Border cosmopolitanism in critical peace education

This paper intends to contribute to recent developments in the theory of critical peace education. The role of cosmopolitanism in critical peace education is examined, particularly in relation to universal moral inclusion, secularism, and universalism. It is then recommended that critical peace education draw from post-universalist and dialogical approaches to cosmopolitanism. Walter Mignolo's border cosmopolitanism is suggested as a decolonising framework for critical peace education. This would entail the theory of critical peace education orienting itself towards the aim of reconsidering cosmopolitanism from the perspective of coloniality. Connections are drawn between border cosmopolitanism and Paulo Freire's problem-posing education. The result is a vision for critical peace education to empower participants through centring personal and lived experience in critical deconstructions of cosmopolitan discourses.

Introduction: Theorising critical peace education

Peace education intends to provide a pedagogy in which participants learn and work towards peace. This often entails the apprehension of various theories of violence and conflict, such as Galtung's (1969, 1990) structural and cultural violence, nonviolent social action (Sharp 1973), and models of conflict escalation and de-escalation (Brahm 2003; Lund 2009). Their theoretical applicability is typically explored in discussions about specific historical and contemporary contexts like the conflict in Palestine, the South African apartheid system and its legacy, and India's historical and ongoing struggle for decolonisation.

Educational researchers have argued that mainstream peace education is overly focused on the transmission of technical proficiencies without working towards broader conceptions of justice and liberation. This critique has been thoroughly elaborated from the

perspective of critical pedagogy (Bekerman and Zembylas 2014; Diaz-Soto 2005; Gur-Ze'ev 2001). Thus, many scholars have recently made efforts to develop a critical peace education with its own distinct theoretical foundations and methodologies (Bajaj 2011, 2015; Bajaj and Brantmeier 2011; Diaz-Soto 2005; Hantzopoulos 2011; Reardon 2013; Reardon and Snauwaert 2011; Trifonas and Wright 2013). This emergent field 'attends to power, local meanings, and enabling voice, participation and agency through the peace education process' (Bajaj 2014). The particular methods of critical peace education generally draw from the work of Paulo Freire (1996, 2001). Monisha Bajaj (2011, 2015) has also played a key role in defining the aims and scope of critical peace education. The philosophies of social transformation that give critical peace education a theoretical foundation have been developed in large part by Betty Reardon (2009, 2013) and Dale T. Snauwaert (Snauwaert 2011; Reardon and Snauwaert 2011). At the heart of this theoretical framework is the Kantian vision for a cosmopolitan society led by a Western liberal vanguard, which will be problematised in this paper.

In response to Snauwaert's observation that 'The philosophical theory of social justice foundational to critical peace education needs further articulation and development' (2011, 315), this paper explores the existing theoretical framework for critical peace education. In particular, its foundation of secular cosmopolitan ethics is explored with reference to existing research on critical cosmopolitanism, and especially Walter Mignolo's theory of border cosmopolitanism. Then, it is suggested that border cosmopolitanism be applied to Freire's problem-posing education as an educational method for a decolonising critical peace education. This approach would use border cosmopolitanism as a pedagogical framework that is both sensitive to local contexts and empowering for participants.

Critical peace education stems from the need for a pedagogy that addresses the profound causes and subtle forms of violence by empowering its participants to work towards

justice. This presents a number of theoretical challenges. Perhaps the most fundamental challenge is to navigate the often contested understandings of relevant concepts like violence, peace, justice, and education. Given peace education's deeply personal concerns and global scope, conceptual disagreements can reflect inequalities of gender, race, class, geography, and other modes of exclusion. While the theories of critical peace education should remain fluid and plural, the development of a pedagogy sensitive to power inequalities is essential if critical peace education is to be genuinely emancipatory. The theory of critical peace education is a discursive space in which to address questions such as: To whom does peace education belong? Whose vision of a better world is it working towards? Critical peace education may even be seen as an 'ecology of knowledges' in contrast to many discourses on peace in which 'using enlightenment reasoning, the west actively produces the non-existence of alternative thinking… [and] an exclusive "canon of truth"' (Horner 2013, 375). In the spirit of a dialogical conception of peace that resists canonisation, this paper will attempt to open avenues of inquiry rather than provide definite conclusions about peace, justice, and cosmopolitanism.

Critical peace education encourages comparative dialogue and local meaning-making to decolonise the top-down, Western-centric knowledge production that typifies peace education. Universalist notions of peace, justice, and human rights are problematised because as Snauwaert (2011, 316-325) says, education is not neutral and such theories are not impartial. Snauwaert suggests that critical peace education be founded upon an approach to justice that is realisation-focused. Realisation-focused justice is informed by Sen (2003; 2009) and Nussbaum's (2003) capabilities approach, which defines social justice as equal access to the functionings ('doings and beings') required to lead a fulfilling life. Each individual retains the agency to define for themselves which functionings are achievements significant for their life to be fulfilling. It is not necessary to seek a universal agreement on

what exactly fulfilment is. The capabilities approach to justice accounts for both the individual freedom to define for oneself what liberation entails, and for the cultural autonomy to define what human functionings are most valuable and fundamental. It is realisation-focused in that justice is evaluated in terms of what is realised in actual lived experience instead of institutionalised ideals. Rather than prescriptive or universalist, critical peace education thus gives space for dialogical understandings of contentious concepts like justice and peace. Snauwaert (2011) identifies significant theoretical potential at the nexus between Sen and Nussbaum's realisation-focused concept of justice and Freire's dialogical problem-posing education. This paper suggests that the nexus between realisation-focused justice and Freirean pedagogy also includes a critical and dialogical cosmopolitanism that is engaged as an immediately relevant discussion of human diversity and commonality.

Critical peace education aims to develop a critical consciousness of multiple forms of violence present in the lives of participants. Theories of violence and oppression are not imposed from external sources, but are instead developed by the participants themselves as part of a living praxis. According to Bajaj, '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' (2015, 155). Since critical peace education must deeply consider the diverse personal experiences of everyone involved, its theoretical development is often approached with caution. A singular theoretical framework would ironically reproduce the 'regulation, universalization, and the development of rigid norms and standards for what peace education ought to be,' which are the very tendencies that this emerging field intends to problematise (Bajaj 2015, 156). Accordingly, the discussion of cosmopolitan values must be conducted carefully to contribute to critical peace education as a pluralistic field that resists a universalisation of European perspectives.

Amidst the many theories of critical peace education, perhaps the most foundational

are those of Freire's critical pedagogy (Hantzopoulos 2011, 228). The field has drawn from Freire in its consideration of the equally important role of student and teacher in knowledge production (Gould 2013, 65-66), the non-neutral and inherently political nature of education (Gounari 2013, 80-81; Reardon 2009, 29; Reardon 2013, 17), the importance of reflection upon personal experience (Bajaj 2015, 157; Goldberg 2013, 156), the risk that education exacerbates power inequalities (Keet, Zinn, and Porteus 2009, 115), and the potential for education to empower participants to identify and resist oppressive power structures (Bajaj and Brantmeier 2011, 221; Snauwaert 2011, 327). Although Freire is often referenced in the literature of critical peace education, the connection between critical peace education and Freire's theories has not been explored in detail. If critical peace education is to incorporate Freire's pedagogy beyond a superficial inspiration, his specific consciousness-raising praxis of problem-posing education should be given serious consideration.

