

Voices of the Global South:
Peace, Development and Education.

By

Charlotte M. Arnold

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
The University of Manitoba
in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg

Copyright © 2011 by Charlotte Arnold

Abstract

We live in a complex and interconnected world. To understand that world, curricula have been developed that touch upon aspects of global education including; Peace Education, Human Rights Education, Development Education, Social Justice Education, and Education for Sustainable Development (Golstein & Selby, 2000). However, post-colonial theorists argue that notions of development, which underpin these educational initiatives, are often rooted in the industrialized West, and may not take into account any of its limitations or flaws. Increasingly, those involved in peace and development research are finding that when it comes to peace and development, we are missing a vital piece of the puzzle, the perspectives of individuals from the Global South. If peace and development curricula do not aim to include these voices, education initiatives may simply exacerbate the injustice they hope to end (Choules, 2007). Therefore, this will require “studying the issues from the standpoint of the South” (Cronkite, 2000, 162).

The purpose of this study is to create space for the voices of teachers of the Global South, so that efforts in peace and development education would be a part of transforming systems of oppression into systems of empowerment and justice. The researcher traveled to northern Uganda to invite teachers there to share their perspectives on the role of education in fostering peace and development. As teachers shared their views, definitions of peace and development were expanded to include aspects of inequality, social justice, care and love. Participants shared the topics they believe must be included, in peace and development education, as well as the role that teachers and schools can take in fostering a more peaceful and socially just world.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	5
1.1 Introduction	5
1.2 Background of the Study	6
1.3 Statement of Problem	14
1.4 Guiding Questions	15
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature	17
2.1 Post-Colonial Theory	17
2.2 The Post-Colonial World	22
2.3 Post-Colonialism and the Era of Development	24
2.4 Post-Colonial Theory and Education	31
2.5 Beyond Post-Colonial: Peace & Global education	38
Chapter 3: History of Peace & Development Education	41
3.1 History of Peace and Global Education	41
3.2 History of Peace and Global Education in Canada	49
Chapter 4: Methodology	58
4.1 Research Design	58
4.2 Data Analysis	60
4.3 Procedure	62
4.4 Research Instruments	65

Chapter 5: Presentation and Interpretations of Data	69
5.1 Educators in the Global North	70
5.2 Educators in the Global South: Definitions of Peace	76
5.3 Barriers to Peace & Development	88
5.4 Voices of the Global South	96
Chapter 6: Recommendations & Conclusions	109
6.1 Summary and Recommendations	109
6.2 Conclusions	118
Appendices	127
Appendix A: Letter of Consent	127
Appendix B: Research Instrument (Uganda)	129
Appendix C: Research Instrument (Canada)	130

Chapter 1: Introduction

The only way to be human is for you to reflect my humanity back at me, we can never become truly human without one another.

Chris Abani, 2008

Have you ever been misunderstood? If you are like me, when we are judged or misunderstood we can feel trapped by a label placed upon us. The reality however, is that who we are arises out of a complex series of circumstances and cannot be completely known and defined by a single moment in time. Misunderstandings are based upon a combination of the thoughts and perceptions of both people involved. When misunderstood, we want nothing more than for the person who is before us to pause and invite our true nature to emerge. If we have the courage to set aside judgments and allow ourselves to truly listen and see one another, the misunderstanding could be transformed, labels would disappear, and a new depth of understanding and connection shared. We would begin to recognize one another as complex, as individuals who process strengths, weaknesses, vulnerability and pain, as beautifully human. We all rely on our own ideas and perceptions to help us make sense of the world around us. Yet these perceptions are defined and transformed by past and present experiences, so much so that our ability to clearly see and understand one another may be clouded unless we are willing to lay aside our pre-defined perceptions.

The lesson of misunderstanding lies in how we often believe we are able to know another human being based upon very little information. We assume to understand motivations, character, the moment, the day, and how willing we are to define and label. However, we also know how quickly ideas can change. We are willing to transform

perceptions as we hear the other out, and discover they are not person we first believed them to be. Within peace and development education, this lesson invites us to consider that what we see, feel, experience, perceive and believe about the world is based on experiences and perspectives which might be influenced by misunderstanding. It makes me wonder, how much of what I see, feel, know, and claim about the world may be clouded by my own perspective.

Background of Study

I consider myself a global/peace educator, who teaches about development, peace, war, world issues and the human condition. Yet, I am a young woman who has enjoyed many privileges that many women around the world can only dream of. I have not struggled in war, I have always been able to study, I have had access to work, education and opportunity. I am a citizen of the industrialized world, also known as the developed world or the Global North. As an individual who has been able to enjoy many privileges, I often wonder if what I am teaching, and how I am teaching about the world is clouded by this perspective. I have come to believe that it most likely is, and while I hope my awareness of this effect has cleared some of the fog, I desire to find additional ways to see the world more accurately. As an educator my passion and dedication to peace and global education is sincere. Like many educators, we dedicate ourselves to teaching peace and development because we believe in the role education plays to guide us toward a path that leads to a more socially just world. In this we can take comfort. Yet, perhaps it is time to ensure that in our passion we do not let our position of privilege dominate our views. We do not want to assume to be the experts, speaking on behalf of those in the

developing world or the Global South. We do not want to be their voice. We do not want to assume to understand their diverse range of perspectives and knowledge. Rather we must find ways to create an open space for dialogue with individuals from the Global South in order to create a united voice. It is time to pause, to listen, and to learn from those in the Global South to make sure we have not misunderstood their reality. It is their voice that may assist us to understand all the complexities, strengths and weakness of the regions we teach about within peace and development education. I want to hear their story, their views of the present complex world so that I do not have to be the one naming their reality. What would happen if we would take the time and have a conversation with individuals from the Global South about their situations rather than continually defining their strengths and weaknesses for them? Who would we see, and most importantly, what might we learn? How would our expectations, solutions and labels be transformed and how would we all gain from a richer view of this diverse humanity?

An Unequal World

Peace and development educators are attempting to explain complex issues facing the world. Our world is a deeply divided and unequal place. For some, it offers a life where we can enjoy many privileges, safety, security and opportunities. For others, life is defined by struggle, insecurity and lack of the basic requirements, such as water, education, and health care required to live a life in security. As the world emerged from the Second World War, knowledge of this global dichotomy became more widespread. With global awareness came an idea of development to work towards achieving greater quality of life for all. As Aristride (2000), former Haitian president notes, in the 1960's

20% of the world's population were living off 70% of the world's wealth. Since that time, the developed world, led by the United States, embarked upon an era of development. For the latter half of the 20th century, governments and agencies such as the World Bank and The International Monetary Fund; dedicated themselves to the work of development. Yet today inequality persists. The gap between rich and poor has in fact widened despite the efforts of development. By the new millennium, the wealthiest 20% of the global population had increased. They now possessed closer to 90% of the wealth. Today, this trend has continued, and those at the bottom are beginning to rise up. From the Arab Spring, to the Occupy Wall Street movement, people are beginning to realize that for the past half century the promise of development and globalization has created a very unequal world. This is of concern for those of us dedicated to peace, development and education. The unequal distribution of wealth raises the question about quality of life for those who are left out of the share of wealth.

While globalization led by various economic structures has managed to generate more wealth than any other time in history, people continue to die of hunger, lack of sanitation and of preventable disease. The UN Food and Agricultural Organization estimate that every day approximately 35,000 children die of hunger, and one-sixth of the world's population go to bed hungry, lacking sufficient calories to live a healthy life. According to the UN organization, these nations would need US\$ 30 billion annually to ensure food security and revive long-neglected agricultural systems. (The UN Food and Agriculture Organization, 2011). Yet funds continue to be dedicated to the causes of war. In Iraq and Afghanistan alone, the United States has spent over 1.2 trillion dollars

waging war, while famine, war, poverty, disease continue to plague much of the world (LaFranchi, 2011).

By the end of the 1990's, it appeared that the recent era of development had been unsuccessful in decreasing the gap in quality of life for many of those in developing nations. In order to reassess the situation and begin the millennium with a renewed focus on the world's poor, the United Nations drafted a list of development goals. The hope was, that with clear, measurable goals, countries and institutions would be united; able to focus efforts and achieve the dreams of development. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), were published by the United Nations in the year 2000. The MDGs consist of eight goals, identifying measurable outcomes that would greatly transform the lives of people on the planet. They identify major inequities that exist in our world and provide the indicators that we may use to outline effective development actions. The deadline was set for 2015. The goals are based on time-bound and measurable targets accompanied by indicators for monitoring progress, and bring together the responsibilities of developing countries with those of developed countries (United Nations, 2011). They were ratified by 189 nations, and signed by 147 heads of state and governments during the UN Millennium Summit in September 2000. This united ratification of the goals, represents the desires of governments and people to achieve social justice and build a world where all feel safe, secure and able to live a life with dignity. They are a statement of the injustice to human life that collectively we are no longer willing to tolerate.

They are as follows.

Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger:

Target 1a: Reduce by half the proportion of people living on less than a dollar a day.

Target 1b: Achieve full and protective employment of people living on less than a dollar a day.

Target 1c: Reduce by half the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.

Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education

Target 2a: Ensure that all boys and girls complete a full course of primary schooling.

Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women

Target 3a: Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005, and at all levels by 2015.

Goal 4: Reduce child mortality

Target 4a: Reduce by two thirds the mortality rate among children under five.

Goal 5: Improve maternal health

Target 5a: Reduce by three quarters the maternal mortality ratio.

Target 5b: Achieve, by 2015, universal access to reproductive health.

Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases

Target 6a: Halt and begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS.

Target 6b: Achieve, by 2010, universal access to treatment for HIV/AIDS for all those who need it.

Target 6c: Halt and begin to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases.

Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability

Target 7a: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programs; reverse loss of environmental resources.

Target 7b: Reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the

rate of loss.

Target 7c: Reduce by half the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation.

Target 7d: Achieve significant improvement in lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers, by 2020.

Goal 8: Develop a Global Partnership for Development

Target 8a: Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system.

Target 8b: Address the special needs of the least developed countries.

Target 8c: Address the special needs of landlocked developing countries and small island developing States (through the Program of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States and the outcome of the twenty-second special session of the General Assembly).

Target 8d: Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term.

Together the MDGs synthesize many of the most important commitments made separately at international conferences and summits of the 1990's. The MDGs reflected the pressing need to reverse the widening gap between the Global North and Global South. The goals force us to acknowledge that after a half decade of development, injustice, poverty, gender inequity; health and sustainability remained ongoing issues that have yet to be remedied.

Today, after more than a decade since the goals were set, the hope of meeting the

2015 targets appears to be fading. We must ask why? How can this be after nearly every country on the planet ratified the goals? In my opinion, while the goals clearly identify the issues, they fail to identify the causes of these systemic challenges. The persistent inequality that we are trying to address is clearly not understood. By simply facing the current issues without understanding the context of inequality, we are left without a new and clear path that would lead us towards a more just future.

For example, some of the policies that have contributed to these conditions remain unidentified by the goals, such as the unfair global trade advocated by many of the UN's strongest members. Unfair trade, has led to a greater sense of loss for much of the developing world. During the era of development following World War II, Haitians were being forced to open markets to subsidized American agribusinesses. The local market, which had previously supplied virtually all domestic needs, by the time the goals were set, had been reduced to only 50%. The impact of under-priced foreign imports was unfair trade practices which worsened poverty in Haiti. The cheap American imports, undercut local farmers, who could not compete with the scale of US agribusiness and many lost their livelihoods (Chomsky, 1999). The rules favored the rich. More Recently as Vandana Shiva (2005), a noted Indian activist and ecologist has observed, the practice of unfair trade policies continues to work against the poor. In India, 30 000 farmers have committed suicide, as they have witnessed their farms slipping from their grasp due the effects of unbalanced trade which favors foreign corporations over the small farmer.

As competition drives economists to place profits above all else, we fail to understand at what costs. The truth is that this system is based on an illusion of progress and on the exploitation of world's most vulnerable. From India, China, to Central

America, the conditions of the poor are exploited, and the poor have become a source of cheap labor. For example, in Honduras, workers earn less than four dollars per day to manufacture goods for the North (Parenti, 1995). As the award winning investigative report titled; *Slavery a Global Investigation* (2001) discovered, the poor continue to be exploited and controlled for the benefit of the rich. Young men who have never tasted chocolate are kidnapped, beaten and forced to work as slaves on cocoa farms on the Ivory Coast. Children are targeted, and even kidnapped, to work in the carpet factories in India. Most of us would agree that an economic system based upon exploitation and slavery is not acceptable and is not going to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, no matter how much money the system is able to generate. Most people would agree that such a system is not what we would ever want to participate in, yet with an economy founded upon economic growth and consumption, we are.

We must ask ourselves why this is happening? How can we on one hand outline targets for development and on the other hand continue with policies that exacerbate the injustice and poverty? How have we gotten it so wrong? Hawken (1993), and others are attempting to awaken critical self-reflection and challenge the North's claims and assumptions of development. Hawken believes that the way we have gone about development in the Global North is "destroying the capacity of the Earth to support life and counting it as progress" (p.33). It appears that how we understand development based upon economic progress alone, is missing a vital perspective. This perspective is the voice of those from the developing world. It is their knowledge and voice that are the piece required to complete the picture of how to understand and approach development. The voice of those in the developing world must no longer be ignored.

Statement of Problem

As these conditions demonstrate, the need for global education has never been more pressing. Global and peace educators aim to build the connections between politics, economics, development and peace, in order to create a context where young people might become more willing and able to bring about social justice. Global Education in the 20th century has a rich history. In the Global North, educators strive to generate curricula which touch upon some aspect of the current global challenges that are facing the planet. These include Peace Education, Human Rights Education, Development Education, Humane Education, Social Justice Education, Environmental Education and more recently Education for Sustainable Development. Peace and development educators recognize within all these different streams, threads may be drawn, that come together to weave a common tapestry (Golstein & Selby, 2000).

This study intends to examine the perspectives regarding development and peace, and how history has defined our vision of progress, therefore potentially blurring the lens through which the Global North understands current Peace and Development education. Notions of development which underpin these educational initiatives are rooted in the industrialized West or Global North, and may not be equipped to take into account any limitations or flaws of their own assumptions (Choules, 2007). As a global educator in the North this is of grave concern. If we are engaging in development, global or peace education, we must consider; what our role has been in exploring, exposing, or maintaining these assumptions and realities when what we have called “development in the Northern Hemisphere is the major source of underdevelopment in the South” (Choules, 2007, p.474). What a shock that would be, and what a challenging task to

humbly admit; we may require some assistance in examining this truth. In my opinion this assistance will come from the very people we aim to ‘help’ through our efforts in development. By listening to their voice we will be equipped to clearly see a new way.

Guiding Questions

By pausing and taking a moment to listen, perhaps we can engage in a deeper understanding of the current issues and potential solutions. This research will focus on questions that will invite educators from the Global South to share their perspectives, knowledge and expertise regarding development, peace and education, in order to challenge and enrich current perceptions and approaches. The research questions being addressed are:

1. What are the views held by teachers from the Global South with respect to peace and global education as taught in the Global North?
2. Can teachers from the Global South provide insight into how we as teachers in the Global North conduct peace and global education?
3. How do the views with respect to peace and global education, of teachers of the Global South compare with the views of teachers from the Global North who are engaged in peace and global education?

Additionally, since many of the teachers from the Global South may likely have experienced conflict I also may address the question;

4. In what ways does local conflict influence Global South teachers’ perspectives of peace and development education in their own country?

In order to address these questions and to understand how perspectives of development have come to be dominated by the Global North, we must understand the history that has led us to where we are today. Post-colonial theory provides the necessary context for contemporary marginalization of the Global South. An examination of this theory is essential in ensuring that the study is a part of overcoming the barriers that thus far have stalled peace and development education.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Post Colonial Theory

If you were to take a minute, and allow the words famine, conflict, war, pirate, refugee, to conjure an image, what do you think you would see? A desert landscape. a crying child perhaps? Images, in our digitized age, are not in short supply. The recent famine in Somalia, as well as widespread poverty and unrest in much of the developing world provide a flood of images. What is hidden however is the context for these images. In an interview with the Globe and Mail, K'naan; a famed Somali refugee, poet, and musician, stated that Somalia and the Global South have been;

A people without context, when you saw the old famine, you saw just a famine and people dying, Africans with their African problems, when you saw Black Hawk Down, you saw black dots on the screen being shot by Americans, and just an unreasonable bunch of bands with guns, there was no context. When you saw footage of pirates in the ocean, disturbing people's livelihoods you saw no context, we are a people first and foremost suffering from context. (K'naan, 2011)

K'naan is not alone in his view. Post-colonial theorists echo his sentiment. They propose that a lack of understanding of the colonial context as well as the continual misrepresentation and marginalization of the Global South by the Global North has had devastating and powerful effects on the modern world. Furthermore, they argue that if we continue to ignore the context, the issues of underdevelopment, conflict, inequality and injustice, topics of vital importance for peace educators, will persist. We must foster

a clear understanding of colonial theory and history, to recognize its impact within the world of development and education. We must also secure this understanding as a foundation to imagine how education might be transformed through an appreciation of post-colonial theory in order for our education systems to rise to the challenge and fulfill their role in creating an accurate context thereby bringing about a more socially just world.

Postcolonial theory is based upon the writing of Edward Said, Gyatri Spivak and Homi Bhabha. These writers invite us to consider that the cause for the persisting inequality and injustice, despite our best efforts, is precisely because we have not yet managed to emancipate ourselves from these roles born out of the colonial experience. In order to construct a more accurate context, postcolonial theory proposes that the current divisions of developed and developing, and the various challenges faced by these regions, as well as our approaches to effect positive change, are all shaped by the history and context of the era of European colonialism, which saw the majority of the world under European control. Therefore, postcolonial theorists believe we must view the world through a lens that places at centre stage the continuing implications of Europe's expansion into Africa, Asia, Australia, and Americas from the fifteenth century onwards, not only as a means of understanding the subsequent histories of these parts of the world but as a "defining moment in modernity" (Crossley, & Tikly, 2004, p. 147)

This defining moment in history affects contemporary issues of poverty, conflict, famine, inequality and injustice, and has mirrored the relationship of colonized and colonizer, in the modern day roles between developed and developing. Edward Said and Homi Bhabha categorize this relationship and explain these roles. The colonizer, Europe

and the West, distinguished themselves as civilized and distance themselves from the uncivilized, backwards and colonized 'Other' (Bhabha in Kapoor, 2003). This 'Other' then became, voiceless, faceless, without history, wisdom, essentially without *context*. This objectification of the 'Other' underpins post-colonial philosophy. With the creation of the 'Other', a line was drawn that separated the colonized from the colonizer, the oppressed from the oppressor, and today the developed from the developing (Said, 1985).

Said's work, which was based on the West's construction of the idea and concept of the Orient, assists in considering what further constructions we have made, of the 'Other', in order to view them in a way that allows the West to mask their domination. He believes our role as educators is to continue to pull back the illusion which masks unseen power. The illusion during the colonial era was the idea that Europe's activities were justified because they were in the business of modernizing, civilizing and rescuing much of the world from darkness. Said believes this attitude did not end with the end of the colonial period. Today, the actions of the nations in the Global North, which maintained the pattern of exploitation and extraction from the Global South are justified because they are in the business of development. (Said, 1985)

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, was born in Calcutta India in 1942. Her work in post-colonial theory has been shaped through the events of Indian non-violent resistance to British rule, Gandhi, and decolonization. Spivak, like Said, recognizes the distance created between colonizer and colonized, however she applies the term *subaltern* to describe those silenced and marginalized through the process of colonization. The subaltern according to Spivak are removed from all lines of social mobility, and are therefore not permitted to form any basis of action or influence over their destinies'.

Their role is to remain at the bottom of the social ladder. As such, they are not given the necessary tools to extract themselves from that position. Denying individuals access to proper education, health, security and opportunity would be methods to ensure individuals remain voiceless, oppressed and not pose a threat to existing power structures (Spivak, 2005). Therefore if contemporary development fails to provide these tools we must call into question the true aim of development.

