'Pedagogies of resistance' and critical peace education praxis

Monisha Bajaj

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

'Pedagogies of resistance' and critical peace education praxis

Monisha Bajaj*

School of Education, University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

This paper explores 'pedagogies of resistance' – or critical and democratic educational models utilized by social movements – and how global examples of engaged educational praxis may inform peace education. The central inquiry of this article is 'How can educational projects that resist larger social, political and economic inequalities offer understandings about how we learn, teach, and act for peace in diverse settings?' Drawing upon literature from various fields, ideas and insights are offered about how the field of peace education can better respond to multiple and diverse realities, particularly those facing marginalized communities. The article provides an overview of key tenets of peace education and ideas central to 'critical peace education;' offers a framing of 'pedagogies of resistance;' and, lastly, details what directions emerge by putting these two educational forms in conversation.

Keywords: social movements; peace education; social justice; critical pedagogy

Peace education responds to various forms of conflict and violence (direct, structural, and cultural) and creates new forms of educational praxis in social contexts across the globe (Galtung 1990). For the most part, the field emerged after World War I and II as educators sought to prevent future wars by teaching for peace (the work of Maria Montessori being a notable example). The field has since expanded to address various forms of violence and has grown into an international movement. Yet, the field is contested. Diverse definitions and approaches have characterized the field, with increasing calls over the past decade for a 'critical peace education' that attends to power, local meanings, and enabling voice, participation and agency through the peace education process (Bajaj 2008; Brantmeier 2011; Hantzopoulos 2011). This paper explores 'pedagogies of resistance' and how global examples of engaged educational praxis may inform critical peace education. Ultimately, this paper asks, 'How can educational projects that theorize and contest larger social, political and economic inequalities offer understandings about how we learn, teach, and act for peace in diverse settings?'

This article is an analysis and synthesis of over 15 years as a peace education researcher, scholar, and teacher. I have taught courses in peace education to hundreds of students (many of whom have gone on to teach peace education or work in this field of educational practice). This piece presents conceptual propositions on how the field can better prepare peace educators for teaching, learning, and action in diverse contexts, particularly amidst widening inequalities and in the 'global South.'

*Email: monisha@stanfordalumni.org

I use the term 'global South' here to refer to social and economic disparities within communities and countries, more than as a grouping of particular nations. I draw on historian Zeleza's (2002) definition of the South 'to conceptualize economic hierarchies and exploitation as much as in spatial and international terms as in *social* and *intra-national terms*' (74, emphasis added). In lived experience, distance from power may be a more useful predictor of realities than geographical location; certain blocks of urban Detroit may experience greater deprivation and disenfranchisement than middle- and upper-class neighborhoods in Delhi, despite the former's location in the 'North' and the latter's in the 'South.'

A central argument of this article is that while most university-level peace education programs offer courses in the global 'North' (in elite universities in industrialized nations or for those able to pursue higher education in 'developing' countries), there is much to be learnt from the experience of social movements and community organizations addressing social and economic hierarchies in highly unequal contexts. I further argue that this learning offers important understandings for aspiring and practicing peace educators, particularly those seeking to interrupt inequalities and work towards lasting and comprehensive peace and social justice. As such, the sections that follow (1) explore the rise of critical peace education; (2) offer a framing of 'pedagogies of resistance;' and (3) detail what directions and models emerge by putting these two educational forms in conversation.

Peace education: origin, definitions, and critical approaches

Peace educators broadly hold certain common understandings that have been further developed by critical approaches. Unifying threads amidst the colorful and vibrant tapestry of peace education include the following:

- Violence in all its forms (direct, structural, and cultural) limits human flourishing (Galtung 1969). Critical peace educators would further highlight that asymmetrical power relationships and their (social, political, historical, and economic) roots create unequal forms of citizenship that education, *and* corresponding social action, must seek to disrupt.
- Educators can provide learners with information and experiences that lead to the knowledge, skills, attitudes, behaviors, and worldviews that promote peace. Critical peace educators emphasize that anchoring the learning process in local meanings and realities offers the best way of enabling student agency, democratic participation, and social action as a necessary outcome of the peace education endeavor. Further, critical peace educators hold that teachers must engage in critical self-reflection about their positionality and role in the educational process.
- Educational spaces can be sites of possibility and transformation. Critical peace educators would further offer that structural analyses of how educational sites are situated in larger social contexts are necessary and must be ongoing. Both those privileged and those marginalized by current social and economic arrangements need to learn strategies for peace, but attention must be paid to the format, structure, and methods of the peace education process in order to prevent good intentions from causing harm or adverse consequences (Bajaj 2008, 2012a).

