

PEACE EDUCATION:
IMAG(E)(IN)ING A FUTURE IN THE APOREA OF THE UNIVERSITY

by

Bryan L. Wright

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Graduate Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto

© Copyright by Bryan L. Wright 2014

**PEACE EDUCATION:
IMAG(E)(IN)ING A FUTURE IN THE APOREA OF THE UNIVERSITY
Doctor of Philosophy 2014
Bryan L. Wright
Graduate Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning
University of Toronto**

Abstract

The field of peace education presently remains undertheorized suffusing praxis and pedagogy as foundation within the edifices of dissembling postModernity marked within the Institute of Rationality. (Re)imag(e)(in)ing critical pedagogy in a *peace education-to-come*, enjoins readers/writers along a putative journey through the violence of metaphysics in the fundamental question of difference bridging chiastic *ethico-philosophical* terrain, reconceptualizing pedagogical endeavour in *ethicus obligatus* to the *other* towards a renewing peace literacy within academe. Peace education can reconstitute the force of community on planes of difference unfolding *socialis aequitus* and peace, reframing the nature of our *being, self* and *other* as the oppositional realm of separation/connection. The opening of peace, as concept, *ethos*, through critical pedagogy in/by the fashioning of discursive forms acknowledging the *semio-theoretical* chain constructing human social relationality proffers a solid theoretical foundation for the field of peace education, re-tracing difference across *socio-ethno-politico-historical* structures. Central tenets of the evolving field of peace education are reconfigured in deontological proposition through deconstruction as precursorial project in reason affording performative discourse transversing the transcendental signified, peace, in *another* idiom eclipsing spatio-temporal illusion, affording diachronous affirmation and revelation in a crucial luminous snapshot within the post-conflict setting of Northern Ireland concerning fundamental matters of peace and

education. Peace education as constituent element of contemporary peace knowledges and principal arena for education for peace within the *unconditional university* is fundamentally challenged in a commitment to peace literacy to adduce and address all interwoven questions of difference, justice, peace, and education within academe. A new beginning compels *another* reading in presence honouring the *other* and *Other* in *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* radically questioning our individual and collective rationality in relation to understandings of human social relationality and the transperformative tenets of peace education in difference through *différance*, cathecting *presence* anew while (re)configuring academe primarily concerned with difference, peace, and social justice as discursis unfolding *impossibility*. Consequently, the order of *phallogocentricism* and its sponsoring patriarchal institution that would sublimate a discourse on/of difference in substitution, as the *same* irrupts in the fissure another perspectivity opening through *presence*, presence in meaning, presence in spatiality, presence in temporality in the *impossibility* of the limit.

Acknowledgments

Learning is a collaborative journey of patience, challenge, and commitment. I wish to express my deep gratitude to those who have provided guidance, been willing to listen, and more importantly walk with me along difficult terrain. My foremost debt of gratitude is for my supervisor Dr. Peter Pericles Trifonas who offered critical guidance and support throughout my journey to this moment. With heartfelt thanks I wish to express my sincere appreciation for his patience during the rough chapters and rewrites as my thinking developed. Your belief in my work and scholarship has served and nurtured this propitious moment in the aporea.

I have truly benefitted from the selfless mentorship and wisdom graciously offered by Dr. David Booth as co-supervisor. His belief in me has been invaluable and a great source of strength as I traversed the latter part of my candidacy. David you are an inspiration.

Additionally, my supervisory committee, Dr. Kathy Bickmore and Dr. Eunice Jang have challenged my thinking and approaches in meaningful ways that enhance this dissertation, each contributing to development and analysis along avenues otherwise engaged. My appreciation also extends to my examiners, Dr. Darren Lund and Dr. Linda Cameron who willingly engaged my work and shared key insights on the underlying questions of difference, justice, and peace.

My colleagues and fellow travelers have provided immeasurable support, insight, and an open ear to the interesting turns and tangents along my course. Dr. Saskia Stille, Dr. Leigh Anne Ingram, and Dr. Kara Janigan have become dear friends and treasured scholars charting possible futures for postModern education. Each of you has made the journey lighter and brighter. I have

also been enriched in the conversations with Maryam Wagner, David Goldberg, Kimberly Bezaire, Dr. Burcu Yaman Ntelioglou, and Wim Laven.

I owe a special debt of gratitude to Dr. James Kilbane for late night conversations and guidance. Likewise, Dr. Robert J. Gould has served as a mentor and support since my early graduate work engaging peace as a question and thought. My appreciation and sincere thanks extends to Stephenie Jahnke.

My thoughts at this time also turn to long time friends and my family that have been the source of great support, strength, patience, understanding, and love. Thanks to my dear friend Tricia Crawford for her unswerving faith in me expressed in genuine love. For your kindness and true friendship, I treasure Matt Johnson and Pat Andersch. For your smile, caring heart, love, support, and insight into life I treasure our time together Osman Bulduk.

I have learned much from my parents Floyd and Juanita Wright who have provided inspiration and strength as I've charted difficult waters. My family and sisters and brother have also influenced my search for social justice and peace through education and inspired many of my flights of thought.

Finally, my appreciation extends to the Dr. Alan Smith, Dr. Claire McGlynn, Dr. Ulrike Niens, and Dr. Brandon Hamber who provided crucial guidance and critique of my field research in Northern Ireland. My gratitude also goes to the willing participants and kind individuals who made my short time in the region one of purpose and meaning. This fieldwork was supported in part by a grant from the Biosophical Institute of Euclid, Ohio and a travel grant by the School of Graduate Studies of the University of Toronto.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments	iv
Chapter One: Into the World—to-wards Peace Literacy	1
Peace Studies (by a name): genealogical strains	11
Peace Education Theory Today	16
A Right to Philosophy and the <i>university-to-come</i>	27
Deconstructing Peace.....	35
Chapter Two: Discursis and Peace—Dialoguing with the <i>Other</i>	49
<i>Ethicus obligatus</i>	59
The Lévinasian Opening	62
<i>Embracing Humanitas</i>	72
Unconditional hospitality: a welcoming (in) Derrida	73
The question of <i>self</i> : the subjectivity of subjectivity	79
<i>Positivist socio-constructivism</i>	85
Emergent Roles and Performativity: Education & Peace	87
Acknowledging future(s) of transdisciplinarity towards efficacious endeavor	103
<i>Socialis aequitas enfolding non-violence</i>	105
<i>Eco-logical presencing in consciousness</i>	111
Chapter Three: What We Think (we) Know—Mapping the ideoscape of Peace (Education)	119
Tracings of Peace (Education).....	121
Chapter Four: A thinking through—Performative Critique	169

Ethnographic snapshot(s).....	173
Spatio-temporality and the course of history	193
A social grammar (of silence).....	195
Tracing the footprint: Locating layers of meaning	202
The agon: research design and subjectivity in the field	202
Inner layers of meaning	204
Onto-epistemological meaning(s)—discoursing ethicus obligatus	204
Onto-theological meaning(s)	209
Exceeding easy essentialism—embracing humanitas.....	211
Spiraling out – Philosophical groundings.....	217
Positivist socio-constructivism	217
Peace	234
Peace Education	239
Chapter Five: Thinking Peace—Prolegomena for the Future	245
References.....	263

List of Tables

Table 1: Reconfiguring Peace Education: Paradigmatics and Possibility.....	57
---	-----------

Appendix

Appendix A: Thinking a methodology.....	276
--	------------

Chapter One: Into the World—to-wards Peace Literacy¹

I went to the woods because I wished to live deliberately, to confront only the essential facts of life, and see if I could not learn what it had to teach, and not, when I came to die, discover that I had not lived.

(Thoreau, 1854/2004, p. 90)

There are differences between philosophy and religion, philosophy and poetry. That is why *one must translate* and this translation stems from the finitude of individuals. Philosophy is indeed the immediate presentation (*Darstellung*), the science of originary knowledge (*Urwissen*), but it is this only in the realm of the ideal and not “really”. If the mind could, in a single act of knowledge, *really* grasp (*begreifen*) absolute totality as a system completed in all of its parts, it would overcome its finitude (*University* 75). It would not need to translate. It would conceive the whole as beyond all determination. As soon as there is determination, there is differentiation, separation, abstraction.

(Derrida, 2004, p. 79)

A rigorous and efficient deconstruction should at one and the same time develop a (practical) critique of the current philosophical institution and engage a positive, rather affirmative, audacious, extensive, and intensive transformation of a teaching said to be “philosophical”.

(Derrida, 2002, p. 90)

Notions of peace are nurtured in the arenas of socialization and historico-political experience manifest in and manifesting localized human social relationality. Our passage of understanding as reader/writer/critical pedagogue is to assiduously deconstruct the presuppositions structuring the edifices of education as formative relationship anew in

¹ Portions of Chapters One, Two, and Three have been previously published in my book chapter: Wright, B. (2011). Deconstructing the Other: Opening Peace. In P. Trifonas & B. Wright (Eds.), *Critical issues in peace and education* (pp. 178–199). New York, NY: Routledge.

revolutionary ethos engendering an equitable and transparent institution that may welcome and abide the presence of the *other*. Enjoined, our excursion (re)imag(e)(ine)s critical pedagogy in the Institution of Rationality unfolding a peace education-to-come as readers and writers, as well as readers as writers, along a putative journey through the violence of metaphysics, subsequent interpretations therein, and the fundamental question of difference. The chiasmic bridging of the ethico-philosophical split constructed in the metaphysical rift, presciently inscribed in Derridean/Trifonasian logos re-con-ceptualizes our ethico-pedagogical endeavour in *ethicus obligatus* to the other re-constituting the “force of community . . . [as] a being-at-home-in-the-world WITH OTHERS . . . opening-up of the Self unto the difference of the Other” (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 150, emphasis in original) on planes of difference unfolding *socialis aequitas* and peace. To be sure, Jacques Derrida and Peter Trifonas have both framed the nature of our being, self and other as the oppositional realm of separation and connection. In the trace of metaphysics, humanity faces its naked self, a self given to, and given meaning in the possibility of difference re-presenting death—a death of the isolated self. Linking the “psychic and figural ground” of relationship between the *self* and *other*, envisions future topologies of friendship and belonging across spatio-temporal chasms in a re-con-struction of community beyond the simultaneity of (pro/pre)-scriptive enactment, modeling “collective intersubjectivity . . . [acknowledging] the threat of alterity” (p. 151) to formative con-struction, re-inscribing difference as relationship.

My dissertation surfaces the critical issues of peace education within the university as performative project in peace literacy, a proposition of transformation in and through the (re)configured tenets of the field of peace education. I proffer in (re)imagination, the possibility of peace through the eyes of the *other*, fundamentally re-con-ceiving the field as a *thinking*

through peace literacy, evincing (a)new rationality. While this task seems quite daunting, and even impossible, I will endeavor to pursue the *impossible* as Derrida suggests, and resist any temptation to settle for a more acceptable (read easier) outcome. The task before us as I note in the epigraphs above is to answer the challenge of taking up the call to peace in the *university-to-come* promulgated in Derridean *logos* and performatively inscribed in Chapter two. It is a task that will forever remain before us despite all diligence, yet we have the opportunity to engage a future that may become the present through the act of stepping through, and into the opening created within the unconditional university of the future through a re-configuration of the field of peace education. I suggest that peace, as opening, is the opening of peace.

Humanity in apogee is faced with deeply challenging and exciting futures. This is particularly true in light of the contestations of ideology and tradition we witness around the world today with their impact for higher education. My purpose is to explore some of the deeper issues of education and peace as an opening into a future for all peoples in globalized and bonded communities of difference through *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy*. I propose this endeavor as an opening in the vein of the *mochlos*, or lever, identified and acknowledged in the third section of Jacques Derrida's (1990) originally published tome, *Du Droit à la Philosophie*² concerning the call to responsibility or performativity, of the professoriate. Derrida's (2001a) image of the unconditional university, or the *university-to-come*, which I sketch in greater detail later in this précis, represents the place and space for a new discourse on peace and peace education for our time. Within the purview of the *university-to-come*, established in and through

² Jacques Derrida's (1990) *Du droit à la philosophie* (Right to Philosophy) was translated into English and subsequently printed as two separate texts, with the first being *Who's Afraid of Philosophy?* and the latter *Eyes of the University: Right to Philosophy 2*. I will be referencing the second book as translation primarily, unless otherwise noted.

a right to philosophy, the opportunity to explore peace is opened and thereby, discovered as the opening to *and* for peace.

My dissertation is both a philosophical and practical examination of the question of peace and its relationship to tertiary education with a primary focus on peace education. Scholarly literature has explored many substantive questions concerning peace, justice, conflict, education, and research as subject itself, yet my archival research resonates with a call for deeper inquiry on the philosophical conceptualizations of peace in/through feminism (Brock-Utne, 1989); content, form, and method of communication comprising education for peace (Haavelsrud, 2008); and ethico-philosophical frame (Page, 2008) as understood and developed within academe. These respective strands of inquiry are indicative of the challenges inherent in an examination of peace as the interplay amongst *self*, *other*, and human relationality oft conceived in tribalism (Derrida, 2001a, 2004; Lévinas, 1969, 2000; Trifonas, 2000a). In the field research for the larger project, I investigated graduate level Peace Education and Peace & Conflict Studies programs that directly engage some of the fundamental questions of peace and conflict, using survey and in-depth interviews with faculty/administrators and students in the post-conflict setting of Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. Greater attention to peace in education is premised on the idea that universities have a fundamental responsibility to educate for peace (Derrida, 2004; Lin, Brantmeier & Bruhn, 2008; Trifonas, 2003a; Wenden, 2004); however, peace and education have a tenuous connection in the Western academy given *socio-politico-historical* interests guised within nationalistic or cultural memes. The field of peace education presently remains undertheorized despite a “a major resurgence [in the past decade], yet in the process it has suffered a deficit of perspective and historical foundations” (Jenkins, 2013, p. 2) after having emerged from early peace research during ante-bellum eras over the past two centuries, while

reflecting a range of perspectives that barely coalesce into a more cohesive, theoretical foundation or philosophy (Page, 2008; Wisler, 2008; Wright, 2008, 2011) as *telos*. Peace education as a field, founded in a multiplicity of largely unexamined *meta-theo-logical* philosophemes fails to see the *other*, in fundamental alterity, preferring an auto-telic future defined, a/in-scribed. The promise of *peace education-for-the-future* resides in the (re/de)construction of philos—in *Other* rationality—not as a singularized course definitively constructed, but rather, a passage beyond the subjectivity of *self*. Peace education, reconfigured in *another's* peace, is re-leased on future planes of difference within stolid academe forging new arenas of thought unlimited in a renewing *epistémè* founded through deconstruction. Peace education then, as a proposed transdisciplinary field³ in the *university-to-come*, drawing on the respective onto-epistemological frameworks and refashioned in the *Humanities-to-come*, can provide an important link between the academy and our larger world given the level of conflicts and crises occurring within and across cultures and nations such as the transforming Arab Spring, continuing upheaval of the lives of millions of people from the Global Financial Crises, Reparation Movements, the Syrian civil war, and the recent Sudanese Famine, but it has weak philosophical and pedagogical underpinnings (Salomon, 2002).

Challenging or deconstructing the silos of the often-isolated critical pedagogies, a daunting task, requires the development of a kaleidoscopic lens which is capable of producing multiple focal points that collectively reveal the image(ry) of peace. This focus on, and reconstruction of the imagery of peace would then be more reflective of the interpretations and understandings experienced within and among diverse societies and cultures around our world.

³ The notion of transdisciplinarity will be explored further in the third chapter with its implications for the field of Peace Education. Examining the concept of disciplinarity itself is fraught with seemingly inexhaustible questions within the 'post-' age (read postModernity, post-structural) arising in the latter half of the past century.

However, the imagery of peace will only be more fully revealed in and through the additional lenses fashioned within the older social sciences. Peace education then, as a transdisciplinary field, is strengthened by the interrogatory gaze of postStructuralism, influenced by the witness and insight of socio-philosophical interpretations weighing phenomenological and noumenological perspectivity, informed through the unraveling of historical narratives, and given voice in and through the *Other*. Differing conceptualizations of peace adduced in the archive of the burgeoning field, are transformed in deconstruction and performatively re-constituted as discursis-en-critique in Chapter two, then performatively read on the archive in the third chapter, and subsequently interrogated through current philosophical underpinnings of education for peace at four different graduate programs in a post-conflict setting towards a proposed philosophico-theoretical ground ushering forth an arriving *peace education-for-the-future*. (Re)imag(e)ining a *peace education-to-come* at the limit of possibility reframes the question of normativity in the realm of thinking, learning, and teaching beyond the strictures of prescription within the Institute of Rationality. The dissertation draws on post-structural thought, (post-)critical theory, and the work of John Dewey as educationalist and reformer, as well as peace education researchers and theorists Betty Reardon, Gavriel Salomon, Johan Galtung, and Magnus Haavelsrud to examine the conceptualization of peace within the university setting, as impetus for transperformative change emerging from academe.