For Spivak, the key question became, can the subaltern speak, can they find their voice? In other words, can we expect Said's 'Other', which Spivak terms the 'subaltern', to speak? While reading Marx, Spivak read a line that provided her with an answer. The best English translation states "They are therefore incapable of asserting their class interest in their own name" (Ibid, p. 477). Spivak recognized that the colonizer's domination was so effective that those who were victims may not even recognize their own marginalization. Her alternative to subaltern, is agency. Agency is action and awareness of one's being made into an oppressed class, within this awareness lies the seeds of resistance and transformation. Spivak believes that in spite of the apparent domination of the developed world over developing world, people still resist and hold the answers for the transformation of oppressive structures. Agency is action, agency is voice. For Spivak, the subaltern can speak and those with the power should listen.

Drawing on Spivak's work of subaltern and Said's establishment of the 'Other' Bhabhab believes that the effect of the colonizer distinguishing himself from the colonized 'Other' has ongoing impacts on the relationship between the Global North and South (Kapoor, 2003). Bhabha sees opportunity for pockets of resistance in the fact that the Other was often ill-defined and endowed with a hybridity of labels given by the

colonizer. The colonized is both “savage and noble, it is the embodiment of rampant sexuality and yet innocent as a child, he is mystical, primitive, simple-minded and yet the most worldly and accomplished liar” (Kapoor, 2003, p.563). Homi Bhabah believes that agency is the capacity to expose these transparent assumptions and inadequate labels of cultural superiority in order to expose their limits. For Bhabha, this space of poorly constructed roles provides the place for agency and resistance. There is a belief that the subaltern, the oppressed, are able to emancipate themselves from these labels.

For post-colonial theorists then, both the oppressed and oppressor play a role. In his work *Orientalism Revisited* (1985), Edward Said outlines the key questions one must consider in a post-colonial world; how have other cultures, societies been represented? What is the relationship between power and knowledge? What is role of the intellectual and people with power? (Said, 1985). The work of post-colonial theorists compels us to examine the impact of colonialism on people, power, and action upon ongoing global economic development. For educators in the field of peace and development education, we must consider Said’s questions as we endeavor to teach about a world we may understand very little about.

While there is a tendency to view colonialism as an event in the past that ended with decolonization, post-colonialists maintain that we require a continuing “commitment to the dismantling of systems of domination, which are collectively maintained and therefore must be collectively fought” (Said, 1985, p. 107). Postcolonial theory emphasizes that we require common dedication to reconsider the colonial encounter, to hold firm the *continuing* impact. Furthermore this collective dismantling should be informed and shaped from the perspective of formerly colonized countries, regions, and

peoples. This change in paradigm is crucial, due to the fact that post-colonial theory examines how colonialism, although officially ended, is now mirrored within a context of contemporary development (Crossley & Tikly, 2004).

Said believes that that role of the intellectual and educators is to make known the invisible quiet of this unseen power (1985). As a post-colonial theorist, Said believes the unseen power still affecting concepts of development is the legacy of colonialism, unequal relationships of power, and the concept of who is right and who is wrong. As this legacy has remained hidden, its presence can be discovered in the work of development and education. Post-Colonial theory emerged following the decades after the Second World War, where the world was attempting to remake itself into a more socially just place, as the horrors of the colonial era and the holocaust would all be left behind. However while the intent was perhaps sincere, the legacy of the West's domination, when swept under the rug would unfortunately continue to cast a shadow on the road ahead.

The Post-Colonial World

The world after World War II was transforming rapidly. Europe, the former world power was crumbling after the war. Colonialism was ending, and the atrocities of WWII raised the level of awareness of the need to protect human rights. By 1949, the world had enshrined a global Declaration of Human Rights. Throughout the decades that followed, people all around the world fought for their rights, for independence and to end the discrimination. Former colonies gained their independence. In the United States during the 1960's and 70's, the civil rights movement, women's liberation and anti-war

movements reflected this assertion of people power. By the late 1980's and early 1990's it appeared that justice and liberty would triumph after a century marked by wars, holocausts and authoritarianism. The dismantling of the Berlin Wall, a symbol which had stood as a monument to oppression and violence, was taken down literally overnight by the people. In South Africa, Nelson Mandela was released from prison and the racist policy of apartheid at last came to an end. As these events unfolded in the age of growing media, we were all witnesses to these marches towards justice. We felt and participated in the joy and dignity that came with ordinary people removing the systems that for so long had controlled and oppressed them. Systems, which appeared so powerful and unalterable, crumbled. Globally there was a sense that we were moving forward and anticipating a new era of peace, the focus could shift from investments for war toward investments that would increase global justice (Swee-Hin & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000). In some ways this was slowly emerging. By the new millennium along with the MDGs mandated by the United Nations, the year 2000 was also declared, the International Year for a Culture of Peace. This declaration reflected global aspirations for a new millennium characterized by social justice and peace. The year 2000 followed a decade where globally the world seemed to be drawing closer to non-violence, peace and global co-operation (Ibid, 2000). These actions were all causes for hope that the 21st century might be more peaceful than the last.

It is clear that in the latter half of the 20th century, steps were taken to solidify human rights and peace as desirable goals to work toward. Yet despite these tremendous accomplishments, the impact of colonialism remained. Although the history of colonialism was never addressed or dealt with, there was a hope that we could simply

leave that nasty part of the West's history behind and move on. However, even to this day we can find vestiges of eurocentrism and ethnocentrism in the relationships being established between newly emerging countries, the former colonial powers and the United States, as well as in the economic policies promoted as development that are advocated by these powerful countries. These have a powerful, if hidden impact on the efforts to bring about a more equitable world sought by many in the field of development. Just as colonialism favored European masters, development modeled by the West and prescribed by western institutions of the IMF and the World Bank would continue to serve the interests of the United States, and developed countries.

Post Colonialism And an Era of Development

Czarnechi (2002) states that the relationship established during the era of colonial rule was one sided where "white, Western culture and values have been imposed on people of color, most viciously in the colonization of Africa, India, and Native America" (p.109). Today, in an era of development, Weber (2007) argues that there continues to be hegemony of North over South. In the North we tend to "exclude, ignore or even trivialize the contributions, writings and texts from the South" (p. 300).

The end of World War II marked the end of European colonial empires. All throughout Africa, Asia, India, the colonies received their independence and were free to develop. Countries which were once viewed as colonies, were now labeled as part of the developing world, and the former colonial powers of the West were labeled as developed. Since that time the West did what it claimed was best for the developing countries. Through the economic institutions and policies, the developed nations of the North

initiated economic programs and aid money with the official intent to address the issues of poverty, malnutrition, and disease which the newly independent developing world seemed unable to remedy without the developed world's help. Unfortunately, the change in label from colony to developing country, from colonizer to patron, did not change the context; the continued exploitation and domination by one group over the other. While the world embarked on a new era of development the West's ingrained image of the 'Other' would continue to shape views of development (Czarnechi, 2002).

Visions of what it means to be developed, can be traced back to a time just after World War II. This moment in global history defined and shaped many of the foundations that have resulted in the world as it is today. The United States emerged from the war as the new global force. The war had not been fought on American soil, and production, manufacturing during wartime had increased. The war also transformed Europe's relationship with her colonies. Europe could no longer maintain the colonies as she was economically weakened. Furthermore, as the horror of the Nazi Concentration camps was revealed, it became difficult to justify colonial endeavors. Increasingly independence movements within the colonies made these endeavors unmanageable and economically risky. Therefore, we see in the decades after the war, former colonies, from the Middle East, to Africa and Asia, gaining their independence (Findley & Rotheney, 2006). It is no small coincidence that many of these regions in the world are currently labeled as developing. It was during the colonial effort and the subsequent granting of independence where contemporary divisions of North and South would be maintained and notions of what it means to be developed would be born, and the continuation of ideological superiority of North over South would be solidified (Conkhrite, 2000).

Evidence of the maintenance of ideological superiority of West over the rest can be found just after the war. In his 1949 inaugural presidential speech, Harry Truman, recognized the great changes sweeping across the globe, as well as the potential role the United States would take in the directing global economic development. His words echo the beliefs and justifications of previous European dominion during colonization. He said:

Today marks the beginning of a period that will be eventful, perhaps decisive, for us and for the world. It may be our lot to experience, and in a large measure to bring about, a major turning point in the long history of the human race...In this time of doubt, they look to the United States as never before for good will, strength, and wise leadership...we must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas. More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas. For the first time in history, humanity possesses the knowledge and the skill to relieve the suffering of these people. The United States is pre-eminent among the nations in the development of industrial and scientific techniques...I believe that we should make available the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life. And in cooperation with other nations, we should foster capital investment in areas needing development. (Truman, 1949)

From his vantage point, Truman labeled most of the world as underdeveloped. With this one word he reduced the immeasurable diversity of the Global South into a single category. He announced what he understood as the new era that the world was embarking upon defined by American perspectives rooted in Western thought. The echoes of colonialism are strong in Truman's word. Whereas Europe aimed to civilize and modernize savage people, the West and particularly the United States will lead, benefit and help the suffering people of the developing world to realize their aspirations. In Edward Said's view, the distance between colonizer and colonized was maintained. Only in the post-colonial era, the 'Other' now would be the developing world.

Truman notes the suffering of the developing world. However, his description of suffering is suffering from lack of context. Missing from Truman's words is any acknowledgment of the colonial experience, which had contributed to these conditions. Perhaps he himself did not know this history. Perhaps he was unaware of the fact that under Belgium rule, half the population of The Congo had perished from their violent and repressive rule. Truman failed to recognize the impact of the colonialism on the societies that he now described. Colonialism had quickly transformed sustenance economies based upon exports, as a source of raw materials and cash crops. This transformation devastated local peoples capacity to grow food for themselves (Bigelow & Paterson, 2002). These economic policies contributed to the suffering Truman was describing in his inaugural speech. However, this historical context was erased as Truman instructed American citizens regarding how they were embarking on a "major turning point in the long history of the human race", where it would be America's moment to lead the way. In the words of Truman, "the initiative is ours". He considered the developed world as

trapped, diseased, primitive, and without insight regarding the way forward. For Truman, the blueprint of development reflected western views of industrialization and economic growth. We in the North were developed, and the rest of the world was developing. Their destination was to become like us.

Development, therefore, became modeled after the West. Nations of the North would set about developing the nations of the South. The “history and culture of the South, did not come into the question” (Conkritt, 2000, p.140). Their specific and unique historical contexts would not be included in plans for development, and successful development would become equated with increases in measurable wealth, not measured by human conditions. This narrow definition, made without any consideration of insights by those living in these areas and based on economic measure only, would have a devastating effect. By focusing on economic growth alone as a measure of development, major issues of hunger, education, self-sufficiency and sustainability, which are not measured in dollars, would end up getting ignored.

Therefore, development for the past 70 years, has largely been focused on financial investment by institutions and governments of the Global North. These investments were geared towards large infrastructure projects, and the expansion of cash crops for exports. The belief was if we increase the bottom line, development would follow. In economic terms this is called the “Trickle Down Effect”, and the theory is based on the belief that money invested at the top will trickle down to the bottom. However, the money was often entrusted to governments of the Global South who were new to managing economies, and whose style of governing was modeled after the violent legacies of the previous colonial masters. Many of these governments were headed by

violent dictators and, as money flowed in during the course of the Cold War, donors favored any government which would align themselves with their respective economic policies. The result has been crippling debt for much of the developing world, economic dependency on the Global North, and civil wars as cash was misused to finance political gain. Services such as education, health and proper sanitation were overlooked. What has occurred through these years was development as corporate imperialism which favored countries of the North. This Western economic model would not be criticized and as Shiva (2005) writes has become the defacto “legal constitution of the world” (p.31).

Progress and development were measured according to the West’s understanding. Once again taking the stance that none within the developing world had any insights or suggestions to offer, knowledge of those living in the South remained insignificant; below that of the West. As a result, the measure of successful development became the bottom line, and development became characterized by “continuing hegemony of Western forms of knowledge, power and the spread of Western consumer culture” (Crossley, & Tikly, 2004, p.150). This version of economic development, accompanied by economic regulations prescribed by the Global North has led to the greater polarization between the developed and developing countries, first through the Bretton Woods System, now through relations of trade (Tikly, 2001, p.153). Western development practices and economic antidotes prescribed for inequality by western dominated institutions of the IMF and WB have the feel of a colonial ruler. Like colonialism’s claim to civilize & industrialize, Western development “claims universal rights while everyday violence and injustice are required to uphold their dominance” (Bhabha, 2005, p. 17). The result is that we continue to live in a world of economic

duality which echoes of colonialism. According to Bhabha, rather than supporting European empires, contemporary imperialism labeled as development, support affluence in the West where development sustains the “silicon valleys and mask persistent poverty, malnutrition and racial injustice” (2005, p. 17).

I believe it is becoming clear to see that development is falling short. To be the transformative force humanity requires issues of inequality to be addressed and that our world becomes a more socially just home for all, where one’s privilege does not rest on another’s exploitation, we must do more. Development, while it has been useful in temporarily helping pocket of individuals it will continue to be unable to transform the structural root of the problem, development is missing a crucial context. The issues contributing to ongoing global inequality have been misunderstood and therefore the approaches continue to fall short of their aims. Our understanding of what it means to be developed, prosperous and to build a good quality of life must be expanded, and education must play a vital role.

Western evolution of the concept of development based upon the foundation of colonial legacy also impacts education. Development and peace education programs initiated by the West will likely promote Western concepts of superiority if they fail to name this post-colonial reality; and include in their efforts an attempt to correct the imbalance of power. By acknowledging this marginalization, individuals may feel empowered to lend their views. Only then might we begin to correct the imbalance. We must begin to open space for dialogue, to allow various means for diverse perspectives, and to invite the voices of the marginalized Global South.

Post-Colonial Theory & Education

Due to the legacy of colonialism, the era of development is at risk of not being able to bridge the gap between the haves and have-nots. Development that does not acknowledge the colonial legacy may not transform the unequal power relations which in turn led to much of the underdevelopment of the Global South. Yet, individuals, educators and activists recognize these shortfalls, and we are dismayed at the widening gap between North and South. This dismay had led to the emergence of peace and global education programs, curricula and journals alongside this era of development. International Institutions such as the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, as well as many NGO's draft curricula for teachers to incorporate in their lessons so as to address social justice.

The United Nation's cyber school bus program touch upon many social justice issues. These include peace education, poverty, gender equity, world hunger and human rights (United Nations, 2011). The International Journal of Peace Studies, published biannually since 1996, aims to promote "discussion about various issues in peace research, including but not limited to, security systems, justice and basic human needs, survival for indigenous people, discourse on peace and war, human security, nonviolent social change, peace and environmental movements, sustainable development, global environmental policies, human rights, self-determination, economic equity, conflict resolution, disarmament, and peace education" (United, 2011).

Peace and development educators outline the aims of the current curricula. These include encouraging international cooperation, emphasis on active global citizenship,

critical thinking strategies to uncover racism, patriarchy, the development of an ethic of caring for others, the environment, social justice, non-violence and conflict resolution (Reardon, 1996; Toh & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000; Harris & Morrison, 2003). These are admirable goals, which many educators actively pursue within their classrooms.

However, the reach of colonialism has had an impact on education as well. Post-colonial educators note that “colonization continues to cast a long shadow over education systems today” (Crossly & Tikly, 2004, p.151). For example, the IMF has a curriculum titled; *Thinking Globally: Effective Lessons for Teaching about the Interdependent World Economy*. The curriculum was developed by the IMF in partnership with the United States National Council on Economic Education. It is designed for secondary school educators to instruct students about the effects of globalization and the importance of understanding the dynamics of the global economy. Within the curriculum, one lesson asks the question; *Why Are Some Nations Wealthy?* This is a valid question in today’s globalized world. The lesson outlines what students should understand as the path to economic prosperity; “economic freedom, low taxes, less government regulation, sound monetary policy, protection of property rights, decentralized markets” (IMF, 2005). It is not surprising then that not once, in the curriculum is there an attempt to include an exploration of the colonial context for part of the answer to this question. Nor does it include voices of the Global South. This approach to the issue of global inequality illustrates what Crossly & Tikly (2004) have observed in development and peace curricula. They claim that many programs place higher value on Western knowledge and experience all the while dismissing “indigenous knowledge systems, values, and beliefs” (p.150). The result is that in practice, schools may struggle to create a program

that serves to critically examine these historical and critical aspects. Davies (2005) believes our students and schools become centres that are unable to raise critical awareness. He believes there is a decline in the required political/global education that would “enable critical examination of political messages” (p. 363). Therefore we can expect the cycle to continue unchallenged and unchanged.

Crossley and Tikly (2004) link post-colonialism, development shaped to suit Western interests, and current education programs with a common aim of control. They state that rather than overt colonialism, “development is now the vehicle for the active promotion of the new imperialism and educational policy as a powerful mechanism through which western inspired international agendas continue to dominate and influence international trends” (p. 152). Rather than confront the issues of discrimination, injustice, exclusion, marginalization and expose the underlying power structures that create conditions of powerfulness and powerlessness, education continues to “oil the obsolete cogs of industrialization: individualism, passivity, diligence and specialization” (Pike and Selby, 2000, p.10). The effect is further separating the lives and realities between those in the Global South and Global North, where the lines between us and them become more difficult to cross as we are not guided to recognize the thread which connects the North’s prosperity with the South’s exploitation. Tikly remarks that, “while there has been some attempts to enhance the international dimension at secondary and high levels, there has still not been any meaningful globalization of education” (2001, p. 152). Therefore, as Pike and Selby (2000) point out, students are often discouraged when examining global issues. They may become paralyzed as they begin to examine issues around social justice as education does not equip them to perceive the relevance of this

information to their lives and fails to clarify their role in that world. They may see poverty as a permanent condition, rather than a process whereby people were made poor through the process of colonization. An understanding of the colonial history would remove this preconception of inevitability. It leads one consider that if poverty resulted largely due to human activity, than perhaps human activity could transform it.

Betty Reardon also sees the effect of post-colonial attitudes in education. She believes that education systems rooted in nations of the Global North, have been organized around two major purposes: “keeping the respective system or Nation ahead of its competitors, and keeping the managers of the system in power” (Reardon, p. 22). Neither of these purposes mixes easily with the stated outcomes of peace and global education. They are at odds. Schools in the industrialized societies of the Global North often serve to reproduce unequal class power relations rather than expose them (Weber, 2007). The risk is that poverty in the Global South, just as domination during colonialism, is accepted as a given, an unalterable reality. Western globalization has come to be viewed as a natural fact or an inexorable force like gravity, which cannot be transformed, rather than as simply an idea, as one way of conducting business and guiding policies which could be changed (Blaney, 2002). For that reason, global issues, such as those which reveal injustice inherent in contemporary globalization, development and practices of the Global North, or even those that highlight achievements of the global South, receive far less attention.

Like Truman’s view of Western ideals half a decade ago, education in the North, including educators and students are under the shadow of colonialism. We tend to view

ourselves as developed, as the experts, as those with the answers, as those equipped to ‘help’. Therefore, if the way we do peace and global education does not guide our students through the task of unveiling systems of power, then, as Blaney argued, we “simply empower our students as participants in the interpretation and production of a global age, we risk largely reinforcing the institutional and discursive inequalities of this age, between those of us in the developed North who assume our role is to know and act for the rest of the world” (2002, p. 269). The effect is that individuals of the Global South become reduced to objects of study rather than participants. This relationship is not what we as peace and global educators desire and therefore we must be vigilant in ensuring we avoid this tendency.

