/colonial or the outcome of class conflict – to assimilate into dominant economic and cultural structures that often do not serve the needs of students and their communities. India's social realities and the roots of violence – direct, structural and cultural – have shaped the emergence of Gandhian studies, as will be discussed in the following section.

Postcolonial India, though characterized by relative political stability³ at the national level since independence in 1947, has experienced virulent and often bloody tensions based on caste, religious conflict between Muslims, Hindus and other religious groups, entrenched gender discrimination, and is one of the most unequal societies in the world today (Thornton and Thornton 2006). At the same time, many social movements in India are at the forefront of large scale initiatives seeking to educate for peace and human rights. For example, UNESCO awarded the City Montessori School in Lucknow, India the 2002 UNESCO Prize for Peace Education, citing the school's efficacy in 'promoting the values of peace, religious harmony, tolerance and coexistence among children' (UNESCO 2002, 14). Most recently, the National Council of Educational Training and Research (NCERT) in India has included peace education (referencing Gandhi's legacy as well in this regard) in its teacher education program, giving in-service teachers the opportunity to participate in a six-week long training that deals with skills, attitudes, knowledge and behavior related to peace and nonviolence (Roy 2008).

In terms of scholarship, however, peace educators have only nominally mentioned Gandhian studies as a localized version of peace education and without a substantive discussion of how the parallel fields might inform one another; similarly, Gandhian studies scholars have not been active in publishing in peace education journals or utilizing a combination of both disciplinary frameworks to advance their scholarship. Peace education and Gandhian studies both provide analyses of violence at individual, collective and structural levels, and express a preferred vision of social justice, nonviolence and peace. While peace education scholars tend to set western industrialized countries as their silent template for analysis of themes such as multiculturalism, gender equity and militarism, present-day India is witness to various forms of cultural and structural violence – namely marked income inequality and deep-seated discrimination (caste, religion, gender, among others) – and direct violence in the form of communal attacks on Muslims, Dalits⁴ and, recently, Christians in the eastern state of Orissa (Das 2008). While the critiques of both disciplines will be discussed later in this article, it is important to note here that the field of peace education has been criticized by some scholars for its proclaimed universality and imposition of western ideals (Burns and Aspelagh 1983; Gur-Ze'ev 2001; Tandon 1989). In response to critics who suggest that peace education assumes a unidirectional diffusion of ideas, the following section reviews Gandhian studies as a field and what lessons its unique development and status might hold for peace education.

The emergence of Gandhian studies as a field in India

By non-violent action, Gandhi meant peaceful, constructive mass action. It is true that Gandhi did not write on peace education in any very specific way, but his whole

philosophy and life have been, of course, important in peace studies and peace education not only for India but for other nations of the world as well. (Prasad 1998, 4)

As suggested by Indian scholar Prasad (1998) in the above quote, Gandhian principles and the de facto promotion of peace education through Gandhian studies are part of the fundamental architecture of many Indian educational initiatives,⁵ as well as those in a variety of other countries.⁶ In addition to teaching about Gandhi as part of the Indian history curriculum in primary and secondary schools, several schools employ elements of Gandhi's philosophy in their names and operational structures. Additionally, dozens of Indian universities have 'Gandhian studies' departments, centers or programs that offer degrees in the subject and emphasize various disciplines within Gandhian studies ranging from history to economics to development studies.

At the primary level, Gandhi promoted an education system called 'basic education', which focused on vocational education and the use of local vernacular as the medium of instruction (Gupta 2007). He emphasized manual labor and hands-on training in addition to intellectual pursuits to provide holistic development as well as skills. According to him, education should be provided for free and special attention should be paid to character building. One of the main components of his educational philosophy was the importance of religious education (in students' own religions) which, according to Gandhi, was synonymous with the concepts of truth and nonviolence. He promoted this form of education as a social good, emphasizing social responsibility, rather than having students view and use their educational qualifications solely for personal gains. Gandhi also advocated for a program of 'new education', which emphasized through practice the values of self-reliance, living within a community and oneness with nature (Prasad 1984).

As previously mentioned, since Gandhi's death in 1948, many universities have initiated Gandhian studies departments and/or 'Gandhi Bhavans', centers to promote peace research and national unity. The focus of each program or course of study ranges from Gandhian philosophy to development issues to environmental concerns to the economy, but all are rooted in Gandhi's life as an historical example of peace, nonviolence and social justice. Universities bearing Gandhi's name and educational philosophy have also been established, such as the Gandhigram University in Tamil Nadu and the Mahatma Gandhi University in Kerala, where Gandhi's life and message are incorporated into the fabric of university life.

Gandhigram University, for example, has been particularly active in its training of peace workers and has sought to contribute to peacemaking through higher education and training. Beginning in the 1960s, conferences were held at Gandhigram to train peace workers and prepare them to go to conflict areas, such as neighboring Sri Lanka (Paige 2002). The University's founder, Gandhian philosopher Dr G. Ramachandran, trained the first group of students in Gandhian principles of nonviolence and also initiated the *Shanti Sena* (University Peace Brigade) training program in Gandhigram, which is an intensive program aimed at providing a series of opportunities for the youth to promote nonviolence as a way of living.

