Journal of Peace Education

ISSN: 1740-0201 (Print) 1740-021X (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cjpe20

Diffraction, transrational perspectives, and peace education: new possibilities

Kevin Kester, Tim Archer & Shawn Bryant

To cite this article: Kevin Kester, Tim Archer & Shawn Bryant (2019) Diffraction, transrational perspectives, and peace education: new possibilities, Journal of Peace Education, 16:3, 274-295, DOI: 10.1080/17400201.2019.1697065

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2019.1697065

JOURNAL OF PEACE EDUCATION
2019, VOL. 16, NO. 3, 274–295
https://doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2019.1697065

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Diffraction, transrational perspectives, and peace education: new possibilities

Kevin Kester[a], Tim Archer[b] and Shawn Bryant[c]

[a]Department of Education, Keimyung University, Daegu, South Korea; [b]Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK; [c]Endicott College of International Studies, Woosong University, Daejeon, South Korea

ABSTRACT

This paper draws on the theoretical lens of diffraction to conceptualize a new approach to transrational peace education theory and praxis in the post-2016 posttruth political era and Industry 4.0 economic period. The paper reviews foundational concepts and approaches from key founders of the field – Paulo Freire and Betty Reardon – before turning to two contemporary peace education scholars – Wolfgang Dietrich and Hilary Cremin – to investigate the contributions of recent scholarship toward diverse diffractive possibilities for transrational peace education. In this sense, diffraction offers pluralistic views and transformative possibilities for transrational peace education in varied contexts. Transrational peace education builds upon peace education to integrate affective and aesthetic perspectives into peace education theory and praxis. Before concluding, we offer some theoretical implications and pedagogic responses for scholars seeking to work at diffractive transrational intersections. The contribution of the paper is toward theorizing new perspectives for transrational peace education theory and praxis in the 21st century.

KEYWORDS

Peace education; transrational perspectives; diffraction; Paulo Freire; Betty Reardon; Wolfgang Dietrich; Hilary Cremin

Introduction

Peace education has had transrational resonances since its inception. From its origins much peace education has emphasized the socio-emotional and historical aspects of learning (Freire 1970; Page 2008; Reardon 1988). Yet, although peace education covers a broad spectrum of interpretations, from emotional competence to international law, the tendency is to neglect the emotional, material, and embodied dimensions in favor of the rational psychosocial aspects. For example, today much peace education literature focuses on the rational mental structuring of curricula and pedagogy to achieve pro-social behaviors (Allport 1954; Fountain 1999; Johnson and Johnson 2005). The assumption behind these rational psychosocial approaches is that pro-social behaviors aggregate to create social peace. Thus, these two contrasting

CONTACT Kevin Kester kkester@kmu.ac.kr

approaches, i.e., socio-emotional and psychosocial peace, offer radically divergent strategies for peace through education. On the one hand, socio-emotional peace centers on people's ontological, material, and embodied realities in conversation with each other; and, on the other hand, rational psychosocial intervention for an ordered and nonviolent society presents the individual mind as the site of aggression and conflict to be altered through educational interventions. By reviewing the work of four prominent peace scholars, we will show that through diffractive engagements, these ostensibly opposing approaches are not necessarily at odds, but may have complementary elements.

A number of scholars have taken the socio-emotional and historical thought forward to theorize on what it means to transcend the rational and emotional oppositions in education and peacebuilding, beginning first with Paulo Freire (though in many ways he remains deeply committed to social change through rational consciousness-raising; see Schugurensky 2014). Betty Reardon, in her work, interrogates the intersections of rationality, affect, masculinity, patriarchy, and militarism, thereby merging the personal/political, inner/outer, affective/analytical, and mind/body dimensions of peacebuilding (see Kester, Tsuruhara, and Archer 2019). Her work engages at the intersections of gender, class, and ethnicity in war and peace. More recently, Wolfgang Dietrich and Hilary Cremin offer newer transrational and aesthetic entry points into the field through inquiring into the limits of rationality in education and peacebuilding. They engage with emotionality, spirituality, and being. We will review the work of these scholars in the pages to come.

Yet, before we begin with our review, we offer three assumptions that we are working with in this paper. First, by centering transrational peace education we are not rejecting rational approaches, such as those peace education endeavors emphasizing pro-social behaviors, although we note the limitations. Rather, we seek to build upon and transcend the limits of individual psychosocial and instrumentalist approaches by integrating them with transrational peace perspectives. Second, we importantly consider critical socio-emotional engagement in transrational peace education to be qualitatively different from empathy-building education (Kurian 2019). For instance, the transrational socio-emotional aspect of this work, for us, seeks to humanize and recognize our interdependencies, turning the gaze back on ourselves, on the assumptions of our peacebuilding field, and on the needs of others, while at the same time disrupting the social inequities that create injustices in the first place. Transrational peace education, hence, seeks to change the world through an integrated approach to changing the self, systems, and the relationships that hold these in congruence. Third, we understand transrational perspectives to be a medium through which to exercise theoretical and practical decoloniality through education by de-centering hegemonic social, political, economic, environmental, and educational norms. These three assumptions drive our analysis.

In the pages that follow, we will first overview the historical context in which transrational peace education must respond today. We then turn to outline some foundational thinking on peace education drawing especially on the work of Paulo Freire and Betty Reardon indicating some intersections with transrational perspectives. Following this, we discuss our diffractive lens that we posit offers new possibilities for thinking in and through transrational peace education. Then, we overview two scholars that we find hold promise for a new model of transrational and aesthetic peace education: Wolfgang Dietrich and Hilary Cremin. Finally, we offer some reflections on the theoretical and pedagogical implications of diffractive transrational thinking for peace education theory and praxis in the 21st century. We begin now with the current historical juncture.

Our historical context

In 2016, the World Economic Forum declared that humanity had entered an era of Industry 4.0 (Schwab 2017). The world listened. States, international organizations, businesses, and educational institutions rapidly accepted this proclamation and prepared policy responses for the new era of 'intelligent capitalism' (Wei and Peters 2018). From a diffractive standpoint, which we outline further throughout the paper, other historical contexts did not simply cease at this point; rather they are interwoven with and intensified by Industry 4.0. For political economists and policymakers, the Industry 4.0 era represents a cultural economic period signified by the emergence of hyper-automation and self-learning machines. From this departure point, a bleak economic future is presented in which machines replace workers resulting in high unemployment and uncertainty that threatens the current social order. Two things are notable about this representation of the near future. Firstly, humanity is displaced, which recalls the posthumanist arguments put forth by Karen Barad (2007) and Patti Lather (2018). Secondly, at the same time that humanity is decentred, the unwavering faith of humanity's technological progress remains firmly planted at the centre of the narrative as the solution to the dystopian crises of its own progress. At the core of both instances lies a focus on the technocratic-managerial economic hierarchy and its necessary producer-manager-consumer relationship. The emphasis is on ensuring a healthy economy with high employment, consumption, and innovation. The implications for education are straightforward. Industry 4.0 is a crisis of ensuring producers a critical mass of employed consumers, in which the education-economic nexus is implicated.