Agharzadeh (2008) clearly argues, if governments, development agencies and educators are seeking to address issues of inequality and injustice of the Global South and to become emancipated from their limited vision, it can only take place when those in the Global South have genuine voice, and the ability to articulate their perspective of the conditions within the environment in which they live. However in contemporary approaches to address injustice the gaze is outwards from a privileged position and any problems or challenges are placed upon the ‘Other’ (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991). When attempting to explain the widening North – South Gap, the Global North blames those who have been the objects of development. Those the Global North would rather believe the myths of underdevelopment, that the developing countries have corrupt governments, poor soil, that the people must be lazy or backwards, rather than examining the colonial history, and economic policies of the North that have also contributed to underdevelopment. Without expanding the dialogue to include those in the global South

we will continue on in the “assumption that the creation of wealth leads to greater well being” (Pike Selby, 2000, p. 165), and fail to find a new way.

It is unfortunate that since the time of colonization, the voices, perspectives and knowledge the people who become the target of our actions, have continued to be ignored, marginalized and discounted. This marginalization has spilled over into education as well. Berlowitz & Long, (2003) argue that the presence of “Eurocentricity in peace education leads to exclusion and distortion...and undermines the status and viability of Peace education” (p. 4). Blaney (2007) argues that what we in the North have understood and continue to understand about the South or Non-European ‘Other’ has been clouded with the history of colonialism and contemporary global inequalities. Unfortunately, students in the Global North have inherited this language and lens and perceive the world as do their parents. I believe it is part of our role as peace and development educators to disrupt this.

We would do well to consider, as educators and as those from the North, Asgharzdeh’s (2008) questions: Who has power and privilege to speak for whom? How have some been rendered voiceless? Can Northern / Western intellectuals speak on behalf of the historically marginalized? Is there a way that we can overcome the history that has rendered some powerful and powerless and come together to share, learn, listen and move forward? These questions echo the words of Edward Said. Said believes that the intellectuals role is not to speak for others but rather “to defeat imposed silence and the normalized quiet of unseen power wherever and whenever possible” (Said, 2004, p. 135). Said wants us to name power, to reveal hidden power and in so doing create more space for marginalized voices of the Global South, the ‘Other’ to speak.

By listening to these voices we might create a new vision of the world that includes diverse knowledge and experience of people from the Global South. Often teachers and schools in the Global South have faced such adversity, and this adversity has provided them with a wealth of insights. Furthermore, their history has been the target of the Northern legacy of colonialism and capitalism. We would do well to consider how their history would shape perspectives on peace and development. This is the context of their voice and this historical experience and influence should be regarded as a vital perspective.

The context of their voice can be understood by the realities outlined by Bot, Dove, & Wilson (2000). Many communities live in poverty and, especially in rural areas, do not have access to water, sanitation. There is limited access to education and students in rural areas must often travel long distances to attend school. Learner/teacher ratios are often high, sometimes reaching 1:100. School buildings are in need of upgrades and as well as there is a need to build more schools. Almost half the schools do not have water or electricity. Most schools do not have libraries, laboratories, or access to learning materials. Unemployment levels are high and can be correlated with educational attainment. The extent and spread of HIV/AIDS and other diseases such as malaria affect communities, including students and teachers.

I must comment that even as Bot, Dove and Wilson are aiming to outline the richness of experience of people in the developing world, these perspectives still focus on the negative. I would add that the context of the voices of people from the Global South can also inform us on joy, the meaning of life, happiness and expand our understanding of community and what our journey as human beings could be.

Reardon writes that with regards to perspectives towards peace, Europeans and Americans found the absence of war, or negative peace, as sufficient while those in the Global South were nearly unanimous in their preference for positive peace, which demands the presence of justice, dignity, and access to those services required to live. Reardon attributes this ideological split as grounded in their contrasting historical experience. Educators of the Global South had fled political oppression, poverty, and were deeply affected by the experience of colonialism and slavery. In the meantime, those of the privileged North viewed peace through the lens, fogged by power and imperialism (1994). This difference in history and context has profound influence on the development of diverse world views. As educators in the Global North we must begin understand and these perspectives.

Beyond Post-Colonial: Peace & Development Education

“To develop a critical stance on one’s own existential world and that of those in distant lands, as the German philosopher Hegel pointed out over 190 years ago . . . one ‘must make a home in the other’” (Choules, 2007, p. 500). While global and peace education aim to bridge the divide may fail, as Berlowiz & Long state, that it not only fails to broaden the scope of the colonial history, the field of peace studies has not been “open to the participation of those outside the usual academic discourse” (2003, p. 7). Choules (2007) adds that the absence of a power analysis and critical view of Western domination serves to benefit “those groups who occupy positions of power” (p.461). The effect of post-colonialism on education is the continued assumption of Northern expertise in approaches to development and knowledge. The very words developed and

developing imply this hidden yet powerful assumption. This assumption creates a context where citizens are encouraged to view “globalization as a fact or an inexorable force... with a taken for granted status” (Blaney, 2002, p.270). Failing to question our assumptions, we risk turning blindly from potential alternatives and may obscure the role of human agency, power and creativity to understand and transform the damaging aspects of the globalized world into something better for all. Clinging to the assumption of Western economic progress which underpins approaches in development limits our potential to change at the precise time in human history when we are desperate for new ideas, new dreams and a new path. The voice of individuals of the Global South is a vital part of widening the discussion on where we as a human family must go. As Weber (2007) states, we need “field work to analyze teacher and teachers as work in the global south” (p. 279). Research demonstrates there is a void that must be filled by the voices, perspectives, and knowledge of individuals from the Global South. If we desire to create a complete and accurate picture of the world, we are going to need all the pieces of the puzzle.

I believe, the future of global education lies in how we bring in the Otherness of social experience from the underdeveloped world into Northern based theories. The result ought to be a “recognition of the universality of knowledge and the diversity of forms it can assume and the various parts of the world it can be located” (Weber, 2007, p. 297). We need to understand if such knowledge will complement, mediate, or develop contractions and contributions to our practice. Research studies that “do not challenge the normalized Western privilege position are likely to exacerbate injustice as they devalue experience and ways of life other than that of the white rational male” (Choules,

2007, p. 463). Many people from the South have fled political oppression, poverty and have the memory of colonial experience. Because of this profound and contrasting historical experience, their views are crucial. (Berlowitz & Long, 2003). If we desire to participate in effective peace and global education and advocacy, this will “mean studying the issues from the standpoint of the South” (Cronkite, 2000, p. 162). In order to deconstruct the Northern conceptual framework, Global Educational researchers stress the need for “data collected in the field through learning from local teachers” (Weber, 2007, p. 294). Furthermore, we also need more “comparative studies on how schools in conflict or post-conflict zones teach about conflict, difference, rights and justice” (Davies, 2005, 369). Relationship between rich and poor nations has been an unequal one (Weber, 2007). As such, there is a need for fieldwork to “bridge the divide in scholarship between the North and South” (Ibid, p.281). It was my intention, with this study to hear and disseminate the voices of the Global South. Additionally, I wanted to compare the voices of these teachers with the voices from teachers in the Global North.

Chapter 3: History of Global & Peace Education

Alongside the development targets proposed by the United Nations in the year 2000, the UN, also name the first decade of the 21st century as the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World. Peace and Global education is a “participatory process that includes teaching for and about democracy, human rights, nonviolence, social and economic justice, gender equality, environmental sustainability, disarmament, traditional peace practices, international law, and human security” (Hague, 2011). While the advocacy of peace set forth by the United Nations has seen an increase in programming and awareness, at the close of this decade, we are a long way from creating the culture of peace that the United Nations proposed. The two declarations authored by the United Nations (ie. the Decade for Peace, the Millennium Development Goals), reflect the interface between education, poverty and conflict. In so doing, world peace becomes directly linked to issues of development. This interface also reflects a global reality; of the thirty-four countries furthest from international development goals, twenty are in conflict (Davies, 2005). Consequently, we cannot simply look at peace education, but must build connections to increasing aspects of development education.

The concept of education becoming the vehicle for peace and development is not new. Long before the United Nation’s declaration, civil society, non-governmental organizations, citizens, activists, and teachers have worked towards creating a peaceful society. For educators this continues through the vision of global and peace education. An examination of the growth and development of global and peace education is needed to understand current approaches in the field.

What is Global Education? In 1993, the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna adopted 'Human Rights Education' as the term to envelope Peace Education and Development Education. There is much overlap in subject area between peace, development, human rights and global education in the school system, as well as the shared challenges to finding where peace and global education should be placed in curriculum. The British educators Greig, Pike and Selby (1987), proposed that 'Global Education' was a term to embrace all of these approaches. As with the global education movement, current school-based peace education encompasses a wide variety of aims and approaches, depending on the audience and socio-political and ideological context (Cook, 2008). Within these shared frameworks, peace education globally, has been defined as education that promotes concepts of non-violence, human rights, social justice, world-mindedness, ecological balance, meaningful participation, and personal peace (Hicks, 2004). Reardon (2001) defines peace education as supported through a culture of peace at home and abroad.

Global and Peace education in the 20th century was rooted in the civil and peace movements and work of government agencies who began to envision a role for education in raising awareness and in fostering citizens engaged to transform society. There was a growing belief, that education could make a positive difference. Contemporary peace education movements date from the late nineteenth century when peace societies in Europe and North America began to advocate international issues through educational programs. Historically, these early programs aimed at educating youth of the dangers of the international conflict. The idea that schools could become the source of social change had begun. (Cooper, 1987). In North America, peace organizations adopted the

perspective that violence and injustice were also changeable through education. This would connect education with peace and social justice in the decades to come.

Increasingly, people fighting injustice also recognized the role of education as being integral to their causes. As the excerpt below makes clear, an international network of women's and gender-integrated peace groups also recognized and depended on education to further their principles and turned to education as a critical force for social change that would promote human rights and peace.

Internationally-minded women of many persuasions shared both a conception of their sex's particular sensitivity to the costs of armed conflict and an essential optimism about the power of education and the limitations of prejudice. By instructing children and adults in the follies of war and the ways of peace, women could prepare the way, as surely as any diplomat, for a better world. ((Toh & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000, p. 171-172)

Both men and women recognized that education was an important vehicle for encouraging peace (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996). These advocates, believed that education would alert young and old, men and women, to the international structures and systemic inequities that they saw as encouraging militarism and discouraging peaceful solutions for their own benefit (Cook, 2008).

Conditions of the past century would continue to shape perspectives and practice of peace and global education. For much of the twentieth century, human hopes for peace often grew out of the pain and experiences of war. Memories of past wars, the enduring legacies of those wars, and the fears of future wars all gave reason to the search

for peace. After 1945, the almost unimaginable terror of nuclear conflict brought fresh urgency to that search (Hoepfner, 2011). Following the devastation of World War II, and particularly from the images and horror that followed the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, global education strengthened its focus on peace, and peace became equated with disarmament (Swee-Hin & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000). This concept of negative peace held that peace was achieved when war ended. It is called negative peace, not because it is bad, but because in negative peace, something is missing; war and the weapons which are used to wage it. Peace movements in Canada, the United States, and Western Europe critically examined and exposed government doctrines of deterrence, and continued to fight to ban nuclear weapons. This led to perspectives of peace as prevention of violence by removing the weapons of war. Canadian NGOs and organizations such as Project Ploughshares and Coalition to Oppose the Arms Trade continue to seek to educate citizens on how the arms trade fuels violence war and stands as a barrier to peace (Project Ploughshares, 2011).

While the roots of peace education as an aspect of global education are efforts for disarmament, reducing conflict globally came to be reflected in the recognition that creating a culture of peace also means working towards removing all forms of violence, “whether it be social, economic, psychological, political or cultural” (Swee-Hin & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000, p. 368). This was a dramatic shift and would have a profound impact on the breadth of peace and global education. By acknowledging that violence takes many forms beyond war and the use of weapons, peace education expanded. No longer was it sufficient to achieve peace by removing direct forms of violence. Peace was to be achieved by removing structural violence. This shift resulted in a focus on

positive peace, where, we add a struggle for social justice in order to achieve peace. This perspective promotes that peace is not only the absence of war but the presence of justice.

By the year 1974, it was recognized that if societies were to work toward bringing about justice and peace, that schools, once again, would be an ideal institution in which to foster the understanding of peace and global issues. In this year, UNESCO 's recommendation on "Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education Relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms" reflect the shift from negative to positive peace by identifying the following three dimensions of peace, intercultural respect, equitable development and international cooperation and solidarity (Swee-Hin & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000). Absent from this list is any mention of direct disarmament. While disarmament is a vital step in achieving these goals, the dimensions named by UNESCO signify an important shift in our understanding of peace. From its inception in the 1970s, school-based global education covered a lot of territory, both in terms of the content and perspectives it urged students to adopt. It is generally accepted that the first articulation of the field was offered in the 1970s by Hanvey in the United States and by the World Studies Project in Britain. Hanvey (1975) set out five elements of global education:

1. *Perspective consciousness*: in which individuals hold views, often unconsciously, according to our own cultural framework.
2. *Knowledge of world conditions*: including economic patterns, population growth and movement, natural resources and use, science and technology, political movements, law, health and security and peace.
3. *Cross-cultural awareness*: of the world's diverse value systems and

societal frameworks.

4. *Global systems dynamics*: including economic, political, ecological and social systems.
5. *Knowledge of choices*: or alternatives to current management patterns, including foreign aid, consumption patterns and security systems.

In comparing various definitions, Pike (2000) argued for (a) the interdependence of all people within a global system, (b) the connectedness and diversity of universal human attributes, values and knowledge, curriculum subjects, aspects of schooling, humans and their environment, and (c) the privileging of multiple perspectives before reaching a view. Bigelow and Peterson (2002) noted the continued need to balance all of these aspects against the framework of social injustice (Cook, 2008).

Peace activists and educators continue to draw connections between peace, and social justice, human rights, ecological sustainability, intercultural respect and spirituality. Educators in the UK, such as David Hicks, began peace education movements, that led to curriculum innovations, and some changes in the schools. In Australia, Robin Burns and other global educators stressed that development that would generate peace must be focused on addressing inequality. In the United States, peace educator Betty Reardon, linked peace with environmental stewardship, and global citizenship. These movements signified the shift mentioned previously that peace and social justice cannot be achieved through disarmament alone (Swee-Hin & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000).

Those involved in peace research and peace studies began to propose more comprehensive and holistic definitions of peace; definitions that embraced opposition to

war but that went much further. The absence of war became defined as ‘negative peace’, while the term ‘positive peace’ was used to describe a range of social, economic, political and environmental conditions. That broader definition of peace grew from a the analysis of the global condition, summed up by Harris and Synott:

In our bloody world, the achievement of peace remains one of the great postmodern dilemmas: We can travel to the moon, but we have not solved the problems of violence that plague the human species. We have learned that we are all related, but we don’t know how to love one another. We’ve created great wealth but do not meet the basic needs of most people. We can travel great distances in short times, but can’t overcome racism and other forms of ethnic hatred. (2002, p. 4)

These words acknowledged the phenomenon of ‘structural violence’ – the suffering, disadvantage and oppression suffered by people because of their race, religion, sex, class, disability, age or other characteristics. These examples are personal and immediate, and they reflect the deep, pervasive character of structural violence, whereby large populations suffer institutionalized or de facto injustices. For example, all citizens of some developing countries may suffer impoverishment because of policies and practices of the World Bank or various transnational corporations.

Those who believe that there were alternatives to injustice, continue to focus on global/peace education to encourage international cooperation by adopting a pedagogy that emphasizes active global citizenship. Central to this pedagogy are; values analysis (Reardon, 1996), critical thinking strategies to uncover assumptions rooted in racism, patriarchy, and post-colonialist structures, the development of an ethic of caring for

others, the environment, and structures supporting justice (Toh & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000), and skills associated directly with conflict management and resolution (Harris & Morrison, 2003). These are contemporary aspects to a global and peace education that would see transformations that would actually bring about justice. This pedagogy would make visible what is often left invisible. This definition of effective peace education demands that we shake up power structures and be willing to look at topics that may be uncomfortable. In comparing various definitions, Pike (2000) argued for “common threads” (p. 65): (a) the interdependence of all people within a global system, (b) the connectedness and diversity of universal human attributes, values and knowledge, curriculum subjects, aspects of schooling, humans and their environment, and (c) the privileging of multiple perspectives before reaching a view. Bigelow and Peterson (2002) noted the continued need to balance all of these aspect against the framework of social injustice (Cook, 2008).

It is upon this rich history that the United Nations and UNESCO made their declaration in 2000, claiming the decade for Peace (UNESCO, 2001). Globally, institutions, governments and non-government organizations are developing toolkits, workshops, documents, activities for teachers to use in their classrooms to promote development and peace and to use as a guide to help students and teachers become aware of the issues facing our global family.

If the ‘violence’ of discrimination and oppression is to be defined so broadly, then a correspondingly broad definition of peace is needed. UNESCO, for one, has embraced such a definition. Hopeful of a peaceful new millennium, UNESCO published an on-line Manifesto 2000 for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence. (UNESCO, 2000) The

manifesto declared an aspiration to share 'responsibility for the future of humanity', 'to shape a world based on justice, solidarity, liberty, dignity, harmony and prosperity for all', wherein a 'culture of peace can underpin sustainable development, environmental protection and the well-being of each person'. People around the world were invited to sign the manifesto, and by June 2002 it had attracted over 75 million signatories who pledged to uphold six powerful principles (UNESCO, 2000)

In these foundational definitions of global education, *peace* was defined in terms of interlocking global systems and occupying an important place. Since these early definitions there has been much reordering and updating in response to new challenges, and unfortunately a quiet abandoning of those features of global education that have proved to be especially difficult to act upon or that threaten to divide a delicately constructed and maintained illusions of society

History of Global & Peace Education In Canada

Canadian global education has developed as something of an amalgam of these national definitions and trends. Global education in Canada shares common ground with development, environmental, human rights, peace and multicultural education. The first expression in Canada of what would come to be called global education followed the publication of a series of educational Royal Commission Reports in the late 1960's and early 1970's (Gidney, 1999). Widely acclaimed for championing of progressive education principles, including holistic curricula, discovery-based pedagogy, values clarification strategies, and resource-based research the educational climate in most Canadian provinces was set for the expansion of peace and global education (Ibid).

In the 1970s there was an increase in the Federal Government's support for development aid and expertise through generous funding of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). By the 1980s, this group was funding global education, professional development centres across Canada for teachers, which in turn, placed effective pressure on provincial ministries of education to formally sanction global education topics (Hargraves, 1997). Inevitably, such enthusiasm also generated controversy. Concerned educators began to generate curriculum and initiatives in development education which were supported and propelled by funding from Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). CIDA was the federal agency responsible for Canada's aid programs. There was a belief that schools were not meeting the needs of educating about the world, therefore with CIDA's funding, the first global education project was begun in New Brunswick in 1987. In 1988, CIDA began to fund teachers' associations to promote development education (Graham, 2000). By, 1992, Alberta, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Quebec Saskatchewan, and the Yukon all received funding and were running CIDA supported global and development education projects. At this time, projects examined development education, peace education and human rights education. CIDA produced materials and resources to support teachers. CIDA's support validated, on a national level, the work that many socially aware and concerned teachers cut off from one another were endeavoring to accomplish on their own. It elevated the need for education connected to the realities of the world (Conkrite, 2000).