The national body charged with overseeing public higher education in India, the University Grants Commission, has supported and funded the development of Gandhian studies. This study identified over 50 active departments/centers on Gandhian studies and these fall under the national educational theme of 'values education', a category which also includes 'Buddhist studies' and 'Nehru studies' (UGC 2004). In 2004, the University Grants Commission infused millions of rupees into an

initiative to expand the number of Gandhian studies centers in institutions of higher education with an eventual goal of establishing and supporting 500 centers of Gandhian studies in Indian colleges and universities (Ramachandran 2004). The stated impetus for this expansion of Gandhian studies was reportedly due to the field's inherent link with peace and conflict studies and its analysis of how to address social inequalities (Ramachandran 2004)

Admission into a masters or a PhD level degree program in Gandhian education is through a national qualifying exam, which is administered twice a year. Most universities that offer Gandhian studies have graduate coursework – masters and doctoral level – and many offer undergraduate or non-degree certificates in Gandhian studies as well. Table 2 presents a sample course of study for a two-year interdisciplinary program in Gandhian studies at Panjab University.⁷

While the university-level offerings in Gandhian studies vary slightly in their goals, scope and orientation, overall, the dozens of university-level degree and certificate programs in Gandhian studies reviewed in this study shared a common emphasis, generally promoting peacemaking and nonviolence as integral themes of their coursework. Most programs also integrated a fieldwork or voluntary service component, and a thesis writing exercise, into their course of study resulting in greater linkages between the classroom and community. Many of the original programs in Gandhian studies were founded by Gandhi's colleagues and fellow independence leaders; however, course offerings in the field continue to expand, suggesting that the field is not just about one individual and is seen, at least by some, to have contemporary relevance. Programs in Gandhian studies have also allied with various other disciplines and/or fields, such as conflict resolution, peace studies, development studies and history.

The number of Gandhian studies programs has nearly doubled in the past decade and new generations of scholars and students have found fertile ground in discussions of his ideals, politics and practices, while at the same time films, books and scholars have subjected Gandhi's philosophy, personal relationships and his role in the Independence movement to extensive scrutiny.⁸ This critical engagement of Gandhi as a historical, political and spiritual leader suggests the contested and productive terrain within which Gandhian studies as a field of study operates.

Current critiques of Gandhian studies include the singular focus on one individual rather than the larger social movements around independence and the lack of emphasis on contemporary issues; although many programs have cited their attempts to incorporate both the broader historical and social context, and current affairs (individual interview with a professor of Gandhian studies, August 2007). Another critique of such university programs is that although departments and courses' offerings are expanding, there is limited demand for them at a time when the world economy necessitates workers with specific skills for survival in a highly competitive labor market (Dabhi 2005). A recent news report in India highlighted that the Gandhian studies department at the Bangalore University had no applicants except for a few opportunistic students who knew their chances of getting a room in the hostel would be improved by applying to Gandhian studies since accommodations were allocated by department (Kappan 2007). The article further noted that these students promptly switched departments once they secured a space in the hostel. Nonetheless, the history of Gandhian studies in Indian higher education – as an interdisciplinary field examining nonviolence, peace and social justice and having an established presence in dozens of universities – is formidable and offers rich comparative insights into the field of peace education.

Table 2. Sample outline of content of master's program in Gandhian studies.

Phase	Topics
Semester I	<p>Life and work of Mahatma Gandhi</p> <p>Psychological and sociological studies of childhood and youth of Gandhi</p> <p>Main principles and teachings of Buddhism and Jainism and their impact on Gandhi</p> <p>Gandhi in South Africa: struggle against racial discrimination</p> <p>Gandhi's early political activity in India</p> <p>Gandhi and social movements</p> <p>Gandhi and minorities in India</p> <p>Campaign against untouchability/caste discrimination</p> <p>Women's participation in politics in India</p> <p>Gandhi and partition of India</p>
Semester II	<p>Gandhi's social and political thought</p> <p>View of God, truth and its significance</p> <p>Concept of nonviolence: contemporary relevance</p> <p>Satyagraha (the force of truth) – meaning, postulates, typology</p> <p>View of human nature: society and social justice</p> <p>Political participation (Panchayati Raj)*</p> <p>Freedom, equality, rights – duties and human rights</p> <p>Gandhi's critique of modern civilization</p> <p>An assessment of Gandhi's contribution to social and political thought</p>
Semester III	<p>Peace studies</p> <p>Peace studies – meaning and scope</p> <p>The theories of war: Clausewitz, Marxist–Leninist</p> <p>Causes of war; attributes of peace; approaches to peace</p> <p>Peace education</p> <p>Peace movements (pacifism; civil rights movement in US; social movements and NGOs in India; non-aligned movement; Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, etc)</p> <p>Global issues and quest for peace: human rights, ecology, population control and equitable economic world order</p> <p>Gandhi's contribution to peace studies</p> <p>Role of world organizations in promoting peace</p>
Semester IV	<p>International relations and organizations</p> <p>Emergence of international organization: The League of Nations, ILO, permanent Court of International Justice</p> <p>United Nations and its functioning, UNESCO, UNICEF</p> <p>Non-aligned movement and its significance today</p> <p>Cold war era (decolonization, arms, nuclearization)</p> <p>Post-Cold War World – its nature and characteristics</p> <p>Proliferation of international organizations (EU, WTO, NAFTA, ASEAN)</p> <p>North–South dialogue, new international economic order and Gandhian alternative</p> <p>Recent trends in international relations, globalization, privatization and liberalization</p>