Of central theoretical concern to critical peace education is the *type* of consciousness to be developed within participants and the form of social change that it enables. Since, according to Freire, 'Education never was, is not, and never can be neutral or indifferent in regard to the reproduction of the dominant ideology or the interrogation of it' (2001, 91), then imperative to the development of critical peace education is an awareness of its own ideological basis. To ensure that this awareness is self-critical, it is necessary to critically evaluate the cosmopolitanism upon which critical peace education is founded, and in particular its historical location and theoretical limitations.

Cosmopolitanism and colonialism in critical peace education

Central to the existing theory of critical peace education is secular cosmopolitan ethics, as applied by Reardon and Snauwaert (Reardon 2013; Reardon and Snauwaert 2011). This framework is based primarily on Immanuel Kant's (1964) categorical imperative, which recommends to 'Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in

the person of any other, never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end' (as quoted in Snauwaert 2011, 318). Equality and moral inclusion are therefore both the principal values to be transmitted by critical peace education as well as the social transformation that it intends to catalyse. According to Reardon, critical peace education must be based upon:

> the international standards of secular ethics articulated in… generations of Western
> political thought… These international standards and democratic norms are integral to
> the subject matter of peace education, providing a framework for inquiry into value
> contentions that is consistent with its political purposes. (2013, 23)

In other words, cosmopolitan ethics centred on Western theory are the primary instruments with which participants in critical peace education consider and compare the merits of various perspectives.

Cosmopolitan ethics offer important possibilities for participants critical peace education to develop the tools for ethical social analysis and justice-oriented action. A deepened sense of respect respect can be fostered across lines of conflict and division through mutual recognition of the other's humanity. This is particularly significant for critical pedagogy given Freire's analysis of humanisation as the primary human vocation (1996, 25). Cosmopolitan identity is not constructed in exclusive terms, unlike nationality or ethnicity, but rather in terms of universal moral inclusion (Reardon 2013, 3). It is morally inclusive in the sense that all are recognised as having a 'fundamental human dignity' and thus sharing an '*equal standing* (membership) in the moral and political community' (Reardon and Snauwaert 2011, 2-4). Reardon sees universal moral inclusion as 'the fundamental social purpose of peace education' (Reardon and Snauwaert 2011, 13). Mutual respect based on a shared sense of humanity is essential for critical peace education to foster understanding and compassion across the diverse terrain of human identity. Additionally, mutual respect enables the dialogical, reflective inquiry that makes critical peace education *critical*.

Reardon asks, 'What is the place of dialogue in reflective inquiry?' and questions

whether it is necessary to come to a consensus on a particular philosophy that distinctly defines justice and peace (Reardon and Snauwaert 2011, 5-6). These questions point to a crucial debate in the discourse of cosmopolitanism, namely the role of universalism and whether dialogue between the diversity of perspectives can or should attempt to arrive at singular truths. Rather than uncritically accepting of Kant's theories of cosmopolitanism as impartial and universal, many have called for a form of cosmopolitanism that 'thinks with Kant against Kant' (Apel 1997; Fine and Smith 2003). This requires challenging Kant's assumption that the European understanding 'of what is both morally desirable and legally acceptable is the absolute and unquestioned standard' (Mendieta 2009, 247). Otherwise, there is a risk of falling into what Eduardo Mendieta (2009, 244) calls a 'naïve cosmopolitanism' that reproduces imperial and colonial power by positing Eurocentric perspectives as universal. The theory of critical peace education should be developed in a way that avoids imperial cosmopolitanism by approaching reflective inquiry as a praxis of dialogue.

Critical cosmopolitanism, and especially those forms referred to as 'dialogic cosmopolitanism,' has been recently explored from a number of theoretical perspectives (Delanty 2006; Fine 2003; Mignolo 2000). Dialogical cosmopolitanism is a 'cosmopolitanism of the subaltern... [which] has been educating those in the metropolises of the West and those who claim to speak univocally and unequivocally for the universal as such' (Mendieta 2009, 252). Rather than seeking a universal cosmopolitan vision, dialogical cosmopolitanism involves 'a process of arriving at it through an engagement with a dialogical imagination that opens up the spaces of mutual transformation' (Mendieta 2009, 254). Dialogical cosmopolitanism shares its vision of cosmopolitanism from below with a number of related approaches to critical cosmopolitanism, including post-universalist cosmopolitanism (Delanty 2006), subaltern cosmopolitanism (Gidwani 2006), rooted cosmopolitanism (Appiah, 1997), vernacular cosmopolitanism (Bhabha 2004), and

cosmopolitanism through border thinking (Mignolo 2000). While these many strains of dialogical cosmopolitanism offer insight into Reardon's question about the role of dialogue in critical peace education, this paper will specifically seek linkages between border cosmopolitanism and problem-posing education. By addressing some of the possibly imperial dimensions of universal moral inclusion, the concept can be reconsidered in a way that engenders a more dialogical form of cosmopolitanism.

Universal moral inclusion as a cosmopolitan ethical principle has the potential to be either imperial or dialogic, depending on how it is approached. As previously discussed, it provides common ground for people who otherwise perceive themselves to have irreconcilable differences. However, positing universal moral inclusion as the principal goal of critical peace education risks overlooking the agency of those on the margins of global society. A pedagogy of inclusion and responsible citizenship is not empowering for all because it mainly tasks the *included* with giving due consideration to the marginalised. If applied uncritically, it gives little agency to the *excluded* to resist the unequal power structures that oppress them. Freire (1996) identified pedagogies of inclusion as irrelevant to the oppressed, or at worst, as reinforcing internalised oppression through the banking model of education. He succinctly stated that the oppressed are not in need of inclusion, because 'They have always been "inside"… The solution is not to "integrate" them into the structure of oppression, but to transform the structure so that they can become "beings for themselves"' (Freire 1996, 55). This transformation is empowering precisely because it is an undertaking of the oppressed, and not the oppressors, who 'can free neither others nor themselves' (Freire 1996, 38). Although the *included* may find empowerment in recognising the humanity of others and working towards inclusion, the *excluded* face the imperative struggle to resist their own internalised oppression. Since the excluded cannot simply include themselves in a system that marginalises them, the 'we' that Reardon says must embrace cosmopolitan ethics

is located towards the centres of power and thus is faced with the choice of whether 'we' either objectify others or include others. Accordingly, Reardon sees secular cosmopolitan ethics as emerging from 'generations of Western political thought' and today manifesting as Western institutions such as 'the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Nuremberg Principles, and the Earth Charter' (2013, 23). In contrast to Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed, which seeks to humanise participants through transforming their internalised oppression into a sense of 'being for themselves,' universal moral inclusion is mainly concerned with recognising not *our* humanity but *theirs*, the historically otherised humanity that presumably needs inclusion.