Discussions on the nature of violence are also one organizing principle of peace education as highlighted in the points above. It is argued that there must be the abolition of direct or physical violence, and structural and cultural violence – or the entrenched inequalities and social hierarchies that deprive individuals of their basic human rights (Galtung 1990) – in order for comprehensive peace to be attained. In conceptualizing the three forms of violence as forming the points on a triangle of violence, Galtung (1969) offers,

> Violence can start at any corner in the direct-structural-cultural violence triangle and is easily transmitted to other corners. With the violent structure institutionalized and the violent culture internalized, direct violence also tends to become institutionalized, repetitive, ritualistic … This triangular syndrome of violence should then be contrasted in the mind with a triangular syndrome of peace in which cultural peace engenders structural peace, with symbiotic, equitable relations among diverse partners, and direct peace with acts of cooperation, friendliness and love. It could be a virtuous rather than vicious triangle, also self-reinforcing. (Galtung 1969, 302)

Adding to our understanding of the types of violence (Galtung 1969), scholar Brock-Utne (1989) has identified levels of violence to facilitate critical understandings about paths towards peace. Brock-Utne discussed the 'organized' level of violence, referencing state involvement or negligence to act despite knowledge of persistent violence, as distinct from the 'unorganized' level, referring to violence that happens in microstructures, such as families and communities that may not be state-sponsored or endorsed.

Whether schooling or sites of education themselves can achieve this herculean task of the elimination of *all* forms of violence at *all* levels is a constant tension in discussions of peace education and critical peace education. However, the belief in the *promise* and *possibility* of educational processes to contribute to social change efforts is largely shared among all peace educators.

In addition to transforming structures of violence, peace education also seeks to create *new* structures that advance peace, social justice, and human rights. Scholarship in the field has examined whole-school approaches (e.g. in Zambia, see Bajaj 2009; in Israel-Palestine, see Bekerman 2009; and in the United States, see Hantzopoulos 2011); school-based programs (e.g. in Colombia, see Chaux 2007; and in the United States, see Lantieri and Patti 1996); and non-formal approaches, such as summer camps and adult education (see van Woerkom 2004; Wisler 2010). Key concepts in these approaches, which are tailored to the context and population, include restorative justice and creative conflict resolution approaches, skills for engaging difference, and content and pedagogy aimed at building peace.

'Critical' elaborations of global peace education have been developed from a multiplicity of political, theoretical, and methodological positions by scholars and practitioners involved in these debates. For example, Zembylas (2011), in writing about peace education in conflict and post-conflict situations, interrogates the value and relevance of concepts such as peace and reconciliation amidst ongoing human rights violations that learners face. Central to critical peace education projects and research is a dynamic and relational understanding of the role of human agency in influencing structural and cultural forms of violence that limit the full realization of human rights by all people(s) (Brantmeier and Bajaj 2013). Scholars of critical peace education also resist the forces towards regulation, universalization, and the development of rigid norms and standards for what peace education ought to be (Bajaj and Brantmeier 2011).

Critical peace educators argue that contextualized forms of peace education are those that are engaged in constant and meaningful conversation with other fields and traditions of critical inquiry (such as critical pedagogy, postcolonial theory, critical race theory, and human rights education, among many others). Rooted in similar commitments to more just and equitable societies, such counter-positioning – especially in contexts where other conceptions and approaches are more popular or historically rooted – pushes peace education to be more flexible, responsive, and relevant in discussions of educational policy, teacher education, and grounded practice within and beyond schools. As is argued, critical peace education is oriented towards the particularistic, seeking to enhance transformative agency and participatory citizenship, and open to resonating in distinct ways with the diverse chords of peace that exist across fields and cultures (Bajaj and Brantmeier 2011). For critical peace educators then, how can 'pedagogies of resistance' inform the conceptualization and practice that undergirds our work?