Note: *Pachayati Raj refers to a localized and participatory system of governance advocated for by Gandhi wherein each village would be responsible for its own community affairs and decision-making.

Analytic foci of Gandhian studies and peace education: siblings with a slight resemblance or distant cousins?⁹

This study employed two strategies for assessing similarities and differences, namely, the collection of topics covered in courses, and a comparison of selected dissertation

work carried out in peace education and Gandhian studies respectively. In the case of the course offerings, the syllabi of six university-level classes, primarily in the US, were coded for significant themes and are shown in Table 3 in ranked order according to the frequency with which they appeared. All of these courses were at the graduate level and had the term ‘peace education’ in their title or course description.¹⁰ Six degree programs in Gandhian studies were also selected for review in order to compare topics and their level of importance.¹¹ No Indian universities were found to be teaching courses with ‘peace education’ in their title. Both sets of cases utilized maximum variation sampling in order to achieve geographical diversity and purposive sampling since most of the materials reviewed were largely available online with open access (Miles and Huberman 1994). Table 3 highlights the ranked order of topics that were found to be most frequently included in graduate courses in peace education and Gandhian studies and Table 4 offers a sampling of dissertations written over time in the two fields.

Tables 3 and 4 suggest some common features of peace education and Gandhian studies, but with a largely distinctive focus of the latter on Gandhi’s life, social inequalities, economic and social justice, and development studies. In Gandhian studies, political empowerment of the rural poor and a more equitable economic distribution nationally and globally dominate much of the coursework, suggesting the important ways that context shapes the nature of both interdisciplinary fields. Peace education dissertations and course topics often discuss war, militarism, pacifism, conflict resolution and disarmament; these topics seemingly reflect the realities of western industrialized countries from which leading scholars hail.

In Galtung’s (1969) terms, these differences roughly equate to a stronger focus of Gandhian studies on structural violence – or the material inequalities at local, national and global levels that lead to social injustice – and peace education’s emphasis on direct violence or the eradication of war and physical violence at all levels of society. Cultural violence, in the forms of racism and discrimination, figure more prominently in Gandhian studies than peace education, though many of the course topics could possibly be taught with attention to cultural violence that this cursory overview of topical areas may render invisible. Social and collective action towards peace also appears more frequently in Gandhian studies perhaps because of the focus on structural and cultural forms of violence.

Table 3. Frequency of topics in peace education and Gandhian studies courses.

Peace education	Gandhian studies
<i>(In order of frequency, from highest)</i>	<i>(In order of frequency, from highest)</i>
1. Violence/war/militarism	1. Gandhi’s life
2. Feminist/gender perspectives on peace	2. Rural development
3. Nonviolence	3. Political empowerment
4. Conflict resolution/transformation	4. Nonviolence
5. Environment/sustainable development	5. Social movements
6. History of peace education	6. Gandhian economics/equitable global economic order
7. Disarmament	7. Conflict resolution/transformation
8. Religion/spirituality/inner peace	8. Gender perspectives
9. Human rights	9. United Nations/international organizations
10. Critical pedagogy/Paulo Freire	10. Environment/sustainable development
11. Restorative justice	11. Indian social and political thought
12. United Nations/international organizations	12. Religion/morality/coexistence

Table 4. Selected dissertations written in Gandhian studies and peace education.

Gandhian studies	Year	Peace education	Year
Gandhi's Approach to Hindu-Muslim Problems (1915–1936: A Critical Study), [Swatantra Arora]	1977	The peacemakers: A profile of seven pacifist tax refusers [Ronn Rucker]	1980
Gandhi's View of Political Power [Jai Narain Sharma]	1984	Northern Illinois University peace education: Historical perspectives, 1828–1983 [Aline Stomfay-Stitz]	1984
A Study of the Role of Non-Violent Strategies in Modern Warfare [Meena Dutta]	1991	Peace education in the local church: An Evangelical apologetic for Christian pacifism [Stephen Richard Miller]	1993
Gandhi and the Indian Capitalists [Jitender Raghuvanshi]	1994	The rhetoric of nonviolent conflict resolution: Toward a philosophy of peace as a social construct [Sheila Marie Murphy]	1996
Satyagraha: A Method of Social Change [Suman Rani]	1999	Traditional approaches to citizenship education, globalization, towards a peace education framework [Lawrence Gerard Macdonald]	2003
Gandhi's View of Legal Justice [Ajit Kumar]	2006	Francelia Butler's contribution to peace education: Peace games, a curriculum for teaching peace through play [Michelle LaSeur]	2006