Canadian global education began to lose ground by the mid-1990s, a period generally regarded as one of conservatism in Canadian education (Gidney, 1999). During this period, global and development educators in Canada were becoming concerned over

their country's approach to development and of its support of education. Critics began to see inconsistencies. While development education claimed to be the way to help the poorest of the poor, many of the development projects by government were seen to "perpetuate systems that kept the poor from gaining real control of their lives" (Conkrit, 2000, p. 154). For development educators, this was seen as a new form of economic control and imperialism. Whether due to these criticisms by educators or for some other cause, in 1995, the Minister of Foreign Affairs unexpectedly announced that CIDA would no longer fund development and global education projects in Canada. Swiftly, half the country's learner centers closed. While this was a setback for large scale development education, some educators regarded the removal of government support as a positive step as it appeared that funding was tied to specific topics while issues that were critical of structural causes of global injustice were not as deeply examined (Pike, 2000). By 1995, most local professional development centres dedicated to the professional development of teachers were closed, and what global education programs remained was transferred to post-secondary institutions (Tye, 2003). Even here, however, funding was tight and development of global and peace programs much reduced. Yet, the moral component of global education did find strong official support through the widespread recognition that schooling must support apparently flagging citizenship training (Gidney, 1999; Willinsky, 2005). Along with several other jurisdictions, Canadian provincial ministries of education identified character and citizenship training as goals for the new millennium, resulting in developments such as a civics course in Ontario, launched in 1999. As global education had linked its program in other places and times to school reform or citizenship training so too in Canada, global educators sought to shore up sagging support by

redefining global education as global citizenship (Reed, 1996). One result of this redefinition was the further marginalization of peace education and effective development education, now transformed almost exclusively into conflict management and resolution in aid of citizenship skills (Toh & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000).

Peace education faced further challenges following 9/11. A challenge posed by the tragic events of September 11, 2001 was that one faced criticism and opposition if they questioned the foreign policy of the United States and the West. In a period of perceived vulnerability by many Western governments, peace talk, which was local rather than internationally positioned, became both more welcome and in many ways, simpler for educational purposes (Cook, 2008).

However, with the UNESCO declaration in 2000 one year prior to 9/11, the United Nations had initiated the Culture of Peace Program, which brought concepts surrounding, peace, development and global education into focus once again. Canada became a signatory to the declaration. The United Nations and UNESCO's vision is to encourage humanity to fundamentally alter the way we think and do things, to endeavor to change behaviors, to incite institutional transformations from the current trend of a culture of war and violence to a culture of peace (UNESCO, 2011). The first recommendation in the Culture of Peace Program is for signing countries to foster a culture of peace through education. This international call to education to address issues facing the planet is echoed by teachers and educational experts. This encourages governments to revise curriculum to promote qualitative values, attitudes and behaviors that will promote peace. According to the United Nations, the desired attitudes and behaviors include fostering, conflict-resolution, dialogue, and active non-violent action.

However the UN declaration of Creating a Culture of Peace also includes aspects often reserved to discussions around development, which reflects that peace cannot be achieved simply by reducing conflict, but rather we will reduce conflict and achieve peace when the world becomes a more equitable, socially just community. As such, the document, to which Canada had signed, encourages educational approaches to promote sustainable environmental and economic development, teach respect for human rights, discuss equality between men and women, encourage democratic participation, dispel ignorance by teaching understanding tolerance and solidarity. Education should foster participatory communication and the free flow of information, and finally, promote international peace and security. (UNESCO, 2011). This list of recommendations reflects the reality that one cannot simply do peace, global, human rights or even environmental education, but that these are all interconnected and related to one another. If we are to effectively work towards peace, the United Nations declaration suggests that we must achieve social justice and global equity.

Peace education is currently considered to be both a philosophy and a process involving skills, including listening, reflection, problem-solving, cooperation and conflict resolution. The process involves empowering with the skills, attitudes and knowledge to create a safe world and build a sustainable environment. The philosophy teaches nonviolence, love, compassion and reverence for all life. Peace education confronts indirectly the forms of violence that dominate society by teaching about its causes and providing knowledge of alternatives (Harris & Morrison, 2003).

This definition of peace education provides evidence of the close alignment of principles behind peace and global education, as it is termed in North America. Other

popular sources on global education at the school level also emphasize the importance of peace education and define peacemaking as mainly an interpersonal experience, resulting in personal conflict, racism, gender and sexual exclusions, and environmental degradation (Goldstein & Selby, 2000). The focus is placed on the local and the personal, rather than the international, despite ongoing concern with what Galtung (1975) called structural violence. This waning of interest in the school curriculum in the international and structural dimensions of peace studies rather than the personal uses of peace-making has clear instrumental value for the classroom and schoolyard. However, the general effect of narrowing peace education's focus to the local has been to further marginalize the global.

Peace education over time has once again occupied progressively less space. The nature of both peace and global education in the school curriculum has changed. The reduction of peace education within the global education rubric has negative consequences for everyone committed to the principles of global and peace education (Cook, 2008). In her analysis of definitions of peace, Cook suggests that peace education has ignored the wider aspects of societal and economic factors and focused on conflict resolution. Aside from definitions including disarmament and perhaps human rights, the burden of these definitions falls on the side of personally experienced conflict management. In other words, addressing the economic, political, and global issues that contribute to structural violence that cause inequality, wars, orphans, the AIDS crisis is complex. It required a wiliness to examine one's assumptions and ways of living. It is a messy endeavor without a clear solution. It demands that we take a close look at ourselves, our lives and our choices which we will see contribute to this structural

violence. That is not something that we in the Global North are eager to sign up for. You are guaranteed to encounter resistance and perhaps a lonely road. Therefore searching for a justification for the inclusion of peace education, Harris and Morrison (2003) argued that it was important because it helped “to create an orderly learning climate in schools” (p. 11). Peace education has been reduced to conflict resolution strategies for personal and school conflicts, sacrificing the more complex issues of structural violence. As important as all these approaches to violence-prevention and management undoubtedly are, few encourage an examination of social or economic structures and the failures within these that create inequities. Thus, the meaning of peace education has become for many a form of community safety. Peace education is currently focused on anti-bullying and conflict resolution strategies (Holden, 2000). Peace education as personal violence prevention tends to ignore or at least silence, the structural roots of violence and war. We limit our understanding of peace as a goal only for one classroom, school or community (Cook, 2008).

This transformation of peace education from the global, to the local, to the personal, has moved away from the important issues that drive a wedge between the Global North and South. Moreover, when it comes to curriculum and how peace education is played out in the classroom we find isolated outcomes and individual approaches initiated by teachers in courses like World Issues. For this reason, I believe we need to expand our understanding of development and peace education by including perspectives of Global South. We must examine how schools can participate in deconstructing ideas of ‘us’ and ‘the Other (Davies, 2005). Secondly, we must look at how current peace and global education practices achieve the outcomes proposed by

major peace developers. Third, the information and foundation upon which development and global education is based on northern notions of development has ignored perspectives from the Global South, thereby further marginalizing and distancing us from them.

In spite of what governments and policy makers claim, the fact remains that many school systems are pressured to prioritize efficiency, results and measurable outcomes over commitments to peace and global education. Where development and peace education encourage critical thinking and self-reflection, schools as societal institutions often serve the power structure that organized them. In this way schools can often become “demeaning and disempowering places, where children and their teachers are either bored into submission or where the transmission and socialization techniques destroy any hope for critical thinking” (Zajda-Majhanovich, 2006, p.12). The likelihood of meaningful criticism is diminished. Secondly, the obscure nature of peace and global education can at times pose challenges to curriculum developers. While we may desire to aspire to the UN’s call to change in behaviors and attitudes, how do you chart and mark such changes? And, as Davies found, “teaching peace and non-violence is mainly rhetorical, theoretical and sporadic” (Davies, 2005, p. 363).

We may long to question power structures and inequality, however this goes precisely against economic values held by many nations in the North. To find a government sanctioning an education that questions what seems natural is a challenge. Where schools, with their divisions in power often serve to reproduce unequal class power relations rather than expose them (Weber, 2007). Freire argues that schooling in much of the developed world “functions to domesticate students by denying them the

right to name their world... and cannot offer any hope of transforming either the individual or world” (1970, p. 349). What we are talking about is a school system that would be critical of the very structure that created it. Rather than being the vehicle for critical examination of society, schools, unfortunately, often serve existing power and social norms, where the “dominant social group relies on a combination of overt as well as hidden exercises of power to preserve its position” (Choules, 2007, p. 464). The issue is that to sufficiently examine sources of inequality, we may need to question what we consider normal social behaviors. These initiatives will always find funding challenges and the corporate/globalized world is unlikely to support such an education, but that is why it is so vital (Cronkite, 2000).

However the same drawbacks are what may make global and peace education more meaningful and valuable, not only for teachers but for all who are citizens of the world. While it may appear more efficient to dedicate ourselves to an education system that ensures outcomes of student learning are confidently predicted, extracted by the teacher and then validated, such a system, while clothed in the fabric of modernization, fails to produce the type of learning required to foster minds ready for the challenges we face. Such a system forgets that “the most profound, most exciting learning is that which is unpredictable” (Pike and Selby, 2000, p. 11). This is precisely what a critical education can offer.

This rich history demonstrates the passion educators have in engaging in education that would offer criticisms that would challenge students and the status quo. As the research argues, I believe that peace and development education are set to take the next step and become transformed through partnering with educators in the Global South.

Chapter 4: Methodology

Research Design

The main purpose of the study is to investigate how the perspectives of teachers from the Global South, with respect to peace and development, influence and transform the practice of teachers in the Global North. The nature of this investigation invites conversations, requires dialogue, voice and an open engagement with educators both in the Global North and South. Therefore, the nature of the study involves attempting to draw out the lived experiences of individuals in order to construct new ideas. A research design based upon phenomenology can assist this aim. In phenomenology, Creswell, (2007) writes that the researcher's aim is to understand phenomenon at a deeper level.

Phenomenologists are interested in showing how “complex meanings are built out of simple units of direct experience” (Merriam & Simpson, 2000, p, 90). Researchers applying phenomenology are concerned with the lived experiences of participants involved with the issue being researched (Groenewald, 2004). Merriam & Simpson (2000) capture the essence of phenomenology as attempting to “uncover the truth and to add to our knowledge” (p. 85). Consequently, data in phenomenology begins with the perspective of the lived experiences of participants. The lived experiences of participants are regarded as pure phenomena and therefore, as valid units of descriptive data (Eagleton, 1983). Welman and Kruger (1999) add that the aim of phenomenological research is to describe the phenomena as accurately as possible, remaining true to the perspectives of the people involved. It is an attempt to highlight the lived experience of

individuals who have insight with the research questions in order to elicit rich and descriptive data with a sense of newness.

The phenomena we are attempting to understand begins with individuals' views regarding how experiences are perceived, unfold, and present themselves. This study is concerned with understanding more fully the perspectives of peace and development of individuals in the Global South in order to ensure that as educators in the Global North teach peace and development, they might represent a broader and more inclusive curricula that aims to expand the conversation beyond the traditional pattern of people in the Global North being the ones who 'know' while those in the developing world remain the passive recipients of development work.

This study includes exploring the perspectives of teachers who have lived and taught in a developing country of the Global South. Their stories, unique description of their life experiences, challenges and triumphs will provide powerful insights into what it means to teach for peace. Interviews are viewed as an opportunity to understand the world from the participants' point of view as the interview provides opportunity for as exchange of dialogue between "two persons conversing about a theme of mutual interest" (Kvale in Groenwald, 2004, p. 13). Researchers in phenomenology are reluctant to outline specific techniques as that may reduce the capability for authentic dialogue (Holloway, 1997). However, the research is designed to allow this conversation to take place as the interviewer poses questions that examine both the concepts held by teachers regarding peace and development as well as the lived experiences that have shaped these perceptions.

Data Analysis

As previously stated, the nature of phenomenology is reluctant to define specific data analysis methods. Hycner adds that ‘analysis’ typically means breaking down into parts and therefore may result in a loss of the whole phenomena or object of study (1999, p.161). Therefore, in phenomenology as Coffey and Atkinson (1996) outline, analysis can be viewed as a procedure to identify essential features and relationships within the data. Data is interpreted, and while the term analysis is avoided, phenomenology recognizes the need for a process in interpretation of data. Data were interpreted with the following guidelines based upon Spiegelberg (1965), Hycner (1999) and Creswell (1998).

- 1) Bracketing; To the best of their ability the researcher’s allows the participant to share their views and perspectives without allowing their own presuppositions, interpretations or meanings to enter the unique world of the participant as they respond to questions. The researcher avoids correcting, debating values with the participant and permits their perspective to emerge. In other words, the researcher while conducting interviews, attempts to lay aside their worldview.
- 2) Identifying Units of Meaning: In this critical phase of interpretations, statements that illuminate the research topic are identified (Creswell, 1998; Hycner, 1999). Through listening to recorded interviews and reading transcripts multiple times the researcher is able to identify units of dialogue that address the central question of the study. The researcher is required to make a significant amount of judgment calls while at the same time bracketing their own presuppositions (Groenewald, 2004).

- 3) Clustering of Units of Meaning as Themes: At this stage the lists of units of meaning are scrutinized in order to capture their essence within the holistic context. (Hycner, 1999) This requires further judgment calls by the researcher. It is understood that the phenomenological researcher is engaged in “something which cannot be precisely delineated, for here, he/she is involved in that ineffable thing known as creative insight” (Hycner, 1999, p.150-151).
Groups of themes are made by clustering similar units of meaning. (Creswell, 1998). The themes are then identified by the researcher, into units of significance. Through the familiarity the researcher develops with the data, central themes are determined which express the essence of the meaning provided by the participants (Hycner, 1999).
- 4) Integration of Themes: Once the process outlined in points 1 –3 has been conducted by the researcher for all interviews, the researcher identifies reoccurring themes as well as variations (Hycner, 1999). While effort is made to cluster common themes, care must be given to ensure that unique and minority voices are not removed as they are important counterpoints to bring out with the phenomenon being researched (Groenewald, 2004).
- 5) Summary of Themes: Once themes have been examined across the spectrum of interviews, the researcher concludes by writing a summary. The summary must reflect the context from which the themes were drawn (Hycner, 1999). In this stage the researcher, according to Sadala and Adorno (2001), “transforms participants’ everyday expressions into expressions appropriate to the scientific discourse supporting the research” (p. 289). This scientific discourse requires the

researcher to go beyond the themes to develop ideas (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p.139).

Procedure

As an educator concerned with peace and development, I have pursued and have had the opportunity to spend time working previously with educators in northern Africa, Uganda and in Central America. These personal experiences impacted my view of the world and helped to broaden my understanding of the human connection and have shaped my teaching philosophy. This in turn shaped my teaching. I attempt to teach in order to build connections between my students and the world. I have also organized and lead student volunteer trips to Central America with the aim of teaching aspects of peace, development and global citizenship. Due to these experiences, I was approached by Dr. Jan Stewart from the University of Winnipeg, to assist on a project in northern Uganda. Dr. Stewart is a renowned Canadian educator, researcher and author on the affects of war on children and youth. As such, she was invited to northern Uganda by Makerere University to work in conjunction with professors there, to develop workshops which would assist teachers in coping with students affected by war. Dr. Stewart was awarded a SHERC grant in order to conduct her research. She invited me to join the team of Canadian and Ugandan professors and graduate students to present the workshops to teachers in northern Uganda.

Being a part of the research team provided me the opportunity to travel to northern Uganda where I would also be able to conduct research for this study. After

approval was received by the University of Manitoba's ENREB, the researcher joined Dr. Stewart's team and traveled to northern Uganda, Africa in April 2010.

The workshops were on the topic of common challenges teachers have in northern Uganda and in Canada with regards to students who have been affected by war. The researcher's role was to register participants in the workshops, to facilitate discussions, lead workshop activities and join conversations where teachers from Canada and Uganda shared challenges and successes on an equal basis. As such she began to develop relationships with the educators with whom she had never met. As the workshops progressed the often hidden barriers between individuals of the global North and Global South began to disappear.

The workshops took place in Gulu and Kigum districts. Forty teachers from the northern part of Uganda participated in the workshops. These teachers represented the schools in the region. They were recommended to participate in the workshops by their principals due to their own dedication to peace education as well as having demonstrated leadership within their schools. Each of the teachers had been affected by the war and were dedicated to education as the vehicle through which a more peaceful Uganda would emerge.

At the beginning of the workshops it was announced that if individuals desired to speak further of their perspectives on peace and development, that they could participate in a study regarding peace and development education. Therefore the participation in this study was voluntary. Teachers were informed of the opportunity and approached the researcher to participate. After expressing interest in the study participants arranged a time with the researcher to conduct an interview either in the morning before the

workshops began, or in the afternoon. Participants were provided with a letter of consent which they signed prior to the interviews (Appendix A). The letter of consent informed participants of the aims and questions of the study. They were also informed of their ability to withdraw their consent at any time and that they may request a summary of the research on the letter of consent.

A purposeful sample of 9 teachers from Northern Uganda, as well as 3 teachers from Canada participated in this phenomenological study. As the study aimed to increase understanding of perspectives of teachers from the Global South, an inclusion of perspectives from teachers in the Global North assisted in concluding if limitations of Peace and Global Education that are dominated by perspectives of the Global North are valid. Inclusion criteria for teachers in Northern Uganda include (a) being affected by issues associated with developing countries such as poverty and conflict (b) identified interest in peace and global education.

In Canada, teachers were selected based upon teaching subjects directly linked with global studies such as; World Issues and Social Studies. Teachers in Canada were approached based upon involvement in teaching global issues, such as peace, conflict and development. Teachers were identified through recommendations of people in the field, such as University professors, or Manitoba Education consultants. The researcher approached three educators who were recommended by people in the field. The Canadian teachers all taught different subjects yet shared in common passion in their dedication to including topics associated with peace and development education.

All interviews both in Canada and Uganda, were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim by the researcher. As Uganda was a British colony, all participants

spoke English and therefore no translation was required. A second impact of British colonization of Uganda is that Acholi people, are named based upon traditional English names, therefore, pseudonyms reflect this reality. In order for the participants to feel confident to freely share their views, their identity was kept anonymous and they were given pseudonyms by the researcher during transcription. Following the statements by all participants are numbers within parenthesis. These numbers refer to the line the statement was made during the transcriptions. Data was stored in a locked cabinet in the researchers office and destroyed after 6 months following completion of the study.

Research Instrument

The study aimed to address the following questions. 1) What are the views held by teachers from the Global South with respect to peace and global education as taught in the Global North? 2) Can teachers from the global south provide insight into how we as teachers in the global north conduct peace and global education? 3) How do the views with respect to peace and global education, of teachers of the Global South compare with the views of teachers from the Global North who are engaged in peace and global education? Additionally, since many of the teachers from the Global South may likely have experienced conflict, if possible, the research may also address a fourth question, in what ways does conflict influence their perspective of peace and development education in their own country?

In order to have a conversation in which the participants would speak to these questions, two separate interview questionnaires were created. The interview questionnaire for the Ugandan teachers gave the opportunity to share their experience

with conflict, to offer insights into the definitions of peace and development as well to provide the opportunity for them as experts to analyze the impacts of Western led development as well as to suggest alternatives and the way to lead to a more peaceful and secure future. (See Appendix B)

A challenge with the interviews with Ugandan teachers was that the researcher would be perceived within the colonial context, as the expert, as an individual unwilling to listen and learn from people in the Global South. With this awareness in mind came a sensitivity to the participants' sense of freedom and safety during the interviews in order that the distance and gap created through colonization might be bridged. Therefore, during the interviews the researcher continually highlighted the importance of sharing knowledge as well as the value of Ugandan experience. The researcher attempted to reveal her own questions as an educator teaching for peace to demonstrate that she did not possess all the answers, and refrained from criticizing statements by participants.

The researcher was also ready to rephrase questions when it seemed researcher and participant, were falling into the roles generated by colonization. This manifested itself in a reluctance by participants to switch roles and explore what 'they', educators in the Global South, could teach 'us', educators in the Global North rather than the other way around. For example, one of the questions asked participants to comment on what they believed Ugandans could teach the West with regards to development. As the researcher endeavored to be sensitive to the colonial history she observed an insecurity and hesitancy among participants to provide answers with much depth and sincerity. This may be attributed to the colonial history as well as the contemporary message that the knowledge and expertise of the Global South is inferior to the Global North and

therefore they would have nothing to teach. Therefore this question was modified.

Participants were asked to share what made them proud as an Acholi, as a member from the tribe from which all individual in northern Uganda are a part. Secondly, they were asked what they would want people in the world to know about the Acholi people. This became a more personal approach to the question, which helped transform responses into personal and powerful messages of the strength and value of Acholi culture and knowledge.