Peace Education, as academic endeavour ensconced within the Institute of Rationality in the new millennium is built on the ontological framework of relationality represented in the preeminent Lévinasian and Derridean thought approaching the *other* (Derrida 2004; Lévinas 1969), reframed through Trifonasian performative presence affording the opening, acknowledgment, and non-consumption of difference in deconstruction as an opening for peace,

anchoring the evolving field. The unfolding of new conceptualizations of peace is given voice within my deontological proposition arising in/through diverse perspectivities affording a meta-framework for discourse on peace and education *in* and *through* the voice of the *other*. It is crucially important in this moment to clarify that the *giving voice*, is not a “speaking the *other*,” but rather, a hearing of the voice of the other in fundamental alterity—or absolute uniqueness (Lévinas 2000; Moyn 2005). Further, it is on this foundation that the opportunity to build a philosophical approach to peace education rests along with an image of an opening of peace, or peace as the opening in *peace education-for-the-future*.

It is the opening of peace, as concept, ethos, and pedagogy through, in, and by the fashioning of discursive forms that creates the opportunity to lay a solid philosophical foundation for the field. I have taken a hermeneutical approach to developing a definition of peace early in this dissertation built on the writings of Reardon (1999, 2001), Galtung (2004), Wenden (2004), and Anderson (1985) among others. Peace is the way of, the space for, and the place where the human community of differences responsibly exist in sustainable equanimity. This definition is broader than any of the singular definitions for peace commonly used within the discipline of peace studies generally, and in the field of peace education specifically, affording the opportunity to explore conceptualizations of peace from the voice of the *other*. Ian Harris and Mary Lee Morrison (2013) acknowledge “many different conceptual definitions of peace” (p. 14) and emphatically link peace and justice as a “respect for life and for the dignity of each human being without discrimination or prejudice” (p. 14) balancing inner and outer peace in a “striving for a sense of inner harmony” (p. 15). Still, John Synott (2005), drawing on Bowen and Hobson’s paradigm of an educational philosophy, exclaims a “coherent educational philosophy, or paradigm” maps the terrain of the field of peace education across: a) philosophemes of human

nature; b) holistic knowledge (enfolding psychology, history, sociology, ecology, political science and economics); c) engaged learning incorporating “processes of abstraction and reflection”; d) society; and e) transformative social change engendered through “educational institutions in society” (pp. 9–13).

These recent tracings of the field notwithstanding, have yet to navigate the philosophico-theoretical edifices constructed on metaphysical foundations poorly defined and inadequately understood, exposing positivistic roots of auto-telic purpose in a revealing of onto-epistemological positions of differentially-situated peace studies and peace education programs within the Western academy. Daniel Bar-Tal (2002) adroitly claims peace education programs mobilize

pupils and teachers to take part in a campaign for change. They are to raise their banner toward an alternative vision of society with the aim of counteracting the beliefs, attitudes, and actions that contradict the objectives of peace education. The objectives of peace education can only be achieved by imparting specific values, attitudes, beliefs, skills, and behavioral tendencies that correspond with the objectives. Imparting values of peace is of particular importance as these values influence specific beliefs, attitudes, and behavior. (p. 28)

Bar-Tal reminds the reader that peace education is an orientation or lens into, or on the world (p. 31), which I clearly interpret as the presentation of the question before us as critical educators today—the fundamental question of philosophy—the philosophy of the question. Ergo, the bold philosophical endeavour unfolding before each of us as reader, author, and reader as co-creator/writer, becomes a question of interstitial connections marked in the notions of peace, difference, social justice, and education through necessary reengagement in teaching and philosophy, a deconstruction of *phallogocentrism* borne in the *meta-theo-physical* tradition of Modernity. Our engagement as critical pedagogues and peace educators along this journey toward peace education for the future, inscribed in the myriad traces of human meaning-making

within the teaching-learning realm is limited to the rising questions of responsibility, perspectivity, apperception, and acknowledgment—an undertaking in rationality bridging the ideas of philosophy, difference, education, social justice, and peace in higher education within Occidental teleology. Given this limit, I interrogate the philosophico-educational discourse regarding the notion of peace as idea/ideal/practice/understanding with the intent of discovery and possible illumination of hidden worlds of meaning.

My dissertation embodies a semio-grapheme style of writing to offer the reader in authorial position, the moment of pause, to think through the construction of semio-linguistic terrain through the use of extra-grammatical phrasing, *italics*, and bracketing of key concepts throughout. I pose to the reader an opportunity to re-read, and thereby re-think the very construction of *langue* and its bondedness in the linearity of *epistémè* through deconstruction. Additionally, I integrate etymology in the style of writing as a crucial linguistic lens in the philosophic discourse engaging the nuances of meaning fortifying inscriptive force. The reader is invited into the difficult and contested terrain of gnosis and epistemology as a deliberate act of consciousness, of subjectivity.

Having already thus begun in deconstruction, I pause in a moment of reflection, inviting you the reader to walk a few steps along the path trod wherein I found myself in *another* land tethered across spatio-temporalities, a passage through absence. An absence of *self* and of *presence*. A non-*presence* in form, access, and *being*, rupturing the ideological trace of meaning outside of the Violence *in* Metaphysics re-calling meaning to/for the *other*, *a priori* (Derrida, 1988). My albeit brief journey into Northern Ireland was deeply moving and transformative from a particularly poignant point (of view) at the Milltown cemetery to other conversations with community members in social watering holes throughout my travels on the Emerald Isle. In the

fall of 2009 my travel included a guided tour of the city of Belfast, including the Falls/Shankill area and the Milltown cemetery set on a hill overlooking the city, where I found myself extremely moved as never before recording the following in my journal that evening,

It struck me, if I was living in this culture, there's no reason for me to believe necessarily that I would be above the ground, or below the ground. And that had an impact, (it still does). I suppose it's like, "What's taking place in society, in the societies that I've been a part of, what's taking place in the society that looks differently or impacts differently in this context?" But the idea of how we individuals and communities address, understand, and need to connect with respective social group identity is very important in various contexts and it's most important where the (personal/political) risk is higher, or the perceived risk is higher. (Author's personal journal, September 2009)

In that moment, I was faced with the existential dilemma enveloping my own *self*/subject-ity. My *being* and *being*-nature flashed into perspective on the canvas of *Other*. Who and what I am were revealed anew, leading to my commitment to this story and its telling for you the reader, co-creating the narrative in (con)text. In the course of the tour, we were told of the walled separation of the Protestant and Catholic portions of the Milltown cemetery: the division of the society was carefully (re)structured in the space of final resting, with a nine foot deep dividing wall—underground.

Subjectivity *qua* subjectivity, evoked in epiphanous moment at the cemetery invokes my life-long quest for learning through *presence*, for indeed my interest in the questions of peace, difference, and education began as a young man. I have come to interpret my journey toward peace through a developing subjectivity commencing in my formative years, enculturated through the *onto-theo-logical* perspectivities of my parents and community. As a keen young lad raised in the rural mid-West of the United States of America in the post Vietnam era, my maturing social conscience began to eschew the rising hypocrisy of a vacuous society of hegemonic privilege trammeling the poor, oppressed, and all peoples of color. Peace was not,

could not be the violent prejudice, discrimination, and oppression I witnessed as the subjugation of the *other* in my society, community, and world. Still: what is/was peace? What was the fundamental nature of human relations and human social relationality? Why was peace predominantly conceptualized in telic courings elicitive of utopic narratives? How do we as disparate peoples in communities of difference re-cog-nize peace? How is peace articulated through the eyes of the *other*? Why, and how is education always already implicated in the question of peace? As this dissertation attests, this inescapable question, of paramount concern to me in my early maturation has continued to root itself into my own ontological frame, nourishing even deeper deontic restiveness.

Thinking peace within the realm of the Western academy mimics our human endeavour to rationally frame the infinite quest of *being* into *presence* as collaborative engagement. Let us begin this thinking, a thinking through the questions of peace and difference, initially broadly brushing the landscape of academic engagement with/in human social relationality as an introduction to the Occidental or Western paradigm, examining genealogical strains later filtered through the archive in Chapter three.

Peace Studies (by a name): genealogical strains

Peace studies theory, like peace education theory are branches of the larger arena of peace knowledges, germinated in early peace research. Both the discipline of peace studies and the field of peace education have been nurtured in numerous perspectives and genealogical strains including: 1) human security, 2) world order, 3) the armaments race, 4) nuclear disarmament, 5) social responsibility and justice, 6) non-violence, and 7) global interdependence

(Reardon, 1990, p. 4).⁴ Each of these perspectives, derivative of meta-theo-physical germ and the seed of activism often originating with an emergent leader or voice of a few, arose within differing *socio-politico-cultural* milieu. While it is not this researcher's interest to differentially value the significant distinctions, founding, and contributions spanning the discipline of peace studies, I simply acknowledge there are many different perspectives that comprise peace studies and conflict studies (e.g., conflict resolution/transformation, alternative dispute resolution, justice studies, peace and justice studies, etc.) that are absent in obscurity when compared to diverse programs within and across respective educational institutions. I posit any singular definition of a multi-purposed, diverse field like peace and conflict studies is an act of reduction and antithetical to the opening of an academic critique of disciplinarity and epistemological construction(s) through *another* rationality. Eschewing reduction, I suggest the interdisciplinary academic field of peace studies and its adjacent fields are generally premised on inquiry into conflicts arising in the human condition and their amelioration, over time, over history, and over space. Peace research on the other hand, in the perspective of Patomaki (2001), may be best understood as an "emancipatory conception" with an original "sharply positivist phase" (p. 725) that would shift later on(to) other theoretical terrain and slowly engage the critical theoretical realm coincident with the postStructuralist fervor in the 1960s in France and a growing liberatory pedagogy born in the regionalized civil rights movements of a searching postwar generation. Peace research is foundational to both the field of peace education and the multiple strains of peace "studies", particularly in the purview of United States academic programming. I trace the multi-

⁴ The range of these perspectives are gathered from multiple resources also including Harris & Morrison (2013) revised edition of *Peace Education*, the annual UNESCO Yearbook on Peace and Conflict Studies spanning 1981-1988, and gleaned from Stomfay-Stitz (1993).

perspectivity of peace studies and its influence on the field of peace education as a mapping through the archive in Chapter three.

Positivism itself may be understood as the thread underlying academic imperative bearing both Greco-Roman and Chinese roots sustaining the (post-)Modern university. I draw on Comte's early conceptualizations of positivism to rehabilitate or reframe *another* approach that would acknowledge epistemological quest rooted in lines of inquiry differentially posit-ioned across our respective understandings of temporality and spatiality. Auguste Comte (1830-1842) offered positivism as a philosophical perspective in the late nineteenth century in a response to metaphysical *epistémè*, recasting authentic knowledge in science in a six volume series. As a political philosophy, positivism bridges the philosophy of science and political philosophy towards "desirable" social reorganization.⁵ With the rise of neopositivism in the mid twentieth Century, the roots of positivism were discarded only to be revived later through cross-disciplinary inquiry into the human condition as construct. Reframing positivism strengthens the field of peace education bound in meta-theo-physical chains acknowledging the thread of the past sewn in/to the fabric of postModern *epistémè*, as a forming of the present. Knowledge as (in)form-ation is a collective social construct that becomes the threading of the past, present, and future and the affect of given rationality. I take up this notion in Chapter two drawing connections between the *philosophico-theoretical* terrain to further develop the ground ahead for the field of peace education.

⁵ Positivism as a term of theoretical analysis is largely disfavoured among postModern academe, yet I would posit a new thread of positivism that liberates the concept from negative chaining suggesting another perspective on this particular thread of *theoretico-epistemology* in reimaged postStructuralism, abiding and acknowledging difference, as thought, rationality, and con-struction in the quest for understanding through education. For greater understandings of Comte's original notion, see Michel Bourdeau (2011); or Comte's original text (French) *Cours de philosophie positive*, Paris: Rouen first, then Bachelier (6 volumes).

My inquiry will be tightly focused on the early theoretical development of the now burgeoning field of peace education traversing intersecting academic terrain. The cross-cutting effect of more recent tangential fields within the academy, (including variants of Multiculturalism, Global/Democratic Citizenship Education, expansive Area/Regional Studies, and Inter-National/Cultural Studies) have manifest in peace studies and peace education primarily through the domain and purview of individual educators and targeted programs. These curricula and programs share some of the same foundations and imbibe limited critical theoretical approaches towards an emancipatory pedagogy seeking to engender more peaceable, possible futures. One such approach to democratic citizenship education critically links peace/conflict theory in/to curricular engagements with the *other* affording social change effecting justice through non-normative education. Kathy Bickmore's (2011) recent work offers critical insights for youth peacebuilding education as particularly captured in anti-bullying education. Earlier, Bickmore (2005) amplifies the crucial role of teacher education arguing "critical citizenship teacher education . . . develop[s a] teacher's capacity to facilitate students' practice with democratic process and skills" (p. 4) provoking epistemic desire (p. 5) in teachers and hopefully students as well to-wards broader "international, pluralistic, critical knowledge bases" (p. 7) applicable to the postModern classroom. Bickmore's focused pedagogy abiding the *other* serves as exemplar for democratic engagement, as peacebuilding in citizenship through education.

The discipline of peace studies (and I would enlarge this to peace and conflict studies) has evolved in germinal, restive soils of imperial ethos, into a multiplicity (Burns & Weber, 1995, p. 35), presenting some emanations of the voice of the *other* in specific locations and

academic programs; yet it remains hesitant to undergo the shift from *self* to *other*,⁶ as proposed in the Lévinasian and Derridean ontology of relationality (see Gur-Ze'ev following), and advanced into de-ontic human social relationality anchoring and anchored in a pluriverse of difference in *différance*. I posit that *différance* presents the promise of peace in tertiary peace education as endeavour beyond prisons of language, interpretation, and meaning freeing the author, and reader, as well as the reader in authorial position, to challenge the empiricity (read linearity) of epistemological construction(s). Jacques Derrida's deconstruction of the empiricism of the sign in *différance* offers *another* meaning, re-marking the *phoneme* and critically breaking the causal chain through delay and deferral. *Différance* and deconstruction advance another avenue for the reader and author as a challenge of the limit of meaning read, and subsequently ascribed. I adduce in the limit of subjectivity, (a between-ness of *self* and *other*), within the discipline of peace and conflict studies, a structural boundedness to be re-constructed in post-critical peace education in chapters two and three. Moreover, the limit of subjectivity and the subjectivity of the subject extends through disciplinarity and provenance within academe, truly hampering the reach of peace studies as currently "embodied" within higher education institutions of the West.

Such limits are challenged however in Johan Galtung's (1978) comprehensive consideration of inequity: he interprets the field of peace research as "an approach rather than a discipline, as committed social science with no respect for any disciplinary or scholastic borderline in social analysis" (p. 15). His pivotal scholarship suffuses the development of peace knowledges from peace research through peace studies to peace education. Galtung's (2004)

⁶ My critique here is based on the narrow onto-epistemological frame that constructs respective academic programs, particularly those limited to the Western paradigmatic approach to education and learning beginning in the ontico-auto-telic *self*.

seminal text *Transcend and Transform: An Introduction to Conflict Work* encapsulates methodologies useful in transforming the triangle of violence—direct violence, structural violence, and cultural violence—into more desirable states of negative minimum peace, positive peace, and perhaps, in the impossibility of unreserved equi-logical relationality—or peace. He admonishes humanity be seen as, and understood as transcendence, stating “humanity is also developing, unfolding its potential” (p. 125) in an emergence in/to *presence*. Johan Galtung’s notion of the capacity of humanity to transcend its states of violence and conflict is evident in the literature of peace education as critically elaborated in the forthcoming chapter reading the archive.