Interestingly, in the Gandhian studies dissertations, broad social issues are discussed such as social change, modern warfare, political power and legal justice, as compared to the peace education dissertations, drawn mostly from North America, in which more specific topics are chosen, such as one institution's approach to peace education, seven pacifists' experiences, or one individual's (Francelia Butler) contribution to the field. This difference could perhaps be due to the differentiated role of scholarly work in each context, or could simply be emblematic of the dissertation requirements, scope of work, or conventions in each context. In the field of legal studies, D'Souza (2007) has noted that scholarship in the 'Third World' is often either commissioned by large development agencies or arises *in response* and as a space to speak back and produce counter-narratives to widely-held assumptions about development. While it is difficult to ascertain the precise conditions and motivations of each author listed in Table 4, the pursuit of doctoral work in North America could be viewed as more of an individual exercise, whereas in India, the inextricable link between scholarship and 'imperial agendas' on the one hand, or 'global solidarities' on the other, appears to be in operation to a greater degree (D'Souza 2007, para 1).

The field of peace education, as it becomes increasingly international and infused with voices of scholars and activists from the global South, has started incorporating some of the concepts in the Gandhian studies column in Table 3, but the syllabi (although recent) and dissertations reviewed present more conventional understandings of the field. Gandhian studies' critical spirit can inform up and

coming peace education scholars who seek to uncover the complex relationships among human rights, social inequality and a comprehensive vision of peace (Bajaj 2008). The notable differences in the approaches of Gandhian studies and peace education reflect the unique origins of each field, their development over time, and the agency and positionality of their proponents.

However, given the increasingly interdisciplinary nature of universities in the United States and the efforts of Indian universities to engage in broader analyses of peace and nonviolence, the two fields could converge based on their shared concern with issues such as conflict transformation, women's rights, sustainable development and nonviolence. Gandhian studies programs train students from many different countries and, in an effort to be relevant to contemporary issues, cover various topics related to peace, nonviolence and globalization. Similarly, peace education programs are increasingly international and are moving away from western, Eurocentric notions of peace to examine issues of global inequalities and structural violence as impediments to peace (Dadhich 2004).

Integrations: core concepts of Gandhian studies for the scholar of peace education

Nonviolence education or Gandhian studies emphasizes positive concepts of peace (rather than peace as absence of strife), the power of nonviolence, the discovery of one's own and others' truths, empathy, forgiveness and community, and proactive peacemaking. ... For Gandhi, a spiritual emphasis grounds the acceptance and reconciliation of ideological differences. Gandhi's thought and example offer moral and spiritual imperatives for application of our efforts to understand and achieve peace in its various manifestations. (Fields 2006, 229–30)

The thinking of Gandhi and Gandhian studies offer productive insights for scholars of peace education in the areas of pedagogy and engagement with (for him, religious and racial, but generally) difference. For example, Gandhi's emphasis on educational skills that promote community engagement and responsibility – rather than a mere mimicking of neo/colonial values and language – resonate with the concepts put forth by Montessori, Dewey and Freire about the relationship between the school and the larger society. Notions of economic self-reliance and self-determination amidst extreme income inequalities that Gandhi put forth based on the historical realities of his time could inform to a greater degree peace education efforts in marginalized communities that seek to transform exploitative economic relationships. An additional component of Gandhi's unique contribution to educational theory is the role of the spiritual life of the child (distinguished from oppressive religious dictates), both in the classroom and in larger social movements (as cited in Rajput 1998). Despite the secular tradition of schools in the west, Gandhi's educational philosophy advocates an acknowledgement of the role of spirituality in children's lives and a space for the nurturing of tolerance and interfaith understanding in the classroom.

For a 'half-naked *fakir*', in the famous words of Winston Churchill, Gandhi offered sophisticated and productive interpretations of religious belief, discrimination and avenues for peace (as cited in Younge 2007, 1). Gandhi's rejection of certain Hindu tenets, such as the caste system and widespread discrimination against women in religious life, suggests his distinction between a blind acceptance of religion on the one hand, and his preference for a humanizing spiritual faith based on peace and social

justice on the other. Gandhi, in his writings and public statements, also insisted upon broad constructive engagement and pluralist tolerance in a society marked by religious or communal violence. In simple terms, Gandhi stated that students should learn about all faiths to promote respect for difference, tolerance, and nonviolence (Kumar n.d.), all of which broadly parallel the values and ideals of peace education.