Pedagogies of resistance

The term 'pedagogies of resistance' has been utilized in a variety of scholarly literature with a corresponding variety of meanings. To this view, the analyses of Jaramillo and Carreon (2014), developed in the context of the pedagogies and practices of Latin American social movements, offer a productive place to start. The authors explain pedagogies of resistance as encompassing 'reciprocity, solidarity and *horizontalidad*,' or democratic and horizontal decision-making structures. Further, the authors note the following in relation to their theorizing of resistance pedagogies:

> In the Latin American context, wide-scale social movements are supported by popular education methods that create the conditions for participants to critique and act upon relations of dispossession. Dispossession is about the effects of capitalism on a people's economic livelihood, but it extends into other realms of sociability. The exclusion of non-Western and non-Eurocentric knowledge, human and natural relations, and cosmovisions, form part of an overarching system of dispossession that social movements contest simultaneously. Conceptually, pedagogical efforts to undo the legacy of colonial-capitalism demonstrate a pronounced attempt to delink from the conceptual apparatus of neoliberal subjectivity altogether. (Jaramillo and Carreon 2014, 395)

Jaramillo and Carreon's work can be taken to suggest that the contribution of 'pedagogies of resistance' to critical peace educators is an emphasis on: (1) education that is meant to offer learners on the margins information that colonial and unequal socioeconomic processes have denied them; (2) methods of education that are accessible, engaging, and democratic; and (3) educational processes that are linked to larger social movements advancing a vision of, and plan of action towards, greater equity and social justice.

Such forms of education resonate with Paulo Freire's concept of critical education that heightens student consciousness by making learners aware of the social inequalities that structure their lived experiences and exist in their communities (1970). As Freire (1970) noted, 'In problem-posing education, people develop their power to perceive critically *the way they exist* in the world *with which* and *in which* they find themselves; they come to see the world not as a static reality, but as a reality in process, in transformation' (italics in original, 64).

Pedagogies of resistance: three cases

The three examples that follow – while neither utilizing the terms 'pedagogies of resistance' nor 'critical peace education' – offer instructive cases for engagement. Zapatista education, schools for children in Dalit communities (formerly called 'untouchables' at the margins of Indian society), and Freedom Schools that operated during the Civil Rights Movement in the US all seek/sought to counter cultural and economic marginalization through democratic and relevant education. Despite their differences, the desired outcome of all of these efforts is greater critical consciousness about unequal conditions, pride in one's own heritage and background, and a willingness to act for social change.

Zapatista Education: Reclaiming Education for Indigenous Youth.

Indigenous self-determination in the region of the EZLN (Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional) is enacted through the creation of autonomous rebel municipalities. … During this initial phase, local community members pronounced themselves Zapatista supporters by rejecting state institutional presence and government social programs. … As a Zapatista community member explained, 'Autonomy and resistance are part of the same struggle; one can't exist with- out the other.' For that reason, she continued, 'we cannot expect anything from the government. We don't accept [social programs] or government teachers … That is why we have our own education, health and other commissions, so we can resolve our own needs ourselves.' (Mora 2007, 69)

Since 1994, the Zapatista revolutionary movement has formed autonomous communities in the Chiapas region of Mexico in order to challenge the Mexican government's historic and contemporary mistreatment of indigenous groups. Extreme poverty and dispossession of indigenous communities have been key issues around which the movement has organized. A key issue for Zapatistas has been highlighting the inadequacies of government education in the region noting poor quality, decontextualization from learners' realities, teacher insensitivity to students' cultural backgrounds, and often, widespread teacher absenteeism (Shenker 2012).

In 1996, Zapatista political autonomy in the creation of governance structures extended to the establishment of schools. Scholars have noted that the objectives of Zapatista-run schools are 'the protection of indigenous culture, values, languages and rights, the promotion of sexual equality, an education geared towards the rural context and the strengthening of communities' independence of external organizations' (Shenker 2012, 433). Additionally, students and teachers participate in community assemblies as a form of democratic education and decision-making. Thousands of students learn in these educational spaces that are set up to respect their rights and create awareness about injustices and violence caused by centuries of abuse and mistreatment (Rico 2014). The strategy of separation of marginalized students into their own schools in diverse nation-states has been a way that activists have sought to address the disenfranchisement students often face in integrated spaces, as seen in the case of India as well.

Caste-based violence and alternative educational spaces.