The same year that Schwab announced the arrival of Industry 4.0, the Oxford Dictionary selected *posttruth* as the word/concept of the year. The Oxford Dictionary[1] defines posttruth as 'Relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief.' In the academic literature, posttruth further signifies deception, political manipulation, and different degrees of acceptance of lying in

politics and social life (Peters 2018; Zavarzadeh 2003). This is amplified today by technology and social media that mass distribute the proliferation of such half-truths, 'alt-facts', and political manipulations to susceptible communities (Kester 2018a). To make sense of this historical juncture, several sociological theories provide insights. First, *late modernity* theorizes that we live in a time of adaptation, of which Industry 4.0 is a part, where modern institutions, such as schools, hospitals, military, and disciplinary agencies are evolving with/in late capitalism, and must consistently reinvent themselves. Concurrently, individuals and communities too are adapting their narratives of self and online presentations daily. This constant adaptation sometimes may lead to exaggeration and lies, perhaps intended perhaps not. This creates increased uncertainty amongst individuals and institutions in the modern world (Bauman 2000; Giddens 1990). Thus, the period of late modernity, entangled with Industry 4.0 and posttruth, helps explain the ever-present shifting of social and political narratives, and the public's accompanying loss of trust in modern institutions. Some scholars blame postmodernism; we do not (see Kester 2018a).

So within this era, *diffraction*, which we explain further in the following sections, offers a new conceptual toolbox in which these converging theories sit to make sense of the various shades, lights, truths, perceptions, and deceptions shining through. To diffract is to observe phenomena from multiple angles thereby allowing different knowledges/bodies to speak (Bozalek and Zembylas 2017). *Diffraction* explains the life force and agency of the coming together of differing materialities and discourses such that numbers, new technologies, and new events construct the sorts of experiential interpretations, i.e., the narratives, that are told and re-told, clicked, forwarded, copied, pasted (Barad 2007). Numbers, algorithms, new technologies, and the coming together now have automated and self-guided agencies well beyond the human-machine interface. From this theoretical melange, we accept that not only are there multiple 'truths' but there are multiple intersecting realities that speak different truths. Thus, reality is multiple, perceptions of reality too are multiple, and multiple actualities are possible (Barad 2007). Confronted with these complexities, the questions often raised are, *If truth is multiple what can education offer?* And, if the world is increasingly machine dependent and machine-learnt and operated, *What can human-led education contribute that machines cannot?* To respond to these questions, within the field of transrational peace education specifically, we now turn to two earlier theorists of humanistic educational dialogue. We argue that the humanistic core of earlier peace education remains instructive for transrational perspectives in the posttruth Industry 4.0 era today.

Paulo Freire, Betty Reardon and humanizing peace education

Much of the literature in peace education acknowledges Paulo Freire and Betty Reardon as core thinkers whose ideas have influenced the practice of

contemporary peace education (Bajaj 2015; Bartlett 2008). We begin chronologically with the work of Freire.

Paulo Freire was born on 19 September 1921, in Recife, Brazil, and rose to significance in the field of education due to his applied and practical approach. Freire was extensively involved in literacy education across parts of Brazil in the 1960s, work that famously led to his exile to Chile in 1964. But upon his return to Brazil in 1980, Freire resumed his literacy work. Freire's main contributions to education more generally, and peace education specifically, include the now well-known concepts of conscientization, humanizing education, praxis, and problem-posing education, which were for him the necessary responses to the problems of banking education and dehumanizing exchanges that he had identified within educational practices (Kester and Aryoubi 2019; Kester and Booth 2010). He wrote more than 20 books over his career to explicate these ideas, most notably *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Freire 1970), a work that has significantly influenced the field of peace education (Bajaj 2015; Reardon and Snauwaert 2014; Schugurensky 2014).

Freire's humanizing approach to education lays some of the foundations for peace education theory and praxis that have informed more contemporary transrational perspectives. In this regard, Freire's theorizing about power relations within education and the means through which to raise critical consciousness and social action among teachers and students, and within the teacher-student relationship, form the core of socially just education (Schugurensky 2014). Like transrational perspectives, relationality is central to Freire's humanizing approach. Although Freire primarily worked in adult education and non-formal educational contexts, others have drawn on his writings to examine the use of Freirean methods within formal education, particularly those educational endeavors aimed at critical social change in schools (McCowan 2006). Freire passed away in 1997 at the age of 75 but his legacy in peace education continues. One such scholar who was impressed by the potential of Freirean methods for humanistic peace education is Betty A. Reardon.

Betty Reardon was born on 12 June 1929, in New York City, the same date that Anne Frank was born in Frankfurt, Germany. Reardon spent her life and career working to develop and integrate peace education into formal educational systems (Reardon and Snauwaert 2014). Unlike Freire, however, the bulk of Reardon's work occurred within formal institutions of schooling and higher education. Reardon originally taught history in middle schools in New England before moving to universities and teacher-training in New York City. She notably extends the work of Freire by emphasizing the gender dimension. For Reardon, confronting and disrupting patriarchy and the war system should be the core objective of peace educators in fostering equity, nonviolence, social justice, and planetary stewardship through education (Kester, Tsuruhara, and Archer 2019). She advocates a comprehensive, global, human rights and cosmopolitan approach to peace education. Here, Reardon emphasizes the correspondence

between classroom pedagogy and social relations, where she argues that the arbitrary hierarchies of nationality, gender, race, ethnicity, class, and sexuality that form in schools are reflections of and preparations for later social life. She argues that participatory democratic practices of teaching, in turn, would better serve the broader social democratic purposes of peacebuilding education to challenge and reconstruct the gendered and racialized social order – in education and beyond (Reardon 1988; Reardon and Snauwaert 2014).

Combined, Freire and Reardon offer a deeply humanizing and compassionate approach to peace education and social justice that is focused on interrogating and transforming society through critical education. We hold their complementary approaches as core to the field. We will now look differently at these common foundations.

A diffractive lens

Diffractive thinking refers to looking differently at data. Diffraction draws from reflexive sociology to present new insights into educational phenomena and data by twisting the lens (Barad 2007; Brookfield 2009; Lather 2018). By examining data through different lenses, novel insights become revealed. We draw on diffractive thinking specifically as this framework offers new and diverse insights into scholarly praxis. We find it similar to the earlier concepts of *bricolage* and *assemblage* from critical theory engagements (Kincheloe and Berry 2004; Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg 2011). However, it is notably different in its entanglement with new materialisms (Davies 2016; de Freitas and Curinga 2015; Zembylas 2017). Whereas the earlier critical theory is more humanistically oriented, diffraction instead de-centers people and gives equal attention to the agency of things. Thus, diffraction speaks to the current historical moment of Industry 4.0 and posttruth, where algorithms and metrics co-produce human and material relations.