The field of peace education has also emphasized a context dependent (as opposed to a universalistic or standards-based) epistemology encouraging variations in focus based on temporal and local factors (Harris 2004), such as the emphasis placed in the 1980s on anti-nuclear education in the US and ‘education for mutual understanding’ in Northern Ireland (Harris 2004, 7). Gandhian studies has also been mentioned in these writings as a form of peace education, but little analysis has been done by scholars interested in peace education and Gandhian studies towards developing the lessons of the latter for the global peace education movement.

Peace education scholars in the US might utilize a Gandhian framework to analyze racial and economic disparities in urban communities, re-examining the structural and material conditions of peace vis-à-vis issues of race and class. In lay discussions, race in the US has often been understood in binary black–white terms, and as a conceptually unrelated approach to studies of economic inequality (Quadagno 1994). One could argue that the US is perhaps at the cusp of change in our historical understanding of race with burgeoning immigrant populations from Asia and Latin America, and increased relative incorporation of many (but not all) immigrant communities (Sassen 2000; Mollenkopf et al. 1992). An understanding of such structural realities would facilitate the analysis of the obstacles and possibilities for peace and peace education within and beyond the classroom in increasingly diverse communities.

Of course, traditional peace education scholarship also has obvious points of clarity to share with Gandhian studies in India. The nation and subcontinent broadly, continues to experience its share of violence, conventionally understood. As stated above, post-Independence India has seen virulent and often bloody tensions based on caste, religious conflict between Muslims, Hindus and other religious groups, and entrenched gender discrimination. The Indian state has often been cited as complicit, at different historical moments, in instances of brutal sectarian violence. As such, peace education’s early and continuing focus on direct violence, disarmament, and militarism has particular significance for India – the newest nation (at the time of this writing) to be exempt from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Integrations continued: Gandhian studies, peace education, inequality and globalization

Gandhian studies is very obviously tied to the life and practice of Mahatma Gandhi. Yet, despite critics claiming otherwise, the field also seeks to develop the links between Gandhian precepts and contemporary issues. Peace education examines various topics and approaches including the arts, non-formal education, theology and historical developments. While peace education has recently expanded its focus to address human rights issues, such as income and racial disparities, Gandhian studies often appears to more explicitly question economic relations and foreground politics. In more direct terms, Gandhian studies has as its foundation a neo-Marxist questioning of globalization, socio-economic relations and inequality. Peace education scholars in the US have, in large part, addressed educational issues without an interrogation of socio-economic relations that privilege some and marginalize many others. Gandhian studies’ critical

approach may be rooted in India's postcolonial condition, its legacy of struggle against imperialism, and critical traditions of Marxist and neo-Marxist scholarship. Despite their obvious difference, this article has sought to bridge the seeming distance between the two related fields by suggesting ways of reading concepts and practices from a vibrant corner of the global South that can lead to a broader and deeper understanding of the diverse forms and possibilities of peace education.

Some of these differences attest to the privileging of voices from the 'North' in peace education. Historically, new perspectives on peace education have largely been developed by peace education scholars in Europe and North America, where substantial access to schooling is already a feature of social life and where there is greater access to technology and resources for the diffusion of ideas through publication. International organizations promoting peace education have sought to redress this imbalance through the publishing and dissemination of materials developed in regions that have been underrepresented in the field of peace education.

The writings of peace education scholars from the global South, despite their limited availability in many cases, have, similar to Gandhian scholars, consistently identified the unequal global system as an important component to address and attempt to dismantle through more peace-oriented educational approaches. In examining scholarship in peace education largely developed in western industrialized contexts as compared with scholars advocating for peace education or Gandhian studies in the global South, the issue of the inequalities imposed by the global capitalist system takes center stage in the latter's analyses (Pathak 2004; Tandon 1989). According to Pathak, a reordering of the education system, as per Gandhi's dictates, is a necessary prerequisite, otherwise 'peace education will remain subjugated to the existing order of violence, inequality, and exploitation' (141). In Tandon's (1989) analysis of peace education efforts in sub-Saharan Africa, he addresses the distinct experiences of African countries with the slave-trade, colonialism and the current 'capitalist-imperialist destruction and exploitation of Africa' (Tandon 1989, 67). Tandon asserts that peace is not compatible with global inequities and that imperialism, largely responsible for these inequities, must be addressed in peace education programs. In this way, Gandhian studies reflects the realities of peace education scholars in the global South with its emphasis on structural and cultural inequalities, such as social, racial, and economic injustices.

Because educators and students in India and other parts of the global South are more directly presented with stark economic inequalities, Gandhian studies' emphases on issues of globalization and development studies are important insights for the field of peace education. By acknowledging the larger global order and the limits it may impose on even the most radical innovations in the educational system, peace education scholars would be better equipped to consider, propose, and evaluate approaches towards greater peace and equity through education. It is important to note that this does not mean that scholars in both fields do not continue to carry out scholarly work in the areas that have conventionally defined each field, but that increased globalization, growing inequalities, and the need for 'homegrown' solutions increasingly necessitate that both peace education and Gandhian studies attend to the local.

Some questions that could be addressed to both fields to guide further research and scholarship are the following:

- To what extent do the historical, political, social and economic context structure the possibilities and limitations of movements and initiatives for peace and nonviolence in education?