This reflects the methods in phenomenology, where the researcher aims to understand the phenomenon at a deeper level and attempt to approach the lived experience with a sense of newness in order to elicit rich and descriptive data (Creswell, 2007). Exploring the perspectives of teachers who have lived and taught in a developing country of the Global South, provided unique insights into what it means to teach for peace.

For Canadian teachers the interview questionnaire was modified in order to draw on similar topics of interest. Participants were asked to share their background and educational history. They were then asked to elaborate on their views of peace, development, the relationships between the Global North and South, and what they understood as the role schools and teachers play in fostering a more socially just world. Participants in Canada were interviewed at a time a place that best suited them.

Following the interviews of all participants data were transcribed verbatim by the researcher. The data were analyze and interpreted in order to draw insights, themes, or trends in the data by examining and comparing the perspectives of teachers in the two regions of study. During transcription, the researcher began to note statements which

spoke to the research questions. She also began to note questions and comments which arose from the data. Following transcription, the researcher reread the transcripts while making notes in order to begin to draw out the themes. As overall themes were identified, these were assigned a code. The researcher then returned to the transcripts and coded statements by participants according to the theme to which the comment belonged. Statements were then organized into sections and clear themes were identified. The themes which emerged include; definitions and conditions of peace and development, barriers to peace and development, the impact of the voices of the Global South with regards to topics of education, economy, care, dialogue and hope. All the while, themes and units of meaning were identified in order to inform the main purpose of the study, to discover how teachers from the Global South might refine our approach to development and our approach to peace and global education as they lend their voice.

Chapter 5: Presentation and Interpretation of Data

The study aims to give voice to educators of the Global South in order to clear the fog of the colonial experience so that our efforts in peace and development education would be a part of transforming rather than perpetuating systems of oppression into systems of empowerment. As teachers of the Global South lend their voice, the picture becomes more clear, an interconnected global context emerges and we are empowered to reveal hidden barriers to peace and development in order that we may achieve the aims of peace and development education.

The group of twelve participants who were interviewed included 9 teachers from Uganda as well as 3 Canadian teachers. As made clear in the review of the research, there exists an under-representation of the views of teachers from the Global South. It was, therefore, determined that the data focus on the views of teachers from the Global South. For this reason, more teachers were interviewed in Uganda than in Canada. At the same time, teachers in the Global North play key roles in developing peace, for that reason, they were also invited to participate. During the interviews the researcher avoided correcting and debating values with the participants and attempted to set aside her worldview. This helped to create a context where participants were able to develop their own story allowing a dialogue to emerge in which the participants felt safe to share their experiences during the war, as well as free to offer criticisms of development approaches and finally to inform practice in peace and development education.

The data will be presented by first, introducing the Canadian teachers by outlining their views on peace, development and education. The focus will then shift to the Ugandan participants. Through their personal stories and experiences of war, they will

share their perspectives regarding definitions for peace and conditions for peace.

Following this introduction, data will be organized according the units of meaning, which emerged as the researcher analyzed the data. Themes within each unit of meaning will be explored which will inform the recommendations and significance of the study.

Educators in the Global North

Joy:

Joy has been a teacher for over 30 years. She has taught in public and private schools, both young people and adults. She spent some time teaching internationally in Europe. She has also worked for the government French language training programs and is an author of seven books. Joy describes herself as an educator whose whole life has been about books. She became a teacher because she wanted to “turn kids on to literature, get them excited about books” (12-17). For Joy, regardless of the subject the role of schools is clear, it is to “civilize and socialize these children” (54). Throughout her career Joy has observed the change in society and in students. She recalls that when she was young “back in the 60’s, we thought we would change the world and we did. We were out in the streets and we did the demonstrations. We did it cause it was a rebellion against all the bourgeoisie values. We had to fight because oh, those values were so repressive” (362-365). Society and young people now are trapped in their comforts and isolated by technology. She remarked, “I’m afraid of the technology because it does tend to isolate kids...we must just give them the opportunity of joining the conversation” (84-86). She continued by adding that “these kids have every freedom in the world. Why would they fight against it? When you are too comfortable. They don’t care, its

complacency” (378-380). Because of this change in society, Joy views “our function as teachers, just to make them realize that there is a conversation that has been going on for 1000s of years...just to be aware of that and they are in a position to contribute and participate and to grow and to be good solid decent people who are excited about things and interested in things and you know who would like to make a difference in a small way” (91-98).

Joy continued by adding that this isolation and indifference is leading students in western society down a dangerous road where “they don’t want to change their lifestyle... they say, what for? What difference is that going to make?” (117-120). She added that students growing up in Western society that is based on the individual has raised a generation where “kids are so narcissistic now. Its hard for you to climb out of your own head and your own body to see what needs to be fixed out there if you are so concentrated on yourself and society seems to encourage that kind of you know that cult of your body” (160-165). As we have been progressing under the weight of individuals and consumption, the greatest threat to compassion and peace according to Joy is that “we are loosing our imagination, to put yourself in somebody else’s shoes. You have to imagine yourself in that person’s shoes. That’s where compassion comes from. So it’s a failure of the imagination” (190-193).

Therefore schools must combat this feeling and “inculcate good values and make kids feel responsible for each other” (148). Furthermore, Joy believes that schools can “teach tolerance and make students imagine themselves in somebody else’s shoes. And imagine a world, and have a sense about one another and care about what is going on in places of the world” (203-206).

With regards to peace and development Joy believes that peace it is "respect. It's allowing each person to find their own way, I don't have to worry about personal security" (226-229). She believes that when it comes to the actions of the Global North in the Global South that the North "tends to patronize, you know cause we come from this first world and we're now coming to help you in the 3rd world ... and this is hard to eradicate from kids consciousness" (250-254). Joys wishes teachers and students between the Global North and Global South could "have more contact. They can teach us. There is just less of a reliance on material wealth to identify with, they tend to have a real sense of community that we are loosing" (270-274). She envisions peace, development and education as something that we can work on together to help us "call upon ourselves and talk about tolerance, compassion and sharing. So we will have to adopt some of the values of the 3rd world, we'll have to exchange the good things and leave out the bad" (308-310).

Sam:

Sam has been a teacher for 28 years in private schools with rural and urban school divisions. He did not plan on becoming a teacher. His experiences with individuals during work as well as traveling led him to it. "I had traveled... and so I saw that and I had been to areas that had background implications for me, certain European countries, so I didn't come with just an insulated view of the world" (60-64). While traveling he was propositioned to remain in a country as a teacher of English. He decided he had better return to Canada to receive a degree in Education in order to teach officially. (4-10). Thus far, Sam has not returned to the country where the seed to teach was planted. But as he said "life's not over yet" (79).

For Sam, peace is “compromising and getting along” (19). Yet the biggest dynamic of peace for Sam is “tolerance...the concept of respecting other people’s opinion...so tolerance and knowledge and information that you can understand why that person has that point of view, where they are coming from. So tolerance, knowledge and empathy, that’s my worldview” (32-35).

When it comes to fostering peace Sam believed that teachers, “have to take a leadership role” (149). The role that education plays in peace is to somehow communicate that “we are hugely privileged... I think we are doing them [students] a world of disservice if we keep kids in a little box and just knowing what they know and being frightened of the world. I think the more they know, the more tolerant they can be and maybe I hate to say, I don’t know if there ever could be world peace but maybe in their lifetime there could be, in someone’s lifetime” (107-113). Sam attempts to remove students from the box through international literature, through reading “books written by a Christian or a Jew a Muslim, we see some things and we talk about things and its really quite nice” (98-101). The rationale behind including works written by authors from diverse countries of the Global North and South is to “remove the Western filter, give students another world. Some authors have anti-western sentiments and students are surprised and think, why do they think that about us? We live in a bubble” (208)

On the topic of development Sam is skeptical. While he does not name the reasons, he said, “I think the intention is good, but between the layers of government and just all the things that can go wrong in terms of government and different people getting money and the trickle down effect, I think it trickles down to very little. That’s why I’d do the trickle up” (184-187). He recommends that he “wouldn’t go to the top

government of that country but... would go to the people, the grassroots” (170). The cause for errors in the approach according to Sam is “colonialism isn’t it? At its best and worst and we were a colony once and we learnt it...I’m not a historian, but I think that’s colonialism” (178-180).

Sam believes that the issue for the North is truth in the media. He said, “we rely on the media a lot and I think we sometimes get it instantaneously...so that’s a good thing, but I don’t know if it’s the truth? And who’s truth is it? So what’s the real story?”(195-200).

Rose:

Rose has been an educator for over 15 years. She has taught English and geography. Currently she teaches courses in physical and human geography. She decided to become a teacher because her dad told her that she would be a good teacher, and she is happy that she followed his advice. She admits though that she enjoys teaching “cause its creative, you are always with kids, because you can have an impact on people and I guess I like to try to effect change” (13-15). Rose believes that teachers can “inspire, and get people excited about what they can do” (18). She recalled her father and said, “my dad always says to me the teacher is the best job in the world. And there isn’t any other job that inspires people to do something with their lives” (90-92). To Rose, the words of her father have seemed to have a big effect.

When asked to define peace Rose explained her view. She said, “I don’t feel you can fight evil with evil. So I think war is the stupidest thing on the planet. All you do is it consumes everything, resources, people and destroys everything. Such a waste of life

and creation. Peace to me is, is really providing a place on the earth where we can all share and get along and if we're always just thinking about ourselves, then I think that's where war starts" (40-45). She went on to describe racism and the construction of difference as the underlying cause of conflict. She continued, "we don't see other people as our equals. We create racism, which is a social construct. So I see you as different so therefore I can take your stuff. That is the opposite of peace. So peace is treating everyone the same. We all have, we are all brothers and sisters, we all spread out" (47-50). Rose believes that this disconnect is harming us all. That we all suffer. She stated "our world is desperate for a connection to each other" (136).

Rose believes that development has taken a misguided and incomplete approach. She observed, "we try to take our view of the world, which is a western, European view and we say, we have the answers and this is how we are going to do it. We need to be open to the people to say what they want for themselves. We may not have all the answers, that every culture may have an answer to something, and it's a working together and development has not be working together it has been, here I come, you're so lucky that I'm going to build you a dam... and it all falls flat." (169-177).

She hopes and believes schools raise awareness of injustice "because eventually when people don't have basic needs, they will fight for them." (104-105). She believes that teachers can assist in breaking down these constructs which place one over the other. She said, "if students are not exposed to it they won't do anything for it. So that's our job. Learn, research and bring this information to them." (97-99). She continued "it's trying to make sense of the world for them. Why is there a developing, or developed world? Showing them cause and consequences of life. I try not to preach. They come to

a lot of their own conclusions. But they, if you show them the problem and the crisis, most people want to do something” (117-120).

The participants from the Global North are dedicated to their work, to their students and to their life in education. The conversations, definitions, and reflections they shared regarding development, peace and education reveal an awareness of the post-colonial reality.

Educators in the Global South: Definitions of Peace

It is difficult to define peace, because I experienced very little...I was still a baby, so I don't know what is peace. (George, 74-85)

The concept and definition of peace and development are fundamental in understanding the approaches in education. Teachers in Uganda were asked to define peace as well as to outline the conditions they believe must be present in order for peace to flourish.

George:

George is a young man of 26. He has been an educator for four years. He teaches in Northern Uganda in a small village 18 km from Gulu. This may not seem far however when one travels along the bumpy roads, 18 km is quite a distance and villages are isolated. For George, he “grew up during this insurgency” (81). George is a member of the Acholi tribe, the dominant group of people who live in northern Uganda. Like many Acholi, living in the villages during the war that lasted from 1987 to 2005, life was really “quite bad” (24). George commented that he was constantly on guard as the “insurgency

can sometimes trickle from the suburb and can sometimes kidnap, they can also come and kill, maim” (31-32). He was himself forced by circumstances of war to become a “night commuter” (18). The night commuters were groups of young boys and girls from the villages who would travel into larger town centres during the night to seek safety. One occasion George remembers when “one time with one of my friends...on that very night they came so near our huts where we had been sleeping, but fortunately we were not picked up by them. My friend was picked up along the way, kidnapped and he was taken by the rebels and he stayed for six months in the bush. I also escaped from them several times... they [the rebels] could sneak things, do terrible things and run away, so it was very difficult, so they were like ghosts” (48- 51). This insecurity for George not only affected his safety but his finances as well. His parent were “tied up at the camps, they could not do the tasks to perform to make money” (61).

When asked to define peace, George paused for a long time. Finally he said, “it is difficult to define peace, because I experienced very little...I was still a baby, so I don’t know what is peace and I grew up during this insurgency and so I know it theoretically. So as a thing in theoretical sense, peace is . . . fulfillment of one’s desires at anytime does not interfering with other people’s interests.” (74-85). He went on to describe the conditions for peace including, “public security, provision of social needs, education, and care... without all those, people will not experience peace” (90-93).

Anthony:

Anthony is a teacher and activist. He began an organization that funds children’s education through sponsorship. According to Anthony “a good percentage of the

children are from the war-zone” (25). He went on to describe how the children “carry many burdens from war, orphans, some who have HIV, and those of child headed households” (28-30). The organization attempts to take a “holistic approach, that carries them from grade 1 to high school, to college education” (41-42).

He also initiated a peace project in 2005. During the war, Anthony continually believed that the war would end, and he wondered what kind of society would emerge. He shared the thoughts that remained with him during those difficult years, “we shall have peace one day, it is coming but we need to build a culture of peace. When we build a culture of peace we will be able to prevent future wars” (50-54). During this time of war, Anthony recalls that there was

No night where I did not hear gunshots... at night you would sleep with your shoes because at night you were sure you were going to run.... I was 16 years old, and you were sure you were going to run. In the night there is no peace. Either they attack the school or around the school or somewhere far, but still you run. So you are always shifting...since that period of war, I was thinking, there will come a time when this war will stop, but how will we be implementing peace?
(67-75)

Now that peace has arrived in Uganda, Anthony observed that “many people say that peace is when there is no gunshots. But peace is not just that. Peace is beyond the silence of a gun. Peace is when we are able to live within ourselves and the community in harmony. When there is plenty of food. Because the leading cause of insecurity is when there is no food” (94-100).

Anthony's definition of peace also emerges from his memory. He can recall a time when he felt at peace. When he was a young boy the people in his village experienced peace. He described this peace from his memory, "we would have people come and feast in our home, for almost a month, everyone is feasting, bringing goats, cows...and my father would buy clothes for the women and children" (108-109). Anthony equated this sense of generosity and sharing as a manifestation of peace. He continued by outlining the conditions for development, drawing connections to his concept of peace. He stated, "development is access to social amenities, food, health care, education, not just for myself but if my neighbors do not have food I am insecure...Dignity must be observed. If you don't have dignity that is another form of violence and another form of insecurity. Lack of dignity is a big one. Lack of dignity is a very big factor" (135-139). For Anthony peace and development should focus on context of current conflict or development issue, we must "know the conditions that lead to war, then maybe we can prevent wars" (313-315).

Anna:

Anna is a head teacher at a secondary school in Northern Uganda. She married an Acholi man, however she is from the Madi tribe in West Nile. During their 30 years together they raised 3 daughters, and lived "throughout these 25 years of insurgency here" (14). Anna recalls life was "wonderful before the war, life was so good. Business was booming, the country was in a really good state. When the insurgency came in 1986, things began to deteriorate with the rebel insurgency, attacks here and there, life became so hard" (24-27). Anna describes some of the hardships faced by her family and the

Acholi people including people running for their lives, leaving their homes, and the government taking people to Internally Displaced People camps. As an educator, Anna recalls that “life was not easy and for teachers it was rough, we really faced a conflict of loyalties, to your what? To your duty, to your profession, at the same time to your family...but we kept serving under these conditions... there was no point in time when we really did not teach. Schools had to amalgamate...converge in one place. To continue on” (33-42).

After experiencing these many hardships, for Anna “peace... is love...because with love, you will not involve yourself in bad activities” (51-52). Love for Anna is the path towards peace. Anna continued by describing peace as influenced by development, which is “when a country has reached a state of affluence, when the economy is going well, there is industrialization, the agriculture sector is booming, non violation of human rights. All this are signs of development” (116-130).

Beatrice:

Beatrice is a young teacher. She graduated with her education degree in 2004 and worked until 2007 for the nongovernmental organization, Medcins Sans Frontiers (MSF) in a village 3 km from Gulu. With MSF, Beatrice’s work was with the children who had been a part of the night commuters. She described that her task was to take care of them (7-23). Even though the war had officially ended, the shelter remained open until 2007 because of elusive rebel groups. Moreover, “there were some children who were still commuting from far. There are others still coming from the villages so we had to stay” (20-22). Today, Beatrice teaches religious studies, political education, and counseling at

an elementary school. She believes that “teaching is very nice, I love it actually. But it is so challenging” (35).

According to Beatrice in Northern Uganda, “each and every person has been touched by this war, in one way or the other. ...students who are returnees, they were formerly abducted and they were brought back to the community and they are there. And there are others who have been victims directly in this war, and there are others who are witnesses, and others who have heard of things” (48-55). Beatrice has experienced the harsh realities of war personally. She tells her story.

My family have been touched in a way that...formerly we were in the village, and because of this war we had to seek from our village to town where we are settled...so during the war it happened that my father stepped on a landmine. And he was amputated, one leg, blown off. He could not now do anything. So we were affected in a way that we had to take up the rest of the responsibility of upbringing our seven, by doing petty jobs. And it was not easy. And to one affected our education...My elder sister had to stop at senior four...Not only that, now we see our mother is the bread winner. She will play the part of mother and father. And because of this, when we were told to go back to the home villages there were other people who did not come to town so they say that our land should be for them. So since we are only girls, there is no need for us to access the land...so now we must remain in town. All this I would put on the war. (123-130)

Beatrice regarded peace as a state of mind. It is when a “person is physically, economically, emotionally, and perhaps spiritually settled. And when a person has no fear” (145-147). Beatrice outlined the following aims for development; that people are “contented, when he or she has good access to health facilities in case you are sick, you are served the same way as the rich people who also get the what? The medical attention” (221-223). She continued by adding that “accommodation, not in the same standard like the other, but if you can sleep well, eat well, and have access to education those are the basic things...not the luxuries, but the basic things. And perhaps work, if you can do something to push them as the day goes...something you can do to sustain your life” (233-238).

Beatrice stated that “it is true, that there are people who live in plenty...and that is everywhere, however the gap in some countries may not be so wide. In Uganda, the gap is wide” (307-309). She believes that they aim of development should be to “bring the gap narrower” (318).

Margaret

Margaret is an Acholi woman who grew up with very supportive parents. She was born in Kampala where she completed her studies. She now lives in Kitgum where she is an art teacher at a girls school. The school has many young women who were kidnapped during the insurgency. She believes that “peace is when my rights does not interfere with anybody’s rights. My right, must not interfere with your right and yours must not interfere with mine” (325-328). According to Margaret in order for peace to prevail “poverty must not be there” (332). Poverty leads to instability. She also believes

that path to peace should aim at “uniform development” (401), because globally “there is a big difference” (402). She also sees the need for equal access to power for all, something she referred to as “true democracy” (388).

Stewart:

Stewart was born in Gulu district in a small village 15 km from Gulu. He has been teaching for 5 years and has been appointed a deputy teacher in his school.

Stewart recalls his experience growing up with war, “I used to live in the village but of course due to the insurgency, we really suffered, life was not easy, because there were a lot of interruptions in terms of learning. Each and every time we running up and down the area...abductions” (19-24).

Despite experiencing the hardship and insecurity of war, Stewart was grateful for the opportunity to share his perspective on peace. Peace is when “you don’t experience all disasters, destructions to human life and happiness” (32). He continued by adding peace is “protection, people are free, they are digging, they are cultivating, so to me I believe they have peace...if we say there has to be development then we must experience all the basic needs” (58,59,126). These basic needs include, “ items that have to facilitate your wellbeing... education and health service, and you have all relative peace to make your living good, that is development” (118-119).