Critical peace education should incorporate Kantian cosmopolitanism and its secular ethics with significant restraint and a critical awareness of its colonial history. Mendieta (2009, 243) cautions that 'we replicate the colonial and imperial implications of Kant's universalistic cosmopolitanism if we remain blind to its geographical and anthropological grounding.' Specifically, this grounding is the perspective of power and privilege, which is a situatedness of cosmopolitan ethics that becomes clear by exploring their colonial history. Kant himself located cosmopolitan knowledge in the centres of European imperial power (Mendieta 2009, 246). He believed that cosmopolitanism was centred in Europe because 'white Europeans were the most developed instantiation of humanity, and... Western institutions represented the fulfillment of the plan of nature and the highest accomplishment of what human make of themselves [*sic*] through the enlightened use of reason' (Mendieta 2009, 247). Kant's idea of human equality included only white people (Mills 2005, 183). He explained the destitution of the colonised with their 'immaturity,' a notion which posited African, Asian, and indigenous people existing somewhere in a temporally backwards imaginary. Kant suggested that through European-led governance and education, African people should be incorporated into the cosmo-polis as slaves, which he saw as the natural

extent of their potential (Mignolo 2000, 724). Inclusion was thus a forcible and colonial

subjugation based upon Kant's categorical imperative, which justified 'the imperialist project

by producing the following formula: make the heathen into a human so that he can be treated

as an end in himself' (Spivak 1985, 248). Kantian cosmopolitan ethics 'civilised' the 'savage'

by including and incorporating them into the colonial ethical order as legal subjects of the

cosmo-polis.

Given the colonising function of Kantian cosmopolitanism, critical peace education

should ground itself in a form of cosmopolitanism that 'thinks with Kant against Kant' (Apel

1997; Fine and Smith 2003). For cosmopolitanism to be critical and emancipatory, it cannot

give European whiteness a privileged status in determining moral values, nor can it 'posture

its provincial and prejudiced European origins in the name of the "universal"' (Gidwani 2006,

16-17). Cosmopolitanism in critical peace education should be post-universalist and

dialogical, providing space for a plurality of ethical and moral ontologies. Otherwise, critical

peace education could adopt a form of 'moral cosmopolitanism' that marginalises non-

Western approaches to cosmopolitanism by erroneously assuming that cosmopolitan ethics

are universal (Delanty 2006, 28-29). In the educational context, as Wessells observes, 'When

outside views of peace are imposed, peace education becomes a neocolonial enterprise that

subverts the very values of equality and social justice that it aims to support' (2013, 94). A

vital theoretical undertaking for critical peace education, then, is to conceptualise a pedagogy

that addresses cosmopolitan ideas as historically specific, powerful, and problematic

discourses open to critique.

Border thinking and critical peace education

Critical peace education can deepen its theoretical framework for a liberatory and

empowering pedagogy by taking a dialogical approach to cosmopolitanism. Since

cosmopolitanism has significant historical and theoretical roots in colonialism and

imperialism, critical peace education should implement decolonising framework in its approach to cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitanism through border thinking, or what I will refer to as 'border cosmopolitanism,' provides a theoretical foundation for a decolonising cosmopolitanism. It also holds great potential to address Reardon's question about the role of dialogue in critical peace education.

Border cosmopolitanism has been articulated primarily by Walter Mignolo (2000, 2009). Mignolo understands cosmopolitanism as rooted epistemologically in the colonial civilising mission and 'geographically in the interplay between a growing capitalism in the Mediterranean and the (North) Atlantic and a growing colonialism in other areas of the planet' (Mignolo 2000, 72). Mignolo begins by problematising the assumption that cosmopolitanism originates in modernity by reconceiving modernity and coloniality as mutually enabling historical projects. He locates the historical origin of cosmopolitanism in the transatlantic colonial networks through which flowed goods, capital, slaves, and ideas, particularly Christianity. In the context of colonialism, cosmopolitanism emerged from as a contested narrative about human difference in terms of culture, modernity, civility, and value. Although cosmopolitanism is still today located in the what Mignolo calls the 'colonial difference,' which is the historically-produced frontier between modernity and coloniality, cosmopolitanism has often been narrated almost exclusively from the perspective of modernity. The exclusion of colonial narratives of cosmopolitanism has been supported by Kant's conceptualisation of enlightenment as belonging to Europeans and primitive ignorance as belonging to the colonised. Border cosmopolitanism is critical of Eurocentric forms of cosmopolitanism in that it 'reconceive[s] cosmopolitanism from the perspective of coloniality… and within the frame of the modern/colonial world' (Mignolo 2000, 723). It engages the narratives that are voiced from the perspective of coloniality through a 'border epistemology' that enables 'the recognition and transformation of the hegemonic imaginary

from the perspectives of people in subaltern positions' (Mignolo 2000, 736-737).

Border thinking in critical peace education could address cosmopolitanism in a way that is historically contextualised and thus genuinely critical. According to Freire, the ideas engaged through a liberatory pedagogy must be historicised in order for the oppressed to develop a critical 'consciousness of their situation [which] leads people to apprehend that situation as an historical reality susceptible of transformation' (1996, 66). Universal truths are not negotiatble, but if challenging their universality reveals their historically specific and subjective nature, they become vulnerable to critique. Border thinking reworks the cosmopolitan question, 'how can cultural differences be accounted for in global civil society,' which presumes that cultural differences exist independently of historical processes, into the critical question, 'how are colonial differences reproduced and incorporated into global society?' Such a question enables critical peace education to explore the ways in which cosmopolitanism has emerged from historical contradictions between modernity and coloniality, and how cosmopolitanism has operated to delineate and transform the borders between the two projects. Peace educators can draw from critical cosmopolitanism and border thinking to contextualise contemporary discourses about rights, justice, and peace. Cosmopolitanism can be approached not as a conclusion of enlightened European thought, but rather as a history of negotiations about whose ideas are seen as modern and thus able to define supposedly universal cosmopolitan values, and whose ideas are seen as colonial and thus racialised as culturally-specific. It replaces universalism as the aim of cosmopolitanism with 'diversity as a universal project (that is, diversality),' which results from dialogue between coloniality and modernity, excluded and included. Diversality is the dialogue between distinct epistemologies that enables 'the relentless practice of critical and dialogical cosmopolitanism rather than a blueprint of a future and ideal society projected from a single point of view (that of the abstract universal)' (Mignolo 2000, 744). In this sense, border

cosmopolitanism is post-universalistic because it eschews universalistic abstractions in favour of 'alternative readings of history and the recognition of plurality' (Delanty 2006, 35). Border cosmopolitanism coincides with Freire's idea of critical consciousness in that it critiques cosmopolitanism through historicisation and locates liberatory agency within the perspectives of the excluded.