Peace Education Theory Today

Current peace education literature represents significant voids and pioneering insights built primarily upon the theoretical base of peace research with influence from peace studies given a growing acceptance of and demand for the field. Furthermore, the lack of onto-epistemological coherence of the larger field of peace research redounds to the field of peace education particularly evidenced within the American academy. Betty Reardon, another pioneering peace educator has posed key questions regarding the framing and conceptual development of the field of peace education since the early 1980s. Reardon’s (1988) book *Comprehensive Peace Education: Educating for Global Responsibility*, a detailed examination of impetus for the field, its development, and the dimensions of such education proffers keen insight alluding to *another* state, or presence possible through “the development of an authentic planetary consciousness [through education] that will enable us to function as global citizens and to transform the present human condition by changing the social structures and the patterns of thought that have created it (p. x). Moreover, the positivist nature of her claim is consonant with

contemporary educational models seeking transformative possibilities for social justice/change. She argues that “comprehensive peace education should be the fundamental framework for most social learning, and certainly for all formal education . . . [where] educational development should be toward embracing the possibilities of . . . human transformation” (p. 74). Professor Emeritus Reardon’s analysis, grounded in a revolutionary feminist critique of *phallogocentrism* and heteronormativity re-sounds a deconstructive reading of the human condition whereby the peace educator captures the evolving state of the field. She claims “there has been no clearly definable conceptual or theoretical trend in the American professional literature on peace education until the recent spurt of articles on education relating to nuclear war and nuclear weapons” (p. 84). Nearly a quarter century later, her evaluation of the growing field presents a nuanced performative and reflective view offering a renewing “vision of universal moral inclusion . . . in which all human beings are accorded respect of their fundamental human dignity . . . [promulgated in] a complex learning that requires pedagogies of multiple forms of reflective inquiry” (Reardon, 2013, p. 3), as aspiration for critical peace education that is politically astute within the academic arena. Evolving peace education has an opportunity to re-define the limits of peace discourse into futures of multiplicity in a transformative positivism, enfolding difference in “pedagogically ethical peace education” (p. 4).

An *ethico-pedagogy* of the *other* and *Other* transited above, posits a re-ordering of the *autological self* in hermeneutic *presence* through philosophico-theoretical terrain. Such *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* compels patient, deeper readings across spatio-temporal divides of constructed ontology and epistemology within the academic field of peace education. Like both Reardon and Galtung, Gavriel Salomon (2002) acknowledges that peace education is a diverse

field itself with divergent meanings for peoples around our world. Salomon summarizes peace education's respective purposes as:

1. mainly a matter of changing mindsets regarding enemies, or
2. mainly a matter of cultivating a set of skills incorporating non-violence and conflict resolution, or
3. mainly a matter of human rights, particularly in the Third World, or
4. mainly a matter of environmentalism, disarmament, and the promotion of a culture of peace in the affluent countries. (p. 4)

He further states, “in the absence of conceptual clarity, the benefit of experience and wisdom is unlikely, and the accumulation of a body of scholarship uncertain” (p. 4). Consequently, the divergent nature of the field presents significant difficulties in finding and examining the ontological and epistemological positions of these myriad perspectives of an identified, singular field.

The issue of conceptual coherence and clarity within the field of peace education is inherently problematic according to Magnus Haavelsrud (2008) given that the concepts in use—peace and education—within the field are “abstractions without any concrete and absolute meaning” (p. 59) and are too commonly synthesized through alignment in “problem orientation (content) and participatory decision-making (dialogical form)” (p. 65). Haavelsrud claims the content and dialogical form need be designed and implemented (i.e. pedagogy, curriculum plans) both within and without the settings of formal educational institutions to realize the benefit and necessity of conscientization (p. 66). Theoretical grounding in the field has increasingly become a critical concern as scholars and thinkers would begin to fathom the questions of difference and

rationality following the myriad threads of human social relationality woven through spatio-temporalities of *presence* in *epistémè*. I posit these foundational queries comprise the challenge of a future already arriving, and present in the field; however, this challenge bears further semio-exegetical rendering that would expose “peace” in education, or peace education, as the fundamental construct of relationship. The semio-linguistic chains binding our conceptualizations of peace and relationship are under review in my dissertation as normative constructions of “peace” presuppose a stability of the sign largely absent and transitive between other signs.

Ilan Gur-Ze’ev (2001) offers a striking critique of the framework of geo-political provenance and interest embedded within academic peace education in the West as a representation of democratic hegemony. For Gur-Ze’ev, the specific (con)text(s) structure(s) a normalizing education in a modernist vein (p. 329) perpetuating epistemic violence (p. 331), offering another critique as discourse in the order of the Lévinasian/Derridean ontology mapped throughout my dissertation. Diasporic counter-education is an improvisation of a de-ontic notion of *philosophico-epistémè* compelling the field of peace education beyond its safe confines of hegemonic positivism, through awareness

of an alternative kind of togetherness, Diasporic togetherness, where improvisation as a concept, as an ideal, as a way of life is central for the possibility of counter-education. In opposition to the various agendas in present-day peace education Diasporic togetherness as actualized in the dynamics of improvisation does not call us to return “home” to sentimentalist-ethnocentric alternatives or to anti-humanist mechanical “solutions” and compensations for the loss incubated by departing from nothingness, “homeland” or “the one.” (Gur-Ze’ev, 2011, p. 115)

Hence, Gur-Ze’ev’s disruptive narrative critique remains presently read too narrowly across the metaphorical and geophysical divide in a North American (con)text. However others, like *Anthology* editors Robin Burns and Robert Aspeslagh (1996) find a level of theoretical

coherence across the divergent field of peace education, identifying five components: 1) the tolerant world, 2) the non-violent world, 3) the just world, 4) a shared world, and 5) a sustainable world (p. 58) in Chapter three. These emergent themes, informed in elements of aesthetic, virtue or care ethics, tether academic peace education in an open inquiry in/on difference as propaedeutic ground for the developing field soon illuminated in Page below, revealing *another* problematic constraining *ethico-philosophical ethos*.

The dearth of a non-fideistic⁷ philosophical rationale in peace education literature was appalling to critical theorists reading beyond the *onto-theo-logical* limits of metaphysics until the recent publication *Peace Education: Exploring Ethical and Philosophical Foundations*. James Page (2008) exploration of five ethical traditions taken from both Occidental and Oriental philosophy posits an ethical grounding of the field of peace education to include: a) virtue ethics, b) consequentialist ethics, c) conservative political ethics, d) aesthetic ethics, and e) care ethics, illuminating the terrain ahead. No single ethical foundation can be sufficient as a rationale, and like Page, I argue for a holistic, integrative approach to the field of peace education, philosophically and ethically grounded. Page's conclusion is remarkably similar to that of transdisciplinarity scholars, as well as the United Nations' program on culture(s)⁸ of peace as integrative concept embodied in the past decade's emphasis (2001-2010) as promulgated within

⁷ Fideism (Merriam-Webster, 2013) may be understood as reliance upon faith alone in the search for religious truth. (See <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/fideism>). The interest and concern for peace has significant roots, particularly in US culture, within religious traditions, but this history need not be automatically conflated with eschatological renderings of peace and religion. My interest in peace education and peace, while informed through an early religious upbringing, does not abide this conflation.

⁸ I have purposefully changed the UN's emphasis on and recent decade for the promotion of a culture of peace to the plural, in keeping with Derrida's principle of *différance*—a holding open of difference as process.

the body of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).⁹

Page (2008) proffers

within virtue ethics, peace may be considered a virtue and/or there may be virtues conducive to peacefulness, and accordingly peace education may be understood as education in that virtue or virtues. Within consequentialist ethics, peace education may be understood as education regarding the consequences of our action and inaction, both as individuals and collectivities, and as demystifying the discourse of war. Within conservative political ethics, peace education may be interpreted as emphasizing the importance of the evolution of social institutions and the importance of order and lawful change. Within aesthetic ethics, peace may be interpreted as something beautiful and valuable in itself, and peace education as emphasizing the importance of that beauty and value. Within care ethics, care may be interpreted as a core element in peace, and peace education as encouraging a fundamental trust and engagement with the *other*. (p.185, emphasis added)

Peace education theory is strengthened through the potential contribution of an applied ethics supplementing the Lévinasian and Derridean *other* (as difference manifest). An applied care ethics and care theory “displaces the lonely, principled moral agent at the heart of traditional ethics with a dyadic relation—‘carer’ and ‘cared-for’” (Noddings, 2008, p. 87) evincing human social relationality. Care theory, as caring encounters and relations when taught, promotes peace in *communitas*, valuing the difference of individual lives across humanity *aspatially*, *atemporally*. As such, the ethics of care and care theory make a marked contribution to a philosophical foundation for the field of peace education. Building on these early roots of peace education as influenced in the arenas of peace knowledges including peace research and peace

⁹ The United Nations considered human rights questions in its fifty-second session in 1997 (resolutions 50/173 and 51/101) at the request of several States, subsequently proclaiming the year 2000 as the International Year for the Culture of Peace (resolution 52/15). In the following session, The International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World (resolution 53/25) was proclaimed and the Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace was adopted (53/243). UNESCO was designated “as the lead agency for the Decade with responsibility of coordinating the activities of the organizations of the United Nations system, as well as liaison with the other organizations concerned” (UNESCO, n.d.a). See <http://www3.unesco.org/iycp/kits/a-55-47.pdf>

studies, Galtung's transcendence, Reardon's holism, and the applied ethics of both Page and Noddings, the field of peace education is poised to engage an open inquiry on difference to move boldly forward in our contemporary age of global bondedness into peace literacy.

Chapter two is a performative re-con-figuration of the distilled central themes of the field of peace education subsequently examined in the third chapter reading of a dynamic field. I commence the chapter focusing on the five formative central concepts of peace education including:

1. (Ethical) relationships with other as defined;
2. Social justice and a critique of violence;
3. Socialization through education;
4. Moral inclusion within worldview; and
5. Ecological concern.

These respective formative concepts are deconstructed through postStructuralism and re-configured as transperformative tenets for a *peace education-of-the-future* in the second chapter.¹⁰ Two additional central themes of peace education, Human security and world order, and Universalism/utopianism are expressly not a concern in this dissertation focusing on transperformative *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* as they pose different fundamental philosophical questions beyond my dissertation. The second chapter opens re-cognizing peace education as a *trace* of Greco-Euro-Anglo-North American philosophies with intersecting and contested notions of human order, purpose, and meaning unfolding in ages of rising

¹⁰ Please see Table 1 on page 57 for a semio-graphic representation of the transperformative tenets developed in Chapter two.

intellectualism and declining *theo-political* empire. As philosophers like Galileo Galilei inverted “Order” in Copernican revolution and original meta-physician René Descartes sought to know and explain the very nature of reality itself beyond mere *onto-theo-teleology*, their progeny, including David Hume and Immanuel Kant, would reject the transcendental for a re-moved and ordered present. A new present, heralding an emergent postModern age following the zeal of the Enlightenment, the fervor of Reformation, and the institutionalization of Education-for-all. The dissolution of the metaphysical trope would continue into the nineteenth century and would shape an arriving *humanus existentialis* peaking with the industrialization of murder during the rise of the Third Reich in Germany. Confining and defining World Order through *socio-political* philosophemes enacted in governance was a necessary and yet insufficient approach in an age marked by “ethnic cleansing,” annihilation, nuclear weapons, and bio-weapons prompting focused concern by peace activists, educators, and scholars. These desperate and disparate conditions, manifesting and interpreted through moralistic and philosophical lenses, would emerge in a consideration of peace forming the initial construction of peace education as felt existential threat in the wake of human violence. Furthermore, within this agon of human contestation, the spectre of Modernity haunts, (re)marking the lives of peoples in thrall to the *onto-theo-logical* limits of the transcendental preferring an “ethno-” centric lens focused through moralism in an effort to re-focus obeisance as tolerance with/in the spectacle(s) of pre-scribed ethics for *other(s)*. Yet tolerance would be envisioned or constructed as ethical relationship(s) with *other(s)* circumscribed through transformational character education to-wards the effective re-shaping of values, attitudes, and beliefs in/to conformity within the emerging academic field. *Ethicus obligatus* as the first transperformative tenet exceeds the will to power structuring human relationships posit-ed in *self/subject-ivity* beyond anti-podal ‘ethical’ constructions.

Universala, a third foundational concept structuring peace education, can be traced throughout the archive of Rationality dispensationally seeding the field into the present in *meta-physical* imagination. Peace education, as an encompassing field of the human terrain captured in the desirous panoptic eye of academe, began bounded within the *onto-logical* preferring a utopic narrative written on the citizens of the world under the guise of international relations. These ancient seeds of *onto-theo-logy* would germinate later in the arriving postModern age re-vealing a scion of universalism once scattered across the fecund field of peace education in contestable notions like the “brotherhood of man,” and the aspirational “world peace” that would elide (m)any manifestation(s) of difference redounding in/to education.

The central focus of peace education as academic endeavor has largely concerned a notion of *socialis aequitas* enfolding a critique of violence as a turn to the ethical as *ethical-relation-with*, which is well marked in Lévinasian *logos*. Within the Lévinasian turn to a justice of the *other*, which I shall expound on further in Chapter two, I find a shift from transcendental moralism to an *ethics-as-ethics*, freed from the chains of auto-telic rapture. *Socialis aequitas* has guided the field of peace education in its early form-ations through the troubled question of human rights as a writing-in-to *socio-political* normativity from an age of (neo-)colonial domination into a pre-sent comprising difference. Peace education be-comes in the instant of *socialis aequitas* as in-corp-oration, or speaking, enjoining the body. As the field would develop primarily in the course of a last century of manufactured chaos, peace education, born of peace research necessarily came to enfold a fundamental critique of violence as avocation towards an ethical, or just, world with stronger affect evincing radical and religious pacifism. The heart of a grounded critique of violence begins in core understandings of power and relations informed in *socio-logical* formations and illuminated in critical theory and pedagogy as well as later feminist

theoretical constructions. A last, but not final, element of *socialis aequitas* enfolding a critique of violence may be framed within the purview of Conflict Resolution/Transformation as a subfield within Peace Knowledges fashioned over the course of the last half century with its strong focus on processes of conflict, violence, and oppression.

Education for peace bears the *trace(s)* of its *onto-theo-logical* roots ascribing *onto-logical* transformation through teaching and learning. Peace education, originating in positivist engagement through peace research, (still) begins with shared *ethos*, or shared metaphysical world through an expansive notion of psychological groundedness whereby attitudes are massaged and learned through educative socialization towards societal transformation. The syncretic nature of positivist, *socio-constructivism* in education for peace, based on a systematic methodology through empiricity as political pedagogy, elides a heteroglossia of difference propounded in a transdisciplinary intellectual perspective. Positivist *tracings* are further evidenced in the final two transperformative tenets of the academic field of peace education. *Embracing humanitas* encompasses an unfolding of culture(s) of peace as manifest in UNESCO's Decade for a Culture of Peace for the Children of the World closing in 2010. The humanist embrace as core concept of recent peace education would consider all aspects of *socio-culturo-political* life realizing universal moral inclusion, with/in/through humanistic, progressive values. *Eco-logical presencing-in-consciousness*, the seventh and final creation of peace education, harkens back to universalist notions, with a deeper concern for a sustainable, or unified world evidencing a *radical-presence-in*.

Each of these five transperformative tenets afford generative planes on which to think through human rationality, relationship(s), and responsibilit(y)ies to the *Other* in a renewal of discourse across/through/on difference. Our thinking together, as a thinking, thinking throughout

this inscription already begun, bears the *trace(s)* of an in(de)terminable past embodied in conjoined lives and enfolded narratives. My dissertation proposes (a)new discourse in the promise of Derridean (im)possibility and Trifonasian justice through the right to philosophy and the *university-to-come* briefly sketched below.

The differential nature of academic discourse across disciplines comprising *epistémè* both constrains knowledge and interpretation while frequently ignoring or even eschewing derivation and origin (Derrida, 2004). In this move, academic disciplines born of Modernity have often sought to confine and exclude the *Other*—as subject, concept, or even *epistémè*—exceeding respective disciplinarian apprehension. It is precisely this move of exclusion, arising from Cartesian roots that compel my further examination. The myriad Social Sciences of the Modern, and now postModern university have engaged the quest for knowledge and understanding concerning the human cosmological condition as a matter of evident relationship, human-in-cosmos. Meanwhile, the Humanities have journeyed inward to explore the quintessential nature of the expression of *being*. It is in the idea of human social relationality that the fundamental nature of humanity is joined, across arbitrary and real divisions of epistemological and even ontological difference within a post-critical age of engaged *presence*. The (re)joining I propose represents my attempt to acknowledge and re-cognize our expression of *being* (human) in the cosmological sphere, such that our human social relationality—the relationships between individual *self/subject(s)* and the *other*, the infinitely *Other* (read non-humans)—enfolds as an exploration of the ethical in relations or human relations with all *Other(s)*. Human social relationality is the cosmopolitical notion of peace in relationship, a human cosmological condition evincing relationship—the *human-in-cosmos*—manifest in the journey towards a new

Humanities borne and born in the *unconditional university* foretold in Derridean (2004) inscription, capable of exploring the quintessential nature of the expression of *being*.