When we speak of education for Dalits, we are talking of their empowerment to challenge caste-based discrimination … The present Dalit movement is equipped with pedagogy and it has done good work to create an ideology that can be the source of moral strength. 'Dalit' therefore does not restrict itself to the caste identity of a community. Rather it propagates a moral position for the community that is bound by a

common ideology and a set of values. These are based on the vision of a new social order. 'Dalit' therefore promotes: Self-respect, Equality and Freedom. These values denounce the concept of both upper and lower castes. … This kind of education pre-supposes both a kind of a teacher and a kind of pedagogy. The teacher here is more of a friend and philosopher, and not a taskmaster. It is very important not to convey to the children that there is some problem with them that needs correction. The teacher should be able to advocate and develop reverence in the minds of children towards the basic values that are at the core of the Dalit identity. (Martin Macwan, founder of Navsarjan, n.d., 3–4)

Similarly seeking to substitute how government schools disempower marginalized learners, the nongovernmental organization Navsarjan in the Indian state of Gujarat emerged in the 1990s as a human rights and advocacy organization focused on the rights of Dalits who make up approximately 16% of India's population. Navsarjan has three self-operated schools and hundreds of afterschool clubs in its educational program, alongside the legal, advocacy, and movement building work carried out to promote the rights of Dalits. These schools were established in response to widespread caste discrimination in schools and the high dropout rate for Dalit students (HRW 2014).

Navsarjan's curriculum includes participatory activities, such as children performing skits and sitting in a circle in class to facilitate interaction, a departure from the usual government curricular approach (Bajaj 2012b). Classes and assemblies reiterate messages about caste equality and eradicating the notion that Dalit children are less than their higher caste peers. Students are also encouraged to critically analyze social realities and become active in the life of their communities through spreading awareness, joining campaigns for equality, and fighting for justice (Bajaj 2012b). The impact of the alternative norms related to caste and gender equity in Navsarjan educational programs are more thoroughly discussed elsewhere (Kropac 2007), but several of the deliberate practices and student responses suggest promising results for this form of resistance pedagogy.

Freedom Schools and the Fight for Civil Rights.

In the words of one volunteer, the purpose of the freedom school was to: 'Start young Mississippians thinking about how they could change the society in which they lived … We tried to draw these students out and, for the first time in their lives, to express themselves – in writing, in speaking. We encouraged them to have discussions in Freedom School … how we taught was just to ask questions. We didn't have a political doctrine or ideology that we were trying to impose on the students, but simply ask them why or what is the problem. Then, how are you going to solve it?' The movement of which the freedom schools were an expression and a part, and the hope that America might yet commit itself to racial justice, were not merely the contexts in which the schools operated; the character of freedom schooling was shaped by that movement, that hope. (Lauter and Perlstein 1991, 3)

Community-organized schools, where learners can gather to access information that affirms their identity and links them to larger social movements, have historical roots. While perhaps not the first of this form of critical education, the freedom schools in the US South (and previously in other parts of the US) run by civil rights activists in the 1950s and 1960s offered thousands of children and adults the chance to develop leadership skills, engage African-American history, learn about nonviolent social action, and understand the political and economic conditions of their communities (McAdam 1990). Volunteers – often carefully selected to ensure the safety of participants and the greatest cultural understanding of learners – were

placed as teachers in these schools that became a training ground for civil rights activists. Students learned how to register to vote (amidst discriminatory requirements for voting that disenfranchised African-Americans) and learned to critically engage the unequal social and material conditions of their families and communities. The inquiry-based curriculum was student centered and was organized under three broad categories: academic, citizenship, and recreational (McAdam 1990). While Freedom Schools no longer exist in the form earlier described, many schools and educational programs drew inspiration from their structure, content, and approach. Despite limitations posed to the functioning of these schools, certainly those interested in resistance pedagogies can connect the consciousness raising of such programs to the people power and strategic campaigns that led to more equitable policies through the US Civil Rights Movement.

These efforts described above need not be 'perfect' examples of peace education or even social movement theory and practice; they need only inspire reflection and engagement with the broader ideals that unite social justice educational efforts. And there are myriad examples besides those mentioned – from the DREAM Activists fighting for the rights of undocumented students in the United States, to the democratic educational spaces set up by Occupy movements globally, to the participatory educational approaches of the Landless Workers' Movement in Brazil (Tarlau 2013) – of how grassroots movements seek to offer or influence a different form of education to empower students and communities who have been marginalized. Peace educators can engage examples of resistance pedagogies by drawing lessons from these experiences and utilizing them as models to inspire new forms of learning and action in their own contexts. Processes of solidarity with local and global initiatives may also result from engaging with examples of pedagogies of resistance in the peace education classroom.