Border cosmopolitanism offers important insight into the idea of universal moral inclusion in critical peace education. Mignolo speaks of the need to move 'beyond both benevolent recognition... and humanitarian pleas for inclusion' (2000, 724). The question of inclusion becomes not just 'how can all peoples be included in multicultural cosmopolitanism,' but also 'how have people already included themselves in the struggle to survive and resist the coloniality of power?' In the context of critical peace education, this means giving space to pedagogies of resistance as valuable and critical perspectives on cosmopolitanism (Bajaj 2015). Critiques of cosmopolitanism, or more specifically of the form of cosmopolitanism constructed through narratives of modernity, are explored as counter-discourses from the perspective of coloniality. Cosmopolitan ideas remain a central subject of inquiry, but rather than containing universal truths they act as 'connectors' that bring to light the experiences of coloniality that are shared by many societies and cultures. Mignolo specifies that these are 'connectors in the struggle to overcome coloniality of power... By connectors I do not mean empty signifiers that preserve the terms as the property of European Enlightenment while they promote benevolent inclusion of the Other' (Mignolo 2000, 742). Instead, 'connectors' emerge from a dialogue between indigenous and cosmopolitan discourses by reworking hegemonic meanings in ways that are locally relevant, somewhat analogous to the way that many indigenous peoples during colonialism syncretised their indigenous religion with Catholic iconography as a method of cultural survival (Stewart and Shaw 1994). One example of a connector might be human rights discourses, which are

employed by a diversity of social movements throughout the world. These social movements primarily gain impetus not from theories of human rights or global citizenship, but rather from local realities such as violent conflicts, development projects that displace them from their communities, and specific indigenous belief systems. For such social movements, human rights discourses are often connectors that communicate their own concerns to other groups around the world who are resisting global power structures. Critical peace education can locate connectors within cosmopolitan discourses to explore the ways in which the 'silenced and marginalised voices are bringing themselves into the conversation of cosmopolitan projects, rather than waiting to be included' (Mignolo 2000, 736). The educational space is transformed from a secluded environment to consider decontextualised universal truths into a dialogical movement with connections to the historical project to resist the coloniality of power.

One connector that is likely to manifest in the practice of critical peace education is secularism. Secularism deserves particular attention because Reardon has recommended that critical peace education adopt a purely secular approach to ethics. She argues that secular ethics are necessary in peace education, perhaps given a political climate in which 'societies growing ever more contentious, torn by multiple competing, morally exclusive religious and political forms of fundamentalism' (Reardon 2013, 4). Reardon says that because

> it is neither morally nor ethically acceptable to infuse religious convictions into politics… we need to clearly distinguish between religious morality and secular ethics, so as to educate for the essential capacities of ethical reasoning without which political efficacy in the cause of social justice is not likely to be achieved. (20)

Reardon makes the clear distinction that in critical peace education, religion is appropriate 'as subject matter, [but] not as the basis of judgement making on public issues' (2013, 22). In other words, religion can be the subject of study in critical peace education, but the lens through which public issues are viewed remains unerringly secular. Maintaining secularism in

peace education makes sense in the US context, which Reardon says informs her proposal (2013, 2), because some forms of religious-based interventions in US public education have stifled critical inquiry (2013, 25). Whether secularism is universally ideal for critical peace education, however, should be re-evaluated with regard to colonial history and the role of religion in contemporary non-Western political cultures.

The question of religion's role in critical peace education could be addressed much more profoundly through the theories of post-universalism and post-secularism. Secularism is not universal, as Habermas points out, and its 'Occidental rationalism [which] was once supposed to serve as a model for the rest of the world, is actually the exception rather than the norm' (2008, 18). It would thus be a mistake to imagine that secular ethics are culturally neutral and universally inclusive, or that they provide a common ground upon which various religious perspectives can be considered. Secularism cosmopolitanism is culturally specific in that it arose simultaneously with Christian cosmopolitanism as 'two different faces of the same imaginary—the imaginary of the modern/colonial world as an interstate system regulated by the coloniality of power' (Mignolo 2000, 730). Rather than a resistance to colonialism, secular cosmopolitanism and its Kantian ethics were a reframing of its justification. Instead of secular ethics serving as the ear through which cosmopolitan dialogue is understood, secular ethics should be considered as a single voice in the plurality of perspectives. While it is necessary to develop an educational methodology to find common ground amidst religious conflict, asserting that religion is inherently violent may reproduce a similar narrative used during colonialism to justify the relegation of religion to the private sphere and the establishment of the modern state headed by secular colonial authorities (Cavanaugh 2014). Critical peace education should be careful to avoid subordinating religious perspectives as divisive and specific or elevating secular ethics as universally applicable conclusions of reason. If cosmopolitan dialogue is framed in such a way, it may

alienate perspectives from many non-Western contexts in which the public sphere is not secular, but rather it incorporates a limited secularism alongside organised religion, animist practices, and folkways (Madsen 2011). Critical peace education should resist adopting 'unreflective secularism,' which imagines 'cosmopolitanism as a sort of escape from culture into a realm of reason where religion has little influence' (Calhoun 2011, 76). The 'realm of reason' that universalist secular cosmopolitanism must be brought back down to earth, where human ideas are subjectivities with geographic location and historical function.

A post-universalist approach to critical peace education might trace the colonial history of secular cosmopolitanism and culturally locate its own implicit values. Such values often include a belief in the legitimacy of international law, an individualistic approach to rights and justice, a prevalent but limited belief in human equality, a conviction that capitalism is the ultimate economic order, a delineation between secular and religious space, and a conviction of its own universality. The goal is not to posit secular ethics as the only culturally-neutral lens of clarity, but rather as one of many lenses available to us as participants in peace education. Post-secularism involves the problematisation of both secularism's universalistic claims and of its relationship modernity. Challenging the notion that secularism is the inevitable result of modernity is a necessary undertaking for border cosmopolitanism.

As an example of reconsidering secular cosmopolitanism from the perspective of coloniality, Mignolo looks to the Zapatista movement, for which democracy 'is not conceptualized in terms of European political philosophy but in terms of Maya social organization based on reciprocity, communal (instead of individual) values, the value of wisdom rather than epistemology, and so forth' (2000, 742). Maya ontology is not secular, and it does not follow the proposal of Kant's categorical imperative that humans are an end in and of themselves. According to the Maya religious narrative recorded in the Popol Vuh

(1950, 165-169), the purpose of humanity is to practice gratitude towards the divine beings and the maize that they created, which is the sacred substance that constitutes human life. Maize is central to both Maya religious life and the communal socioeconomic order. If cosmopolitan ethics imposes secularism upon Maya communities by creating a political subject that is an end in itself, it violently disjoints Maya ontology and society. Maya religious beliefs and agricultural communal structures were ruptured during the Guatemalan genocide of the 1980s, in which the secular logics of rationalism and urban planning manifested as the forced resettlement of Maya people into 'model villages' that resembled a colonial grid pattern, making possible the intensive monitoring and repression of their agricultural and religious practices in the name of modernist progress (Schirmer 1998). Equating secularism with modernity and religion with backwardsness can have disastrous consequences. On the other hand, if secular ethics draw from Maya ontologies as a valuable source of insight, then dialogical cosmopolitanism is made possible through the 'complimentary learning process' between secularism and religion (Habermas 2008). Cosmopolitanism becomes critical and liberatory only through dialogue at the borders between modernity and coloniality, secularism and religion.