- Given the applied nature of both peace education and Gandhian studies, in what ways can universities engage in working towards greater peace and social justice while still maintaining their role as laboratories for the study of social phenomena?
- How can research and scholarship in peace education and Gandhian studies speak to each other, and across the vast divide of differentiated social realities, in generating productive theoretical positions for scholars and practitioners? How do epistemological practice, research methods and questions take into account distinct social, political, cultural and economic contexts?

While these questions are not easily answerable, consideration of them may push both fields forward. In the case of peace education, it can force a critical and solid re-examination of the structural limits and possibilities of peace education in diverse contexts. In the case of India, attention to heightened militarism and the need to examine contemporary issues vis-à-vis the changing structures of globalization can allow for the continual reinvention of Gandhian studies in order to support an interdisciplinary approach to political and social analysis and action.

This paper explored the fields of Gandhian studies and peace education, seeking to understand what each could learn from each other. For peace educators, Gandhi's educational ideas about nonviolence, cultural empowerment, self-reliance, and moral development add to the conceptual resources available to scholars and practitioners in our emergent field. By understanding the diverse chords that resonate with peace education across the globe and within distinct cultural and social contexts, new directions, insights and information can increasingly inform peace education in order to make it more attentive to issues of identity and diversity. Ultimately, the continual renewal and reinvention of approaches to peace and education – regardless of the scholarly or disciplinary field to which such endeavors belong – can improve the ability of researchers and practitioners to examine the roots of violence and explore ever-expanding possibilities for peace.

Acknowledgements

This research was made possible with the generous support provided by the Provost's Faculty Diversity Research Award of Teachers College, Columbia University (2007–2008). This article also benefited greatly from the contributions of Stephanie Bengtsson, Radhika Iyengar and Bikku Kuruvila.

Notes

1. Mahatma literally translates as 'great soul' and Gandhi was widely referred to by this nickname during his life and afterwards.
2. Allen's (2007) work, in which he develops a 'Gandhian peace education' philosophy, is a notable exception to this gap in literature linking Gandhi to peace education.
3. Of course, the Indian state has experienced (and unfortunately too often been complicit in) brutal sectarian violence against Sikhs in the northwest state of Punjab, in the majority Muslim state of Kashmir for decades, and armed insurgencies in the northeastern states, not to mention the insurrectionary Naxalite movement in rural central and eastern India at different points in the country's post-Independence history. All these forms of violence notwithstanding, the social cohesion and legitimacy of the Indian nation state has largely survived and in many ways remained strong.
4. Dalits (literally translated as 'broken people') constitute 15% of India's population. Human Rights Watch finds that 'Entrenched discrimination violates Dalits' rights to education,

- health, housing, property, freedom of religion, free choice of employment, and equal treatment before the law. Dalits also suffer routine violations of their right to life and security of person through state-sponsored or sanctioned acts of violence, including torture' (Human Rights Watch 2007, 1).
5. When mentioning Gandhian principles in education, I refer to his emphasis on the concepts of peace, truth, and nonviolence as well as his specific experiments with education documented in his 1932 writings (Rajput 1998).
 6. It is important to note that Gandhi's name and his philosophy of nonviolent resistance to domination have also inspired educational innovation throughout the global South. Examples include the Gandhi School in Hungary, which seeks to empower marginalized Roma students by providing high quality and culturally-specific education (Katz 2005), and the Taman Rama Gandhi School in Bali, which emphasizes religious tolerance and cultural diversity (Tamatea 2005). While differential interpretations of Gandhi's philosophy result in varied school policies and practices, the diffusion of Gandhian norms reflects an interesting and simultaneous 'globalization from below' process that complicates larger discussions of globalization which presume one-way flows of cultural values, political, economic and administrative practices from the North to the global South (Tamatea 2005, 139).
 7. Information obtained from Panjab University's web site, accessed 8 May 2008 at <http://gandhianstudies.puchd.ac.in/slb.htm>.
 8. On the level of popular culture, films such as *Gandhi my father* and *The making of the Mahatma* portray a more critical picture of Gandhi as a father and husband in contrast to his idealized role as Indian independence leader. On a scholarly level, the appeal of Gandhi as a social phenomenon has also been widely discussed from a range of methodological perspectives. See, for example, Sumit Sarkar's (1983) important treatise on modern India noting the unique combination of factors leading to his emergence, namely: (1) the particular conditions of, and Gandhi's experience of a successful movement in South Africa with peoples of disparate religions, communities and castes, which afforded him status as a pan-Indian leader that his peers with ultimately regional bases could not claim; (2) a deeply felt and worked out philosophy owing something to Emerson and Thoreau, but nonetheless highly original (as cited in Sarkar 1983); (3) his disciplined and controlled approach to mass participation, which appealed to business groups and better-off sections of the peasantry who all stood to lose if political struggle turned into uninhibited, violent social revolution; and (4) his critique of industrial civilization, inspired by mid-nineteenth century English writers like Carlyle and Ruskin, which had considerable appeal to a then largely agrarian society in turmoil (Sarkar 1983). See also Shahid Amin's provocative challenge to conventional historiography, the independence movement, Gandhi, and the role of memory (Amin 1995).
 9. This question employs the metaphor of twins and siblings as inspired by David Wilson's work on the relationship between the fields of Comparative Education and International Education (Wilson 1996).
 10. The Peace Education syllabi consulted were from the following sources: Cabezudo (2007, Universitat Jaume I (UJI), Castellón, Spain); Harris (2006, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee); Jenkins and Reardon (2007, Universitat Jaume I); Lin (2004, University of Maryland); Lucas (2003, Teachers College); Morrison (n.d., University of Connecticut).
 11. The Gandhian studies course outlines and descriptions consulted were from the following universities: (1) Department of Gandhian Studies, Panjab University; (2) Gandhian Studies, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian School of Mines University; (3) School of Gandhian Thought and Development Studies, Mahatma Gandhi University; (4) Gandhian Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Jammu; (5) Centre for Gandhian Studies, University of Rajasthan; (6) Gandhian Studies Centre, Department of History, University of Calcutta.