Towards agency and solidarity in critical peace education

This article seeks to bridge initiatives and movements that espouse pedagogies of resistance – in their diverse and multiple forms as described above – with critical peace educational praxis by offering two directions. First, students can gather information about such democratic educational initiatives in order apply a critical lens that leads to practice in other locales. Second, utilizing the insights gleaned from the study of resistance pedagogies can inspire and inform context-specific praxis that weaves together analysis, education, and action. These two orientations may counter the sometimes-decontextualized learning and preparation of assignments in peace education courses and connect learning with actual programs and social conditions.

University-level peace educators would do well to offer opportunities for connection where cross-learning, reflective practice, acts of solidarity, and participation can occur in authentic ways. Pedagogical projects and course assignments could be undertaken for the benefit of, and in genuine dialogue with, actual educational programs and social movements. Internship and fieldwork requirements could build solidarity and strengthen social justice efforts. Where students may have existing connections with organizations and movements, these linkages often emerge organically. For students who may not have extensive prior experience, educators may need to model and facilitate forms of engagement that offer opportunities for horizontal learning and solidarity.

Some university-level peace educators indeed integrate a community-based component into their courses; this article calls for such collaborations to be commonplace in peace education courses. For example, the syllabus of Professor Maria Hantzopoulos under the requirement for a 'Theory into Practice' community project reads:

> This is a chance to create just, humane, and hopeful spaces with youth and put some course theory into practice. The goal is to work with youth, facilitating the capacity to develop their full potential as human beings (individually and as members of a just community). This project should build upon the principles of peace pedagogy – one that is collaborative, participatory, and inquiry-based.

The fundamental purposes and goals of critical peace education require further articulation in order to advocate for greater and more integral connections to social movements and community change initiatives.

In elaborating the goals of critical peace education, and how organizations and movements espousing pedagogies of resistance can complement the learning endeavor, several key competencies emerge. These competencies seek to build on scholar Edward Brantmeier's (2011, 356) stages of critical peace education that he defines for teacher education:

(1) Raising consciousness through dialogue
(2) Imagining nonviolent alternatives
(3) Providing specific modes of empowerment
(4) Transformative action
(5) Reflection and re-engagement

Importantly, Brantmeier notes that educators and learners can start in any of the stages and that 'change phases can be overlapping and simultaneous' (357). Brantmeier's stages for how peace education courses should be designed provide a foundational grounding for the core competencies below, which are to be considered in terms of the abilities and capacities students should acquire through formal and non-formal peace education initiatives.

Table 1 offers some core competencies for critical peace educators – whether classroom teachers or educational practitioners working in other settings – and possible approaches. These competencies and approaches should be highly context specific, and educators would do well to tailor them further.

Each of the elements listed in Table 1 may contribute to the preparation of the *learner-actor* who is equipped with the skills and capacities to teach for comprehensive visions of peace in a variety of settings. There are many more competencies that may be elaborated depending on context (and many more examples from peace education scholarship than those listed in the table). Educators should undertake a situational analysis attending to the power dynamics in a particular setting before engaging in any form of peace education.

Orienting peace education towards the key competencies listed in Table 1 may offer a concrete way of assessing efficacy and guiding learning processes. While the fluidity and flexibility of peace education is indeed a strength as local communities and educators can tailor it to distinct contexts, certain key competencies that strengthen learners' capacities and skills to engage in effective praxis may offer peace educators common language and vision.

Table 1.   Core competencies for critical peace educators and learners.