An approach to critical peace education based on border cosmopolitanism would require a pedagogy that provides a language to address the linkages between the personal and the global. The Zapatista movement, with its repurposing of words like *caracol, autonomía, and derechos*, operates by reworking the Spanish colonial language to describe their lived experience. In Zapatista communities, a critical discourse of cosmopolitan ideas is produced in autonomous 'little schools.' The education in these schools involves a praxis to decolonise participants' ways of thinking, knowing, and feeling, and to critique globalisation from the perspective of the *cosmovisión* that is central to Maya experience (Forero 2016, 26). In effect, the Zapatista little schools are putting into practice the linguistically deconstructive border

cosmopolitanism that Mignolo theorises. Since the reproduction of hegemonic cosmopolitan narratives is so intensively linguistic, Freire's problem-posing pedagogy could incorporate border thinking to decolonise cosmopolitanism through the deconstruction of generative themes.

Generative cosmopolitan themes in critical peace education

Freire's problem-posing pedagogy offers a precise framework for a dialogical and decolonising approach to cosmopolitanism in critical peace education. Bajaj has expressed concern about the 'the sometimes-decontextualized learning and preparation of assignments in peace education courses' (2015, 160). Accordingly, she says that critical peace education should draw from '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' (2015, 157). The cosmopolitan sense of moral inclusion here is not universal, but rather it is rooted in the communities and societies within which peace education is conducted. Wessells also emphasises the role of local knowledge in peace education and identifies:

> an omnipresent risk of creating isolated peace education programs that make little
> contact with the lived realities of children and people in the local context… that
> [assume] the definition of terms such as *peace* and *education* is universal and that
> approaches developed in urbanized, industrial societies can be applied with some
> minor tailoring or adaptation to war-torn countries. (2013, 90)

Engaging with contested understandings of cosmopolitan concepts should be carried out in a dialogical way. Universalist theories might be critically discussed to explore the extent to which they are or are not relevant, empowering, and connected with the lived experiences of participants. Freire also noted that if not implemented carefully, universalist ethics can have a detrimental effect on liberatory pedagogies: 'In its desire to create an ideal model of the "good man," a naïvely conceived humanism often overlooks the concrete, existential, present

situation of the real people' (1996, 74). Freire's criticism that humanist ethics sometimes appear to disregard geographically-rooted identities, beliefs, and experiences may reflect his orientation towards liberation theology, which seeks to rework Christian orthodoxies into a narrative of resistance from the perspective of indigenous lived experience (Reynolds 2013). Universalist ethics are not inherently humanising or empowering. A cosmopolitan education that is universalistic may imagine its participants as lacking the full capacity to make ethical judgements, thus reproducing the banking model of education in which students are empty and passive recipients of the 'correct' knowledge (Freire 1996, 53). To deny the validity of local perspectives in ethical dialogue reproduces the coloniality power by maintaining the hegemonic claim that modernity has to cosmopolitanism. Freire expounded a critique of the banking model of education and proposed an alternative, a pedagogy based on problem-posing methodologies to raise critical consciousness, which is also useful as a decolonising framework for post-universalist and dialogical cosmopolitan peace education.

As liberatory projects, dialogical cosmopolitanism and Freire's critical pedagogy share a sense of unfinishedness. Unfinishedness is the starting point for Freire's soteriology; Humans are unfinished beings in an unfinished historical moment (1996, 65-66). Drawing from Fromm (1966), Freire characterises cultures of oppression as necrophilic, in that people are seen as things, as reified labor, as beings who are finished and thus no longer have life or agency (Freire 1996, 41; Snauwaert 2011, 328). The oppressed, by becoming aware of their unfinishedness through conscientisation, see themselves as fully human because they have historical and ethical agency (Freire 2001, 59). The historical moment in which human beings find themselves is also unfinished, and thus 'the point of departure must always be with men and women in the "here and now," which constitutes the situation within which they are submerged, from which they emerge, and in which they intervene' (Freire, 1996, 66). Critical and historical consciousness enables a systematic exploration of their own thought-worlds to

identify the connections between their internalised oppression and the injustices that structure society.

Like Freire's pedagogy, dialogical cosmopolitanism embraces reflexive and self-critical thought, emphasising cosmopolitanisation as an ongoing and unfinished process over cosmopolitanism as something already complete (Delanty 2006, 35; Mendieta 2009). Dialogical cosmopolitanism is critical because it favours a politics of openness instead of a politics of closure and finishedness (Gidwani 2006, 17). Just as the participant in critical pedagogy finds the possibility of emancipation in locating one's own historical agency, 'If reflexive cosmopolitanism acknowledges its rootedness, its materiality in certain institutions and histories, it may become an emancipatory form of cosmopolitanism' (Mendieta 2009, 254). Considering the geographic and historical specificity of cosmopolitanism does not reduce its global relevancy, nor does it support Kant's claim that cosmopolitanism belongs to those at the centres of imperial power (Mendieta 2009, 246). Kant saw human beings as cosmopolitan to the extent that they were incorporated into an imperial cosmopolitan identity. By contrast, critical dialogical cosmopolitanism contends that mutual respect and solidarity does not rely upon a shared cosmopolitan identity, but rather can form through linkages across differences at the social, cultural, and global scales (Calhoun 2002). Freire's pedagogy gives critical peace education a methodology of exploring these linkages without losing relevance to the local context. Participants exchange stories, interpretations, discussions, and reflections, which are then expanded upon by exploring their connections with broader cosmopolitan values such as inclusion, equality, and solidarity. Rather than aspiring to objectivity, universality, and finishedness as universalist cosmopolitanism so often does, participants engage with the generative themes that emerge dynamically while allowing the resultant ideas to remain a plurality of unfinished, geographically-specific, and sometimes-contradictory connections between the personal, social, and global.

Critical peace education would benefit from implementing Freire's problem posing education as a methodology of border cosmopolitanism. Problem posing education is a method of eliciting and exploring generative themes critically with the intention of creating new ways of understanding, sometimes even to the extent of reworking language, as previously discussed. Revisiting Freire's methodology of generative themes is also particularly appealing in light of Reardon's critique that 'The full extent of the transformative Freirean cycle is rarely pursued in our classes, most lamentably not even in most peace education classes' (2013, 18). Cosmopolitanism presents a thematic universe full of topics that could serve as generative themes in the educational context. A post-universalistic cosmopolitanism in critical peace education would resist thinking of cosmopolitanism as a defined and finished set of values or processes. In order for education to be empowering, and for cosmopolitanism to be dialogical, the educator cannot 'elaborate "itineraries" for researching the thematic universe, starting points from which [the educator] has predetermined' (Freire 1996, 89). Instead, the existent values and perspectives of participants are elicited. Cosmopolitan concepts, which may be embedded within such perspectives, are avenues through which the personal connects with the social, the local connects with the global. Cosmopolitanism within the thought-world of participants is not treated as the inevitable result of modernity or rationalism, but as historically-specific constructions.