A Right to Philosophy and the *university-to-come*

The *unconditional university*, or the *university-to-come* manifests, and is manifested in a right to philosophy in Derridean (2004) inscription in *Eyes of the University: Right to Philosophy*

2. My proposal for a *peace education-to-come* is formed in the unconditional university posit-ing another uni-vers(e)ity of Rationality in difference that is the untethering of the contemporary Institute of Rationality bound in structured academe, through a/n (re)en-visioning of the right to philosophy. The question of the right to philosophy, its place, space, and purpose presented in Derrida's speech at Columbia University following the establishment of CIPH (*Collège International de Philosophie*),¹¹ is one that has blossomed with the aid of the winds of academic exchange and dialogue across literal and metaphorical oceans that divide.

For Derrida, an implicit right to philosophy exists given the inevitable arrival and existence of international institutions such as the United Nations and UNESCO in the past century (Derrida, 2002, p. 2) demonstrating a philosophical commitment signified in membership of nation-states across the global community (pp. 3-4).¹² I re-position education for the future in the postulated *democracy-to-come* extending Derrida's argument on *The Right to*

¹¹ CIPH (*Collège International de Philosophie*) was founded in Paris, France following the move by the French government to remove Philosophy as a subject of study in secondary education; however, the incoming Prime Minister Francois Mitterand, was persuaded by Jacques Derrida and other contemporary philosophers who organized to challenge this move arguing for the instantiation of philosophy across the curriculum and the recognition of Philosophy as a crucial area of study for the country. (See Trifonas, 2000a, for more details).

¹² As other scholars have understood, Derrida did not and would not use the term global community, but I choose to use it here to frame the aggregation of the overwhelming majority of nations. Moreover, I think his reticence to have used the phrase global community, largely based on a disinclination to diminish difference is overcome by the number of signatories to such international charters and conventions, notwithstanding the repugnant attitude of non-signatories.

Philosophy from the Cosmopolitical Point of View, as an opening to-ward peace which would emerge in the unknown future unfolding an educational system for all, committed to access to the language and culture of the people (p. 3). The moral imperative to depose the hegemonies of the continental and analytical traditions of philosophical thought (p. 11) could be realized through a liberation of philosophy that would “think and discern, evaluate and criticize, philosophies” (p. 15) to engage an enlightened citizenry through deconstructive philosophy rather than “governmentality” (Rajan, 2007, p. 145).

The *democracy-to-come* would be an engaged process of living, balanced and balancing the rights and responsibilities of all persons towards all *other(s)* with equanimity refashioning the tapestry of difference in *différance* by interweaving disparate pasts at the arriving intersectionalities of the future. In this creative or inventive, yea even innovative space, the *democracy-to-come* would reposition subjectivity itself beyond the nominalism of *self* referent.

The unique foundations purposed in the birth of the United Nations in 1945 as a larger body of governance beyond the nation-state, began in the fertile soil of human striving with an initial philosophical understanding of a more just and pacific approach honoring fundamental human rights, dignity, and the worth of the human person in order to strengthen and maintain international peace and security.¹³ Likewise UNESCO, founded later the same year, arose from the roots of reimagined futures that would honor human dignity, purpose, and being. The missional objective of UNESCO, building peace in the minds of men and women, was based on its philosophical founding statement born from a questioning of the possible and necessary

¹³ See United Nations website www.un.org The four main purposes as summarized: 1) to keep peace throughout the world; 2) to develop friendly relations among nations; 3) to help nations work together to improve the lives of poor people, to conquer hunger, disease and illiteracy, and to encourage respect for each other’s rights and freedoms; and 4) to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations to achieve these goals.

conditions for the establishment of long-term peace and security in the world through “heightening collaboration between nations through education, science, and culture in order to ensure the universal respect of justice, of the law, of human rights and fundamental liberties for all, regardless of race, gender, language or religion” (UNESCO, n.d.b).¹⁴

One of the key difficulties marking the leading and only quasi-governmental embodiment of a “Right to Philosophy” lies in the origins and exclusory logic of UNESCO as Greco-European foundation for global community, or mondialized world¹⁵ poignantly addressed in Derrida’s lecture *Of the Humanities and the Philosophical Discipline: The Right to Philosophy from the Cosmopolitical Point of View (the Example of the International Institution)*. The case of the *other/other others/Other* arrives (*à venir*) and be-comes the central focus in the *ethico-philosophico-pedagogical* arena wherein

The axiomaticity of this logic directed at excluding an “Other” from the fundamental (pure) archive of its heritage would be only natural from a philosophical perspective of human historicity that narcotizes the productive value of difference and thus denies the validity of allowing for the possibility of heterogeneous opening to a world community from a cosmopolitical point of view. (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 149)

The right to philosophy must necessarily become the constative and continually performative ((en)action) of the foremost global body of Philosophy in an effort to engage the notion and (im)possibilit(y)ies of peace for a world comprising difference. Such a charge and affirmation constitutes our own respective *otherness* under interrogation.

¹⁴ For a succinct descriptor of philosophy’s foundation and founding of UNESCO see the website

<http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/human-rights/philosophy/>

¹⁵ Derrida’s opposition to the term *community* is seen in *Deconstruction in a Nutshell* (Caputo, 1997, chapter four). He offered the term mondialized to mark the difference inherent in respective subjectivity.

To interrogate the historicity of Western institutions like UNESCO in order to improve them, to make them more responsive and responsible to alterity, therefore ethical and “better” suited to the constitution of their original intentions and purposes, the right to philosophy must be safeguarded. This involves making the commitment to realizing a community of the question that puts what we think we know always under erasure. *Moving toward the impossibility of the future from a cosmopolitical point of view requires looking backwards to the memory of the part and rearticulating the terms of our responsibility to what happened before.* To do this, Derrida explains, “the right to philosophy may require from now on a distinction among several registers of debt, between a finite debt and an infinite debt, between debt and duty, between a certain erasure and a certain affirmation of debt—and sometimes a certain erasure in the name of affirmation.”¹⁹ (Trifonas, 2000a, pp. 182—183, footnote in original) [emphasis added]

As critical (peace) educators we are re-minded through the dismissal of an easy path—a forgetfulness-to-remember—that ignores the experiential nature and *beingness* of *other* as historical *other*, as the *other* that is the *other* of concept recalling the obligation in/of debt to the *trace*. Moreover, I think it is also necessary that this call to memory, from memory, is also a doubling of meaning here, where the debt spoken in Derrida and elaborated in Trifonas is cautiously read, seen, heard as an *ethico-philosophical* responsibility within pedagogical institutions to respect the derivative nature of *onto-theo-logical* framework constructing meaning in the historical “trace” and the perspectivity of the historical *other*. An infinite obligation towards *ethico-philosophico-pedagogical* futures nurtures the democracy of the future through an unfolding of education, in education—a move to-wards peace literacy.

The right to philosophy as posed by Derrida, is built on four salient features situating the New Humanities in the university without conditions: (1) anchoring them in the habitus of knowledge, (2) free from undue influence, (3) informed by the discipline of philosophy, and (4) unconditionally ensconced within the institution (Rajan, 2007, pp. 144–45). Rajan’s reflection on the image of the unconditional university positions the New Humanities as the plane of inquiry that would encompass the multiple discourses concerning peace and thus provide the framework

for the establishment of an informed theoretical foundation for peace education itself within the academic arena of the forthcoming university.

Specifically, this unconditional university, or university without conditions would be the place where academic freedom is coupled with “the right and freedom to question and assert, or even, going still further, the right to say publicly all that is required by research, knowledge, and thought concerning the *truth*” (Derrida, 2001a, p. 24, emphasis in original). Even though it may seem axiomatic, it is this truth that concerns us, whereby “the university professes the truth, and that is its profession. It declares and promises an unlimited commitment to the truth” (p. 24). The journey to truth (re)en-visions in Derrida’s (2004) *Eyes of the University*, under the text “The Principle of Reason” is one of thinking, and thinking about thinking, or reflection, where the university offers a

time for reflection, here, signif[ying] . . . that the internal rhythm of the university system is relatively independent of social time and relaxes the urgency of command, ensures for it a great and precious freedom of play. An empty place for chance: the invagination of an inside pocket. The time for reflection is also the chance for turning back on the very conditions of reflection, in all senses of that word, as if with the help of a new optical device one could finally see sight, could not only view the natural landscape, the city, the bridge, and the abyss, but could “view” viewing. As if through an acoustical device one could “hear” hearing, in other words, seize the inaudible in a sort of poetic telephony. Then the time of reflection is also an other time; it is heterogeneous to what it reflects and perhaps gives time for what calls for and is called thinking. It is the chance for an event about which one does not know whether or not, presenting itself *within* the university, it belongs to the history of the university. (p. 154)

As an instantly eidetic and generative maneuver, such reflection occurs as a moment of indissociability of presence and presencing of the *other*—an ocular transaction spoken in the sense of a listening expression of experience seen while acknowledging the auditorial imagery generated across spatio-temporal planes of understanding. Opening understanding and its methodologies in the university without conditions vitally repositions the profession of faith of

the professoriate (Derrida, 2001a, p. 52). But, what are the limits on this profession, and more importantly, of the truth? To what degree have such limits been imposed upon the discourse concerning peace within the Western academy as both silence and its double, open inquiry? I take up this question later in an examination of *peace as other*, suggesting that in this commitment, the university is both charged with the task and beholden to the task of truth.

Michael Peters (2004) holds the unconditional university as the place of “freedom to assert, to question, to profess, and to *say everything* in the manner of a literary fiction” (p. 42), even to a point of critical resistance (p. 43). As an unformed and potentially emergent space, the university without conditions would be true to its profession and seek to know, think, and honour the encompassing awareness of the multiplicity of all truths (p. 44) re-vealed in the intersecting question(s) of difference, peace, and (social) justice.¹⁶ Arriving at Derrida’s seventh and final

¹⁶ Derrida lists seven propositions or theses, as the profession of the profession of the *university-to-come*:

1. These new Humanities would treat the history of [wo]man, the idea, the figure, and the notion of “what is proper to [wo]man” (and a non-finite series of oppositions by which man is determined, in particular the traditional opposition of the life form called human and the life form called animal) . . . “consistent scientific and deconstructive analysis” framed within the constructs of Human Rights and Crimes against Humanity.
2. These new Humanities would treat, in the same style, the history of democracy and the idea of sovereignty, which is also to say . . . the conditions or rather the unconditionality on which the university and within it the Humanities are supposed . . . to live. The deconstruction of this concept of sovereignty would touch not only on international law, the limits of the nation-state, and of its supposed sovereignty, but also on the use made of them in juridico-political discourses concerning the relations between what is called man and woman.
3. These new Humanities would treat, in the same style, the history of ‘professing,’ of the ‘profession,’ and of the professoriat, a history articulated with that of the premises or presuppositions (notably Abrahamic, biblical, and above all Christian) of work and of the worldwide-ized confession, at the very point where it goes beyond the

point, or profession, we see a questioning of the very authority of the university—in the New Humanities—to knowledge, to the profession (or profession of faith), and to an engaged pedagogy. I posit that in the unconditional university—the future as future arrives (*à venir*)—and the possibility of a *peace education-for-the-future* is born.

The unconditional university is an imagination project that calls into question the university proper and its role in society. In this questioning of role, *ethos*, and rationale, Derrida

sovereignty of the head of state, of the nation-state, or even of the ‘people’ in a democracy.

4. These new Humanities would treat, in the same style, the history of literature. Not only what is commonly called History of literatures or literature themselves, with the great question of its canons . . . but the history of the concept of literature, of the modern institution named literatures, of its links with fiction and the performative force of the ‘as if,’ of its concept of *oeuvre*, author, signature, national language, of its link with the right to say or not to say everything that founds both democracy and the idea of the unconditional sovereignty claimed by the university and within it by what is called, inside and outside departments, the Humanities.
5. These new Humanities would treat, in the same style, the history of profession, the profession of faith, professionalization, and the professoriat. The guiding thread could be, today, what is happening when the profession of faith, the profession of faith of the professor, gives rise not only to the competent exercise of some knowledge in which one has faith, not only to the classical alliance of the constative and the performative, but to singular *oeuvres*, to other strategies of the ‘as if’ that are events and that affect the very limits of the academic field or of the Humanities.
6. These new Humanities, finally, would thus treat, in the same style, but in the course of a formidable reflexive reversal, both critical and deconstructive, the history of the ‘as if’ and especially the history of this precious distinction between performative acts and constative acts that seems to have been indispensable for us up until now.
7. The seventh point . . . I let *perhaps* arrive at the end, now, the very thing that, by *arriving*, as an *arrivant* or arriving one [*en arrivant*], by taking place or having place, revolutionizes, overturns, and puts to rout the very authority that is attached, in the university, in the Humanities: (a) to knowledge (or at least to the model of constative language), (b) to the profession or to the profession of faith (or at least to its model of performative language), (c) to the *mise en oeuvre*, the putting to work, at least to the performative putting to work of the ‘as if.’ (Derrida, 2001, pp. 50-53, emphasis in original)

poses a critical pause that is reflected in the performative *ethico-philosophico-spatio-temporality* of the pedagogical institution in *stricto sensu*. Precisely, in the interwoven realms of thinking, knowing, teaching, and learning, the structuring rationalities require fundamental (re)examination bound in Kantian trace and successively re-framed in the *as if* within Derridean *logos*. For Derrida, I believe, the *as if* employs in the conditional state of inventiveness, the invention of the moment that is event. The invention/event marked here, in the *logos* may reside at that moment inside or outside the metaphysical realm and teleological constraints. The work imagined herewith in Derrida exteriorizes the “inventive” nature of the event freeing it in possibility and purpose.

In these professions that found the *university-to-come*, lie the opening to this emergent realm of inquiry, revealing a further fecund opening of discourse on the truths of peace and peace education from varied perspectives. Such truths of peace, or *peace through the eyes of the other* are nurtured and sustained within the unconditional university that would approach any question boldly and deliberately. Particularly, engaged scholars may pose fundamentally revealing questions that would examine the core ideologies that ground and sustain cultures and societies in conflict to-wards “seeing the *other*”. Furthermore, such inquiry would openly address all questions of peace and conflict within the broader discipline of peace studies itself and serve to elicit an *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* in a grounded, theoretically informed, field of peace education, which I will turn to later in the third chapter.

Discourse, de-construction, and difference in *différance* comprise and construct the post-critical educationalist’s toolbox affording elemental enquiry into the epistemological project for the postModern era of manifest global insecurity, manifesting ideological divisiveness and strife.

Meeting these *ontic* challenges through engaged pedagogical praxis entails a broader, de-ontic approach to the philosophical within education, a path in/to/through deconstruction.

Deconstructing Peace

Our intellectual journey towards peace is mapped in the imagery of language and its institution. While it is not necessary to trace each of the wanderings (and even wonderings) of all our onto-theological forebears to recognize our standing, it is important to examine the resources that we would utilize on our journey through education to peace. Deconstruction is the initial touchstone that would mark the trail, arising within the Derridean *topoi*. Deconstruction as a concept has been challenged and disputed since the early work of Jacques Derrida; however, critics of deconstruction have often misapprehended the role of the idea as an end to meaning and being, but we are reminded “deconstruction *does not* seek, in like fashion and by similar means, to recapture the essence of what is ‘proper’ to the horizon of humanity outside of a *community of language* by obstreperously wanting a reclamation of the truth of the spirit of Being still very much alive and living within being, yet well lost, from the dawning of time” (Trifonas, 2000a, pp. 18–19, emphasis in original). Rather, deconstruction then, affords the conditions of a

rethinking of thinking a thought thought-out promot[ing] the cultivation of an informed grounding of action by tying it to the writing of strategy, a self-teaching of a teaching of learning, through which to approach the undecidability of the decision to sign. To leave the trace of the mark of the Self with and for the Other. In this sense, what we could call a definitive non-typologizing of the play of “writing in the literal sense”⁵³ of the “sensible and finite” is for Derrida the freedom of a kind of writing not “thought on the side of culture, technique, and artifice”⁵⁴ within which we find the unmistakable markings of the ironical dictatoriality of the fallibility of “a human procedure, the ruse of a being accidentally incarnated or of a finite creature.”⁵⁵ A chance to fight against the metaphysico-ontotheological Law of the non-ethics of the sign. The relegation of writing to an inferior position in the codicity or “semio-schematicism” of language as a metaphor of something ontologically “prior” or “originary” within a “system of a signified truth”⁵⁶ of predetermined and essentializing meanings is (or

it can be) used to put down” or to discredit the subjective or interpretative aspect of the signifying function of “the book.” *For the difference of difference is the very thing the Empire of Metaphysics cannot bear.* (pp. 20–21, footnote in original, emphasis in original)

Trifonas’ liberative thought is deconstruction—an enactment as pre-cognition beyond the limits of metaphysics, locating rationality at the nexus of a subjectivity in the *other*. In this (de)scriptive move, Trifonas offers *another* reading of the sign of both the *self* and *other*, creating thought anew. Deconstruction of the *other* must begin in the realm of a de-construction of the very process that is the unsettling of the concept, a simultaneous excavation in/through/and beyond metaphysics unchaining rigid meaning(s) evocative of the transcendent. *Deconstruction is not satisfied partially. Deconstruction is never at peace.* This *philosophico-linguistic* move disrupts the constative with the performative nature captured in and capturing the concept itself, as we shall see in the case of (the concept) of peace redounding to tertiary peace education. Deconstruction is as much an examination of the processes of creating the concept of the *other*—the invention of the other—as well as it is an examination of the concept itself, the concept of the *other*. Deconstruction as read through Trifonas’ inventive re-engagement marks the limits of the rationality of the concept of peace anew, across the bounds of limited language and meaning towards horizons unbound by *logos*, semiotics, and *meta-physics* where peace is re-conceptualized through *historico-narrativity*, spatio-temporally into presence beyond presence. The nature of de-construction, as Derrida states, is such that it is ethical and recognizes the reciprocity of the *other* as a relation marked by infinite responsibility. Deconstruction is

inventive or it is nothing at all; it does not settle for methodical procedures, it opens up a passageway, it marches ahead and marks a trail; its writing is not only performative, it produces rules—other conventions—for a new performativities and never installs itself in the theoretical assurance of a simple opposition between performative and constative. Its *process* [démarche] involves an affirmation, this latter being linked to the coming—the *venire*—in event, advent, invention. But it can only do so by deconstructing a conceptual and institutional

structure of invention that neutralizes by putting the stamp of reason on some aspect of invention, of inventive power: as if it were necessary, over and beyond a certain traditional status of invention, to reinvent the future. (Derrida, 2007, p. 23, emphasis in original)

In invention, de-construction opens the door to the *other* that exceeds invention *a priori*.