Specifically, this approach offers new insights for peace scholars gazing in at their own practices in the field, and on the discursive and material productions of the collective practices of peace education (Brookfield 2009; Kester and Cremin 2017). In other words, accepted norms of the discipline produce certain outcomes and expectations, which express themselves slightly differently in different contexts, and these differences matter. Sometimes these outcomes are unintended, such as the violences enacted through the peace educator by his/her own actions, e.g., promoting Western-centric peace work by emphasizing the nation-state or race while simultaneously calling for greater inclusion. Hence, diffraction is in and of the mind and body, as well as the material (Levy, Halse, and Wright 2016). Sometimes the gaze is from evaluative agents and assessment metrics, e.g., administrators, policy-makers, funders, rankings, tenure procedures, etc. Other times the gaze is from the material, e.g., institutional affiliations, class background, financial resources, etc. Here, the peace

educator is an effect rather than a cause. Diffraction, then, focuses attention on these important differences – human, machine, time, place – and the diverse productive knowledges and practices emerging from these heterogeneities. In other words, diffraction engages the epistemic, ontological, and ethical – the mind, body, heart, and material – at individual and collective levels in education, peace work, and peace research (Barad 2007; Bozalek and Zembylas 2017).

In this vein, diffraction offers insights by way of relations, and the differences produced through these relations. This recalls the humanistic relationality of Freire and Reardon. It also brings forward the relations between the human subject and the material-natural world explored in transrational perspectives, which we discuss hereafter. In this, it is complex, new, dispersive, combining the strengths of humanistic reflexivity with materialism's foregrounding of the new productivities and agencies of the non-human worlds (Barad 2007), where the representational is disrupted (MacLure 2013; St. Pierre and Pillow 2000) and the individual educator is 'already part of the substances, systems, and becomings of the world' (Alaimo 2014, 14). It is compounded by the speed and unpredictability of algorithms. As Kester (2018b) writes, 'diffraction has implications for embodiment and a re-examination of the relationality between selves, others, the text, context, and larger social and political possibilities' (8) that educators and students find themselves with/in. The multi-hues and lines of flight that this re-presents may be partially explained through different diffractions. For example, Zembylas (2017) writes, 'educational researchers have to accept that the theoretical and analytical concepts of their particular ontology are insufficient to understand data, therefore they have to give genuine voice to difference that goes beyond their ontological understandings' (1409).

We turn now to examine peace education through transrational perspectives. This new frame diffracts the peace work of the earlier scholars. In our final analysis, we too acknowledge that the contributions of these scholars have been diffracted through our own interpretations and engagements with the field. This leads us to reflect on both the limits and possibilities of a diffractive rendering of transrational peace education, which we take up in the final section.

Some contemporary scholars

This section explores the contributions of two contemporary thinkers to the field of peace education. Each of these scholars works primarily within the European context – Austria for Dietrich, and the UK for Cremin – although through professional networks they have also contributed to the development of the field in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. This review of two contemporary scholars in addition to the two foundational thinkers is not meant to be exhaustive. Due to space constraints (and our focus on transrational perspectives) we cannot review the many other important peace educators working

within diverse contexts. We accept this geographical and cultural limitation for the present paper as it does not impede our argument. However, we do note that future papers should examine further a diffractive peacebuilding education with insights from the global East and global South (see Kurian and Kester 2018). What Dietrich and Cremin contribute importantly to the earlier humanistic work is divergent thinking beyond the focus on the rational human agent. Dietrich approaches peacebuilding from a transrational perspective, while Cremin offers aesthetic approaches to peacebuilding.

Wolfgang Dietrich and transrational perspectives

The review of contemporary scholars begins with Wolfgang Dietrich, who is responsible for conceiving of, experimenting with, and promulgating the idea of a transrational twist in peace studies. Dietrich's corpus of published work is noteworthy for synthesizing knowledge from disparate sources and from superficially dissimilar traditions to draw attention to a perennial cultural concept: peace. Dietrich's Many Peaces Trilogy is used here as a framework for outlining the salient contributions of his work and their implications for the practice of transrational peace education. This covers plural onto-epistemologies, elicitive didactics, and holistic education.

The first volume of the Many Peaces Trilogy, *Interpretations of Peace in History and Culture* (Dietrich 2012), answered his own call for Many Peaces from 1997 (Dietrich and Sützl 2006) to take seriously the radical plurality posited by postmodern thinkers. The book elaborates a transrational framework claiming that peace can be understood rationally, and moreover, it is also a lived experience that can be perceived emotionally and spiritually. The logical extension of this proposition, and first implication for transrational peace education, which echoes postcolonial calls for epistemological diversity, is that plural onto-epistemologies are thus necessary to even begin to approach with justice the concept of peace. It shifts the question of the technocratic-rational management of conflicts from 'how can we achieve peace' to 'what kind of peace are we seeking to achieve?' While continuing to value rational orientations, transrational perspectives supplant the onto-epistemological hegemony of modernity because they privilege non-modern perspectives by placing them on equal footing, albeit in a dynamic and fluctuating equilibrium. Revisiting the topic of practical decoloniality, which we addressed earlier in the paper, privileging non-modern perspectives and giving them equal onto-epistemological weight to modernity is an act of decolonization in practice and yet does not repeat the binary and oppositional language of (de)colonization that critical scholars, like Boaventura de Sousa Santos and Vandana Shiva have been arguing for decades (Shiva 2005; Shiva, Kester, and Jani 2007; de Sousa Santos 2014).

The acceptance of plural onto-epistemologies led to the creation of the theory of the Many Peaces. What is important in this theory is to note that

ontology is equally considered alongside epistemology. This is the case because 'being' is equally important with 'thinking'. The initial research behind the first volume of the trilogy uncovered the pattern that interpretations of peace tend to cluster, which have been called the peace families: energetic, moral, modern, postmodern, and transrational peaces. Energetic peaces, historically the oldest, focus on peace as harmony of natural forces, in which peace is often represented as a fertility goddess and the human being experiences peace or non-peace as harmony or dissonance with heaven and earth. Moral peaces are understood to be characterized by the codification of norms to achieve justice: energetic traditions of harmonizing with heaven and earth are thus replaced by 'best practices,' meaning absolute rules that should be followed. Modern peaces follow the same logic as moral peaces but replace God with human reason – the structures of peace are justice and security. Postmodern peaces, then, are characterized by their response to and doubt towards the premises of moral and modern peaces. Instead, they focus on the small truths and interpersonal justice that can be achieved momentarily and ephemerally in our daily concrete relationships. Finally, transrational peaces are a synthesis of the previous four families but also a response to the hegemony of postmodern thought that has collapsed the peaces of harmony and truth into the peaces of justice and security. Transrational peaces, therefore, include rationality and re-emphasize the internal subjective (and external objective) aspects of peace.