Problem posing education can relocate cosmopolitan ideas away from the rational human individual and towards the historical and social processes that reproduce cosmopolitanism. Participants 'discover themselves to be the "hosts" of the oppressor [and] contribute to the midwifery of their liberating pedagogy' (1996, 30). In this case, cosmopolitanism in its entirety is not necessarily an ideology of the oppressor. It is more likely that the internalised oppression to be expelled relates to the way in which the coloniality of power is reproduced by narrating cosmopolitanism exclusively from the

hegemonic perspective of modernity. By identifying the origin of the oppressor's ideology as external to oneself, Freire's problem-posing education exposes the reproduction of internalised oppression so that it can be critically analysed. A critical self-awareness develops in which participants ask not just 'what are the values that inform my own perspective,' but also 'from where are these values produced, and for what purpose?' Such reflections reveal the oppressor's ideology as historically specific and socially constructed, and thus possible to be changed. In problem-posing education, oppressive ideologies are expelled first by identifying them within individual and collective thought, and then positioning them as generative themes for inquiry. Problem-posing education finds generative themes in 'the thought-language with which men and women refer to reality, the levels at which they perceive that reality, and their view of the world' (Freire 1996, 78). Naming the world in this way allows for the possibility of transformation through renaming (Freire 1996, 69). Together, the generative themes form a 'thematic universe,' a thought-world whose boundaries are defined by the 'limit-situations' that constrain language, thought, imagination, and action. The critical consciousness that is the goal of Freire's pedagogy 'implies the possibility of perceiving the "untested feasibility" which lies beyond the limit-situations' (1996, 94). By posing problems directed at the generative themes, the boundaries of limit situations become malleable. The narrative of cosmopolitanism from the perspective of modernity involves its own limit-situations. By identifying them, exposing their contradictions, and expelling them from their internalised thought-world, a new discursive space opens in which voices of coloniality gain significance. The methodical problematisation of generative cosmopolitan themes could enable the reconsideration of cosmopolitan values from the perspective of coloniality.

If border cosmopolitanism is applied to problem-posing education, the outcome might resemble a dialogue between the hegemonic values that inform secular cosmopolitan ethics,

such as democracy, rights, and citizenship, and local ways of knowing that have been historically subordinated to such values. In the classroom, this can be undertaken as problem-posing dialogue that begins with the question, 'what do we know?' and works outward to identify the particular power structures that reproduce that knowledge. The role of the educator is to present the hegemonic cosmopolitan values as historically specific ideas that often serve to reinforce the coloniality of power.

Taking secular cosmopolitanism as a theme, problem-posing education may begin by identifying the colonial difference produced by its discourse. Since 'themes imply others which are opposing or even antithetical [and] indicate tasks to be carried out and fulfilled,' its potential opposing themes would need to be considered (Freire 1996, 82). Some themes that cosmopolitan discourse constructs as its antitheses may include local perspectives, violence, or religious morality. The resultant dichotomies would be then challenged. For example, the idea that cosmopolitanism opposes violence can be problematised by exploring the history of cosmopolitanism as an instrument of colonialism and neocolonialism. Further investigation of this thematic universe can develop a deeper understanding of these mutually constitutive themes, their specific histories, and their social functions. As another example, 'local perspectives,' as antithetical to universal truths, may be a connector between the plurality of ontologies of the Majority World that have been constructed as indigenous and thus limited in their perceived applicability. By repositioning indigeneity as a more universal experience than Europeanness, cosmopolitanism becomes subject to narratives of coloniality. The task implied by this particular limit-situation would be open to contestation because the vision of a society liberated from the conflation of cosmopolitanism and modernity is a space that Freire would likely call 'untested feasibility' (1996, 83-84). Perhaps this task would involve the reimagining of cosmopolitanism as indigenous to a particular place, or the reimagining of particular indigeneities as involving experiences that transcend place. This exact line of

inquiry, however, is merely hypothetical rather than prescriptive, as problem-posing education generates themes in dialogue with all participants.

Nussbaum (1994) presents a concrete example of cosmopolitan education that may become more empowering through a dialogical and problem-posing pedagogy. She sees great possibility in an education that draws connections between the personal and the global, and envisions a curriculum on gender and family that explores the diversity of family configurations throughout the world. By doing so, students gain insight into the peculiarities of their own context and the other existent possibilities. 'Through cosmopolitan education,' she says, 'we learn more about ourselves' (Nussbaum, 1994). It is this notion that border cosmopolitan turns on its head, so that it might read, 'through education that is truly about ourselves, we learn more about our connections to the cosmopolitan.' Such a curricula would begin with the immediate reality by asking participants about their own experiences with family and gender. Common ground between participants' narratives becomes a new generative theme: what power structures are creating these common experiences? Perhaps some groups would identify patriarchy as a cosmopolitan connector by referencing similarities between family normativities in different societies. Rather than explaining hegemonic configurations of family as the inevitable result of modernity, they might be seen as connected through coloniality, since colonialism reproduces and reinforces a particular form of gender-power (Mohanty 1988; Reardon 2010). Like in Nussbaum's approach, participants consider their own experiences in relation to a diversity of family forms throughout the world. However, by beginning with and centring the local, cosmopolitan issues can be discussed from the perspective of coloniality rather than universalist modernity. If the goal of cosmopolitan education is for participants to be not just included but also empowered, then they must be encouraged to begin with what they know and work outwards towards a critical understanding of their relationship with global power structures.

Nussbaum's cosmopolitan education operates to instil a sense of global citizenship by giving consideration to many places and cultures. Thus, students learn 'that they ought to respect the basic human rights of citizens of India, Bolivia, Nigeria, and Norway' (Nussbaum, 1994). Such a pedagogy might be highly relevant to students located towards the centre of imperial power, since the actions of the included affect the marginalised more so than vice versa. But what does it mean to educate working-class students in the Global South, many of whom are struggling to access clean water and basic education, that they must consider the human rights of all people when making decisions? It may be more empowering begin by addressing local injustices, and then explore their connections to greater structures of oppression. The goal is not to simply moralise students with a sense of global responsibility, but also to build critical knowledge about issues that affect them. Dialogue is a practice of realisation-focused justice in which participants determine which social issues are the most significant hindrances to the realisation of justice and humanisation. Locally-relevant strategies to address these issues may be enhanced by exploring generative themes that act as connectors with communities in other parts of the world who may be facing similar modes of oppression.