William

William is a history teacher from a neighboring district to Gulu in Northern Uganda. He grew up in Kitgum district. He completed his secondary school in Northern Uganda and has been teaching in the north for 10 years, where all “throughout the insurgency, I have remained here” (13). As was the reality for many Acholi, William

stated that living with war “was a really sad experience” (12). While the sadness was evident in William’s voice, he wanted to share his experience, to try and build the context of what life was like for people during the war. He explained,

When the rebels are near by, we fear they can be apprehended or abducted...when we hear some gunshots, then people become scared. I saw some people who were killed. I passed by, persons on the roadside. There was a time when I came through an ambush during the time we were passing in the vehicle here. One of the passengers was killed. So when the government soldiers came to intercept and then the rebels fled away, but the dead person was there. We often slept in the bush. And some wild animals like pythons, the snakes...but god protected us. (25-33)

Even though William believes god protected him, it was clear that the experience of war remained with him. He continued, “we would go sleep with others but you would scatter yourselves so that if people come to check on you, they won’t find you all in one place. We lived that way for more than ten years...horrible, horrible. There was a time when about a few hundred people were killed, killed! You cannot imagine. When they find those people they were just scattered, they went into the bush. They started hunting people like wild pigs and the rest, on finding you, they butcher you” (36-45).

Eventually William married, yet war continued to stalk life. He explained how on one occasion his “wife was almost abducted, they only sympathized with her because of her condition, so one of the babysitters was taken and they went to Sudan, they took her for 10 years. (She) came back when she was already a dead person. Terrible experiences...that is how it has been” (47-52).

William's friends were also abducted and he spoke of their experiences.

Those, who were not killed, have come back. Once they learn you want to escape, they beat you fairly well, or at times they may kill you to show the other people that if you try to escape this is what we are going to do. We kill you in the presence of all the rest...so they are absent minded, all of a sudden they are there in a different world... and we try to handle them in a human way, knowing that the experiences that they had were not easy. (66-79)

When asked to describe peace, William smiled and said, "I would define peace as a situation whereby one feels relaxed, no fear, no insecurity, peace of the heart, peace of the mind...you don't hear gunshots, the materials that you need to have, those that are extensions for life, if you have, food, water, shelter, housing, and um anything connected to the life to make you feel comfortable, what you need, then you have peace" (98-100).

Development should therefore be a path toward peace, and according to William create a society where,

Medically, a person can see a doctor, health. Here, in many cases you have many children who are dying. Also economically, we cannot sustain human life.

Inequality, humanly speaking there is a feeling as, we need to overcome that one, so that inequality when a person thinks, why should this certain person have this when I don't have? And the person will plan to gain it in a bad way. It leads to problems. (150-155)

David:

David teaches in a small rural village school. He is a science teacher and carries the responsibilities of the entire science department. He has taught for 8 years in private

and government schools. David was born in Kitgum, and he lived in Northern Uganda throughout the war. David was willing to share some of his memories of that period. He recalled, “rebels were maybe 200 meters from town, so it was very scary. So life was not so easy, uh everyday you have to hear gunshots, everyday you have to hear gunshots, so it was not a good situation” (28-32). As a teacher he sees evidence that war has had an impact on students. He explained, “students still struggle, because some of them have actually seen their own parents being killed, some of them see people who were battered, and some of them were abducted...my school is in the village so even these people are more affected so we have a lot of those kinds of things” (39-45).

David understands peace as, “when you live happily with your people, without any external disturbances. You sleep well, you eat well, then you have peace. You go to school, you have good work” (53-56). He went on, in his very soft spoken voice to connect his perspective on peace and development. He described an analogy for his vision of development, “A very simple example. Like a bicycle chain. If one gets broken, we don’t move. So that is everybody has a part to play. Everybody is the chain. The bicycle chain, it can also be broken. We are all the chain” (114-116). This vision implies that we rely on one another, and that development must serve everyone. Furthermore his analogy teaches that if one region of the world is suffering, it affects us all.

Joseph:

Joseph is a teacher, activist and politician. He was born and raised in Gulu district. He studied agriculture and then received his degree from teachers college. He is only 26, but has already been appointed a head teacher (5-30).

From the beginning of our conversation it became clear that Joseph is a strong speaker and activist. He shared his passion and his inspiration; “I was always a leader. I’m assertive, I stand, so I have found that people coming and saying, why don’t you represent us... my dad was a leader. But he did not go far because of all the conflicts” (53- 55).

Joseph believes that peace is “a situation where you don’t have any kind of disturbance and you have all you need, not just about you being happy, happy, happy, but about all the community having everything. Because having a road that comes from my compound to my neighbors and once my neighbor is having a problem, then problem becomes mine” (58-64). He elaborated his definition by telling the following story,

Maybe I have a lot of chickens, I call myself rich. But they do not lay, and maybe my neighbor has only one that lays. I have all the chicken I need, so if I’m in bad times with that person who is my neighbor, saying I already have everything I need. The day I need an egg I will not have them. So that’s what it means... you may have everything you need in Canada, but you may need the smallest thing that is up to Africa, that is very insecure...so you come here, but if there is no peace here you become unpeaceful. (88-97)

He believes that one of the greatest goals we should be aiming for is to “leave the world better than you found it, so if development can be geared to leaving the world better than how we found them, then the impact would be so good” (117-120). Leaving the world better according to Joseph includes, “time to go to school, try to eradicate ignorance. It is a world that is helping, that is, having a low level of diseases and infections. A world that is free of insecurity” (133-135). His rationale for this approach

towards development rests upon his belief that “we live in a global village, that is what we must accept...When we encourage a bad thing in one part of the world we are going to encourage a bad thing to the whole world” (142-144).

Peace then according to the participants is linked directly to development. This reflects an understanding of positive peace. These teachers have all experienced war, loss and the fear of horrible acts. Yet as Anthony stated, “peace is beyond the silence of the gun” (94). They all minimized the experiences of war and were eager to discuss what peace is and how they envision it. Peace is the presence of justice. It is the ability “to sleep well, eat well, and have access to education” (Beatrice, 221). Essentially it is the ability to be able to meet your basic needs and live a life with dignity as you choose. A second theme was the idea that peace is sharing. As Anna stated, “peace is love” (51). Peace manifests itself in a culture of care and generosity. Here, the focus is on the community not the individual needs. As George stated peace is when, “fulfillment of one’s desires at anytime does not interfering with other people’s interests” (74-85). Therefore equality becomes crucial, and minimizing the gap between the rich and poor is a part of creating peace. Finally peace emerges when we come to recognize we need one another, we are a part of the chain as William suggests.

Barriers to Peace & Development

*We don't understand one another,
this escalates into conflict. (Anthony, 184)*

Following examinations of the concepts and conditions of peace and development, participants also discussed what they had understood and experienced as barriers to achieving peace and development. A deeper view of barriers may assist teachers in peace

education to clear the road to peace. As Uganda is regarded as a developing country, perspectives on the definition of development, what they believe the aims should be, and how development has been successful and unable to meet the needs. It was interesting to note the hesitancy of participants to criticize, perhaps a continuation of the colonial message of cultural inferiority.

George stated, “the thing that prevents peace and development are so so numerous” (98). He began with discussing, “conflict of interests, one will start to fight one another” (112). He continued by identifying inequality and the “unequal distribution of resources” (113) as a barrier to peace. George sees the unequal distribution of resources and development not as natural phenomena but as an intentional strategy to maintain power, which frustrates the oppressed and leads to violence. He stated there “has been biased... so here in the Northern, here we become a total different place. When you cross to that side (Southern Uganda), you will see a lot of development has taken place, so the people want to gain that same level but do not have access to power. So not having access to power means going through unusual means, conflict” (116-120).

A third barrier according to George is the “tendency to grab land” (127) by investors. Interestingly enough, investment & privatization is often viewed by the west as evidence of development but in reality it “was not through negotiation means, where the people [Northern Ugandans] themselves agree. So that is another disagreement which peace will not prevail” (134-135).

These barriers are linked to colonization. George outlines the impact that colonization still has on peace and development.

The British ruled Uganda...they were given opportunities basing on assumptions and perception, based upon what they believed they first came to Uganda. So Northern people were developed into the army...the central area were looked at as people who were wise, the West Nile were being looked at as commissioners... so that splitting which was based on the colonial aspect also made them develop certain impact until now...so that one brings a lot of conflict. That colonial experience had a big impact, so much. So that is one of the pieces that must be looked at if peace will prevail. (155-165)

When it came to offer criticisms of Western effort in development George began slowly. He stated,

I do appreciate the effort which is being made by the westerners. They have really supported. And without them, sometimes we could be in a bad conditions maybe more than we are right now. But one thing that I don't agree with them, and I would wish them to change it is taking things in the perception of the way they have learned things before they have come, so they want to implement things in the Western style here...it will not stay in place. (233-242)

He spoke of an example of what he saw during the insurgency,

During this period where war was so intense they would come, would come with all their assistance but they would marginalize the *very* needful people...who are on the ground. Because they have no access to intellectuals who brings this ideas, they will always be abandoned and their situations tend to be more worse. So it [money], is being given to people who are making money. Everyday the

government gives them funds and they are the ones taking this portion, the very needful people are now left and they are not getting anything. So that is why I dislike so much the supply of the Western people. So they stop at a certain level, they don't go beyond. So it makes their programs to look like it is helping but it does not. (258-272)

Furthermore he sees that much of the development offered by the West comes with a "borrowing condition, always has the string attached to it which are sometimes undesirable for the developing countries" (312-313). These conditions force developing countries to comply with economic ideas of the West. George believes developing countries "need to be independent, outside, and democratic. There should not be conditions to be in the style of any Western governments" (315-317).

He identifies part of the problem also on corruption within Uganda. He stated, "this is the corruption of the practices here. It is like a bottle with no bottom, it will never fill up" (286).

Anthony smiled when asked to touch upon the barriers to peace and development. He stated, "um, I think there is something else that you people [Westerners] call development and for me it is not development...it is oppression of another way" (621). He continued, "we have seen donations from countries. They bring us toys. Toys, actually toys, that kills the creativity of our children... I grew up here, and I used to make my toys, toy cars... I would concentrate. That helps a child develop their concentration. If you bring him already a toy, he will just play with the toy. He does not know creativity. You have killed the creativity of this child" (552-556). He spoke of how

development can also may contribute to what he saw as cultural degradation with roles of men and women. Young girls “are supposed to learn how to cook...but you bring a toy. She is seeing a drum, she is seeing a toy, a keyboard. She does not have time to learn the basic domestic work. And that destroys our community” (558-560). Anthony added that the West not only bring its culture and values through development but also through media. “There is a lot coming from the Western world in the media. Talk about the music, the films, they all talk violence. Talk about hip hop, the rap music, the words are not friendly. They talk of violence, money, sex... a child grows up and sees all this violence, they themselves become violent” (578-590).

Anthony also commented on the work of government and agencies as they address economic strategies. “There is a lot being done in the aspect of economic programs. So that alone helps to bridging the gap. But again, it’s a contradiction because the government has also allowed free players. Its oppression in another way. They do not set up rules for interest rates...You are not helping me, you are exploiting me” (394-401).

For Anna the barriers to peace and development are based upon economics. In Uganda, she explained “our economy is basically based on agriculture, we cannot move, we cannot export, we cannot earn foreign currency, we are yet at that state of trying to gain” (132-135). She continued by explaining that “corruption has eroded our society, people are just thinking of how much they are going to gain... so that takes us back, we can never grow... Corruption, nepotism all this, discrimination leads to underdevelopment.” (164-166).

Beatrice identified several barriers to peace and development. First she stated the “tendency for segregation, corruption and when you deny a person his or her rights to do certain things” (179-183) acts as a barrier. Secondly, she believes that “ignorance ...there are certain things that you do and it will hurt others, but you may not be knowing, that is ignorance. Not that you intended to do so, but that is ignorance” (185-187). Negligence is a further barrier to peace and development, and is manifested when people do “not do their duty...doing certain things that you know will hurt others” (192). Beatrice sees inequality and exploitations as major hurdles that stand in the path of peace and development. She explained, “if someone knows what they deserve and you deny it, that person will become what? Violent” (200). She continued to challenge that people in the developed world “should be concerned, I think global difference in that economical standard...if the better off people they would put if for bragging or you abuse the rights of others because you have something at your hand then that will bring violence” (205-209).

She spoke of the reality of what it means to be poor in Uganda. She said, “we have so many families who eat only one meal in a day. They do certain work that is hand to mouth. If you work today, then you will eat, in case you don’t work, you don’t eat. So that is the kind of situation we are in. So it is quite difficult to again, for that person to think of development, broaden their perspective. They must eat. So that is the immediate thing now” (249-253). This leads to an insecure situation. She explained that there are those in the world with privilege who,

Use their riches to exploit others....no matter how poor a person is, they have got brain, and you cannot stop them from thinking. Even if they are poor, at least he

will think. So the kind of things that you do, hurting the person...the rich person will have a problem... You do not cooperate with them you exploit them instead. (330-336)

When it comes to barriers to peace and development Margaret was very clear. “Greed, greed, greed. Greed for money, greed for wealth, greed for power...all this conflict that has been taking place is because of greed and power and wealth” (464-465). Yet, she asserted that “we must not point fingers at anybody. It is now our collective responsibility to solve this problem, young and old in the whole world” (313-135). Despite that concept on the way forward, Margaret’s one regret regarding the current model of development is the negative role the developing world has come to play. She asked, “how long will we remain begging from donors? For me, they also get tired, this is what I tell them if people don’t like to hear it. I hate begging by the way. I think if they work hard and take education seriously then their future is bright. And for the future of Uganda” (271-275).

Stewart began by stating that development cannot be measured through investments and in “terms of buildings and infrastructures... because if you look at our state, we suffered and all basic needs, all basic essentials, were not in place, health, education, and as I speak there are children who study under the tree” (119-124). Before he outlined how he perceived development being misguided, he was clear that “first of all I would appreciate for the good work they have done, in actually bringing peace... and as I speak I am seeing a very good change in terms of all the resources being in place and of course they are trying to work hard to bring what is expected to upbring the suffering

children and to bring these people who suffered up. Yes.... The NGOs played a big role...if I can judge, we need to extend for support, we really need to work hard and upbringing these children and reinstate peace” (149-155).

William identified three barriers to peace and development. These are poverty, misunderstandings and inequality. Poverty, he stated “is the major net to come and stop peace...also, the interpretation of love to a white person and to a black person, but we are all children of god, we must love one another... that these misunderstandings must not lead us to fight. What we need to do is love” (116-124). Regarding inequality, William stated that “inequality, humanly speaking, there is a feeling as we need to overcome that one” (148). William also noted the tendency of the West to at times “push their ideas...if Uganda wants us [West] to help, you must do ABCD, they have this way of challenging this” (160-164). David echoed this idea, that the West sometimes “can bring people down because of selfish interest... the money is being spent on other things. It doesn’t reach the grassroot” (104-106).

Joseph saw through the rhetoric of development. The flaw in the current system is simply “the rich remain rich and the poor remain poor” (192). The flaw of the model of Western led development begins at the most basic level, language. “All these people who are coming and strategists... you don’t speak my language, which is Luo, so I speak a different language” (194-195). The same could be said of the language of peace and development. Joseph continued, “I think these countries, which are the donor countries. I think they have good perceptions, and they have good acts...but the whole thing is being misused down here. So if only you people could come down and implement these things by yourselves...you go down yourselves then in five years you would achieve”

(247-250). Joseph shared the frustration of those in developing countries who continue to see their industries, and resources being expropriated and controlled by the West, leaving Ugandan's in a state of dependence. He explained for example, that "we are supposed to be extracting oil, you maybe have a very bright idea, that please, why don't we export your crude oil into Canada, we refine from Canada then we bring it back for you to use. I think that will be not fair" (287-288).

As barriers were explored by participants themes emerged. The first common barrier to development and peace according to the participants is the role of the Global North or the 'West'. First in terms of colonization and second in terms of how the West tends to play the role of expert and dictate development. Therefore, peace and development education should include an examination of this history to understand current global contexts. The legacy of colonialism is echoed in development approaches advocated by the Global North. This continued assumption of Northern superiority over the Global South is clearly felt and frustrates individuals in the Global South.

Voices From the South: Education, Dialogue, Care, & Hope

When you go home, don't forget about us. Don't forget about us, tell your students about us (William, 235-236).

With the barriers to peace and the shortcomings of development outlined, teachers were then asked to offer their views on the way forward. Their stories express their, perspectives and recommendations for the way that peace and development education might be transformed, the roles of educators in fostering that transformation, as well as where they imagine the future may lead. The words shared offer a map, with the voices

of those from conflict zones of the global South serving as a guide. Their voices guide us towards a broader view on peace, development education and hope.

Voices: Education for Peace

When examining the role of education in fostering peace, teachers were enthusiastic to share their views regarding how education can impart the message of peace and development as well as to offer solutions to development challenges the world is facing. Beatrice believes that education can “empower the person to see solutions to their problems” (345). Teachers involved in peace and development education should raise awareness of the consequences of their students’ actions, and offer the chance to “widen the view, that certain kinds of actions that you do, you have to weigh the negative and the positive” (359-360). Beatrice also outlined the impact of an education system that would not foster this kind of thoughtful reflection. In such a system,

[individuals] will not have the time to thinking in the ins and outs, they just see the one thing they want and go... at least when you are educated you don't take things for granted, you see both sides of the coin, you know that action you are taking and where it will lead. (362-373)

This is an important comment. With her comment, Beatrice is offering a critique of the Western economic model of growth and consumption upon which development is based. Consumption requires us to see, to want, and get. We are compelled to ignore the ins and outs of our decisions. According to Beatrice’s eloquent definition of the role of education in fostering peace and development, the question must be asked, are we a truly

educated society, or are we ignorant? Joseph echoes this sentiment. He believes education must go further than outlining development challenges and include the aim of fostering citizens who base decisions not only on personal gain but the wider implications. He stated, “we need education, let the people understand the consequences of all this, before they decide, because here people are deciding without understanding the long term” (177). He also believes that in order to understand the wider consequences of decisions, “the community must be involved” (185).

Joseph added that a system that fails to adopt a more inclusive worldview will serve to perpetuate injustice and inequality. Joseph believes that “teachers must be empowered to do what they do best. Education is messed up. It will not eliminate ignorance... This is good for people with power, and they will remain there” (230-231).

George believes that education also plays a vital role in fostering a peace and more just society. He said, “If there is no proper functioning education system, there is going to be no world...education is the core, [from] which any developmental process must take off” (365-368). He encouraged all teachers to “begin from where you are... There is no perfect time that has been given for teaching peace... Tell them the things that one needs to so that it becomes a true aspect of humanity” (472-473). He believes that schools are such important venues to foster change and to challenge the status quo. Schools should be the places where students are encouraged to question assumption, to not give up hope. For George this rests on his firm belief that “things done by human beings can also be undone by human beings. So it doesn't mean this is a permanent condition, that lasts for so long a period of time, but the good things will win” (445-447).

Anthony also holds that “starting peace education to children. They will know peace, conflict management, conflict prevention, when they are still young. They will grow up with this so they become lifelong peace practitioners. Then we will build a culture of peace” (303-306). He believes that education should not only teach about peace but should also assist students in knowing “the conditions that lead to war. Let us talk about this. Let’s see how we can address these issues and then maybe we can prevent wars” (313-315). Again he reiterates that we must begin to take peace beyond the first stage of conflict prevention to deeper transformations of the heart. He believes that peace education should be “taught to children when they are still young, so that they will grow up with peace there. Because peace building is not about stopping wars. But if a child can build an inner peace he will not attack the other. He will love the Other” (519-522). This perhaps what is the crucial threshold that must be crossed, to love.

Stewart also agrees that “peace starts from the classroom”(67) but encouraged caution that “we don’t was to remain in the classroom” (75), “to encourage peace, you need to really teach outside the classroom too, and that is to the community and interact with it” (80-82).