The second volume of the series, *Elicitive Conflict Transformation and the Transrational Shift in Peace Politics* (Dietrich 2013), makes the case for a didactical approach that takes a plurality of peaces and diverse onto-epistemologies into account, which we have labeled here as elicitive didactics. It starts from and answers the question of what individuals and communities do if they are more than just rational, and how to integrate that into an understanding of how to deal with conflicts? Dietrich draws on the idea of elicitive conflict transformation from John Paul Lederach's (1997) work. What Dietrich offers anew is a systematic categorization of some elicitive techniques based on breath, voice, and movement. From his field experiences in Latin America in the 1980s, Dietrich concluded that humanitarian aid workers in general were insufficiently trained and poorly prepared for field work: not only were they not helping the target communities, in many cases they were making matters worse. Therefore, an educational approach was necessary that would meet the needs of peace workers deployed in the field, which was a catalyst for the creation of the Innsbruck School of peace studies and its emphasis on holistic approaches, scenario-based training, and experiential learning. Dietrich makes the case that these elicitive didactics need to be an integrated part of curricular design from the beginning. The implication for transrational peace education, then, is that it is not enough to sit in a classroom and talk about 'getting to yes' (Fisher and Ury 1981) or crafting theories on/with/in the global South (Connell 2007), but scholars and students need to practice living peace as an integrated part of the didactics.

Elicitive Conflict Mapping (Dietrich 2018) is the third and final installment in the Many Peaces series and implies the necessity of holistic education. Elicitive conflict mapping (ECM) is a holistic tool for analyzing conflicts that takes into account all of the insights of the previous two volumes. The method ultimately posits that conflicts are never just interpersonal or intersocietal but always at the same time transpersonal (Dietrich 2013, 204) and transsocietal (Dietrich 2018, 38). Approaches such as conflict resolution attempt to deal with the surface-level conflict episode, but conflicts are also rooted in spiritual, material, and emotional questions that are manifestations of spatio-temporal perceptions of duality and separation. Addressing the deeper sources of conflict means accessing and addressing these spiritual, material, and emotional questions in addition to the rational dimensions of conflict. Heeding the call of countless others before, the implication is that transrational peace education needs to be about the whole human being in all his or her intrapersonal and interpersonal layers (see also Cremin 2016, in the next section). If not, students and scholars are merely working on the episode, not dealing with the underlying causes of the conflict.

Wolfgang Dietrich's work plants a transrational paradigm shift for peace education. It is not just a shift of coordinates or adding detail to unknown regions; it is a redrawing of the entire map. Following the three topics covered above: plural onto-epistemologies, elicitive didactics, and holistic education, it is clear that seriously applying these principles goes far beyond reforms to peace education. A transrational approach requires a philosophical orientation to teach to the whole human being: cognitive knowledge, emotional competence, physical well-being, and spiritual depth. While other forms of peace education do this too, transrational perspectives offer a new grammar for amplifying the emotional and spiritual aspects of peace education. This further requires changes in curricula and pedagogy to allow for elicitive didactics that train holistically many facets of the human experience. Finally, this requires openness to onto-epistemological diversity, meaning respect for ways of knowing and being other than scientific positivism. The concluding implication is that this offers a hopeful new approach to transformative peace work through transrational educational engagement. Scholars have the opportunity to begin practicing these insights for new ways to approach peace education.

Hilary Cremin and aesthetic approaches to peacebuilding

Next, we turn to Hilary Cremin from the University of Cambridge. Whilst much of her earlier work focused on peer mediation and restorative practices in schools, it is her critiques and recommendations for peace education that shall be discussed here. Cremin began to become critical of the effectiveness of peace education programs and was inspired by Gur-Ze'ev's (2001, 2011) call for systematic reflection on the theoretical assumptions, conceptions and aims of

peace, peace education, and peace education research in the light of post-structuralist objections. She discussed what she felt were three crises of legitimation, representation, and praxis within the five areas of peace, education, peace education, research, and peace education research (Cremin 2016). *Table 1* below reproduces Cremin's summary, as published in 2016, of how the three crises manifest in the five areas. These crises suggest a lack of reflexivity within the five areas that result in the reproduction of structural and cultural forms of violence, and the reliance upon partial Western-centric models. These crises lead to a loss of authority and impact within each targeted area. Cremin integrates transrational thought throughout her work to address these crises (Cremin 2016, 13).

The above observations led Cremin to further critique the onto-epistemological assumptions contained within peace programming in schools (Cremin and Guilherme 2016), in peace and conflict studies in higher education (Kester and Cremin 2017), and in peacebuilding education more broadly (Cremin, Echavarría, and Kester 2018). For example, Cremin and Guilherme (2016) build upon Galtung's (1975) forms of violence to discuss the different manifestations of violence inherent in schools. Using Galtung's peacekeeping, peacemaking and peacebuilding differentiation the authors suggest an over-reliance on peacekeeping in schools as a means to respond to the perceived direct violence. However, they suggest these approaches are connected to negative peace and run the risk that they will 'become a tool for maintaining the status quo and the continuation of structural and cultural/psychological violences' (Cremin and Guilherme 2016, 1128). Kester and Cremin (2017) then argue that a lack of onto-epistemological self-reflection amongst peace scholars within the field of peace studies leads to the manifestation of the exact violences the field seeks to alleviate. Drawing from Dietrich (2012), Gur-Ze'ev (2001),

Table 1. Summary of five interrelated crises. Reprinted with permission, Cremin (2016), 12.

	Peace Studies	Education	Peace Education	Research	Peace Ed Research
Crisis of Legitimation	On-going need to tackle structural and cultural violence	Schooling as violence. On-going and worsening inequalities in and through education	On-going need to tackle structural and cultural violence in education	Loss of mandate and authority. Challenge of representing complexity	Need to ensure synergy with peace values
Crisis of Representation	Need to integrate non-Western traditions of peace	Social and educational exclusion. Non-recognition of diversity	Need to increase models that build on indigenous ways of knowing	Colonizing research practices, and processes of Othering	Lack of reflexivity; needs for new models of peace education research
Crisis of Praxis	Unexamined assumptions creating dissonance in the field	Teaching that ignores diversity, active learning and contestation	Agenda can be driven by funders and charities rather than participants	Participants often only superficially involved	Lack of impact on the lives of participants

and Zembylas and Bekerman (2013), Kester and Cremin (2017) argue peace studies relies upon modernist assumptions that go often unquestioned. They propose 'second-order reflexivity', a collective reflection on the field as a response to mitigate some of these challenges, as it is 'through second-order reflexivity that structural and symbolic violence within, through, and by scholars in the field becomes fully visible' (Kester and Cremin 2017, 1420). Finally, this second-order reflexivity lens is placed upon peacebuilding education where Cremin, Echavarría, and Kester (2018) suggest three challenges facing peacebuilding education today: 1) the presence of nationalism in many peace education programs; 2) the cultural imposition of Western ideology and colonialism through peace education; and 3) the dominant reliance on rational forms of learning often inconsistent with the transformative and inclusive purposes of peace education. Hence, Cremin is critical of the premises and practices of peace education.