Derrida's developmental examination of the process and conceptualization of the invention of the *other*, presented in his two lectures given at both Cornell University and Harvard University during the mid-1980s, was subsequently published as two volumes, *Psyche: Inventions of the Other* (Derrida, 2007, 2008). From this creation or, I should say, invention, the *possibility* unfolds a re-thinking of the concept of the other, as *other*, in fundamental alterity, not as any manifestation of exteriority or creation of a *self*/subject affording another conceptualization of peace itself spatio-temporally as unbound concept, but rather the

possible, it is the invention of the possible, the *tekhnē* of a human subject within an ontotheological horizon, the invention in truth of this subject and of this horizon; it is the invention of the law, invention according to the law that confers status; invention of and according to the institutions that socialize, recognize, guarantee, legitimize; the programmed invention of programs; the invention of the same through which the other comes down to the same when its event is again reflected in the fable of a *psyché*. (Derrida, 2007, p. 44, emphasis in original)

Deconstruction, the in-ter-pretive processural movement in/of *langue*, semiotics, and rationality, is always already a "re-thinking" of concepts and ideation affording a desirable re(con)ceptualization of peace, difference, and peace education—a re-thinking of the subjectivity of the *other*. As a process of movement in and through *langue*, deconstruction represents a becoming of the *other* as creatively invented in Derridean logos.

Thus it is that invention would be in conformity with its concept, with the dominant feature of the word and concept "invention," only insofar as, paradoxically, invention invents nothing, when in invention the other does not come, and when nothing comes to the other or from the other. For the other is not the possible. So *it would be necessary to say that the only possible invention would be the invention of the impossible*. But an invention of the impossible is impossible, the other would say. Indeed. But it is the only possible invention: an

invention has to declare itself to be the invention of that which did not appear to be possible; otherwise, it only makes explicit a program of possibilities within the economy of the same.³⁰ (Derrida, 2007, p. 44, footnote in original) [emphasis added]

In this moment of creation, analogous to mythology, a *self*/subject con-structs or creates, or invents the *other*; *another* who/that/which is always, already present and *Other* in the instantaneity of the moment misapprehending the doubling nature in *ethico-philosophic* conditionality for a passage of cognition—a re-cognition of *other* as *Selfsame* (p. 45). Herein, Derrida opens understanding or rationality to its only course—the con-ception of the *impossible* as the creation of futures in the creative realm within the pluriverse of *self* and *other* through invention. I posit a re(con)ceptualization of peace through difference—a thinking of difference, differently—or invention beyond the limit of the possible—the *impossible*—is fundamental to the “founding” of the field of peace education in the post-metaphysical age.

The inventiveness of the notion of deconstruction is infinitely deconstructive as Jacques Derrida (2008) de-scribed in “Letter to a Japanese Friend” wherein he responds to a query of provenance

in spite of all appearances, deconstruction is neither an *analysis* nor a *critique*, and its translation would have to take that into consideration. It is not analysis in particular because the dismantling of a structure is not a regression toward a *simple element*, toward an *undecomposable origin*. These values, like that of analysis, are themselves philosophemes subject to deconstruction

I would say the same about *method*. Deconstruction is not a method and cannot be transformed into one. Especially if the technical and procedural significations of the word are stressed It must also be made clear that deconstruction is not even an *act* or an *operation*. Not only because there is something “patient” or “passive” about it Not only because it does not return to an (individual or collective) *subject* who would take the initiative and apply it to an object, a text, a theme, and so on. Deconstruction takes place, it is an event that does not await the deliberation, consciousness, or organization of a subject, or even of modernity. *It deconstructs itself. It can be deconstructed* [Ça se déconstruit]. The “it” [ça] is not here an impersonal thing that is opposed to some

egological subjectivity. *It is in deconstruction* [en deconstruction] (p. 24, emphasis in original)

Composing a finite reply to the infinite, Derrida would foreclose closure (*clôture*) of value(s) in the act of *inscription* affording the re-newal of literacy, meaning, and *epistémè*. Such renewal offers fresh cognitive terrain unfolding as presence nurtured in the earlier *ontotheological* soils re-fortified through engaged post-critical pedagogy. We shall build on this infinite opening to explore the confluence of peace, philosophy, and education through difference.

Enfolded within this concept of the concept of invention lies the portal or node within the nexus of the cosmopolitical frame of our inter-subjectivity and the openings of difference, peace and the *other*. The logos of Derridean inscription (2007) reads “the other is indeed what is not inventable, and it is therefore the only invention in the world, the only invention of the world, *our* invention that invents *us*” (p. 45, emphasis in original). Herein the *us* is the creation of the *self*, as *and* in relation to the fundamental *other*, “for the other is always another origin of the world and *we are to be invented*. And the being of the we, and being itself. Beyond being” (p. 45, emphasis in original). The opening created in the inventiveness of the other is infinitely vast and provides the essential non-space, in Derridean *différance*, to examine the linkages among philosophy, the right to philosophy, the question of difference, peace, and education to which I expound in the next chapter. In this infinite space of inventiveness, which we shall never wholly traverse, I would propose the arrival (or I should say “the arrival” of our awareness) of the *unconditional university* that would afford the arrival of a peace as seen through the eyes of the *other*.

Derridean thought on invention likewise has been deconstructively read, suggesting another heading. Tom Cohen (2001), writing on the intersection of metaphysics and the Humanities edited an inventive collection wherein Derrida invokes the new Humanities co-

incident in/with the *university-to-come* and prominent scholars across disciplines including law, literature, ethics, history, gender, politics and psychoanalysis among others, engage a discourse sprouting in the fecund soil of Derridean re-imagination(s). Cohen notes that Derrida's notion of invention itself is simply that—invention. While Derrida clearly marked this path with the signs of its development, Cohen interrupts, or takes Derrida to task and pushes the concept of invention in an-other direction, stating

the Derridean project may (perhaps must) be read as a wager, an *intervention*, an *interruption* of a set of programs—metaphysics, phallogocentrism, empiricism, materialism, and so on—and a future it could not name or dictate but only, by this *intervention*, make possible as an “event.” These programs must pass through, or cross, a site of interruption or translation, and why that effect could be referenced . . .to something as seemingly irreducible, minor, and banal perhaps as “spacing” or the movement of what Derrida will name “trace.” Irreducible, prefigural, dependent not on entities but the interval, not on the word or concept but the mark, not on historical agency but that before which “history” must appear as imposed narrative. (pp. 12–13, emphasis added)

In his de-scription that may be interpreted as dis-criptive apperception, Cohen suggest Derrida's *oeuvre* may be best understood as a movement through, to *other* understanding, I suggest is the constant state of between-ness of *other* and *self*. Continuing Cohen remarks the

transperformative—as translational and performative wager—seems to require a movement through the inventions and parawords of his work, a curling back or closing off so that that discourse can take up its host or incubate . . .[a] holding . . .open for further extensions, and enabling that which they cannot predict and which *the trans-architect could or would not recognize*. (Cohen, 2001, pp. 16–17, emphasis in original)

Moreover Cohen's tangent, presented as an intervention, is offered as passage or movement through metaphysical space and meaning through dis-connection (obviating recognition), but, such interpretation imposes a structured enfoldment misreading the inventive notion as constative in the guise of its performative unfolding. A difficulty arises in Cohen's analysis of the inventive moment of Derridean deconstruction with his reduction of invention

itself to event. Tom Cohen apparently equates the processural, even performative nature of deconstruction itself as the creative force of such an event, confusing meaning (our rationality) and the moment (our apperceptive experience). If Cohen's re-inscription of Derridean invention in/of/"for" deconstruction is only inter-vention—an imposition of the "self" or "other" in the passage—changing the onto-theological *telos* in conscription, such that the *other* that is *other*, the *other* that is *Other*, the *other* that invents us as I re-inscribe again, "the other is indeed what is not inventable, and it is therefore the only invention in the world, the only invention of the world, *our* invention that invents *us*" (Derrida, 2007, p. 45, emphasis in original), is subsumed in the sign of the *self/same* in *onto-theological* frenzy. But Derrida reads and understands deconstruction and the idea of invention *otherwise*, thereby the fundamental alterity that is precisely outside and beyond remains and the arrival at the invention of "concept" itself emerges along the journey—the invention of peace, as a concept of the relation of *being-in-the-world* we hold with the *other*.

Deconstruction as "philosopheme of (non)closure" then, is an inventive unfolding that presages *another* thinking in/of/"for" the institution of Reason facilitating a (re)framing of the question of peace itself through the generative arena of meta-(re)construction beyond the limits of the *meta-physico-theological*. Deconstruction is the most useful approach to address the question of peace education within tertiary education with its porous, or fluid foundation(s). Deconstruction as a post-meta-philosophical approach to reading, inscription and the reading of inscription re-frames the subject nature of meaning across spatio-temporal planes of epistémè affording an-*Other* inter-pretation of the foundation of rationality, meaning, and subjectivity in elliptical shift. In this strategic move the bonds of inscription are loosed, opening processural conceptualization(s) to the *Other* in non-possession—a different opening to-ward the *other* in

différance to-ward peace anew. A new peace emerges in the ellipse that be-comes the way of, the space for, and the place where human communities of difference responsibly exist in sustainable equanimity. Utilizing the inventive nature of deconstruction I transverse the historico-political human terrain and intellectual history of peace education mapped across topologies of difference and meaning, as initially conceived, in a new age of institutionalizing education emergent across 19th century Europe and anglocised North America into the present in Chapter three, after reconfiguring the central tenets of the evolving field in the second chapter. The intellectual tracings framed in the field of Peace Education as it has slowly coalesced through Peace Research and Peace Studies over the past two centuries expose an intricate web of human existentialism in an striking tapestry evocative of seemingly ageless positivism interwoven with fiberous strands of socio-constructivism¹⁷ shaping and re-shaping onto-theological ideals in a late postModernist age. A viable peace education for the future then be-comes the affirmative engagement with the *other* in *ethico-pedagogical* endeavour that would fully acknowledge presence within the academic arena or *university-to-come* through the *working-through-out* the intellectual wisdom(s) of the multiple elements or aspects en-framing definition (e.g., *otherness*, *self*, empathy, subjectivity, (singularity and supplement), ethics, law, justice, society, education,

¹⁷ I join a reframed positivism with constructivism within a consideration of the sociological to offer a key transperformative tenet for a future peace education within the unconditional university. Constructivism as a philosophical perspective was initially present in Kantian ethics. John Rawls subsequent interpretation of Kant repositions the rational person as moral agent. An abridged definition of constructivism frames the metaethical account as “idealized process of rational deliberation, choice, or agreement” (Bagnoli, 2011), pursuing normative truth. I have bridged the sociological and philosophical deliberately here to overcome the presupposition of a universal rationality, posing socio-constructivism as the influence of subjectivity on the social such that the very subject nature of *self* informs the rational agreement of the metaethical and normality. In this construction, I notion to the indissociability of *being* in relation and presence as transperformative maneuver spanning constructed epistemologies toward *other*-standing.

teaching, learning, etc.) to which we shall turn in the present chapter and expound further in Chapter two.

Deconstruction as a reading through *semio-linguistic* terrain of the archive and the narrative of a discourse on education for peace is the passage through the subjectivity of the *self* in the presence of the *other* always, already present. Deconstruction affords possibility at the limit of human rationality, opening subjectivity in the chiasm of the *onto-meta-theo-logical* affording *another* plane for epistemological flight. Deconstruction is the performative engagement with difference on theoretical terrain in Chapter two. Similarly, deconstruction illuminates the trajectory of peace in difference in the third chapter repositioning *epistémè* within peace education and the larger field of peace knowledges unfolding anew peace literacy; an opening to-ward *another* approach or perspective as the opening to *Other* without foreclosure. Chapter three traces the *historico-narratives* of germinal antecedents of the field of peace education predominantly from peace research, and peace studies in its evolution primarily through two authoritative volumes: *Peace Education in America, 1828-1990: A Sourcebook for Education and Research* and *Three Decades of Peace Education Around the World: An Anthology*. Progressivist actors, scholars, and activists demonstrating moral duty and pursuing positivist *socio-constructivist* perspectives as mapped in the Chapter three have seeded the field in and through peace movements challenging many forms of violence while mystically turning from other renderings of structural violence threaded in counter-posing ideological narratives or even *philosophemes*. In the second section of the chapter the desire for and design of nomenclature “defining” (the structure) of peace education is re-pre-sented. Following the literature on the germinal fields of peace education I deliberately locate *myself* in the work

through a *post-meta-philosophical* approach in de-constructive reading/in-scription/reading of in-scription in/on *spatio-temporal* planes of meaning and *epistémè*.

Locating *myself* within the question of peace and the question of peace education is an infinitely complex maneuver. I understand the question of peace as imbricated in the fundamental question of the *self*/subject¹⁸ and the *other* as the ontic expression of *being-in-the-world*.¹⁹ It is simultaneously an expression of subjectivity encompassed within the notion of a subjectivity of subjectivity itself. The individual *self*/subject is necessarily bound within the limits of ontology and epistemology *a priori* as given, yet is compelled into a present comprised by the slice of past futures and future pasts.²⁰ Embarking on this journey of *self*-discovery as a post-meta-physical endeavor necessarily invokes a Derridean *trace* of metaphysical narratives

¹⁸ In this dissertation I will use the joined term of *self* as understood in Emmanuel Lévinas (1969) *Totality and Infinity*, and subject as developed in Heideggerian existentialism notioning phenomenological subjectivity relieved in *post-metaphysical* Derridean interpretation. Bridging the divide between a *being* as presence, or *self* with the subject as *other* in the Lévinasian vein, I acknowledge both the presence of individual being and the *other* in *self* that is unknowable, re-constituting the subject nature of the individual *being* in order to attempt to capture the ineffability of presence in presence.

¹⁹ I draw from Heidegger's metaphysical construction and understanding of the connection of the individual in the world, in and through Being. Specifically, I begin with Heidegger's notion of *being-in-the-world* as relation to Being or the transcendent and read Derrida's question of Heideggerian Being as 'immanent transcendence' that establishes a connection of the *self* as individual, present, and living in the world with *others* across seeming chasms of difference. (To engage further in the metaphysical arena see Heidegger, 1999; Trifonas, 2000a and 2000b; and O'Conner, 2007).

²⁰ The parallel notions of past futures and future pasts implies spatio-temporal fluidity. I find the idea that individual futures at moments in the past are different given the interconnectivity that is space-time, which bears on one's respective *onto-epistemology*. Stephen Hawking (2001), (Hawking & Mlodinow (2010)) has elaborated on this fundamental principle in work exploring quantum physics. This notion is particularly salient to issues of conceptualization related to our attempts to rationalize the noumenal within the phenomenal as descriptive human social relationality. Hawking's (1988) interpretation speaks of the disjuncture of time in temporality and the separation of ground/foundation/location in spatiality as "there is no absolute time. Each observer has his own measure of time" (p. 88). The discontinuity reveals linearity in porosity and surfaces another critique of the Western paradigm in the structuration of conceptualization/meaning.

inflecting pneumatic strains or *onto-philosophical* critique within contemporary epistémè. The task engaged in deconstruction in Chapter two and framed through the archive of the field in Chapter three is to deconstruct human social relationality, or the relationships between individual *self*/subject(s) and the *other* to-wards an exploration of the ethical in relations—human relations with all *other*(s)—and consequently, the very subjectivity of peace as concept or “subject” itself within academia.