The overall structure of the problem-posing education proposed here is to begin with local knowledges and work outwards until the liminal space of the modern/colonial difference is encountered. This is the space that contains cosmopolitan ideas such as democracy, rights, peace, and development. Rather than seeking to fill this space by instilling a particular 'finished' set of cosmopolitan values upon participants, it should be explored as a discursive territory in which meanings can be challenged and reworked from the perspective of coloniality. In this way, critical peace education empowers participants as active critical voices in the ongoing project of cosmopolitanism.

Conclusion

Critical peace education is highly promising as a pedagogy that addresses peace and conflict in a pluralistic and methodically critical manner. Motivated by a profound belief in human equality and the liberatory potential of critical inquiry, this emergent field of theory and practice could be inclusive and empowering as cosmopolitanism becomes increasingly relevant to the human experience. Cosmopolitanism, however, exists not in a universal realm of thought but in the dividing lines of the modern/colonial world system. To be truly critical and liberatory, critical peace education must address cosmopolitanism as it manifests at the borders of modernity and coloniality. This vision of cosmopolitanism, as elaborated by Mignolo, is post-universalist and dialogical. Accordingly, universal moral inclusion must not just include people as equals in moral considerations, but must also include a diversity of perspectives as equal contributors to normative moral discussions, even if those perspectives are not always secular in nature.

Border cosmopolitanism offers one framework for dialogical cosmopolitanism in critical peace education, but there are other approaches to dialogical cosmopolitanism, such as subaltern cosmopolitanism and vernacular cosmopolitanism, that could contribute to a decolonising framework for cosmopolitanism in critical peace education. Critical peace education may benefit from drawing from such theories of cosmopolitanism as it develops theoretical and methodological nuance. I anticipate that by exploring these other forms of dialogical cosmopolitanism, more linkages can be drawn with Freire's problem posing education. It may also lead to visions of more specific curricula for critical peace education, which should carefully avoid serving as an itinerary to lead participants to predetermined universalist conclusions.

Border cosmopolitanism as a praxis undertaken in critical peace education could contribute to future subaltern perspectives on key concepts in peace education such as peace, justice, and rights. Reconsidering cosmopolitanism from the perspective of coloniality

remains an ongoing and unfinished project because it draws from continually evolving pedagogies of resistance informed by subaltern experiences that are living and changing. Colonialism and cosmopolitanism are both intensively linguistic processes, and thus their critical analysis could benefit greatly from Freire's linguistically deconstructive problem-posing education. His pedagogy can contribute to a critical peace education that responds to the vocation of humanisation, which he says is universal yet unfinished, and which also constitutes the cosmopolitan vision. For critical peace education to operate from a realisation-focused theory of justice it must respect the agency of human beings in determining for themselves what justice means. Local perspectives of cosmopolitanism must be both the starting point for critical inquiry and the object of its ultimate transformational aim. Problem-posing education offers a methodology to position the histories, assumptions, and contradictions of cosmopolitanism as generative themes open to critique. Informed by border cosmopolitanism, such critique can begin to rework cosmopolitan discourses into a language adequate to describe cosmopolitanism as experienced through coloniality, and thus into a language for empowerment.

References

Apel, Karl-Otto. 1997. "Plurality of the Good? The Problem of Affirmative Tolerance in a Multicultural Society from an Ethical Point of View." Ratio Juris 10 (2): 199-212.

Appiah, Kwame A. 1997. "Cosmopolitan Patriots." *Critical Inquiry* 23 (3): 617-639.

Aronowitz, Stanley. 2011. Introduction in *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage,* by Paulo Freire, 1-19. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bajaj, Monisha. 2011. "Human Rights Education: Ideology, Location, and Approaches." *Human Rights Quarterly* 33: 481-508. doi:10.1353/hrq.2011.0019

—. 2015. "'Pedagogies of Resistance' and Critical Peace Education Praxis." *Journal of Peace Education* 12 (2): 154–166. doi:10.1080/17400201.2014.991914

Bajaj, Monisha, and Edward J. Brantmeier, eds. 2011. "The Politics, Praxis, and Possibilities

of Critical Peace Education." Special section, *Journal of Peace Education* 8 (3).

doi:10.1080/17400201.2011.621356

Bekerman, Zvi, and Michalinos Zembylas. 2014. *Teaching Contested Narratives: Identity,*

Memory, Reconciliation in Peace Education and Beyond. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

Bhabha, Homi K. 2004. *The Location of Culture.* Oxfordshire, UK: Routledge.

Brahm, Eric. 2003. "Conflict stages." *Beyond Intractability*. Accessed 29 August 2016.

http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/conflict-stages

Calhoun, Craig. 2002. "Imagining Solidarity: Cosmopolitanism, Constitutional Patriotism,

and the Public Sphere." *Public Culture* 14 (1): 147-171.

—. 2011. "Secularism, Citizenship, and the Public Sphere." In *Rethinking Secularism*, edited

by Craig Calhoun, Mark Juergensmeyer, and Jonathan Vanantwerpen, 75-91. New

York: Oxford University Press.

Cavanaugh, William T. 2014. "Religious Violence as Modern Myth." *Political Theology* 15

(6): 486-502.

Delanty, Gerard. 2006. "The Cosmopolitan Imagination: Critical Cosmopolitanism and Social

Theory." *The British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1): 25-47.

Diaz-Soto, Lourdes. 2005. "How Can We Teach Peace When We Are So Outraged? A Call for

Critical Peace Education." *Taboo* 9 (2): 91-96.

Fine, Robert. 2003. "Taking the 'Ism' Out of Cosmopolitanism: An Essay in Reconstruction."

European Journal of Social Theory 6 (4): 451-470.

Fine, Robert, and Will Smith. 2003. "Jürgen Habermas's Theory of Cosmopolitanism."

Constellations 10 (4): 469-487.

Forero, Eduardo S. 2016. "Educación Indígena Zapatista para la Paz y la No-violencia

[Zapatista Indigenous Education for Peace and Nonviolence].” *Espacio Abierto* 25 (1): 23-36.

Freire, Paulo. 1996. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra B. Ramos. New York: Continuum.

—. 2001. *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage.* Translated by Patrick Clarke. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield

Fromm, Erich. 1966. *The Heart of Man: Its Genius for Good and Evil.* New York: Harper and Row.

Galtung, Johan. 1969. “Violence, Peace, and Peace Research.” *Journal of Peace Research* 6 (3): 167-191.

—. 1990. “Cultural Violence.” *Journal of Peace Research* 27 (3): 291-305.

Gidwani, Vinay K. 2006. “Subaltern Cosmopolitanism as Politics.” *Antipode* 38 (1): 7-21.