Yet, although Cremin critiques the assumptions underpinning peace, education, and peace education, she too argues that within these crises lie opportunities. Cremin (2016), for example, suggests two 'fruitful areas' that positions much of her ongoing work. These two areas include building upon Galtung's legacy in relation to positive peace, and developing theory and pedagogy for 'aesthetic peace education' drawing on Page (2008) and Dietrich (2012). She links, in her words, the concepts of 'Gandhi's Satyagraha; Gur-Ze'ev and Rozenzweig's hospitality, co-poesis and improvisation (2011); Buber's I-Thou relations ([1937] 2004); and Dietrich's energetic peace (2012, later transrational peace)' (Cremin 2016, 13) to promote holistic and inclusive peacebuilding by shifting the onto-epistemological assumptions of practitioners.

Cremin (2016), and Cremin and Bevington (2017), for example, discuss creating ontological and epistemological shifts to incorporate peacemaking and peacebuilding approaches in schools and other educational organizations. These onto-epistemological shifts emphasize an Ethics of Aesthetics and Ethics of Care (Page 2008), changing the relationship focus between teacher and student, and changing the purpose of education away from an over-reliance on rational knowledge accumulation. Included in these shifts is an encouragement of Buber's I-Thou relations promoted through peacemaking processes that pave the way to transition away from I-It peacekeeping relations (Morgan and Guilherme 2013). This aesthetic turn in education and peace education links directly with Dietrich's transrational philosophy by integrating the body, heart, and soul into an education model that currently focuses predominantly on the rationalizing head. Similarly, Cremin and Archer (2018) suggest this shift requires a radically new educational paradigm that moves into transrational pedagogies and integrates 'ways of working towards new ways of being, where the aesthetic, the spiritual and the relational aspects of life reclaim their vital importance for the future of the planet and its peoples' (Cremin and Archer 2018, 300). Cremin (2018a) argues this transrational approach opens up new knowledges that would otherwise be unacknowledged.

> Firstly, the prefix 'trans' expresses the cross-cutting, transcendent and eco-systemic nature of peace in a way that the linear prefix 'post-' misses; and secondly transrational peaces are grounded in rationality, but also contain the embodied, the sacred, the affective, the discordant, the aesthetic, and so on. (2018a, 1552)

These onto-epistemological shifts become central to Cremin's approach to peace education and connect to the topic of diffraction discussed in this paper. For Cremin, using transrational methods that move beyond the reliance on partial psychologized practices in peace education offers new approaches that stir the body, heart and spirit as well as the head. This shift directs attention on how we interact with each other opposed to the delivery of prescribed behavioral curricula and pedagogy. It is this relational focus that leads into Cremin's interest in aesthetic and transrational peace education. Such peace education uses arts-based methods, performance, and affect in innovative new ways to evoke reflection and interaction in/with others. This approach can be seen in her authoethnography (2018b) that calls for 'qualitative enquiry into peace education that is existential, autoethnographic, vulnerable, performative, and critical' (1), and seeks to evoke emotional responses from readers. Cremin contributes the aesthetic dimension to transrational perspectives on peace education.

Discussion

Through the integrative review above, the common interpretation of peace has been shown as partial, colonizing, and even violent. In this section, we now turn to provide some theoretical and pedagogical implications drawing from the above transrational scholarship to reimagine peace education theory and praxis from a new diffractive onto-epistemology.

Theoretical implications

In an effort to subvert the reproduction of particular forms of cultural and structural violence within peace education new frameworks are required that make visible these violences. We posit the diffractive insights provided by reviewing the foundational and transrational peace scholars offer innovative ways for peace education to move beyond some of its current limitations. As Bozalek and Zembylas (2017) state, a diffractive rendering 'allows us to explore ways of mapping routes of "reading" through space and time and to create collaborative cartographies that are not merely 'representational' (130). Diffraction offers a process-orientated pedagogy and ontological introspection that turns 'reflexivity on reflexivity itself' moving beyond representationalism and first-order reflexivity (Kester and Cremin 2017, 8). There are two interconnected theoretical implications to be explored here: first, the necessity for the

integration of multiple ways of knowing, such as mind, body, heart, and spirit, in conjunction with multiple ways of being; and, second, transrational peace education must seek a balance between the analytical, affective, and new materialist approaches in theory and method to seriously engage with diverse onto-epistemologies.

First, employing a diffractive approach to peace work implies a comprehensive engagement with the study of conflict and peace from the perspectives of mind, body, heart, spirit, and materiality conjoined. Koppensteiner (2018), for example, discusses the value brought by exploring the different ways of knowing available to us, including: somatic knowing through the body (sensing); empathic and affective knowing through the heart (feeling); intellectual knowing through the mind (thinking); intuitive knowing through the soul (intuiting); and transpersonal knowing through the spirit (witnessing) (68). These renderings allow scholars and students to experience peace and conflict from multiple sites and draw parallels within and across relational layers of knowing, and ultimately being (Dietrich 2014).

Second, an interconnected aspect of these theoretical engagements is that a diffractive approach reveals analytical, affective and new materialist insights in harmony (see Reardon and Snauwaert 2014). Dietrich (2012), for example, discusses the importance for each of the five families of peace to be incorporated into peacebuilding education, as each contains insights as well as limitations. For instance, although there are limits to the modernist, rationalist and psychosocial traditions noted above, this does not mean a transrational approach should be devoid of rationality and psychological considerations. Instead, to reiterate, a transrational approach 'does not overcome [rationality], but crosses through it and adds the aesthetic component that is always inherent in interpersonal relations but that has not been observed that attentively by modernity' (Dietrich 2012, 266). Cremin (2016) echoes this argument calling for aesthetic peaces to complement postmodern rational approaches to peacebuilding in the classroom. Hence, Many Peaces are to be explored from myriad directions and through multiple layered forms of experience, contemplation and presence.

Thus, to balance the critical analytical aspects of peace, a diffractive reading of transrational perspectives also suggests the need to enhance affective practices, arts-based approaches, contemplative learning, material alignments, and nature-based applications in addition to empirical inquiry and philosophical arguments. Affect here seeks for the participants to be drawn out of the head and into the body, heart, soul, and material-natural world. These affective aspects then interconnect with Barad's (2007) materiality to illuminate the multitude of sites and bodily-nature intersections where learning takes place. These diffractive approaches utilize art, poetry, theatre, material experimentation (Davies 2016), and meditation, as well as analytical discussion and critique, and would include non-Western and Southern onto-epistemologies to be

explored alongside European and North American traditions. It is our contention that this diffractive approach allows for a multitude of ways of knowing, being, and learning beyond and between peace education and transrational perspectives to be brought into harmonious dialogue. This allows participants to question and move beyond the privileging of Western and Northern representational onto-epistemologies, thereby disrupting colonizing aspects of some current peace education practices.