Notes on contributor

Monisha Bajaj, EdD, is assistant professor of education in the Department of International and Transcultural Studies at Teachers College, Columbia University. Her research and teaching interests include peace and human rights education, and educational policy and practice in diverse international and US contexts such as Zambia, India, the Dominican Republic and New

York City. She is the editor of the *Encyclopedia of Peace Education* (2008) and the author of a Spanish-language teacher training manual on human rights education (UNESCO 2003). Her current research, supported by a National Academy of Education/Spencer post-doctoral fellowship, explores human rights education initiatives in India.

References

- Allen, D. 2007. Mahatma Gandhi on violence and peace education. *Philosophy East & West* 57, no. 3: 290–310.
- Amin, S. 1995. *Event, metaphor, memory: Chauri Chaura 1922–1992*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Ardizzone, L. 2003. Generating peace: A study of non-formal youth organizations. *Peace & Change* 28, no. 3: 420–445.
- Bajaj, M. 2008. ‘Critical’ peace education. In *Encyclopedia of peace education*, ed. M. Bajaj, 135–46. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Bartlett, L. 2008. Paulo Freire and peace education. In *Encyclopedia of peace education*, ed. M. Bajaj, 39–45. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Brantmeier, E. 2007. Everyday understandings of peace and non-peace: peacekeeping and peacebuilding at a US Midwestern high school. *Journal of Peace Education* 4, no. 2: 127–48.
- Brock-Utne, B. 1985. *Education for peace: A feminist perspective*. Willowdale, ON: Pergamon Press.
- Burns, R., and R. Aspeslagh. 1983. Concepts of peace education: A view of western experience. *International Review of Education* 29, no. 3: 311–30.
- Cabezudo, A. 2007. Education for peace. <http://www.epd.uji.es/Outlines/2007-2009/2007-2008/fall2007/cabezudo.pdf>.
- Dabhi, P. 2005. In Gandhi’s land, few takers for his ideology. *Express India*, Wednesday, April 20.
- Dadhich, N. 2004. Peace education in third world: A view. In *Towards a more peaceful world: International and Indian perspectives*, ed. N. Dadhich, 119–27. Jaipur: Aalekh Publishers.
- Das, P. 2008. Project Orissa. *The Hindu*, October 27. <http://www.hinduonnet.com/fline/fl2519/stories/20080926251900400.htm>.
- D’Souza, R. 2007. Imperial agendas, global solidarities, and socio-legal scholarship on the ‘Third World’. Paper presented at the Law and Society Association, at Berlin, Germany.
- Duckworth, C. 2008. Maria Montessori and peace education. In *Encyclopedia of peace education*, ed. M. Bajaj, 33–37. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Fields, G. 2006. Gandhi and Dewey: Education for peace. In *Problems for democracy*, ed. J. Kultgen and M. Lenzi, 229–43. New York: Rodopi.
- Galtung, J. 1969. Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research* 6, no. 3: 167–91.
- Galtung, J. 1973. Education for and with peace: Is it possible? In *Essays in peace research*, ed. J. Galtung, 317–33. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlertsen.
- Galtung, J. 2009. *Violence, war, and their impact: On visible and invisible effects of violence*. <http://them.polylog.org/5/fgj-en.htm>.
- Gupta, A. 2007. *Going to school in South Asia: The global school room*. London: Greenwood Press.
- Gur Ze’ev, I. 2001. Philosophy of peace education in a postmodern era. *Educational Theory* 51, no. 3: 315–36.
- Haavelsrud, M. 1996. *Education in developments*. Norway: Arena Publishers.
- Harris, I. 2004. Peace education theory. *Journal of Peace Education* 1, no. 1: 5–20.
- Harris, I. 2006. Peace education. <http://www.uwm.edu/~imh/ED%20POL%20520.htm>.
- Howlett, C. 1982. The pragmatist as pacifist: John Dewey’s views on peace education. *Teachers College Record* 83, no. 3: 435–51.
- HRW (Human Rights Watch). 2007. *Apartheid: Caste discrimination against India’s “Untouchables”*. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- Jenkins, T., and B. Reardon. 2007. www.epd.uji.es/Outlines/2006-2008/2006-2007/spring2007/reardon-jenkins-course.pdf.