Anna agreed, “teachers are capable of changing situations” (76). She believes that the future may be affected as teachers, “handle the young generation, which are to be the what? The future generations” (82). Therefore efforts to foster peace and justice and development can have a positive effect. David added that education working towards peace and development, teachers “sensitize the students, we are role models” (80).

According to the teachers, education plays a vital role. It should aim to challenge students to think of the wider impact of their decisions as well as encourage global

perspectives. Education that is working towards peace and development should inspire action and change, where we believe that students are able to make an impact on their world.

Voices: From Misunderstanding to Dialogue

Participants also identified the consequence of economic inequality, which continues to flow in the colonial pattern from North to South, and from the rich to the poor. They identified this pattern as weakening the ability of education in fostering peace and development. Whether it be education, development or the work of peace, there is a need to listen and foster dialogue with those living in the contexts where efforts are most often directed.

Beatrice recommended that those involved in initiating programs should be willing to “lower themselves and get the information, the needs for these people...they are human beings, they should cooperate with them, should have to pay attention to their views sometimes and to see how to incorporate with theirs, in order to live a peaceful life” (402-404). Partnership across the gap between rich and poor, humility is what Beatrice recommends. She stated that the “rural people may have a better focus on doing certain things” (410). Anthony added that the marginalized must be included because “the innocent people suffer the most” (433). Again William echoed this same invitation. He recommends that development aim to “equip the underprivileged people with tools so they can improve in their ways of living. Rather than give money, they can make life good for themselves” (163-164). He continued by adding that the Global North listen; that “the rich should learn from the poor that they are capable, and that they are human beings like any other person” (182).

George stated that dialogue is important because otherwise actions are being directed in a void. He said, “sharing ideas, because you cannot know what I am thinking unless you talk to me. Unless I reveal to you, you cannot come to know” (221-224). Therefore if those working in development and peace do not enter into dialogue, they remain ignorant and fail to ‘know’. Anthony believed that without dialogue as a priority, those working in the field of fostering peace and development may “destroy the existing peace in the name of bringing peace. So no one is an icon of peace, we must share ideas we have to tolerate one another. You give me time to explain to you why I do that and I also give you time to explain to me why you think I should not do that we will strike a deal” (756-760). Stewart described the dialogue between people of North and South as “borrow(ing) language” (172). Joseph added that an attitude of humility will lead us towards a future that is based on a wider set of knowledge and understand. He stated, “Accept that we don’t know so much and we also accept that we know much. So a situation where you assume you know everything, you cannot let anyone give new ideas...we can through education” (110-112). Joseph invited teachers, development workers, people from the North and South to engage in a conversation of the issues but to go deeper. He asked, “why don’t we have our teacher to teach in your schools? Why don’t we have teachers visiting your places? Then we share” (321). “We can share from our knowledge, but what we need to share, must be from the perspective of our own hearts” (359).

Voice: Development of an Economy of Care

You need to teach the heart. Don’t force them to do, let their heart force them to do. Let their heart talk to them. To teach for peace, we teach the heart (George, 489-492).

Imagine if during Truman's speech he had said that the aim of development would be generosity? Not charity, that is a top to bottom approach, but true generosity that flows from a heart and ethic of mutual care and love. Rather than generosity however, our economy is based on Western ideas of progress, rooted in self-interest, consumption and the expansion of wealth. Thus far, these have not had the ability to bridge the gap between rich and poor. Joseph outlines the basic fundamental problem with the current system and why it perpetuates inequality rather than eradicating it.

He stated,

We are employing the people, the tea plantations look very nice, but what's the impact? We have a lot of negative impacts which is gradual, we should not look at development in terms of what it's bringing today we should look at development in terms of what will my grandchildren who are coming up, will they live peacefully in that very world? (158-164) If you are swimming in wealth, you will not want a poor person to come and compete with you, so you enjoy the game, you go and speak around, but then you send your children to good schools and you motivate the poor to send their children to the bad schools. at the end of the day, people cannot compete. (235-240)

This economic system must be transformed. Anthony added, "peace is connected to these other things, poverty. So do you think they work towards peace or making peace? Are they also addressing the economic issues, of the life justice issues?" (373-376). Donations are good but let us do more to these world powers to tell them to bring lasting peace...When there is peace we all prosper" (511-512). David also sees flaws in

the current system. He agrees that the North “understand the problems, but how to address it, they don’t know what they need” (99). They might have identified the problem, but the North fails to comprehend the needs. By integrating the voice and perspective the economic policies could be expanded and guided by goals other than profits.

Repeatedly the message of a need to shift from profits toward caring, was mentioned in the interviews. Individuals told stories of how they have experienced caring, how they care for others and how they see this as impacting peace and development. Sharing is not only to impact our knowledge but to touch us at a human level as well. This is perhaps the largest missing piece in the language of peace and development work. The participants often outlined the current economic system, which underpins development efforts as part of the challenge to overcome. Participants would remind us that there must be an aspect of community, of care and of love within the economy that we must aim for if we are intending to build a world that reflects the Millennium Development Goals. That we must begin to see one another as friends, and then we will have the motivation to no longer accept the conditions that are afflicting people today. Joseph stated “you have known me as a friend. The moment you begin to understand me as a friend then you become connected to my environment” (85).

When asked what message he would like to impart to students and people of the Global North, William stated he would tell them that “they are privileged in the sense that they find themselves in a developed nation, compared to Africa. So they must not misuse that privilege, the students must not misuse that privilege” (189-191). Misusing privilege according to William would be to forget or lose hope. He challenged, “you need to not

forget about equality, you need to not forget about hope, be mindful, because at times we think things just came to exist by themselves, the markets, all these scientific theories, but they should not give up hope, they should explore many things and come up with innovations which will help bringing more light” (195-201). For William, privilege and wealth is not for personal gain as the Free Market and economic policies of the North promote. Rather William understands that “those certain talents have been given to us, so we can serve one another” (211). This worldview stands at the complete opposite end of the spectrum when it comes to the perspective of individual self-interest. The North’s view is that our talents are for personal gain, and as one person gains, benefits may trickle down. William’s view can assist in transforming the North’s view of the world.

George also believed it was important to point out the differences in privilege between North and South. “If I am to talk to your students, I would first relate to them the different aspects of humanity, the way you are living is not the way that other people are living, the way you think maybe common, but there are different aspects” (188-189). So they will come to believe as they hear the interview or read the survey, and start to believe, and these people who are intelligent who have lived and believe now it is true, more real” (205-208). Often students are overwhelmed and claim that there will always be injustice, George however believes that the oppression, the inequality, the poverty, the conflict, all these challenges are not the end and can yet be transformed. “Whether we are living in skyscrapers, whether you are living in grass-thatched houses, one thing you will find is that we will have problems. So problems is not the end of humanity, it is often the creation of human beings so it can also be solved by human beings. We had this war for 20 years, and we solved which seemed unsolved” (435-440).

For Beatrice caring about one another should be the aim of development, “sensitize the rich people, how do you see us as a part of the community, build a kind of relationship and you will find even if he is absent, this rich person even if he is absent the community members around him will take care of his home. He is a part of them” (413-419). Therefore as we care for others, we will care for ourselves. Beatrice’s philosophy to life is based upon her idea of what makes one happy, and it is not based on possessions. She shared, “I think it is that people think of yourself, and your moneys and the rest of it you are happy, but whenever I give I get again. People see it is a weakness in me, but I see it as a strength” (440). For Anthony, care was also a theme. He commented:

Let people learn to give. And you give with that passion I think let it reach out and you see how it reaching out and it changes somebody’s life and is also changes yourself. So the aspect of giving and see it reach out and changing somebody’s life is important. That to me itself is the creation of peace. (712-716)

Caring for one another is central to Anthony. He repeated, “I think children should be taught they should learn to give” (703). He lives by this ethic and stated, “you can never be a crocodile in a foreign land, if you have failed to be a lizard in your own home. You never achieve far away, if you fail to achieve it at home”(740-741). For Anthony he is not only hoping for generosity from abroad, he practices it as well. He shared that he is “able to reach out to people who are not from my clan, not from my tribe” (723). This is an invitation, to reach out beyond who we see as our people, our clan, our tribe. Anna added, “you can write poems related to peace... we can try to live by what we have picked from one another...through sharing and comparing” (107-109).

Margaret understands the impact care can have as we shift from a view of charity to generosity. For Margaret, she believes as people are able to see one another as truly human, as we hear stories, people's heart become transformed and a spirit of generosity and mutual care is created. She shared such a moment.

We care only for ourselves, now go tell stories...Stories are good because Uganda is far from Canada (428, 454), and I saw these whites gathering tears, and I thought for us we get used to violence by the way, it is now a part of us. After 23 years, it is now like part of us. So I saw them shedding tears, two teachers and 5 students paid for school fees. I feel that if we tell our stories we can get a life experience... you see people, feel touched...We need communicating so that when there s a disaster in Canada I feel sorry and when there is a disaster in Uganda, you feel sorry. (457-458)

Voices: Hope

Individuals are capable of overcoming tremendous circumstances. The individuals I spoke with suffered tremendously in ways that I cannot imagine. Yet it seems that the heart is capable of holding sorrow, joy and hope all at once. During the interviews, while we did discuss the impact of war on their lives, people were always eager to move on from there. To look forward. Their strength and hope is inspiring. It invites optimism, even though the circumstances in the world seem dire, if individuals who have come through so much still choose to see the world as full of hope, then so should the rest. This is a final message that we must integrate into our practice. To build solidarity as we imagine a new path.

Beatrice's view of the way forward rests on hope, "my hope is broad...my hope that I would have and have other people who would have the same dream as I have, to be the voice of the voiceless. Be the eyes of those who do not see...however, it is not possible for me to fulfill that kind of hope or dreams alone" (462-466). Contrary to what people in the developed world might think, Beatrice would not choose to change her story. "I don't regret being Acholi (laughs). Of all things, being in Uganda, and in the world map, Uganda is the third world...I appreciate our culture, that has been disorganized a bit with this war...but Acholi culture is sure sure, they are inquisitive, kind with strangers, so that one is a source of my pride" (449-458).

Margaret also believes in the capacity of individuals to transform the world. She would see even the smallest action, planting a tree as an act of transformation. She asks, "tell me if we all planted 5 trees every year, then in 5 years you will see that we have changed the world" (310).

George does admit that "we have fought, we have suffered but we still have hope" (418). George hopes because he views human as having "everything in common. Much as we don't have similar situation prevailing all in the situation we are living in. We still have something in common, all of us desire for peace. All look for peace" (214-216).

George smiled as he said, "as an Acholi, I'm proud of being myself, and I don't wish to change, I don't wish to change. Even if tomorrow there is going to be another war, the same land. I wish to be who I am. Because our heroes, don't normally come out as heroes, because of softness, they come out of tough conditions" (428-430). George is a hero. He is my hero, he can be a hero a lead to encourage us not to give up. He is not

waiting for the privileged North to tell him where his hope lies, he has it in his heart. But he is inviting those who perhaps have not suffered to join him.

William added “I thank God that he created me here. I’m proud of our culture, we have a lot of love. There are those who came about and spoiled our name, but I feel that our culture is not very bad, it is not very bad” (218-220). The motivation that I have, it is a big hope, I am still alive, there are still very many things that I need to do, that might lead to peace. That’s my hope, so long as I live and I have all the energy in me, I can see very many things that’s a big hope, life is a big hope” (229-231).

George concluded his interview with the following words. It is my goal to have the courage to follow his advice for it is the way to create a more just and peaceful world. He invited educators to “let us feel it at heart. You need to teach the heart. Don’t force them to do, let their heart force them to do. Let their heart talk to them. To teach for peace, we teach the heart” (489-492).

Chapter 6: Recommendations and Conclusions

The study aimed to understand the views held by teachers from the Global South with respect to peace and development education in order to provide insight into how teachers conduct peace and global education. To address the research questions the study was designed to invite educators of the Global South to share their voice in order to transform the colonial experience so that our efforts in peace and development education would be a part of transforming, rather than perpetuating, systems of oppression into systems of empowerment. This study has been a journey, not only in the geographical sense but also a journey of the heart, and mind where I have been led beyond the borders of my worldview. This was the aim. To take time to pause, to invite and to listen to individuals from the Global South in order to remove the Western lens through which we view the world. The individuals who participated have indeed challenged the definitions, and assumptions of peace and development education.

As mentioned, participants from the Global North had an understanding of the postcolonial reality. In this sense, it seems that the educators are ahead of the politicians, policy makers, and curriculum developers. Teachers understand this context, and that is an encouraging find. They share common ideas with educators from the Global South regarding the perspective that peace is more than simply the absence of war, but includes, dispelling ignorance, difference and inequality. They also recognized the continued attitude of the West is best, and endeavored to challenge these assumptions. What was unclear however was the source of their understanding. Did they arrive at it through their educational training or through personal experience? Speaking from personal experience, my training as an educator did not include any exploration of the post-colonial legacy. In

fact it was not until my graduate training where I was exposed to the writings of Paulo Freire and Edward Said. Therefore the first recommendation of this study is that training of teachers should include discussions on post-colonial reality and how this history is the foundation upon which contemporary divisions of developed and developing were established. As the literature advocates and the research supports, the role of teachers is to help expose ignorance, to reveal what was hidden, to assist our students in understanding this complex reality. We can expect our students to arrive in our classrooms with a view of the world shaped in part by colonialism, it is our job as educators to have the background and knowledge in order to challenge and expose these assumptions. As such, educational training should at minimum be exposing teachers who will likely cope with topics of global inequality with the necessary background to sensitize them in order that they will be able to raise awareness of the issues of post-colonial theory in their classrooms.

The second theme, which emerged from the educators in the Global South, is the need to transform and emancipate ourselves from the roles which prevent people around the world from recognizing their common humanity. Roles created during colonization have created a sense of distance between people of the Global South and Global North. It is in the garden of distance, difference and misunderstanding in which the reality of suffering, pain, and injustice grow. The discussions were shaped by this belief. Whether it was in definitions of peace, barriers, education or hope all were linked by this common central idea, all of them carry an aspect that requires distance and difference to disappear in order that our common human reality emerge. Therefore the study recommends that peace and development curricula actively pursue ways to recognize certain differences in

history and privilege and equality, but not to stop there. We must demonstrate that regardless of differences, we have much in common. The study found that as differences fade we may see that we are all the same and therefore this may assist our students to recognize the connections they have to young people around the world and open up ways to teach to the heart.

With regards to the way that we teach peace and define peace in our classrooms it is not enough to simply discuss the aspects of negative peace. A third recommendation is that peace curricula that endeavor to teach peace, must include discussions which touch upon inequality and privilege. These curricula must include a dimension in which students are lead through discussions and reflections regarding privilege. Teachers play a key role in providing the context where students gain a deeper understanding that peace cannot be actualized while some people live in affluence and others suffer. Curricula which avoid this discussion, are simply contributing to underlying causes of, ignorance, inequality and therefore violence. We must as educators continue to discuss global inequality, as a barrier to peace and development. We must examine the root causes of the current inequality, and not shy away from the role of the West in setting up a world in which the rules may favor the rich. Peace is dispelling ignorance in order to awaken an awareness and concern for the future and for people around the world.

The teachers through their discussions of barriers to peace, provided insights into potential ways our approaches might be transformed. If we can name and remove these barriers when they are present in our classrooms, peace and development education would be achieved. Underlying all barriers is the post-colonial attitude and the cultural hegemony of North over South. Educators repeatedly identified the colonial legacy as

well as the echo of this history as barriers to achieving peace. Therefore a fourth recommendation is that peace and development education must include a discussion of the colonial context. The road that has led to the contemporary inequalities was laid during the era of European colonization. As the research indicated, and as the participants stated, the West continues through certain aspects of development to wield control, and ignore the true needs of the South. Development remains in the interest of the North. Therefore curricula must touch upon this aspect otherwise they are denying the history of current inequity and serving to mask the truth.

It is upon this foundation of colonialism and through the West's worldview that we have come to understand development, economics, and what we must value as human beings. Yet the study found that it has been through the Western blueprint of development where further barriers to peace have emerged. These include poverty, and exploitation of the poor in the Global South. Therefore a fifth recommendation of the study is that we must be willing to examine critically development, which has focused mainly on economics, and has thus managed to keep the rich, rich and push the poor towards desperation. The study found that participants believed that in order to achieve peace, we must transform the fundamental Western construct of self-interest as the only motivation in life. The West's worldview is completely wrapped up in the assumption that self-interest is our main motivator. It is difficult to imagine an alternative. For this reason, the perspectives which challenge this view of the world, and how we might achieve happiness and dignity for all, are so crucial. In order to begin to critically examine perspectives of development, teachers, in a discussion on worldview can use this opportunity to challenge the West's view, to explore alternative ways of seeing the world

and extrapolating how the world would be different if more ideas were integrated. We must not only be willing to listen to the voices of the Global South but also allow the values, knowledge, and experience to shape the way we live our lives.

A sixth finding of the study was regarding the role that education might play in fostering peace and development. The perspectives of participants may serve as guide towards the potential outcomes of peace and development curricula, as well as touch upon the role of schools and teachers in fostering peace. The study found that teachers in northern Uganda believe that teachers and schools must aim to incorporate peace as an emotion, as love, as contentment, and as action. In essence, teaching for peace and development should foster love, empathy, action and awareness. Educators advocated that the teachers and schools may empower individuals by providing students the opportunity to come to know the wider implications of their actions and gain a sense of the long term. These values are far more challenging to implement and measure. However, the participants' openness demonstrated that when it comes to discussions of war, peace, and developments words and statistics while important, may also serve to remove the human element, and therefore take away from the definition of peace as love. How does one teach love? By demonstrating love and being a role model of care with our students teachers can embody an emotion. Peace education as love, is action and, therefore our curricula must provide opportunity for action.

Teachers in the Global North mainly saw the role of educators and schools as awareness raising. Action and direct care with the community were not as strongly emphasized. Teachers in the Global South however consistently spoke of action as a part of teaching. Therefore a sixth recommendation from this study to examine ways to teach

love and to discover the impact of providing opportunities of action on students attitude towards peace, development and social justice. Secondly, studies could examine the source of how on the one hand teachers from the Global North and South have similar attitudes regarding definitions of peace, and of Western hegemony of the North over the South. On the other hand, when it comes to the role of schools and teachers, teachers in the Global North did not highlight action, whereas teachers in the Global South did. Research should examine the source of this difference. The fact that teachers in the northern part of Uganda, who recently suffered war and therefore continually relied upon the action and care of others, might be the source for their tendency to attribute peace as action. Furthermore, one could contrast the views of teachers in the southern part of Uganda, where there has not been the recent experience of war to see how their views compare with teachers from Canada, and from northern Uganda to determine, the role of conflict specifically on shaping values of empathy and an attitude of care?

A seventh recommendation is that global education programs must not only teach about the developing world and the issues we are facing but must also create an experience where these issues become real, become something more than simply content, to allowing the human connection and reality emerge. In practice this can take several forms. To make issues more real and to understand the implications of our actions we must try and bring these realities into our classrooms. Workshops and role-plays are traditional methods. However perhaps we must be open to developing courses that take us beyond the walls of the classroom. Exchanges, volunteer and field study courses immediately transform what was abstract into human. This is a transformational process. If leaving the classroom is not possible, teachers could develop social networking with

teachers and students from different regions of the world, in an attempt to rebel against the message that we cannot make a difference.

This exercise of dialogue, of listening to teachers in the Global South has been powerful indeed. As we listen we are engaged in action. I have come to realize that listening is itself an act of emancipating myself from my post-colonial framework. Through listening the message is that the traditional roles of colonizer and colonized, developed and developing are not longer adequate. Through listening we are saying, I do not have all the answers, and I need your help. Listening is transformation of the relationships of donor to recipient into cooperation, from difference towards common human connections. The implication for peace and development education is that in order to listen, we must be silent. In my classroom this could involve sharing the actual insights of participants and inviting my students to listen. It may also include bringing in speakers, reading case studies, and allowing the students to share their experiences. A recommendation that would directly enable listening and dialogue among educators would be encourage teachers from the Global South to travel to Canada to teach in our schools, or via skype.