Core Competency	Possible educational activities and approaches	Examples from peace education scholarship
Critical thinking and analysis	• Critical Media Literacy • Analyzing the roots and current impact of forces of domination • Interrogating identity and unequal forms citizenship	Duckworth's (2014) work on exploring how educators in the US teach about the tragic events of September 11, 2001 offers important insights into the role of oral history, contested memories, and critically engaging the media in schools and classrooms
Empathy and solidarity	• Cultivating an understanding of the psychological and emotional impacts of violence • Viewing injustices facing others as limits on the freedom of all • Identifying actions and approaches that can bring awareness to local and global inequalities	Brantmeier's (2011) work offers an example of how understanding one's positionality can inform efforts to cultivate empathy and solidarity with others, particularly in the setting of teacher education
Individual and coalitional agency[a]	• Facilitating situational analyses and decision-making that can lead to informed action • Emphasizing creating 'power with' (not 'power over') others in collective action processes • Resisting forces of silencing and apathy in order to act for the larger social good	Bajaj (2012a) discusses how differentiated agency is cultivated in international peace and human rights education efforts, and offers insights into strategies for social change
Participatory and democratic engagement	• Engagement in local issues of justice and ability to link them to global trends and realities • Attention to global processes that privilege some and marginalize many • Understanding examples of 'little d' democracy that involve people power, movement building, and community engagement	Hantzopoulos' (2011) description of radical conceptions of participatory democracy, fairness, and justice in a US public high school offers important lessons and examples for those working with youth in schools in various contexts
Education and communication strategies	• Developing fluency in various forms of conveying key ideas to diverse audiences (e.g. formal, nonformal, and community education)	Subramanian's (2014) work on counter-storytelling for social change allows for marginalized voices to be cultivated, amplified, and heard in discussions about community issues and policy efforts

Table 1.   (*Continued*).

Core Competency	Possible educational activities and approaches	Examples from peace education scholarship
	• Knowledge of diverse pedagogical approaches including film, popular education, narrative/testimonio, multimedia, oral history, etc.[b] • Utilizing storytelling, multiple perspectives, and primary sources in the creation of pedagogical tools	
Conflict transformation skills	• Exploring the roots of violence to understand ways to mitigate individual and group conflict • Understanding how diverse individuals and communities approach conflict, dialogue, and peacemaking • Examining and attending to the historical roots, material conditions, and power relations of entrenched conflicts in educational interventions	Bekerman and Zembylas' (2014) work on teaching contested narratives explores how educators grapple with issues of emotion, trauma, and identity in contexts of ethnic and social conflict, offering important directions for teachers to become 'critical design experts' in their classrooms
Ongoing reflective practice	• Journal writing, autobiography, examining the roots of one's own identity (racial, gender, sexual orientation, religion, class, etc.), self in relation to others • Creating communities of practice that offer collective forms of feedback and thinking[d] • Ability to link self to collective, family to community, and analyze sources of rupture and tension holistically	Zakharia (n.d.) discusses of the use of political autobiography and journal writing assignments in peace education courses as a way of preparing 'reflective practitioners,' who challenge and interrogate issues of privilege, agency, voice and power

[a]Elsewhere, I elaborate a notion of coalitional agency for the fields of peace and human rights education, drawing on the concept developed by Karma Chávez and Cindy Griffin (2009) (in regards to cross-cultural feminist solidarity (see Bajaj 2012a).
[b]See also the word of Voice of Witness, an organization that collects oral histories of victims of human rights abuses in order to create curriculum and theater performances to raise awareness and inspire action. More information at http://voiceofwitness.org.
[c]For more on the use of primary sources to present multiple narratives and promote peace education, see the work of the project on 'Rethinking the Region: New Approaches to 9–12 U.S. Curriculum on the Middle East and North Africa,' accessed at http://teach-mena.org/.
[d]Inspired by an activity that Professor Ofelia Garcia utilized in her bilingual education courses, my peace education students created a 'double-entry' journal where they could speak back to readings and course texts to create an ongoing dialogue throughout the course (this process is also described by Zeena Zakharia here: http://www.ineesite.org/en/discuss/preparing-reflective-practitioners). After graduation, a handful of former students decided to continue writing a double-entry journal, engaging in readings and sharing their professional experiences with each other as a way of continuing their reflective and engaged praxis as peace educators.

The core competencies presented in Table 1 also resonate with other peace education literature, such as Cannon's (2011) 'think, care, act' framework, and Betty Reardon's transitional capacities for the 'learning purposes of education for and about peace' (2000, 418, emphasis in original). Thus, rather than a new framework, the core competencies presented in this article seek to build upon and enrich conversations in the field of peace education and offer additional conceptual resources for scholars and practitioners (Harris and Morrison 2012). The complementarity of the core competencies with Freirean concepts and critical readings of peace education seek to further inform and inspire social action.