I map a tracing of the footprints in the archive of peace education through a performative critique of discourse in the fourth chapter, comprised in a brief narrative written in the lives of faculty and graduate students at prominent sites of tertiary education in Northern Ireland and one in the Republic of Ireland during my brief moments with them over the course of the academic year 2009-2010. My rationale for situating my fieldwork in post-conflict Northern Ireland as a place and space of contested narratives and onto-theologies was supported in confirmation of many of the individual faculty members who interpret their respective work primarily as peace education, rather than peace studies as it was differentially located across specific disciplines and fields within particular universities including education studies, psychology, and social sciences faculties among others. My field research presented in the chapter became an endeavour witnessing the *trace of footprints in the archive* and my analysis an attempt to performatively de-construct the archival and historico-narrativizing process encapsulating post-conflict peace education through the transperformative tenets developed in the previous chapters.

Chapter four reveals the imagery of my field research through discourse. I initially envisioned a research project informed and influenced in the post-conflict setting where *socio-ethno-politico-historical narratives* interplay in society and the individual lives of peoples, informing and structuring education. The ethos of Merten’s (2007), Merten’s, Holmes, and

Harris (2009) transformative paradigm informed the design, implementation and analysis of my field research developing in the snapshot of Northern Ireland peace education. I engaged the fundamental questions of difference, justice, and peace through a postStructural lens on research and education following Derrida (2004), Lather (2001), and Trifonas (2009) to examine two primary research questions focusing on conceptualisation(s) of peace within tertiary education. My first research question was centered on peace: How is peace conceptualised among/by students and faculty (in post-conflict societies/settings) in the area of Peace Education? And the second more expansive query focused on difference in education: What does it mean to educate for peace? How do these conceptualisations lead to conflicting conceptions of educational purpose(s) and (curriculum) programs within the arenas of Peace Education? The focus of the image of an applied peace education comprises the chapter with a supportive appendix (A) outlining methodological concerns.

Moreover, my performative critique in Chapter four becomes a thinking, thinking through the discourse of metanarratives presented in an ethnographic snapshot guided by the transperformative tenets outlined on planes of difference. The dual passage of the critique is an acknowledgment of the iterative spiral of the *ethico-philosophico-pedagogical* aspiration of the field of peace education and the inter-phasic realm (transistioning) of meaning with/in the university as institution of rationality. I open the fourth chapter with an introduction of the performative analytical framework applied and follow with an ethnographic snapshot of the institutional and social settings structuring the lives of both graduate students and faculty in my brief study. Throughout the chapter, I endeavour to preserve the voice of the *other*, attenuating presence in spatio-temporality at the confluence of *socio-ethno-politico-historical narratives* structuring subjectivit(y)ies. My focus on the layers of meaning in the impression of the footprint

of discourse as archive is a tracing of ontico-epistemological ground traversing distinct inner layers of meaning conceived in ontology, theology, and epistemology that spiral out in/to/through diverging philosophical constructions (e.g. positivist socio-constructivism, instrumentalism and utilitarianism) revealing ethical realms as a (re)imag(e)(in)ing original *ethico-pedagogico-curricular* approaches surfacing heterological difference. In this albeit brief snapshot I invite the reader (inscriptive author) onto the plane of *another* discourse as a re-thinking, or thinking through, the key questions of difference in the performative space conceived, between peace and education within the post-conflict setting of Northern Ireland situated within/on diverse institutions of Rationality.

The core concepts and conceptualizations of peace or human social relationality are bound in fundamental philosophical questions between the constative and performative as expression and meaning. I utilize a *philosophico-methodological* approach as analytical framework to interrogate the question of peace in education, or peace education, encapsulating the double movement of a *listening to the voice of the other* and a *reading as writing* drawing on Trifonasian (2000a) performative critique as an interpretative lens deconstructing the narrative of the question of pedagogy and praxis. Performative critique as applied de-construction affords new understandings. Peace remains *other*, a transcendental signified, or given notion as sign with specific meaning and value in the *semio-theoretical* chain constructing human social relationality.

My dissertation focuses on the philosophical roots of an evolving field through an exploration of the theoretical foundations supporting diverse approaches and emphases within Western academe. It is not my intent to examine the pedagogico-praxelological realms of peace education in this journey (that is another labor for the future), but rather to deepen our collective

understandings of peace education as academic endeavour in a passage through *ethico-philosophical* inquiry. The final chapter offers different flights of thought as exploration of future(s) present and past. In Chapter five, I propose possible future explorations of key theoretical arenas in the field of peace education and imagine further connections between the largely North American approach in its complexity and the unique approaches in the field around the world. My proposition for an ethical re-visioning of peace education positions a reflexive, (post-)critical peace educator on the terrain of critical theory traversing questions of justice and difference through re-negotiating the foundations of rationality to-wards human social relationality, or peace in the presence of the *Other*. I conclude this dissertation following the path illuminated through Derridean deconstruction and Trifonasian *justice-to-come*, posit-ing a future-present that disrupts the constructed linearity of rationality, and therefore epistemology, confounding *presence* in auto-nomic signature. Bridging the chiastic divide of temporality and spatiality, I propose *another* reading in *presence* honouring the *other* and *Other* in *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy*, re-visioning *peace education-for-the-future* as a collective journey through difference as discursis, unfolding *impossibility*. And thus shall we begin, once again, in discursis on the bridge in Chapter two.

Chapter Two: Discursis and Peace—Dialoguing with the *Other*

Who is more faithful to reason's call, who hears it with a keener ear, who better sees the difference, the one who offers questions in return and tries to think through the possibility of the summons, or the one who does not want to hear any question about the reason of reason?

(Derrida, 2004, p. 138)

For nothing can be taught or learned other than what is believed to be known and understood.

(Trifonas, 2000a, p. 173)

Chapter two deconstructs the question of peace, interrogating its conceptualisation, envisioning an introspective plane of enquiry for the field of peace education as currently manifest across the Western academy in the late postModern era. I pursue the impossible task seeking to disambiguate peace and the question of education as preliminary opening. Initially, I foreshadow the arriving five transperformative tenets, recasting through deconstruction each of the formative constructs of the field by invoking the metaphysical foundation of Lévinasian secular meta-ethics and Derridean thought, weighing questions of peace and difference addressing inscriptive signification anchored to and through the right to philosophy across *semio-theoretical* and figural maps in a quest to reconfigure the field of peace education in the post-metaphysical age. I map intersectionalities of philosophemes and educational purpose in a move that would unfold towards de-ontic pluriversity, acknowledging the fundamental alterity of the *Other* as precursorial project in reason to suffuse an *ethico-philosophico-pedagogical* endeavor

within peace education and the institution of rationality. Concluding this chapter, the deconstructive lens focusing on peace as concept is further honed by the re-formative gaze of contemporary, critically engaged pedagogues and tempered in the fires of Derridean critique, weighing peace education by theorizing an interrogative perspective through which I performatively read the archive and examine a crucial snapshot within the post-conflict setting of Northern Ireland concerning matters of peace and education. Building on this reconfigured theoretical landscape in the next chapter, I then examine the conceptualizations of peace that are held, understood, and spoken, in the voice of the *other*, through an examination of education for peace within the diverse Northern Ireland university settings.

I posit that education for peace is a reflection of the humanist endeavour to rationally situate *self-in-world* as a joining in purpose with *other(s)* in diachronous affirmation beyond isolated and isolating *onto-theo-logical* limits. This journey in education from the *self* through the *other* to peace commonly traverses the rocky shoals of human existentiality surfeited by waves of truth re-forming, or re-structuring shores of meaning illuminated in *being*. In this stage of my journey in-scribed within, I must begin again with peace as concept (or iterative formation) conceptualized and simultaneously undefinable from the perspective of *other*. I suggest that peace remains *other*—untetherable, adjacent, and shifting as the sands on the shoreline(s) of our con-structed metaphysical castles of *epistémè*, for peace as normative concept, captured within (Western) *meta-physics* remains a transcendental signified, a given notion or idea as sign with specific meaning and value in the *semio-theoretical* chain constructing human social relationality. However, peace may only be considered as an infinitely complex notion with regard to our understanding of difference across *socio-ethno-politico-historical* structures, grounded in and grounding our *being-nature* or respective interpretations of

onto-epistemo-theo-logy. I posit that peace then, as concept or conceptualisation, exceeds the limits of the transcendental signified in the *supplement* of the *aporetic other* as peace becomes enframed (with)in the *trace(s)* of other signifieds as perceived and incorporated within meaning and rationality engaging all presence—“*eidos, arche, telos, energeia, ousia* (essence, existence, substance, subject) *aletheia* [(truth)], transcendentality, consciousness” (Derrida, 1978, pp. 279–280) fully. Peace becomes in the *interplay* of differently weighted signs, as the signification of values in langue, con-fining and con-scribing meaning for the individual *self/subject* in the moment of interaction with the *other* that is *Other* as a cognitive conditionality, or cognitive state of *being-in-relationship-with-Other*. I suggest it is the opening of peace, as concept, *ethos*, through critical pedagogy in, and by the fashioning of discursive forms acknowledging the *semio-theoretical* chain constructing human social relationality that an opportunity to lay a solid theoretical foundation for the field of peace education arrives, re-tracing our understandings of difference across *socio-ethno-politico-historical* structures. Grounding the field in pre-sence anchors *ethico-pedagogy* at the core of contemporary peace knowledges and resituates peace education as the constituent element in an arriving peace literacy within the *university-to-come*.

Just as a non-coherence of definition complicates and challenges the definition of peace for the *self, other, and third*, I extend this issue of elemental paradox to the evolving field of peace education as presently situated within academia, claiming a non-coherence of definition or broader collaborative purpose, complicates and challenges the definition of peace education itself within Western academe, thwarting the vital work of the field as it is currently constituted in/with universities around the world. Peace education then, as constituent element of contemporary peace knowledges and principal arena for education for peace within the *unconditional university* is fundamentally challenged in a commitment to peace literacy to

adduce and address all interwoven questions of difference, peace, and education within the academy. A new beginning compels *another* reading that would radically question our individual and collective rationality in relation to understandings of human social relationality and the central tenets of peace education in difference through *différance* cathecting *presence* anew while re(con)figuring academic arenas primarily concerned with difference, peace, and social justice.

Each of the central concepts of peace education further sketched in Chapter three is bound within *meta-physical* realms of meaning, form, and rationality conscribing aspirational future(s). In this stage of the journey to peace through the *other*, I begin anew, foreshadowing the reconfiguration of the five central concepts structuring the field of peace education within the Western academy through deconstruction. These central concepts imbibe an indeterminate and even fanciful notion of peace and may be summarized (*sans* ordinality) as:

1. Human security and world order

One of the first tenets of early peace education understood as deriving from structured worldviews delineating human order in and through *socio-political* manifestations of *onto-theological* perspectives as reserved for one's own community or affiliative relations. This tenet primarily concerns outside threats to the individual *self*/subject impacting one's phenomenological awareness and sense of safety and security as structured within worldview.

2. (Ethical) relationships with *other* as defined

Initial tenet to define the relationship between the *self* and *other* following the originary premise of the previous tenet in the production of a code through which one's ethical obligation to the *other* is conscribed.

3. Universalism as worldview

Universalism is commonly framed as the originary tenet of peace education in a utopic elision of difference represented in diversity.

4. Social justice and a critique of violence

Adherence to circumscribed rule of law is another central tenet of maturing peace education manifesting justice while seeking to ameliorate perceived distress or injury from the perspective of the *self* or one's own community. This aspirational code is infused with a critique of present violence limited to perspective.

5. Socialization through education

In/formal institutionalization of education inculcating values and norms to the learner.

6. Moral inclusion within worldview

Similar to the second tenet and following the originary premise of the first in the production of a code prescribing one's moral obligation to *others* within the limit of worldview.

7. Ecological concern

Most recent tenet in the field of an evolving peace education that would increase awareness of the larger world beyond one's own community, particularly with regards to the non-human world.

However, a requisite philosophical remapping of peace education mindful of an ethically embodied peace through the eyes of the *other* sustains an evolving field within the *university-to-come* in consonance with *relation-to-other*. Recasting the seven tenets from the position of the *Other* shifts subjectivity and thereby perspectivity itself, which is directly implicated in the role of the (post-)critical engaged educator as well as the concerned educator for peace, in a resignification of peace in education as:

1. *Humanus existentialis*

Reframes human security and world order concerns beyond an insular *self*, acknowledging prescribed ideolog(y)ies traced through (pre)Modern tropes signifying dominance (i.e. power over, value/belief structures, normativity) as rationality and the "right" or preferred order of *being*.

2. *Ethicus obligatus*

Exceeds a conscribed ethical code that narrowly positions the *self* only in relation to perceived equals (*other(s)*), moving beyond an obligation immediately constrained by purposed perceptivity within purview of one's own community.

3. *Universala*

Reposes a utopic elision of difference whereby the *self* limits presence and positioning within, among, and between persons, and between the *self* and non-anthropomorphic life.

4. *Socialis aequitas enfolding non-violence*

Acknowledges a limit of law and right (*droit*) that constrains capacity for ameliorative action in the service of *other(s)*. Such a limit is particularly concerting in relation to the *other* communit(y)ies with which we share an environment and emerging globalized world. Additionally, a non-violent stream of social justice often limited in both reach and scope through affective awareness of the *Other* is overcome in pursuit of a *justice-to-come*.

5. *Positivist socio-constructivism*

Reforms access to and through institutionalized education, which is consistently constrained the world over inadequately preparing the learner for global citizenship while inculcating frequently unexamined values, in/through the educational endeavour. Re-founds the institute of rationality on a reflexive, critical ground open to unbounded enquiry concerning gnosis, rationality, and *epistémè*.

6. *Embracing humanitas*

Expands a prescribed moral code intended for social group maintenance through the adoption of (a) particular ideolog(y)ies consonant with one's own community beyond restrictive inclusionary criteria. Embracing *humanitas* re-releases a critically constrained moral obligation to the *other* that would remain within the consideration of a specific worldview, obviating responsibility to the *other* via exclusionary principles within the code towards the *Other*.

7. *Eco-logical presencing-in-consciousness*

Re-posit-ions a limited scope or framing of ecological concern regenerating one's *self-in-world* as a new *presence-in-world* beyond a significant anthropocentric bias excluding all (*other*) sentience and non-human life. Eco-logical presencing as consciousness steps beyond the boundaries of prescribed ideological limits with traces of the (pre)Modern constraining perspectivit(y)ies in/through (pre)rationality.