A eighth recommendation is that we must include in our peace and development curricula is an aspect of economics. Economics are connected with development, which in turn affects peace. When it comes to economics and development, the teachers provided strong recommendations. The current economic model according to participants is missing a vital piece, people. The message that we must care for one another is not a chapter in any economics policy book, yet for the teachers from the Global South, care is central, and all activities can be guided around this central point.

Development and education which do not aim to foster caring will only serve to exacerbate inequality as the impetus for change rests upon one becoming concerned with the 'Other'. This is a central theme. We must care for one another. Caring grows from sharing, from listening, from action. Therefore we must include an aspect within our curricula which sows the seeds of care. This is challenging, it is messy and beyond the comfort zone of many teachers and students. No one can force someone to care. Furthermore, we want to avoid the post-colonial attitude of charity, which places one at the mercy of the other and move towards authentic care and generosity.

The teachers spoke of their own experiences in caring for others and receiving care as changing the world. Actions of care also serve to emancipate. They are statements of dissatisfaction with injustice. Being a part of an action that cares for another again transforms barriers. How can teachers do this? Pursuing care in our classrooms emerges in the relationships we have with our students. Do we care for them? It also emerges through providing them the opportunity to care for another. In this sense the privilege experienced by people, including our students, can serve to isolate their hearts, whereas the teachers spoken with encourage us to care because it is in the action caring that we become apart of one another. Becoming a part of one another is the springboard to action. We become motivated by care, not guilt but love. Therefore, education for peace and development can include stories, speakers, actions and opportunities to care.

Some of the most beautiful and humanized moments during the discussions with teachers occurred when the participants discussed hope. As I grew up as a young girl, I can remember watching the commercials about young children being affected by famine

in Ethiopia. At the time, in my young mind, these messages did serve to build perhaps empathy, but the strongest response was the attitude that I felt bad for them. Rightly so, a famine is bad. However, coupled with 'feeling bad', came all kinds of negative implications and assumptions. I subconsciously thought these young ones probably would want to be me, to live in Canada. Never was the message an attempt to suggest that I would desire to live there, to learn from them. The result was again difference and separation. For this reason, when teachers spoke of their pride this was a powerful exercise in tearing down the fortress of western superiority, even though I had wanted to rid myself of it all along. As they spoke, they smiled, they became happy, more human. And I realized, none of them desired to trade places with me. This was a powerful moment, because it totally shatters concepts justified by domination. For education it implies that we must walk a fine line between raising awareness of issues, building empathy while at the same time not cornering people into the role of victim and savior, but rather allow the strength and pride to emerge.

Even in their hope, the teachers return to the concept of connection. They recognized that hope is built upon the future and the past experience in which people came together to affect change. This is a liberating message. It implies that I, with my western privilege and assumptions, I am a welcome, and necessary partner in building peace.

Conclusion:

The findings from this study contribute to the scope of peace and development education as well as offer many recommendations regarding the approach and content of global education programs. The recommendations to peace and development teachers are to not shy away from topics of privilege, of love and action, and the impact of colonialism. They try and teach to heart as we endeavor to understand our common humanity as we listen and care. Several questions also arise from this study. Research could examine the characteristics of teachers both internationally and locally, that motivate them to become involved in peace and development issues. Research into developing curricula that foster an ability to teach to the heart, and that focus on experiential learning could be contrasted with traditional methods. Research could examine the potential impact of a program that would connect students from the Global North with the Global South. Furthermore, the question remains as to whether the Global North will take a look in the proverbial mirror and make the changes required to listen to the Global South thereby participating in a future that is more socially just.

The study aimed to deepen my understanding of my role as an educator in teaching peace and development as well as to ensure that I am including all the diversity and knowledge of teachers from the developing world.. During my travels and conversations I was honored to meet many interesting people and teachers. On the surface we are different. We speak different languages, have different cultures, traditions, food and vastly different experiences with regards to peace and development. Yet these differences melted away. Throughout my travels, through listening, through experiencing care, sharing ideas, laughter, food and tears we accomplished the aims that may lead to a more peaceful and just world. We became a part of one another.

References

- Abani, C. (2008). *Telling stories of our shared humanity*. Ted Talks. Retrieved July 28, 2008, from www.ted.com
- Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. A. (1991). *Postmodern education: Politics, culture and social criticism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Asgharzadeh, A. (2008). The return of the subaltern: International education and politics of voice. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 12(4), 334-363.
- Astride, Jean-Bertrand. (2002). Globalization a View From Below. *In Rethinking Globalization: Teaching for justice in an unjust world*. Wisconsin, USA: Rethinking Schools Publishing.
- BBC (2001). *Slavery a Global Investigation*. Documentary film: True Vision of London.
- Berlowitz, M., Long, N.A., & Jackson, E.R. (2003). The exclusion and distortion of African American perspectives in peace education. *Educational Studies*, 5-15.
- Bhabha, H.K. (2005). Is Frantz Fanon still relevant? *Chronicle of Higher Education*. 51(28), 14-15.
- Bigelow, B., & Peterson, B. (2002). *Rethinking globalization: Teaching for justice in an unjust world*. Wisconsin, USA: Rethinking Schools Publishing.
- Blaney, D.L. (2002). Global Education, disempowerment, and curricula for a world politics. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6(3), 268-282.
- Bot M., Dove, S. & Wilson D (2000) *The Education Atlas of South Africa*. Pietermaritzburg: The Education Foundation.

- Chomsky, N. (1999). *Neoliberalism and the global order: Profit over people*. Toronto, ON: Hushion House.
- Choules, K. (2007). The shifting sands of social justice discourse: From situating the problem with “them”, to situating it with “us”. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy and Culutral Studies*. (29), 461-481.
- Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. 1996. *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cook, S. A. (2008). Give peace a chance: The diminution of peace in global education in the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 31(4), 889-914.
- Cooper, S.E. (1987). Women’s participation in European peace movements: The struggle to prevent World War I. In R.R. Pierson (Ed.), *Women and peace: Theoretical, historical and practical perspectives* (51-75). London, UK: Croom Helm.
- Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd Ed). CA, USA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Crossley, M. & Tikly, L. (2004). Postcolonial perspectives and comparative and international research in education: A critical introduction. *Comparative Education*. 40(2), 147-156.
- Czarnecki, K. (2002). Postcolonial theory and the undergraduate classroom: Teaching “the red convertible”. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture*. 2(1), 109-112.

Davies, L. (2005). Schools and war: Urgent agendas for comparative and international education. *Compare*, 35(4). 357-371.

Eagleton, T. (1983). *Literary theory: An introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Findley, C.V. & Rothney, J.A. (2006). *Twentieth century world*. Wadsworth Cengage Learning, Belmont; CA.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Continuum, New York: USA.

Galtung, J. (1975). *Essays in peace research*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Ejlers.

Gidney, J. (1999). *From hope to Harris: The reshaping of Ontario's schools*. Toronto, ON: Universtiy of Toronto Press.

Glatthorn, A.A. & Joyner, R.L. (2005). *Writing the award winning thesis or dissertation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Goldstein, T., & Selby, D. (Eds.). (2000). *Weaving connections: Educating for peace, social and environmental justice*. Toronto: Sumach Press.

Greig, S., Pike, G. & Selby, D. (1987) *Earthrights: education as if the planet really mattered*. London: WWF/Kogan Page.

Groenwald, T. (2004). A phenomenological research design illustrated. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 3(1).

Hague, (2011). *Appeal for peace*. Retrieved December 10, 2010, from <http://www.haguepeace.org>

Hargraves, S. (1997). Peace education: Politics in the classroom? In R. Case & P. Clark (Eds), *The Canadian anthology of social studies: Issues and strategies for teachers*. (109-121). Burnaby, BC: Simon Fraser University Press.

- Harris, I. (2002). Challenges for peace educators at the beginning of the 21st century. *Social Alternatives*, 21(1), 28-32.
- Harris, I. M., & Morrison, M. L. (2003). *Peace education* (2nd ed.). Jefferson, NC & London, UK: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers.
- Hawkins, P. (1993). *The ecology of commerce: A declaration of sustainability*. New York, USA: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Hendrix, J. C. (1998). Globalizing the curriculum. *The Clearing House*, 71(5), 305-308.
- Hicks, D. (Ed). (1988). *Education for peace: Issues, principles and practice in the classroom*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Hicks, D. (2003). Thirty years of global education: A reminder of key principles and precedents. *Educational Review*, 55(3), 265-275.
- Hicks, D. (2004). Teaching for tomorrow: How can futures studies contribute to peace education? *Journal of Peace Education*, 1(2), 165-178.
- Hicks, D., & Bord, A. (2001). Learning about global issues: Why most educators only make things worse. *Environmental Education Research*, 7(4), 413-425.
- Hicks, D., & Holden, C. (Eds). (2007). *Teaching the global dimension: Key principles and effective practice*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Hicks, D., & Steiner, M. (Eds.). (1989). *Making global connections: A world studies workbook*. Edinburgh, UK: Oliver & Boyd.
- Hoepner, B. (2002). Peace Education and years 1 to 10 studies of society and environment learning area. *Queensland School Curriculum Council*.

Holden, C. (2000). Learning for democracy, *World studies to global citizenship. Theory into Practice*, 39(2), 74-80.

Holloway, I. (1997). *Basic concepts for qualitative research*. Oxford: Blackwell Science.

Hycner, R. H. (1999). Some guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data. *Qualitative research* (3), 143-164.

International Journal of Peace (2011). Retrieved September 25, 2010 from

<http://www.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/>

International Monetary Fund, (2005) *Why are some nations wealthy?* Retrieved October 23, 2011 from

<http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/center/students/hs/think/lesson6.pdf>

Kapoor, I. (2003). Acting in a tight spot: Homi Bhabha's postcolonial politics. *New Political Science*. 25(4), 561-577.

K'naan, (2011). *Bono, K'naan on Somalia famine*. Retrieved, September 30, 2011, from

Globe and Mail; <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/africa-mideast/famine/raw-videos-bono-and-knaan-on-the-somali-famine/article2161500/?from=2161238>

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*.

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

LaFranchi, H. (2001). How the Iraq war has changed America. *The Christian Science Monitor*. (Dec 10).

Merriam, S.B. & Simpson, E.L. (2000). *A guided to research for educators and trainers of adults*. (2nd Ed.) Florida, USA: Krieger Publishing Company.

Parenti, M. (1995). *Against empire*. City Lights Books. USA.

Pike, G. (2000). A tapestry in the making: The strands of global education. In T.

Goldstein & D. Selby (Eds.), *Educating for peace, social and environmental justice*. Toronto: Sumach Press.

Pike, G. & Selby, D. (1988). *Global teacher, global learner*. London, UK: Hodder & Stoughton.

Pike G. & Selby, D. (2000). Civil global education: Relevant learning for the twenty-first century. *Convergence*, 33(1/2), 138-149.

Project Ploughshares (2011). *Research and Action for Peace*. Retrieved November 22, 2010, from www.projectploughshares.ca

Reardon, B. A. (Ed.). (1988). *Educating for global responsibility: Teacher-designed curricula for peace education, K-12*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Reardon, B. A. (1988). *Comprehensive peace education: Educating for global responsibility*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Reardon, B. A. (1993). *Women and peace: Feminist visions of global security*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Reardon, B. A. (1994). *Learning Peace: the promise of ecological and cooperative education*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Reardon, B. A. (1996). Militarism and sexism: Influences on education for war. In R. J. Burns & R. Aspeslagh (Eds.), *Three decades of peace education around the world: An anthology* (143-160). Camden, CT: Garland Publishing Inc.

Reardon, B. A. (2001). *Education for a culture of peace in a gender perspective*. New York: UNESCO Publishing.

Said, E. (1985). Orientalism reconsidered. *Cultural Critique*. Autumn, (1). 89-107).

Said, E. (2004). *Humanism and Democratic Criticism*. USA: Columbia University Press.

Sadala, M. L. A., & Adorno, R. deC. F. (2001). Phenomenology as a method to investigate the experiences lived: A perspective from Husserl and Merleau-Ponty's thought. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 37(3), 282-293.

Shiva, V. (2005). *Earth Democracy: Justice, sustainability, and peace*. Massachusetts, USA: South End Press.

Spiegelberg, H. A. (1965). *The phenomenological movement*. The Hague, Netherlands; Martinus Nijhoff.

Spivak, G.C. (2005). Scattered speculations on the subaltern and the popular. *Postcolonial Studies*, 8(4), 475-486.

Tikly, L. (2001). Globalisation and education in the postcolonial world: Towards a conceptual framework. *Comparative Education*, 37(2), 151-171.

Toh, S. H. (1993). Bringing the world into the classroom: Global literacy and a question of paradigms. *Global Education: Global Literacy*, 1(1), 9-17.

Toh, S. H., & Floresca-Cawagas, V. (2000). Educating towards a culture of peace. In T. Goldstein & D. Selby (Eds), *Weaving connections: Educating for peace, social and environmental justice*. Toronto: Sumach Press.

Truman, H. (1949). *Inaugural presidential speech*. Retrieved February 23, 2009, from http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/truman.asp.

Tye, K.A. (2003). Globalizing global education to nurture world citizens. *The Education Digest*, 69(4), 18-23.

- UNESCO, (2001). *Creating a Culture of Peace: 2000-2010 United Nations International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence For the Children of the World*. Retrieved October 9, 2010, from www.cultureofpeace.ca.
- UNESCO, (2000). *Manifesto*. Retrieved October 9, 2010, from <http://www3.unesco.org/manifesto2000>.
- United Nations. (2011). The Cyberschoolbus. Retrieved October 9, 2010, from <http://cyberschoolbus.un.org/>.
- United Nations. (2011). *Make poverty history*. Retrieved October 9, 2010 from <http://www.endpoverty2015.org>.
- United Nations. (2011). Food and Agriculture Organization. Retrieved April 5, 2009, from <http://www.fao.org/>.
- Weber, E. (2007). Globalization, “glocal” development, and teachers’ work: A research agenda. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(3), 279-309.
- Welman, J. C., & Kruger, S. J. (1999). *Research methodology for the business and administrative sciences*. Johannesburg, South Africa: International Thompson.
- Wilinsky, J. (2005). Keep the whole world at your fingertips: Education, globalization and the nation. *Education Canada*, 45(1), 24-26.
- Zajada, J.I., Majhanovich, S. & Rust, V. (2006). Introduction: Education and social justice. *Review of Education.Springer*, 52(9), 9-22.

Appendix

Appendix A: Letter of Consent

April 19, 2011

Dear _____

This letter of consent requests your participation in a research project that I am conducting. This study is being conducted as my thesis research for the completion of my Master's/PhD in Education at the University of Manitoba. You have been invited to participate in the study because of your expressed interest in peace and global education or based on the recommendation of professionals in the field. The consent letter explains the project and how you would be participating in the project, if you so choose. By signing the consent letter, you are indicating your willingness to participate in this study.

The research title is: Understanding Global and Peace Education: Voices and Perspectives of Teachers in the Global South. The primary purpose of the project will be to examine: (a) the views held by teachers from the global south with respect to peace and global education as taught in the global north, (b) determine how teachers from the global south could provide insight into how we as teachers in the global north conduct peace and global education, and (c) to explore how views with respect to peace and global education, of teachers of the global south compare with the views of teachers from the global north.

If you participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in a private one-on-one interview between yourself and the primary researcher at a time and place that best suits you. The interview is a set of questions relating to your perspectives on peace, development and education as well as those experiences and training that you believe have helped shape your views. The time commitment is approximately 1 hour for the interview. You will respond verbally to the questions and the interview will be digitally recorded on a sony digital recorder and stored in a secure location, password protected on the researchers macbook, no field notes will be taken .

The data collected will then be transcribed by the primary researcher, and no other individual will have access to the data. You will be given a pseudonym to ensure that everything you discuss during the interview remains anonymous (p) and each interview will be saved with a code, for example; globalsS interview A. This material will be stored until all data has been analyzed and a final report is submitted to the University of Manitoba Education Faculty. At that time, in approximately 6 months all data will be destroyed by confidential waste and shredding, digital information password protected and then erased. Data will be disseminated by comparing perspectives of participants from the Global North and South. Findings will be presented at the University of Manitoba. When completed, this research may be presented to professional audiences and may be written about in professional journals. There are no risks to participating as confidentiality will be assured with pseudonyms. The benefits of the study will assist in bridging knowledge from different regions of the world and providing the opportunity for

those who are often the target of Northern theories to contribute their perspectives and wisdom. Should you like to receive a summary of the final report, please check the “yes” box at the end of this letter and include your postal or e-mail address.

Your signature on this form indicates that you have understood to your satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project. In no way does this waive your legal rights nor release the researcher from legal and professional responsibilities. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time and without consequence, and can do so by making such a request to the researcher. If you decide to withdraw from the study, all previous data collected through your interview will be destroyed through confidential waste. Your continued participation should be as informed as your initial consent, so you should feel free to ask for clarification or new information throughout your participation.

If you have any concerns or questions, please contact the Charlotte Arnold, the primary researcher whose contact information is below, or you may also contact the Human Ethics Coordinator at the University of Manitoba at Margret_bowman@umaitoba.ca or at 204-474-7122.

Charlotte Arnold
Graduate Student
Faculty of Education University of Manitoba
c.arnold@uwinnipeg.ca

Advisor: Dr. Don Metz
Adjunct Professor
Faculty of Education University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, MB
Canada
d.metz@uwinnipeg.ca

Please check: _____ I agree to participate in the study described above.

Name: (please print) _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

_____ Yes, I would like to receive a copy of a summary of the results of this study.
The summary can be sent to the following: (email or postal address)

Researcher's signature: _____ Date: _____

Appendix B: Research Instrument – Global South Interview Questionnaire

Preamble:

The terms global North and Global South are now more commonly used to describe regions of developed and the developing world. I'm interested in what teachers from both parts of the world think about regarding peace, development and education, so that we can learn from one another. Thank you for your time and willingness to share your perspectives with me and those who will consider your words as they teach.

1. Can you tell me something about yourself?
 - a. How long have you been a teacher?
 - b. Could you describe experiences living and teaching in a developing country?
2. How would you describe peace?
 - a. How would you describe peace and global education?
3. What do you consider a well developed society?
4. What have we in the Global North / developed world gotten right
5. What have we gotten wrong regarding the challenges of the Global South?
6. Have we misunderstood the situations of the Global South?
7. If you could tell teachers in Canada something about how we should teach about development and peace what would that be?
8. What do developing countries need from developed countries?
9. What do developed countries need from developing countries?
10. How are some the ways we might work together to achieve aims of global and peace education?

Conflict Questions

Could you tell me about your experiences with conflict?

Appendix C: Research Instrument - Global North Interview Questionnaire

Preamble:

The terms global North and Global South are now more commonly used to describe regions of developed and the developing world. I'm interested in what teachers from both parts of the world think about regarding peace, development and education, so that we can learn from one another. Thank you for your time and willingness to share your perspectives with me and those who will consider your words as they teach.

1. Can you tell me something about yourself?
 - a. How long have you been a teacher?
 - b. Could you describe challenges you think teachers in developing countries may face in teaching?
2. How would you describe peace?
 - a. How would you describe peace and global education?
3. What do you consider a well-developed society?
4. What have we in the Global North / developed world gotten right in our relation to the Global South?
5. What have we gotten wrong regarding the challenges of the Global South?
6. Have we misunderstood the situations of the Global South?
7. What do you think teachers in the Global North should teach in peace and global studies?
8. What do developing countries need from developed countries?
9. What do developed countries need from developing countries?
10. How are some the ways we might work together to achieve aims of global and peace education?