- Kappan, R. 2007. No takers for Gandhian studies in Bangalore varsity. *The Hindu*, August 15.
- Katz, S. 2005. Emerging from the cocoon of Romani pride: The first graduates of the Gandhi Secondary School in Hungary. *Intercultural Education* 16, no. 3: 247–61.
- Kumar, R. 2008. *Mahatma Gandhi and peace education: An analysis*. <http://www.mkgandhi.org/articles/g&peacedu.htm>.
- Lin, J. 2004. Education for global peace. http://www.education.umd.edu/EDPA/courses/EDPL788A_peace_Lin.pdf.
- Lucas, P. 2003. Fundamental concepts of peace education. <http://www.tc.columbia.edu/PeaceEd/docs/fundamental%20concepts%20of%20peace%20education.doc>.
- Mayor, F. 1995. How psychology can contribute to a culture of peace. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* 1, no. 1: 3–9.
- Miles, M.B., and A.M. Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mollenkopf, J.H., and Castells, M. 1992. *Dual city: Restructuring New York*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Morrison, M.L. n.d. Women and peace. http://www.paxeducare.org/syllabus/GEP_Program_Syllabus.doc.
- Page, J. 2004. Peace education: Exploring some philosophical foundations. *International Review of Education* 50, no. 1: 3–15.
- Paige, G. 2002. *Gandhi's contribution to global nonviolent awakening*. Hawaii: Center for Global Nonviolence.
- Pathak, D.N. 2004. Building culture of peace: Role of peace education and conflict resolution. In *Gandhian alternative to contemporary problems*, ed. A.D. Mishra, R K. Singh, and S.K. Tiwari. Delhi: Abhijeet Publications.
- Prasad, D. 1984. *Peace education or education for peace*. New Delhi: Gandhi Peace Foundation.
- Prasad, S.N. 1998. Development of peace education in India (since Independence). *Peace Education Mini Prints* 95: 1–14.
- Quadagno, J. 1994. *The color of welfare: How racism undermined the war on poverty*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rajput, J. 1998. Gandhi on education. *National Council on Teacher Education*. http://www.ncte-in.org/pub/gandhi/gandhi_0.htm.
- Ramachandran, S.K. 2004. At UGC, Gandhian studies back in vogue. *The Tribune Newspaper*. <http://www.tribuneindia.com/2004/20041031/delhi.htm#5>.
- Reardon, B. 1985. *Sexism and the war system*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Reardon, B. 1988. *Comprehensive peace education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Reardon, B. 2000. Peace education: Review and projection. In *International companion to education*, ed. B. Moon, M. Ben-Peretz, and S. Brown, 397–425. New York: Routledge.
- Roy, R.R. 2008. India's teachers get training in peace education. Indo-Asian News Service. <http://www.wichar.com/news/152/ARTICLE/2390/2008-01-29.html>.
- Sarkar, S. 1983. *Modern India, 1885–1947*. Madras: Macmillan India.
- Sassen, S. 2000. *The global city: New York, London and Tokyo*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Schwebel, M. 2001. Promoting the culture of peace in children. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* 7, no. 1: 1–3.
- Stomfay-Stitz, A. 1993. *Peace education in America, 1828–1990. Sourcebook for education and research*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Synott, J. 2005. Peace education as an educational paradigm: Review of a changing field using an old measure. *Journal of Peace Education* 2, no. 1: 3–16.
- Tamatea, L. 2005. The uses of Gandhi in education in Bali: Different responses to globalization – implications for social justice. *Journal of Peace Education* 2, no. 2: 139–59.
- Tandon, Y. 1989. *Militarism and peace education in Africa: A guide and manual for peace education and action in Africa*. Nairobi: African Association for Literacy and Adult Education.
- Thornton, W., and S. Thornton. 2006. The price of alignment: India in the new Asian drama. *Journal of Developing Societies* 22, no. 4: 401–420.
- UGC (University Grants Commission). 2004. University Grants Commission – information: Guidelines for innovative program schemes of University Grants Commission (revised during IXth plan). <http://www.inflibnet.ac.in/info/ugc/ugcScheme.html>.

- UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization). 2002. UNESCO Prize for Peace Education. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001290/129085e.pdf>.
- Wilson, D. 1994. Comparative and international education: Fraternal or Siamese twins? A preliminary genealogy of our twin fields. *Comparative Education Review* 38, no. 4: 449–86.
- Younge, G. 2007. The illogic of empire: Beneath the radar. *The Nation*. <http://www.thenation.com/doc/20070205/younge>.