While each of these recast concepts serve to ground aspects of peace education from its infancy into the present, I proffer five key transperformative tenets necessarily re-configure the educational endeavour of peace education within the institution of rationality for the late postModern age presented in Table 1: Reconfiguring Peace Education: Paradigmatics and Possibility below. Each of these concepts as developing constructs born, and continually borne of human agony carry specific value and meaning for respective individual *communitas* and may be best re-cog-nized as unfinished sculptures originally fashioned in the crucible of a Modernist ontological quest re-borne into a *present-of-presence*. Across the arc of human rationality mapped from and through Greco-Euro-Anglo-North American philosophies, the concept of peace is contested in the eyes of the *Other* who has primarily been ignored, silenced, un-counted, dis-counted, diminished, and largely only measured in *socio-politico-historical*, enforced, structural absence. The *other* and the *other other* shall remain omnipresent in this (con)text and must necessarily be the subtext of Chapters three and four. You and I, as reader and author, are in this instant co-constructing the *other* spatially and temporally, as this particular in-scription is consumed. The task into perpetuity for the engaged post-critical educator is to renegotiate our own rationality as individual *self/subject(s)* in the pre-sence of the *Other*, *aspatially-atemporally* and to incorporate *all* presence, considering difference openly and addressing all questions of

Table 1: Reconfiguring Peace Education: Paradigmatics and Possibility

Tenets	Emphasis	Formative Central Concepts of Peace Education	Transformativative Tenets of Peace Education
(Ethical) relationships with other as defined <i>Ethicus obligatus</i>	Ontological	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Onto-theological worldviews as design of ordered relations between different cultures/societies/nations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Exceeding onto-theo-logical limit constrained in purposed perspectivity •Justice defined in <i>other</i> (Lévinasian opening)
	Epistemological	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Transcendent structured knowledge as defined lens 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Re-posit <i>self</i>/subject •Subjectivity beyond <i>self</i> (autotelic subject)
	Scope of Consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Exclusive—limited to social groups •Code of obligation to <i>other</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Beyond limited ethical obligation due perceived equals •Extending ethical obligation to all <i>others</i>
Social justice and a Critique of Violence <i>Socialis aequitas enfolding non-Violence</i>	Ontological	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Rule of Law (droit) produces expected justice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Ethical justice (beyond coded metanarratives) •Aspirational true social justice defined in <i>others</i> (Lévinasian opening) •Acknowledges limit of law/Right constraining ameliorative capacity towards <i>others</i>
	Epistemological	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Projected decrease in injury (violence) to <i>self/other</i> through cooptation/assimilation •Critique of Violence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •<i>Justice-to-come</i> •Refashioning (peace as) educational purpose •Bridging disciplinary in <i>ethico-philosophico-pedagogy</i> •Linking philosopheme, langue, and semiotic <i>topoi</i>
	Scope of Consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Exclusive—limited to social groups projected on <i>other</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Inclusive—social justice for all pursued in non-violence (e.g. physically, emotionally) without coercion, manipulation

Socialization through education <i>Positivist socio-constructivism</i>	Ontological	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Idealized education for social (world) order 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unfettered access to/through <i>Unconditional university</i> (Derrida) • Engaging Principle of Reason/Truth <i>Reason-to-come</i>
	Epistemological	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inculcating values/beliefs/norms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ethico-pedagogy-to-come</i> • Unconditional response • Transparent and just scholarship (Trifonas) • Reflexive, (post-)critical enquiry on gnosis, rationality, and <i>episteme</i> • <i>Unconditional-hospitality</i> (a teaching)
	Scope of Consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclusive—limited to social groups 	
Moral inclusion within worldview <i>Embracing humanitas</i>	Ontological	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moral obligation limited to <i>other</i> conscribed in worldview • Onto-theological worldviews limited to social group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethical justice (beyond coded metanarratives) • Re-leases moral code acknowledging <i>Other</i>
	Epistemological	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transcendent structured knowledge as defined lens 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewed speech/reading • Deconstruction as a new reading • Peace beyond teleological axiomatics
	Scope of Consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclusive—limited to/through particular demos 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Unconditional-hospitality</i> (Derrida) • Whole of humanity (Thomas)
Ecological concern <i>Ecological presencing-in-consciousness</i>	Ontological	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Onto-theological worldviews limited to social group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-positions <i>self-in-world</i> as <i>presence-in-world</i> • <i>otherwise</i> than <i>being</i> (Lévinas) • De-ontological perspectiv(y)ies
	Epistemological	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inculcating values/beliefs/norms • Exporting ontological structure(s) • Peace through democracy • Imposed ideological systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Democracy-to-come</i> (Derrida) • <i>University-to-come</i> (Derrida) • Embodies anew rationality
	Scope of Consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited to humanity, or adjacent groupings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whole of humanity (Thomas, Wright) • Non-anthropocentrism

peace in the peace education classroom of the future. Our beginning then, already underway, and necessarily partial and abrupt, unfolds in the consideration of the transperformative tenets beginning to coalesce within Western academe under the umbrella of peace education including: *Ethicus obligatus*, *Socialis aequitas enfolding non-violence*, *Positivist socio-constructivism*, *Embracing humanitas*, and *Eco-logical presencing-in-consciousness*.

Each of the five transperformative tenets represents the positional subjectivity of relationship as a movement from *self* to the *other* constituted in my thesis. The five central tenets are initially transformatively remapped in the following construction(s) or definitions under respective headings, and subsequently de-constructed to reconfigure the field of peace education within the institute of rationality presaging a reflexive, post-critical, *peace education-for-the-future*. I subsequently utilize the respective transperformative tenets to fashion a sharp lens through which to focus on a Northern Ireland snapshot of education for peace in Chapter four through performative critique. Radically mapping the poststructural shift passing from the *meta-physical* or *onto-theo-logical trace* promises *another* future for education, for education for peace engendering peace literac(y)ies anew. Germinal thematic and pre-positivist elements of early education for peace discovered in Chapter three seed the five transperformative tenets in my proposal; however, the non-specific ordering of these tenets critically re-minds the reader within the question of subjectivity, juxta-posing aporetic constructions of gnosis, rationality, and *epistémè*.

Ethicus obligatus

The antecedent form of the transperformative *ethicus obligatus*—defined (ethical) relationships with the *other* is extensively rooted in *Greco-ethology* and (pre-)theological bonds. It offers a fascinating point of departure for a reflexive, post-critical *peace education-for-the-*

future. As one of the first tenets of early peace education, obligation to the *other* was freighted in juridical terms emanating in religio-political, Abrahamic *telos* and manifest through socio-political, *onto-theo-logical* perspectivities reserved for one's own community or affiliative relations (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996; Stomfay-Stitz, 1993). With a primary concern for threats to one's sense of safety and security, obligation due the *other* is constrained, de/limited in/to identity groupings, and reserved according to worldview conscribed in canonical forms. One's ethical obligation to the *other* originates in pre-scribed and pro-scribed (ethical) relationships with *other* as defined by constituted associational affiliations (e.g. socio-religious groups, religio-political groups). The moral construction of inclusion and exclusion manifested in and manifesting social group boundaries elucidated through the integral linkage of the *onto-theo-logical* root of Modernity is traced through to associational affiliation and formatively constructed in religious and theological traditions; yet this associative construction of bond is fundamentally weakened in its scope of affiliation limited to kith, kin, and adherents within respective traditions, and most notably so across traditions from one community/culture/society/nation to another. *Another* reading however, emerges in Lévinasian and Derridean *logos*, (re)charting subjectivity through ethics across planes of difference that becomes a re-posit-ing of *self* in just relation to the *other* beyond limited ethical obligations codified in historical narrativities. I proffer this reading as another ethical rendering of human social relationality in a reconfiguration of the key tenet unfolding as transperformative *ethicus obligatus* through a repositing the *self* beyond the constraints of onto-theological limits superceding autotelic subjectivity while revealing anew justice defined in *other* beyond the limit. Here I turn to the primacy of ethics as relation between the *self* and *other* following Lévinas' revelatory conception of ethics as first philosophy.

Subjectivity is contested and becomes the question in the *aporetic other*, always, already present, following *another* ethics re-conceived in Emmanuel Lévinas' oeuvre con-scribing my obligation due. Inverting subjectivity incisively affords the opening of peace as concept, ethos, and pedagogy through, in, and by the fashioning of discursive forms creating the opportunity to establish a theoretical foundation for the field of peace education. The opening created in the moment of the arrival of the *other* is the space in which peace enters. An *ethicus obligatus* converts the option of refusal (of the *other*) to one of affirmation in that specific moment by (re)enacting relationship as balance tracing the secular meta-ethics of Lévinas and the incisive philosophy of Derrida. Additionally, the role of the Lévinasian *face* in its diachronous balance of the *self* and *other* within and in the face of the *face of the other* represents a further possible opening of an amorphic or indeterminate lens through which to focus on the moment and its image. In the arrival of the *third*, the diachrony of the *self* and *other* is exposed as insufficient and requiring a response beyond ethics that would acknowledge the infinitude of the *other* in fundamental otherness, alterity, or infinity (Lévinas, 1969, p. 51) re-orienting the focal point of obligation, as ethical ground(ing) in *peace education-for-the-future*. To whom am I obliged already presupposes the ethical and demands enquiry concerning obligation, subjectivity, responsivity, performativity, and right. *L'éthicité de l'éthique* necessarily (re)cognizes the limits of rationality as construction capturing justice in impossibility. Such acknowledgment of the *other* is offered in the notion of dis-interest (Gaston, 2005, p. 20) compelling adjudication (Manning, 2001, p. 155), a summons already present confronting the *self as (a) self* in isolation. The immanent summons situates the field within the arenas of peace knowledges engendering a renewing peace literacy and offering a de-ontological, philosophical ground honoring the *Other* bound in *meta-physical trace*.

The Lévinasian Opening

Emmanuel Lévinas (1906) was born in a Lithuanian Jewish family in January 1906 shortly before the “first” World War, commencing his avocation through philosophy and metaphysics in Strausbourg, France in 1923. As a noted scholar, his inquiry into the human condition, informed in the cultural milieu of Europe during successive crises, would permeate his writing and present original approaches to the very questions of existentiality and *being* informing three core tenets: *socialis aequitas*, *ethicus obligatus*, and *embracing humanitas*. Justice, a primary concern for the budding philosopher, initially framed as a response to the *face* of the *Other* in his seminal *Totality and Infinity* asserts “[t]o welcome the *Other* is to put in question my freedom” (p. 85, emphasis added).²¹ *Another’s* claim (on the *self*) in subjectivity—the quintessential question of justice—is framed whereby “[t]he welcoming of the *Other* is ipso facto the consciousness of my own injustice—the shame that freedom feels for itself” (p. 86, emphasis added) recalling the reader in negative freedom where shame is thematized through the presence of the *Other*.²² The “I” or *self* is confronted in her/his isolation structured in given onto-theological worldviews designing ordered relations between different cultures/societies/ nations through transcendent epistemological frame(works). We hear this calling as an *unfreedom* that is truly freedom, the only freedom possible given an emergent conscious obligation to the *other* inscribing justice to a young Lévinas. The *face*, as the moment—the origin of connection—re-

²¹ The semio-grapheme here draws visual and cognitive attention to the *Other* with italics as *Other*, to give pause in reading, offering a moment to think of the use and opening definition of the *other*. Where Lévinas’ inscription did not italicize in this specific quote, I have placed particular emphasis here. I will commonly use this style throughout the dissertation.

²² Lévinas explicitly uses the *Other* to situate the absolute *other* that is not conceivable in any full measure. In a mark of transcendence, the absolute, *Other*, as I have intentionally italicized, is to draw the reader’s attention to a distinction between any *other*, all *others* who are not the *self* and the *Other* that is beyond, or complete *presence-in*. Lévinas’ notion is a refinement of Heideggerian metaphysics, yet remaining in the chiasm of the *onto-meta-theological*.

connects desire and *being* rendering the *meta-theo-physical*, *aprioristic* construction of *self*, *other*, and responsibility as justice beyond the constative at the moment of *becoming-toward-the-other* whereby

Being of the existent is a *Logos* that is the word of no one. To begin with the face as a source from which all meaning appears, the face in its absolute nudity, in its destitution as a head that does not find a place to lay itself, is to affirm that being is enacted in the relation between [wo]men, that Desire rather than need commands acts. Desire, an aspiration that does not proceed from a lack—metaphysics—is the desire of a person. (Lévinas, 1969, p. 299, emphasis in original)

Crucially, the re-connection of *being* with desire illuminates many academic encounters across metaphorical Cartesian chasms founding Modernity and with it, *phallogocentrism*. Heeding *another* call then, future peace education necessarily reengages across phenomenological and noumenological in ethical responsivity to the *Other* at the moment of arrival.

Peace as signified is too frequently read and uncritically constructed as given or existent within the realms of academic peace education. Our compelled responsibility to the *other*, to peace, as ethical obligation beyond limit through deconstruction re-orders signification in difference and manifests justice exceeding conscribed provincial ethical codes (read: community, society, nation) in that

justice consists in again making possible expression, in which in non-reciprocity the person presents himself as unique. Justice is a right to speak. It is perhaps here that the perspective of a religion opens. It diverges from political life, to which philosophy does not lead necessarily. (Lévinas, 1969, p. 298)²³

Moreover, provincial desire coded in obligation limited to social groupings or associational affiliations as inscribed in Lévinas' early notion of justice remains incomplete—structuring

²³ Lévinas' interpretation of the transcendental in metaphysics allows disjuncture between the religious or theologico-telos and the political. This pertinent distinction is the disruption from metaphysics to a secular *meta-physics*.

response and responsibility within the limit, denying the *other*. The question of justice remains forever bound in langue that must necessarily preclude choice in the re-cognition of the exteriority of *being other*. Ethical obligation of the *self* towards the *other* calls into question my *being* and presence in an instance of de-coding conscriptive, rigid adherence to ascriptive *socio-politico-ontologies* of exclusion. The ethical becomes, in deconstructive reading, as

nothing that concerns thought can overflow . . . [consciousness]; everything is freely assumed. *Nothing—except the judge judging the very freedom of thought* . . . [as a] presence of being in the phenomenon . . . utter[ing] . . . the *yes* of which the I is incapable, which brings the preeminent positivity of the Other . . . Certitude rests, in fact, on my freedom, and is in this sense solitary. Whether it be through a priori concepts which enable me to assume the given, or whether it be by adherence of the will (as in Descartes), it is finally my freedom alone that takes the responsibility for the true. As-sociation, the welcoming of the master, is the opposite course: in it the exercise of my freedom is called in question. If we call a situation where my freedom is called in question conscience, as-sociation or the **welcoming of the Other is conscience**. The originality of the situation does not only lie in the formal antithesis it represents with regard to the cognitive consciousness. The calling in question of oneself is all the more severe the more rigorously the self is in control of itself. This receding of the goal in the very measure one approaches it is the life of conscience. (Lévinas, 1969, p. 100, emphasis in original) [bold emphasis added]

Our consciousness is uniquely provoked in a re-newing *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* that reforms the teaching-learning realm of peace education. Conscience, good conscience for Lévinas, is a responding to the *other*, an act of justice—the only act of justice—affording expression, a “right to speak” (p. 298), a welcoming of the voice in presence as performative engagement with the *Other*. Difference obtains in the fundamental alterity of the *other* as the only course of justice, foreshadowing the Derridean turn, as justice can be, and only be rooted *in* difference, necessarily comprising a critical element of each of the central transperformative tenets of the prospective field of peace education arriving. The *metaphysical* shift to an ethics of the *other* in Lévinas implies a thinking, rational subject, one that necessarily manifests consciousness, actively; yet the journey to *another* is incomplete and remains in a state of

incompleteness at the moment of welcoming the *Other* with/in the *Self*. Such welcoming, a hospitality later unconditionally premised in Derrida, begins here in the moment of *presence*, un-encountered, unacknowledged heretofore. Our journey in presence, pre-sently mapped on the terrain of *Other*, continues through an inversion of subjectivity itself, for the *self* in “calling in(to) question” the *self*, a performative move beyond, traced throughout the path to a reflexive, post-critical peace education of the future is built on these five transperformative tenets.

The epistemological emphasis capturing the ethical within peace education in the future begins at the limit of a secular ethics based on the *self*, *other*, and the *third*, or *other other(s)* (Moyn, 2005, p. 182) exceeding limited intuitions of certain Lévinasian scholars framing his teleological project in simple justice; moreover, previous assumptions regarding onto-theological justice at the limit of ethics (Farley, 2005; Manning, 2001; Moyn, 2005; Thomas, 2004) challenges our notions of transcendence in onto-epistemolog(y)ies. Our response as critical pedagogues and peace educators compelled by the *other* framed in Lévinas’ later works,²⁴ requires performative engagement of the constative profession of justice, in justice, as an act of movement across, capturing *ethicus obligatus*. Entwined, ethics and justice is

a reflection on justice beyond the face to face relation between subject and other and into the relation of multiple others, into the realm where my obligation to the singular one is crossed by my obligations to other others . . . [through] the process of deliberation and adjudication between various interests that is the work of justice [which] only arises through the appearance of the third. (Manning, 2001, p. 150)

In the aspect of the moment of arrival of the *third*, my presence is reordered on unconstituted planes of difference dissociating ethics for/in the *self*, releasing onto-epistemological strains

²⁴ Robert John Sheffler Manning’s (2001) inspirational text *Beyond Ethics to Justice Through Lévinas and Derrida: The Legacy of Lévinas*, reinterprets Lévinas later works and their influence on Derrida as performative response to *others*. The text illuminates the relationship between ethics, justice, and the *Other*.

earlier bound in onto-theo-logical realms. The opening or movement of ethics into justice exceeding encultured, conscribed, coded meta-narratives framed exclusively in one's culture/society/nation echoes the distillation of Lévinasian and Derridean discourse meticulously captured in Manning, re-framing positionality. An applied *thinking-through* of secular, ethical justice ushers assumed onto-theo-logical worldviews into relief in the limit of their respective construction(s) as transformative move in/to justice. *Ethicus obligatus*, as a transperformative tenet for peace education, juxtaposes justice and adjudication across ethical planes of difference conforming the *self* and *other* beyond Lévinasian proscriptive responsibility since

the obligation to the singular is crossed by other obligations to other others [*Other*]. This situation wherein conflicting and competing obligations meet and oppose one another demands adjudication. One must consider the multiple and conflicting obligations and adjudicate between them. (Manning, 2001, p. 155)

A new justice emerges in the eyes of the *other*. Engaging this *meta-theo-physico-logical* moment, I propose a renewing *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* for a post-critical peace education eschewing dogmatic onto-epistemologies rooted within the constraints of rigid *socio-ethno-politico-historical* foundations narrowly weighing spatio-temporal expansivity as a question of difference. The opening of ethics as framed within worldview is exposed to its own fragile nature of judgment in subsequent process of adjudication as an inward opening of the metaphysical cell of rationality. It is in this initial opening of ethics to justice by Lévinas and subsequently Derrida, an opening for peace engendering an *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* for peace education within the academic arena commences in reformation of presumed onto-theological worldviews via deconstruction.