Hence, for us, exploring alternative onto-epistemologies connects directly to Dietrich's Many Peaces, and through the lens of diffraction amplifies the resonance on how ontology intimately affects epistemology. This allows for knowledge and being systems from around the world to be interwoven, thus bringing threads of diversity and material complexity further into transrational peace education theory and praxis (Cremin 2016). While remaining cautious to neither appropriate, minimize, nor misrepresent the complexity inherent within diverse traditions, perspectives and structures from Southern, Indigenous, and spiritual onto-epistemologies would provide diffractions that push participants out of their self-confirming first-order reflections (Bozalek and Zembylas 2017; Kester and Cremin 2017). Alternative frameworks, such as Indigenous onto-epistemologies and posthumanistic approaches, including Gaia Hypothesis (Brantmeier 2013; Lovelock 1972), would too open new possibilities for the study and practice of peacebuilding education with old as well as new forms of knowing and being. For example, practical decoloniality from the approach of transrational perspectives on peace education seeks to diffract anthropocentric models of the human-nature relationship. It opens to the possibility of perspectives outside of the human (e.g., nature and ecosystems materiality).

These two theoretical implications are not exhaustive and intend to only highlight the possibilities for 'crossing through' the existing limitations of peace education. The implications connect to Lederach's (2005) paradoxical complexity and creativity where participants, exposed to multiple ways of knowing and being, become more able to hold complexity and new creative pathways that were not previously visible to them. In the following section, we offer some pedagogic strategies for practicing transrational peace education that emerge from these diffractive insights.

Some pedagogic possibilities

To practice transrational peace education from a diffractive standpoint, peace pedagogy must emphasize the grassroots and local capacities for peacebuilding that extend beyond cultural, national and international efforts, as well as the aesthetic, cognitive, material, and ethical dimensions of peace. Here, pedagogy aims to empower learners of all backgrounds across social sectors in elicitive ways (Lederach 1997) to 'do something' and engage in 'transarmament', a collective effort toward nonviolence through nonviolent civil society (Galtung 1983). In this,

the transrational peace educator seeks to bring together minds and bodies with the body-politic toward new social and material conditions grounded in justice. The transrational peace educator, then, is a facilitator, elicitor, nurturer, and socially engaged active citizen. The emphasis for peace pedagogy becomes less preoccupied with the curricula of peace interventions delivered (and/or administered) by facilitators, and instead places emphasis on how the facilitator *is* and holds the space *with* participants *toward* a better vision *and* action for a more socially just discursive and material world.

Hence, we suggest the facilitator be seen similarly to Paulo Freire's (1970) 'student teacher – teacher student' relationship, and Reardon's (1988) 'edulearner' concept, as each becomes holders of space, and directs new diffractive possibilities. The facilitator is seen in parallel (horizontally) to the other participants, as a co-resource and co-researcher, as each explores specific topics in collaborative and elicitive modes (Lederach 1997). This equaling between roles connects to Cremin's aspirations for Buber's I-Thou relationships and connects to Dietrich's ideas of resonance, correspondence, and homeostasis. As the transrational peace educator engages with the participants a 'contact boundary' (Dietrich 2012) is created where each participant affects the others illuminating new epistemic, ontological, and ethical insights through the interaction. This 'contact boundary' includes the material world in which these human relations are caught in mutual entanglement. Koppensteiner (2018) discusses the teacher, environment and researcher as mutual (re)sources assisting participants to explore issues through different ways of knowing and being as discussed above. This in turn affects the time, space, place, and person in intersecting ways, or what diffractive scholars describe as 'working the ruins' together (Lather 2018; St. Pierre and Pillow 2000). Bozalek and Zembylas (2017), for example, discuss the utility of using multidisciplinary reading groups and individual journal writings that 'enable us to see that it is not the (reflexive) self that has constitutive force, but self and others (social and material elements), entangled in multiple ways and across multiple spaces and times' (123).

A transrational peace pedagogy in practice, then, would imply the necessity of global and local inclusion of diverse voices and bodies. To achieve this, transrational peace educators must prevent against the dominant logics of Western-centricity, state-centrism, and methodological rationalism in the field becoming reified through the teacher-student, human-nature, and school-society relationships (Kester 2017, 2018c; Kurian and Kester 2018). A key focus for this type of affective interaction becomes about how the facilitator works to be sensitive to holding space, time, place, and person able to affect each other in subtle ways. The facilitator and participants must be prepared to do the work *in relation to*, and must see themselves as joint explorers, learners, and bodies as opposed to separate and detached entities. The emphasis of the educational moment then concerns how the facilitator

and participants nurture relationships in interactions and mirror key values of curiosity, vulnerability, and risk taking (see Cremin and Kester forthcoming; Lederach 2005). Facilitators and participants become 'scouts, scientists, and artists of conflict work' (Dietrich 2014, 55), providing opportunities for the mind, body, heart, material, and soul to be explored through a variety of direct experiences, and indirect dialogue, without 'taking the lead or imposing his or her own concepts on the conflicting parties' (ibid, 2014, 53). These experiences draw from alternative group practices, onto-epistemologies, individual reflection, contemplation, and silence, as we have detailed throughout this paper.

Finally, we will now briefly demonstrate how we incorporate into our own diverse teaching practices aspects from each of the four scholars introduced here. We bring together these disparate strands, borrow from them, and interweave them. Following Freire, we all start with our own experience and that of our students. Then, following Reardon, Kester uses student experiences to interrogate the intersections of gender, militarism, peace and materiality in the social microcosm of the classroom, where the teacher is simultaneously 'edu-learner'. This process involves systemic analysis and the envisioning of alternative possibilities (see Jenkins 2019, for more). Following Dietrich, Bryant uses active listening exercises in his classes. In addition to being a concrete skill for negotiation, coaching, or psychotherapy, active listening represents a transrational twist as it shifts the focus temporarily from the course content to the internal emotional experiences of the students and to the interpersonal dynamics of the group. Active listening exercises can serve the goals of applied skill-building, social cohesion amongst students, and provide a moment of reflection on the content learned. Archer employs contemplative, nature-based, autoethnographic, and arts-based practices from Cremin's aesthetic approach to diffract mind, body, heart, and spirit. The purpose of this in his work is to build new levels of awareness in the participants and explore Dietrich's ideas of resonance and correspondence. For example, Archer facilitates experiential activities such as secluded time in nature and autoethnographic reflection to support group exploration of ontological, epistemological, and ethical assumptions of self-discovery and social action. Hence, the transrational pedagogies connect directly to the key peace educators discussed throughout this paper with a focus on student-centered experience/inquiry (Freire and Reardon); breath, body, and voice practices (Dietrich); as well as arts-based practices and autoethnographic insights (Cremin).

In conclusion, Kester (2018b) writes: 'in turn, a more holistic approach that emphasizes relationality and teaching to students' bodies – through embodied learning, meditation, and experiential activities – that links the subject with her psyche and society could be a more socially aware approach' (12). The transrational peace educator is not separate from these experiences but is a key resource inevitably becoming 'a new element in the dysfunctional social system

and alters it with their mere presence' (Dietrich 2014, 55), as students and facilitators teach, learn, research, and co-create together. The classroom experience is thus a laboratory and theatre. It is a place of experimentation and of performance, both of which are co-created with students and our own personal agency toward new social and political action possibilities. Learning under such conditions is diffractive, aesthetic, transrational, performative, and co-productive.