Concluding thoughts

> People all over the world are using educational tools to liberate themselves from human suffering caused by direct and structural violence. Where there are conflicts, there are peace educators. (Harris 2013, x)

Engaging with concrete examples and pedagogies of resistance opens up the field of peace education practice from the limited terrain of programs or initiatives that self-identify as peace education to those that espouse the broader values and ideals of critical pedagogies that work towards social justice. Given the contextual conditions and histories of inequality, such programs – such as Zapatista schools, schools that challenge the caste system in India, and many other contemporary forms of critical education – offer students a wider canvas on which to project and imagine their visions for the field, inspired by global examples that seek to transform individual and collective conditions of inequality.

Juxtaposing pedagogies of resistance with a critical peace education oriented towards building reflective practice and solidarity suggests several further questions that could be explored by educators, scholars, and learners:

- What content, pedagogy, structures, and practices are needed in educational spaces that seek to cultivate critical consciousness among learners (Freire 1970)? How might such educative practices orient towards social action in ways that can effectively challenge unequal socioeconomic and political conditions?
- In what ways can the core competencies of critical peace education be further developed, expanded, and operationalized in practice?
- How do learners in different settings understand and act upon the insights drawn from pedagogies of resistance and critical peace education in ways that are locally meaningful?

Peace education, as an inquiry-based endeavor, is not about converging upon answers, but rather is about generating new questions and processes at each stage. This article has offered suggestions for critical peace educators to engage global models of resisting domination in unique and democratic educational spaces. By highlighting how such engagement can inform the core competencies of peace education, it is hoped that scholars, educators, and students will continue to deliberate and discuss the role, purpose, and value of peace education in connection to the lived experiences of diverse people(s) across the globe.

Notes on contributor

Monisha Bajaj is an associate professor of International and Multicultural Education at the University of San Francisco, where she directs the MA program in Human Rights Education. She is the editor of the *Encyclopedia of Peace Education* and author of *Schooling for Social Change: The Rise and Impact of Human Rights Education in India* (winner of the Jackie Kirk Outstanding Book Award of the Comparative & International Education Society), as well as numerous articles. She has also developed curriculum – particularly related to peace education, human rights, anti-bullying efforts, and sustainable development – for non-profit educational service providers and inter-governmental organizations, such as UNICEF and UNESCO.

References

Bajaj, M. 2008. "Critical Peace Education." In *Encyclopedia of Peace Education*, edited by M. Bajaj, 135–146. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Bajaj, M. 2009. "'I Have Big Things Planned for My Future': The Limits and Possibilities of Transformative Agency in Zambian Schools." *Compare* 39 (4): 551–568.

Bajaj, Monisha. 2012a. *Schooling for Social Change: The Rise and Impact of Human Rights Education in India*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Bajaj, Monisha. 2012b. "Human Rights Education in Small Schools in India." *Peace Review* 24 (1): 6–13.

Bajaj, Monisha, and E. J. Brantmeier. 2011. "Introduction to the Special Issue of the *Journal of Peace Education* On the Politics." *Possibilities and Praxis of a Critical Peace Education* 8 (3): 221–224.

Bekerman, Zvi. 2009. "Identity Versus Peace: Identity Wins." *Harvard Educational Review* 79 (1): 74–83.

Bekerman, Zvi, and Michalinos Zembylas. 2014. *Teaching Contested Narratives: Identity, Memory, and Reconciliation in Peace Education and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brantmeier, Edward J. 2011. "Toward Mainstreaming Critical Peace Education in U.S. Teacher Education." In *Critical Pedagogy in the 21st Century: A New Generation of Scholars*, edited by C. S. Malott and B. Porfilio, 349–375. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Brantmeier, Edward J., and Monisha Bajaj. 2013. "Peace Education Praxis: Select Resources for Educators and Researchers." In *Educating about Social Issues in the 20th and 21st Centuries: A Critical Annotated Bibliography*. Vol. 2, edited by S. Totten and J. Pedersen, 139–159. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishers.

Brock-Utne, Birgit. 1989. *Feminist Perspectives on Peace and Peace Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cannon, Susan Gelber. 2011. *Think, Care, Act: Teaching for a Peaceful Future*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Chaux, Enrique. 2007. "Aulas en Paz: A Multicomponent Program for the Promotion of Peaceful Relationships and Citizenship Competencies." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 25 (1): 79–86.