Goldberg, David A. 2013. “The Road to Inclusion: Citizenship and Participatory Action Research as a Means of Redressing ‘Otherness’ Among Homeless Youth.” In *Critical Peace Education: Difficult Dialogues,* edited by Peter P. Trifonas and Bryan Wright, 153-161. Dordrecht: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-90-481-3945-3_11

Gould, Robert. 2013. “The Transformative Power of Engaged Thinking for Peace Education.” In *Critical Peace Education: Difficult Dialogues,* edited by Peter P. Trifonas and Bryan Wright, 59-68. Dordrecht: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-90-481-3945-3_4

Gounari, Panayota. 2013. “Critical Pedagogy and Peace Education: Understanding Violence, Human Rights, and the Historical Project of Militant Peace.” In *Critical Peace Education: Difficult Dialogues,* edited by Peter P. Trifonas and Bryan Wright, 69-97. Dordrecht: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-90-481-3945-3_5

Gur-Ze'ev, Ilan. 2001. “Philosophy of Peace Education in a Postmodern Era.” *Educational*

Theory 51 (3): 315-336. doi:10.1111/j.1741-5446.2001.00315.x

Habermas, Jürgen. 2008. "Notes on Post-Secular Society." *New Perspectives Quarterly* 25 (4): 17-29.

Hantzopoulos, Maria. 2011. "Institutionalizing Critical Peace Education in Public Schools: A Case for Comprehensive Implementation." *Journal of Peace Education* 8 (3): 225-242. doi:10.1080/17400201.2011.621364

Horner, Lindsey K. 2013. "Peace as an Event, Peace as Utopia: A Re-imagining of Peace and its Implications for Peace Education and Development." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Eduation* 34 (3): 366-379.

Huaman, Elizabeth S. 2011. "Transforming Education, Transforming Society: The Co-construction of Critical Peace Education and Indigenous Education." *Journal of Peace Education* 8 (3): 243-258. doi:10.1080/17400201.2011.621374

Keet, Andre, Denise Zinn, and Kimberley Porteus. 2009. "Mutual Vulnerability: A Key Principle in a Humanising Pedagogy in Post-conflict Societies." *Perspectives in Education* 27 (2): 109-119.

Lund, Michael S. 2009. "Conflict Prevention: Theory in Pursuit of Policy and Practice." In *The Sage Handbook of Conflict Resolution,* edited by Jacob Bercovitch, Victor Kremenyuk, and I. William Zartman, 287-321. London: Sage.

Madsen, Richard. 2011. "Secularism, Religious Change, and Social Conflict in Asia." In *Rethinking Secularism*, edited by Craig Calhoun, Mark Juergensmeyer, and Jonathan Vanantwerpen, 248-269. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mohanty, Chandra T. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." *Boundary 2* 12 (3): 333-358.

McLaren, Peter. 1999. "A Pedagogy of Possibility: Reflecting Upon Paulo Freire's Politics of Education." *Educational Researcher* 28 (2): 49-56. doi:10.3102/0013189X028002049

Mendieta, Eduardo. 2009. "From Imperial to Dialogical Comsopolitanism." *Ethics & Global Politics* 2 (3): 241-258.

Mignolo, Walter. 2000. "The Many Faces of Cosmo-polis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism." *Popular Culture* 12 (3): 721-748.

—. 2002. "The Geopolitics of Knowledge and the Colonial Difference." *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 101 (1): 57-96.

—. 2009. "Cosmopolitanism and the De-colonial Option." *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 29 (2): 111-127.

Mills, Charles W. 2005. "Kant's Untermenschen." In *Race and Racism in Modern Philosophy,* edited by Andrew Valls, 169-193. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Nussbaum, Martha. 1994. "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism." *Boston Review.* Accessed 15 January 2017. https://bostonreview.net/martha-nussbaum-patriotism-and-cosmopolitanism

—. 2003. "Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlements: Sen and Social Justice." *Feminist Economics* 9 (2-3): 33-59.

Popol Vuh. 1950. Translated by Adrián Recinos, Delia Goetz, and Sylvanus G. Morley. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Reardon, Betty A. 2009. "Human rights learning: Pedagogies and politics of peace." Paper presented at the UNESCO Chair for Peace Education Master Conference, Rio Piedras, April 15. Accessed 29 August 2016. http://www.pdhre.org/HRLreardon.pdf

—. 2013. "Meditating on the Barricades: Concerns, Cautions, and Possibilities for Peace Education for Political Efficacy." In *Critical Peace Education: Difficult Dialogues*, edited by Peter P. Trifonas and Bryan Wright, 1-28. Dordrecht: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-90-481-3945-3_1

—. 2015. "Patriarchy, Pedagogy, and Learning Toward a Culture of Peace." In *Women, War,*

and Violence: Topography, Resistance, and Hope, edited by Mariam M. Kurtz and Lester R. Kurtz, 613-624. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Reardon, Betty A., and Dale T. Snauwaert. 2011. "Reflective Pedagogy, Cosmopolitanism, and Critical Peace Education for Political Efficacy: A Discussion of Betty A. Reardon's Assessment of the Field." *In Factis Pax* 5 (1): 1-14.

Reynolds, William M. 2013. "Liberation Theology and Paulo Freire: On the Side of the Poor." In *Paulo Freire's Intellectual Roots: Towards Historicity in Praxis*, edited by Robert Lake and Tricia Kress, 127-144. New York: Bloomsbury.

Schirmer, Jennifer. 1998. *The Guatemalan Military Project: A Violence Called Democracy.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Sen, Amartya. 2003. "Development as Capabilities Expansion." In *Readings in Human Development: Concepts, Measures and Policies for a Development Paradigm,* edited by Sakiko Fukuda-Parr and A. K. Shiva Kumar, 3-16. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

—. 2009. *The idea of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Sharp, Gene. 1973. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*. 3 vols. Boston: Porter Sargent.

Snauwaert, Dale T. 2011. "Social Justice and the Philosophical Foundations of Critical Peace Education: Exploring Nussbaum, Sen, and Freire." *Journal of Peace Education* 8 (3): 315-331. doi:10.1080/17400201.2011.621371

Spivak, Gayatri C. 1985. "Three Women's texts and a Critique of Imperialism." *Critical Inquiry* 12: 243-261.

Stewart, Charles, and Rosalind Shaw, eds. 1994. *Syncretism/Anti-Syncretism: The Politics of Religious Synthesis*. Oxfordshire, UK: Routledge.

Trifonas, Peter P., and Bryan Wright, eds. 2013. *Critical Peace Education: Difficult Dialogues*. Dordrecht: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-90-481-3945-3

Wessells, Michael G. 2013. "Cosmology, Context, and Peace Education: A View from War

   Zones." In *Critical Peace Education: Difficult Dialogues*, edited by Peter P. Trifonas

   and Bryan Wright, 89-100. Dordrecht: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-90-481-3945-3_6

Zembylas, Michalinos. 2013. "Critical Pedagogy and Emotion: Working Through 'Troubled

   Knowledge' in Posttraumatic Contexts." *Critical Studies in Education* 54 (2): 176-

   189.

Zeng, Minhao. 2014. "Subaltern Cosmopolitanism: Concept and Approaches." *The

   Sociological Review* 62 (1): 137-148.

Disclosure statement