Conclusion

In summary, this paper has examined the contributions of four key peace education thinkers: two foundational, two contemporary. Although the scholars span different periods, backgrounds, and theoretical pedagogical approaches, they have in common a mission to build peace, social justice, and intercultural understanding through education. By positing that this mission is not possible through cognitive and rational means alone, these scholars argue peace education requires a broader scope of the human experience than is often taken into account in conventional peace education. By extension, we operate from the transrational premise that in these times of increasing social complexity, continued faith in technological positivism, further automation of Industry 4.0, and the onto-epistemological uncertainty of posttruth politics, transrational peace education has much to offer. Furthermore, a diffractive examination of transrational perspectives presents new insights. Here, the approaches consider the material, discursive, embodied, and posthuman, while at the same time connecting students and scholars to their shared humanity. By employing a diffractive lens and following the insights put forth by transrational peace philosophy and elicitive conflict transformation, we conclude there is potential to mitigate some of the recurring limitations of conventional peace education approaches today. In the end, it is one of the greatest challenges for contemporary peace education that peace educators continue to repeat some of the same kinds of onto-epistemological exclusions and structural violences that they are striving to overcome. Engaging diffractively with the transrational philosophies of the four scholars contained herein may just offer the possibility for new approaches to peace education that transcend the orthodox limits of the field.

Note

1. https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/post-truth.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Kevin Kester is Tenure-Track Assistant Professor of International Education and Global Affairs cross-appointed to the College of Education, Graduate School of Education, and School of Global Affairs at Keimyung University in Daegu, South Korea. He researches and teaches the sociology and politics of education and global affairs with a focus on comparative and international education; education, conflict and peacebuilding; de/postcolonial and postmodern thought; and critical pedagogy. His latest publications are in *Irish Educational Studies; Teaching in Higher Education*; and *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. E-mail: kkester@kmu.ac.kr.

Tim Archer is a final year PhD candidate and Hughes Hall College scholar at the University of Cambridge. He is a researcher-practitioner in conflict transformation and peace education with interests focusing on philosophical and practical approaches to peace and education. Tim predominantly works with young men on notions of masculinities and peace, as well as facilitating training for potential frontline workers, such as teachers or peaceworkers, to work in and on conflict. Email: dta30@cam.ac.uk.

Shawn Bryant is an Assistant Professor at Endicott College of International Studies in Daejeon, South Korea, and maintains an affiliation as a member of the core faculty of the MA in Peace Studies at the University of Innsbruck, Austria. He holds a PhD in International Peace, Conflict and Development Studies from the Universitat Jaume I in Castellón, Spain. His research interests include transrational philosophy, body-based conflict transformation modalities, elicitive didactics, and transpersonal research methods. His latest publication, *Fighting With No One: Reflections on Education, Aikido, and Peace*, appears in the *Journal of Martial Arts Anthropology*. Email: shawn.bryant@endicott.ac.kr.

References

Alaimo, S. 2014. "Thinking as the Stuff of theWorld." *O-Zone: A Journal of Object-Oriented Studies* 1: 13–21.

Allport, G. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. London: Addison-Wesley.

Bajaj, M. 2015. "'Pedagogies of Resistance' and Critical Peace Education Praxis." *Journal of Peace Education* 12: 154–166. doi:10.1080/17400201.2014.991914.

Barad, K. 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bartlett, L. 2008. "Paulo Freire and Peace Education." In *Encyclopedia of Peace Education*, edited by M. Bajaj, 39–46. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Bauman, Z. 2000. *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bozalek, V., and M. Zembylas. 2017. "Diffraction or Reflection? Sketching the Contours of Two Methodologies in Educational Research." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 30: 111–127. doi:10.1080/09518398.2016.1201166.

Brantmeier, E. 2013. "Toward a Critical Peace Education for Sustainability." *Journal of Peace Education* 10: 242–258. doi:10.1080/17400201.2013.862920.

Brookfield, S. 2009. "The Concept of Critical Reflection: Promises and Contradictions." *European Journal of Social Work* 12: 293–304. doi:10.1080/13691450902945215.

Buber, M. [1937] 2004. *I and Thou*. New York: Continuum.

Connell, R.W. 2007. *Southern Theory: Social Science and the Global Dynamics of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cremin, H., and T. Archer. 2018. "Transrational Education: Exploring Possibilities for Learning about Peace, Harmony, Justice and Truth in the Twenty First Century." In *Transrational*

Resonances: Echoes to the Many Peaces, edited by J. Echavarría Alvarez, D. Ingruber, and N. Koppensteiner, 287–302. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cremin, H. 2018a. "What Comes After Post/Modern Peace Education?" *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 50: 1551–1552. doi:10.1080/00131857.2018.1461384.

Cremin, H. 2018b. "An Autoethnography of a Peace Educator: Deepening Reflections on Research, Practice and the Field." *Emotion, Space and Society* 28: 1–8.

Cremin, H., and K. Kester. forthcoming. "Bare-Foot Hope for Peace: Vulnerability in Peace Learning." In *Pedagogy of Vulnerability*, edited by M. McKenna and E. Brantmeier.Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Cremin, H., and A. Guilherme. 2016. "Violence in Schools: Perspectives (and Hope) from Galtung and Buber." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 48: 1123–1137. doi:10.1080/00131857.2015.1102038.

Cremin, H., J. Echavarría, and K. Kester. 2018. "Transrational Peacebuilding Education to Reduce Epistemic Violence." *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice* 30: 295–302. doi:10.1080/10402659.2018.1495808.

Cremin, H., and T. Bevington. 2017. *Positive Peace in Schools: Tackling Conflict and Building a Culture of Peace in the Classroom*. London: Routledge.

Cremin, H. 2016. "Peace Education Research in the Twenty-First Century: Three Concepts Facing Crisis or Opportunity?" *Journal of Peace Education* 13: 1–17. doi:10.1080/17400201.2015.1069736.

Davies, B. 2016. "Ethics and the New Materialism: A Brief Genealogy of the 'Post' Philosophies in the Social Sciences." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 39: 113–127.

de Freitas, E., and M. Curinga. 2015. "New Materialist Approaches to the Study of Language and Identity: Assembling the Posthuman Subject." *Curriculum Inquiry* 45: 249–265. doi:10.1080/03626784.2015.1031059.

de Sousa Santos, B. 2014. *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against Epistemicide*. London: Routledge.

Dietrich, W., and W. Sützl. 2006. "A Call for Many Peaces." In *Schlusseltexte Der Friedensforschung*, edited by W. Dietrich, J. Echavarria Álvarez, and N. Koppensteiner, 282–301. Vienna: LIT.

Dietrich, W. 2012. *Interpretations of Peace in History and Culture*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dietrich, W. 2013. *Elicitive Conflict Transformation and the Transrational Shift in Peace Politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dietrich, W. 2014. "A Brief Introduction into Transrational Peace Research and Elicitive Conflict Transformation." *Journal of Conflictology* 5: 48–57. doi:10.7238/joc.v5i2.1940.

Dietrich, W. 2018. *Elicitive Conflict Mapping*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fisher, R., and W. Ury. 1981. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement without Giving In*. New York: Penguin.