Chávez, Karma, and Cindy Griffin. 2009. "Power, Feminisms, and Coalitional Agency: Inviting and Enacting Difficult Dialogues." *Women's Studies in Communication* 32 (1): 1–11.

Duckworth, Cheryl. 2014. *9/11 and Collective Memory in US Classrooms: Teaching about Terror*. New York: Routledge.

Freire, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Galtung, Johan. 1969. "Violence, Peace and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research* 6 (3): 167–191.

Galtung, Johan. 1990. "Cultural Violence." *Journal of Peace Research* 27 (3): 291–305.

Hantzopoulos, Maria. 2011. "Institutionalizing Critical Peace Education in Public Schools: A Case for Comprehensive Implementation." *Journal of Peace Education* 8 (3): 225–242.

Harris, Ian. 2013. *Peace Education from the Grassroots*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Harris, Ian, and Mary Morrison. 2012. *Peace Education*. 3rd ed. Jefferson, MO: McFarland Publishing.

HRW. 2014. *'They Say We're Dirty': Denying an Education to India's Marginalized*. New York: Human Rights Watch.

Jaramillo, N., and M. Carreon. 2014. "Pedagogies of Resistance and Solidarity: Towards Revolutionary and Decolonial Praxis." *Interface: A Journal for and about Social Movements* 6 (1): 392–411.

Kropac, Michael. 2007. *Dalit Empowerment and Vocational Education – An Impact Study*. Working Paper Series. New Delhi: Indian Institute of Dalit Studies.

Lantieri, L., and J. Patti. 1996. *Waging Peace in Our Schools*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Lauter, Paul, and D. Perlstein. 1991. "Introduction." *The Radical Teacher* 40: 2–5.

Macwan, Martin. n.d. "Education for Social Reengineering: A Concept Note to Support the Dalit Movement through Primary Education." Accessed September 10, 2014. http://navsarjan.org/dalits/PrimaryEducation.pdf

McAdam, D. 1990. *Freedom Summer*. Oxford University Press.

Mora, Mariana. 2007. "Zapatista Anticapitalist Politics and the 'Other Campaign': Learning from the Struggle for Indigenous Rights and Autonomy." *Latin American Perspectives* 34 (2): 64–77.

Reardon, Betty. 2000. "Peace Education: A Review and Projection." In *International Companion to Education*, edited by B. Moon, S. Brown, and M. Ben Peretz, 397–425. New York: Routlege.

Rico, A. 2014. "Educate in Resistance: The Autonomous Zapatista Schools." In Roarmag.org, Accessed July 8. http://roarmag.org/2014/01/zapatista-autonomous-education-chiapas/

Shenker, S. 2012. "Towards a World in Which Many Worlds Fit?." *International Journal of Educational Development* 32: 432–443.

Subramanian, Mathangi. 2014. "(Counter) Storytelling for Social Change." In *US Education in a World of Migration: Implications for Policy and Practice*, edited by J. Koyama and S. Subramanian, 221–237. New York: Routlege.

Tarlau, Rebecca. 2013. "Coproducing Rural Public Schools in Brazil: Contestation, Clientelism, and the Landless Workers' Movement." *Politics and Society* 41 (3): 395–424.

Wisler, Andria. 2010. "Portraits of Peace Knowledge in Post-Yugoslav Higher Education." *Journal of Peace Education* 7 (1): 15–31.

van Woerkom, M. 2004. "Seeds of Peace: Toward a Common Narrative." *New Directions for Youth Development* 2004: 35–46.

Zakharia, Zeena. n.d. "Preparing Reflective Practitioners." Discussion Forum of the Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies. Accessed July 8, 2014. http://www.ineesite.org/en/discuss/preparing-reflective-practitioners

Zeleza, Paul Tiyambe. 2002. "The Challenges of Writing African Economic History." In *Contested Terrains and Constructed Categories: Contemporary Africa in Focus*, edited by George Bond and Nigel Gibson, 59–84. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Zembylas, Michalinos. 2011. "Peace and Human Rights Education: Dilemmas of Compatibility and Prospects for Moving Forward." *Prospects* 41: 567–579.