Fountain, S. 1999. *Peace Education in UNICEF*. New York: UNICEF.

Freire, P. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Continuum.

Galtung, J. 1975. *Peace: Research, Education, Action. Essays in Peace Research, Vol. 1*. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers.

Galtung, J. 1983. "Learning to Hate War, Love Peace, and Do Something about It." *International Review of Education* 29: 281–287. doi:10.1007/BF00597972.

Giddens, A. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gur-Ze'ev, I. 2001. "Philosophy of Peace Education in a Postmodern Era." *Educational Theory* 51: 315–336. doi:10.1111/edth.2001.51.issue-3.

Gur-Ze'ev, I. 2011. "Improvisation, Violence and Peace Education." In *Critical Issues in Peace and Education*, edited by P.P. Trifonas and B. Wright, 104–121. New York: Routledge.

Jenkins, T. 2019. "Reardon's Edu-Learner Praxis: Educating for Political Efficacy and Social Transformation." In *Exploring Betty A. Reardon's Perspective on Peace Education: Looking Back, Looking Forward*, edited by D. Snauwaert, 199–205. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

Johnson, D., and R. Johnson. 2005. "Essential Components of Peace Education." *Theory into Practice* 44: 280–292. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip4404_2.

Kester, K. 2017. "The Contribution (Or not) of UN Higher Education to Peacebuilding: An Ethnographic Account." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 15: 464–481. doi:10.1080/14767724.2017.1303364.

Kester, K. 2018a. "Postmodernism in Posttruth Times." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 50: 1330–1331. doi:10.1080/00131857.2018.1461417.

Kester, K. 2018b. "Coproducing Peace: Beyond Psychologized Approaches — Toward a Transrational Onto-Epistemology and Dialogic Learning Community as the Foundations of Peace Education." *In Factis Pax: Journal of Peace Education and Social Justice* 12: 1–24.

Kester, K. 2018c. "Reproducing Peace? A CRT Analysis of Whiteness in the Curriculum and Teaching at A University of the UN." *Teaching in Higher Education* 24: 212–230. doi:10.1080/13562517.2018.1476339.

Kester, K., and H. Aryoubi. 2019. "Paulo Freire, Citizenship and Education." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Citizenship and Education*, edited by A. Peterson, G. Stahl, and H. Soong, 1–17. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kester, K., T. Tsuruhara, and T. Archer. 2019. "Peacebuilding Education in Posttruth Times: Lessons from the Work of Betty A. Reardon." In *Exploring Betty A. Reardon's Perspective on Peace Education: Looking Back, Looking Forward*, edited by D. Snauwaert, 29–40. New York: Springer.

Kester, K., and A. Booth. 2010. "Education, Peace and Freire: A Dialogue." *Development* 53: 498–503. doi:10.1057/dev.2010.86.

Kester, K., and H. Cremin. 2017. "Peace Education and Peace Education Research: Toward a Concept of Poststructural Violence and Second-Order Reflexivity." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 49: 1415–1427. doi:10.1080/00131857.2017.1313715.

Kincheloe, J.L., P. McLaren, and S.R. Steinberg. 2011. "Critical Pedagogy, and Qualitative Research: Moving to the Bricolage." In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, 163–178. Vol. 4. London: Sage.

Kincheloe, J.L., and K.S. Berry. 2004. *Rigour and Complexity in Educational Research: Conceptualizing the Bricolage*. Maidenhead, New York: Open University Press.

Koppensteiner, N. 2018. "Transrational Methods of Peace Research: The Researcher as (Re) source." In *Transrational Resonances: Echoes to the Many Peaces*, edited by J. Echavarría Alvarez, D. Ingruber, and N. Koppensteiner, 59–81. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kurian, N. 2019. "Empathy: Simple and Inevitable? Development Education and Narratives of African Poverty." *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning* 11: 120–137. doi:10.18546/IJDEGL.11.1.08.

Kurian, N., and K. Kester. 2018. "Southern Voices in Peace Education: Interrogating Race, Marginalisation, and Cultural Violence in the Field." *Journal of Peace Education* 15: 1–28.

Lather, P. 2018. "What New Sensibility, Configuration, or 'Dominant' Logic Now for Educational Theory?" *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 50: 1602–1603. doi:10.1080/00131857.2018.1468651.

Lederach, J.P. 1997. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Lederach, J.P. 2005. *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Levy, G., C. Halse, and J. Wright. 2016. "Down the Methodological Rabbit Hole: Thinking Diffractively with Resistant Data." *Qualitative Research* 16: 183–197. doi:10.1177/1468794115571434.

Lovelock, J.E. 1972. "Gaia as Seen through the Atmosphere." *Atmospheric Environment* 6: 579–580. doi:10.1016/0004-6981(72)90076-5.

MacLure, M. 2013. "Researching without Representation: Language and Materiality in Post-qualitative Methodology." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 26: 658–667. doi:10.1080/09518398.2013.788755.

McCowan, T. 2006. "Approaching the Political in Citizenship Education: The Perspectives of Paulo Freire and Bernard Crick." *Educate: The Journal of Doctoral Research in Education* 6: 57–70.

Morgan, W.A., and A. Guilherme. 2013. *Buber and Education: Dialogue as Conflict Resolution*. London: Routledge.

Page, J. 2008. *Philosophical and Ethical Foundations of Peace Education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Peters, M. 2018. "The Information Wars, Fake News and the End of Globalization." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 50: 1161–1164. doi:10.1080/00131857.2017.1417200.

Reardon, B. 1988. *Comprehensive Peace Education: Educating for Global Responsibility*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Reardon, B., and D. Snauwaert. 2014. *Betty A. Reardon: A Pioneer in Education for Peace and Human Rights*. New York: Springer International.

Schugurensky, D. 2014. *Paulo Freire*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Schwab, K. 2017. *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. New York: Currency.

Shiva, V. 2005. *Earth Democracy*. London: Zed Books.

Shiva, V., K. Kester, and S. Jani. 2007. *The Young Ecologist Initiative Water Manual: Lesson Plans for Earth Democracy*. New Delhi: Navdanya.

St. Pierre, E.A., and W. Pillow, Eds. 2000. *Working the Ruins: Feminist Poststructural Theory and Methods in Education*. New York: Routledge.

Wei, Z., and M. Peters. 2018. "'Intelligent Capitalism' and the Disappearance of Labour: Whitherto Education?" *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 51: 757–766. doi:10.1080/00131857.2018.1519775.

Zavarzadeh, M. 2003. "The Pedagogy of Totality." *JAC* 23: 1–53.

Zembylas, M. 2017. "The Contribution of the Ontological Turn in Education: Some Methodological and Political Implications." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 49: 1401–1414. doi:10.1080/00131857.2017.1309636.

Zembylas, M., and Z. Bekerman. 2013. "Peace Education in The Present: Dismantling and Reconstructing Some Fundamental Theoretical Premises." *Journal of Peace Education* 10: 197–214.