Tertiary peace education in the future is fundamentally challenged in its ontological and epistemological positionality concerning the intricacies of subjectivity and singularity captured in Manning's excellent exegetical rendering of these two French philosophers' search for justice

wherein the *self* is challenged at the moment of the arrival of the *third* to exceed the limits of interest bound in singularity, or as Lévinas stated in his treatise, *Totality and Infinity*, “*The other qua other is the Other*” (Lévinas, 1969, p. 71, emphasis in original). Justice reordered, and reimagined in the eyes of the *other* only arrives in the presencing of the *third* (Manning, 2001, p. 117).²⁵ Obligation and responsibility to the *other*, beginning in adjudicatory processes, is instantly re-framed in a deliberate *a*positionality that mediates any distance—proximity—between the *self* and the *third* in an immediate re-posit-ioning of the *self* as subject as “my responsibility for the other is troubled and becomes a problem” (Lévinas, 2000, p. 157), compelling me to shift my focus, or to become dis-interested in the *self* and more interested in the *other* in the *face* of the *other other*. This movement or shift is indicative of a change in both the subject position of the *self* with relation to *another* on cognitive and emotional terrain and the early signs of an individual *self*'s realignment towards the *Other* in transformational signaling, evoking *ethicus obligatus*. Moreover, Lévinas should not be interpreted so narrowly as to set proximity within strict limits of con-ception, but rather the unsettling of our individual and egocentric existence(s) given “my responsibility for my other becomes a problem when it has to be measured and balanced against my responsibility for the third and by the other's responsibilities to the third” (pp. 117–118). That is to say, the “*I*” or *self* develops in the proximal relationship to the *other* **and** all *other others* (which is the *third*) a responsibility that is obligatory towards the wellbeing of the *other* and all *other others*. We, you and I, individually and collectively, become, and are obliged to care for and/or be concerned for the *other*, at once a cognitive and emotional state or condition, which we can no longer ignore instantly exceeding

²⁵ Lévinas (2000) understood the limits of justice in the *other* in his early treatise and would later inscribe a maturing conceptualization of justice in the *other other*, or *third* in *Otherwise Than Being or Beyond Essence*.

provincialized ethical *metanarratives* or codes in view of the *Other*. Positivist *socio-constructivism*, a third key transperformative tenet, offers a new plane of difference wherein such metanarratives are further deconstructed, elucidating fundamental linkages. In an intricate chaining of signs, justice, adjudication, proximity (spatially/temporally), and subjectivity become indissociably linked, through difference, in the question of peace and education, dismissing the false concern of an autotelic, (ethical) *self*.

Subjectivity as the nature of my representation(s) of a *self* to *other(s)* is to be constrained in the arrival of the *other* as re-presentation of the *Other* transforming an autotelic, (ethical) *self* obligated to community into an ethical *other* beyond limited as-sociation or affiliation. This act of transformation in the *self* further develops the key question of responsibility, or responsibilities to and for the other/third as ethics, justice, and the human beyond Being (Thomas, 2004). The opening of ethics inside the diachronous balance of the *self* and *other* as “the face who breaks through the form of its *own appearance as a third* firstly demands justice of the ‘I’ who awakens to the injustice of the system” (p. 106, emphasis added) emphatically linking justice in the notion of subjectivity, elucidating the transperformative. I posit it is this moment of opening within (of the *self* to the *inner-third*) affording the opening without, between the *self* and the *third* that ethical justice is conceptualised. The initial opening, or the opening to the *self* as *inner third*, is a necessary condition for the opening of the second, and as such, illustrates the notion of dis-interest in the *self* for a preference (or interest) in the *third*, obviating the refusal of the *other*, whether *other* arrives in the presence of the *self*, *other*, or the *third*. With the question of judgment, commonly uncritically mediated in proximity (both spatially and temporally), our consideration traverses existential and rational planes of difference compelled in *another* vision of *self* beyond the limits of restrictive ethical codes(s) narrowly concerned with

the realm of provinciality read as community/society/nation constrained in purposed perspectivity. At the moment of arrival of the *other*, “I”, a *self*, incomplete and wanting, confront my metaphysical limits in *onto-theo-logical* stasis and become compelled in/to/through human social reationality recasting notions of social totality as an encompassing of *self*, *other*, **and** the *third*. Justice as ethical obligation resounds in clarion call to/from **all** *other(s)*, transforming my subjectivity and adjudicating my response, hence

justice is a moment of the ordination of subjectivity by the Other for the social totality. This is a move from the anonymity of the totality . . . to the moment of singular identity before the Other, who does not justify me but demands a response. In other words, the Other does not just command/order me but commands me to command, which is to locate myself there before the Other and thus introduce myself to the whole of humanity. Nothing remains between two. The ethical exigency must be translated into an ontological act of calculation and judgment. (Thomas, 2004, p. 118)²⁶

For Thomas, re-reading Lévinas, opens adjudication to limit in *droit*, as this substantial contribution through exegesis directly impacts the field of peace education, and consequently all questions of peace and difference. It is this specific moment or act, the deliberative moment of adjudication (see Manning above), that ontological chains are loosed and *another* epistemological order is ushered. Such an ontological act cannot be otherwise, since one must have a prior reference position in order to act, which indeed arises from an ontological framework, whether it is acknowledged or not in the *aporia* of the university.²⁷ Accordingly, the act of calculation and judgment serves as a relational tool to position the *self*/subject, where such positioning is a referent to one’s ontology. Herein, we, (you and I as reader, author, and reader as

²⁶ Thomas is asserting an explicit ontological function in the face and arrival of the *other*, which contrasts with Lévinas’ claim refuting ontological bias or structure. In doing so, Thomas has advanced the original work and been true to its purpose by pushing Lévinas beyond himself.

²⁷ While the reference is to Lévinas’ own metaphysical interpretations here, the work of understanding and indeed meaning-making is “built upon” a connection to *other* which can and only must precede, which I interpret to be fashioned in or through purposed perspectivity, a perspective that must necessarily in-form one’s *being*.

author), face the challenge of confronting our own resistance or refusal in the moment as we read with formed eyes, a given body, socialized language in structured semiosis, and received *socio-ethno-politico-historical* narrative scripts. Our approach and willingness to engage the scriptology of our lives as post-critical (peace) educators is fundamentally questioned in inverted subjectivity in a present moment of response and responsibility, spatially *and* temporally across interconnected planes of difference re-organised in ethical bonds with the *Other*.

Awakening implies a moving beyond initiating the moment of dis-interest for Thomas, or a diminishment of one's interest in/for the *self* in preference for the *other/third*, which is a concept explored subsequently throughout our dis-course, or remapping of the notion of refusal. Rethinking social justice as a question of difference, differently, within the social totality is a rethinking of ethics and justice,

not merely a rethinking of the grounds of social justice but a questioning of the meaning of the traditional grounds or foundations of justice as a presupposed, impartial universal. Thus Lévinas' claim that he did not make a distinction between the right before the other and the right before the third does not mean that he did not recognize a difference between "ethical justice" and "justice" as a moment of calculation but rather that the call to justice by the Other is *already a call to respond* and make a judgment in the face of an incomparable uniqueness. (Thomas, 2004, p. 118–119, emphasis added)

This call is more than a request put to the *self*; it arrives in the form of a demand that requires action. Any action in the opening of the *self* to the *third* is a shift in the proportionality of interest between each party. Moreover, this shift is the very act of interest, or the *between-being* that may be more commonly understood as inter-subjectivity.²⁸ This shift re-presents the state of justice as

²⁸ Etymology, a crucial lens in philosophic discourse is especially important to Derridean thought. The etymology of the word interest is derived from *inter-* "between" + *esse* "to be." It is "to concern, make a difference, be of importance." (Harper, 2001-2013). See http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=interest&searchmode=term

preceding the individual volition of a *self* concerned for the *other* from the position of *self*-concern into the summons of an ethics of difference.

Attuning ethics in justice re-positions subjectivity in *ethicus obligatus* through a transperformative shift, while maintaining the integral balance between these elements in peace education. The metaphysical concern of ethics and justice within the opening of ethics to justice represents “the two-side event of the *face to face* encounter itself that it is a relation that confronts the unique *other* but also concerns itself with the whole of humanity. Thus, while for Lévinas the ethical relation is linked integrally to justice, it is of utmost importance that the one is not reduced to the other” (Thomas, 2004, p. 116, emphasis added), as would be subsequently elaborated in Derridean logos. Our interest in the opening of the moment lies in the scope of interest—the whole of humanity in diversity—in a re-posit-ioning of difference. Specifically, the breadth of the scope of interest—the whole of humanity and *otherwise than being*—evokes the notion of peace as an *ethico-pedagogy-to-come* through a privileging of interest in all others in relation to the *self*.

According to Lévinas the relation between the self and the other not only produces knowledge of the Other, but that which is much more important than mere knowledge and which calls such knowledge into question: the self’s obligation to and responsibility for the Other. The relation between self and other produces this obligation and responsibility and thereby also produces the idea of justice, nonviolence and peace. The relation subjects the subject to this obligation and this responsibility. In other words, it remakes the subject [or the *self*] as a responsible subject, an ethical subject, and does so even against the subject’s will. (Manning, 2001, p. 148)

In this moment, the moment of Lévinas’ critique of a presumption of a knowledge of the other, Manning is not claiming that such a knowledge is full, or complete, or a consumption of the *other* or *Other*; rather, he is suggesting that *mere* knowledge becomes the opening to obligation

and responsibility for the *other*, the *other* that arrives as the *face* of the *other* illuminating epistemology, ethics, and subjectivity in indissociable triumvirate.

This metaphysical act, invoking justice, serves as the impetus for a further shift in the lives of the *self*, *others*, and the *third*. The opening now becomes the avenue for a movement from refusal of the *other* (upon her/his arrival to the *self*) to the embrace of **all others**, an *embracing humanitas*, and in this embrace one may discover the seeds of peace. Such an embrace of all others as compelled by justice, subordinates judgment to justice in order to preclude differential responses arising from spatio-temporal adjudication producing injury to the *other*. The subordination of judgment to justice occurs with the call to responsibility in the presencing of the *other* wherein judgment—the act of singularity—becomes an instant act of insufficiency resulting in dis-interest. Lévinasian *ethico-justice* informs and supports the (re)configuring of the central tenets of a peace education in/to open *ethicus obligatus*, true *socialis aequitas* and *positivist socio-constructivism* for peace. Furthermore, this embrace of the *other*, always a question of justice, may be understood as an act of hospitality without reservation presented in Derridean inscription, comprising the foremost element of an *embracing humanitas*, another transperformative tenet of an arriving *peace education-for-the-future*.

Embracing Humanitas

Our discourse necessarily turns to the quintessential question of moral inclusion surfacing in peace education. Bound in the limit of perspectivity shaping an *ethicus obligatus* to the *other* above, the prescribed moral code rooted in ontological trace is re-leased in an *embracing humanitas* beyond utilitarian social group maintenance. Founded in and through adoption of (a) particular ideolog(y)ies consonant with one's own community, moral obligation to the *other* is recodified towards *other other(s)* and the *Other*, exceeding uncritical rationalisation obviating

responsibility to the *other* via exclusionary principles. An *embracing humanitas* is cautiously balanced between inter- and intra-subjectivity continually weighing notions of identity and invention on the precipice of justice in the moment of arrival and presence of *Other*. The arrival of the *Other* bridges spatio-temporality in all manifestations and conceptualisations, necessarily traversing disparate and diverse rational and *onto-epistemo-logical* constructions; consequently, contemporary notions of meaning and rationality remain troubled on inter-phasic planes of difference and peace in academe.

Unconditional hospitality: a welcoming (in) Derrida

Welcoming the *Other* in *embracing humanitas* is re-presented in Derridean hospitality without conditions. Founded on a welcoming of the *other* in the previous tenet as open acknowledgment in *presence*, an *embracing humanitas* is the performative obligation to all *other others*, or the *third*. The promulgation of unconditional hospitality in this tenet deconstructs structural knowledge conscribing *onto-meta-theo-logical* limits of human social relationality (read worldview and world order) towards ethical justice. Hospitality as a concept remains a decisive element in relationship and community reflecting the same metaphysical constraints present in ontology acknowledged earlier in this chapter redounding to the field of peace education. Pure hospitality constitutes a welcoming of “whoever arrives before imposing any conditions on [her/]him, before knowing and asking anything at all” (Derrida, 2005, p. 7), relieving contested chains of subjectivity and inspiring anew *ethico-philosophical* imagination. Emphatically we might adduce, hospitality and ethical obligation are two sides of the same concept; just as true *ethicus obligatus* is necessarily unconditional, arriving only in the presence of the *other*, moral inclusion expanded to *Other* encompasses otherwise than *being* as “the question of hospitality is thus also the question of the question; but by the same token the

question of the subject and the name as hypothesis of descent” (Derrida, 2000b, p. 29). The weight of the subject (a subjectivity in subjectivity) in the moment of arrival of the *other* is the given of the given that constitutes subjectivity wherein the subject—*self*, is charged with an irrefutable and perpetual responsibility to the *other* in inescapable human social relationality, or peace. This dissertation presents inter- and intra-subjectivity as an imperative for social justice and consequently, social change that would engender peace through an open inquiry of difference as transperformative endeavour.

Certainly our asking to whom do I owe sanctuary presents many other pertinent questions as well, of which some have already been addressed. Initially, we must imagine a distinction of the stranger/*other* (or the *other/third*) that approaches us in place—or, our abode (Derrida, 2000b, p. 14). The stranger/*other* presents his or herself unexpectedly and expects your hospitality as an irrefutable right of the stranger. Subsequently, upon receiving the *other*, at that very instant, the right to hospitality is diminished and transformed into the knowing of the *other* (Derrida, 2000a, p. 8). At this moment of transformation, the *third* becomes *other* and demands the subject/*self* (see Thomas above), answer all future arrivals of the *Other*. In this implicit demand, the unconditionality of our reception of all *others* is made manifest. Hospitality, due all *others*, is seen as a cosmopolitan right, not sentimental and not given to moral concern (p. 3). Unconditional hospitality, or the receiving of the *Other* without reservations, dis-orders the ontological and re-sets a limited and limiting moral obligation concerned in auto-telic nominalism through the deconstruction of barriers between the *self* and *other*. Hospitality without conditions re-poses the limit of ethical and moral inclusion within one’s worldview across newly imag(e)(in)ed planes of difference notioning an *embracing humanitas* within the realm of a future education for peace. The absolute arrival of the *other* is the penultimate

question facing humanity (Derrida, 2000b, p. 35), constituting both ontological and epistemological emphases of each of these two initial transperformative tenets of peace education.

The notion of hospitality rewrites the limit of responsibility for the *self*/subject, weighing ethical and moral obligation in the presence of the *Other*, constituting a state of subjectivity between. A(pre)scriptive identity formatively constrains subjectivity, complicating one's relationship to *self* and *other* in the confluence of ontological trace effecting the phenomenological. The precarity of subjectivity woven in the *being* signed Derrida²⁹ captures the capriciousness of authority in the matter of subjectivity, the role of identity in subjectivity, and the positionality of *self/other* generating a “caught between.”

Jacques Derrida was born in El-Biar, Algeria on July 15, 1930 into a family that had lived in Algeria for centuries before its conquest and colonization by the French. His grandparents had become French citizens in 1870, when the *Crémieux Decree* granted citizenship to the Jewish population of Algeria, who, like its Arab and Berber inhabitants, had until then been considered French subjects with limited civil and legal rights. Jacques described more than once the effect on him of arriving at school one day at the age of 12 to be told that he could no longer attend classes. He had been excluded from the French public school system because of the severe *Numerus Clausus* imposed on Jewish students after the Vichy collaborationist government rescinded citizenship for all Algerian Jews. He was able to return to school a year after the arrival of Allied troops in North Africa, but never forgot how it felt to be a victim of discrimination, deprived of basic civil rights, and treated as an unwanted foreigner in his own land; to realize, as he put it, that he was a citizen of no country at all.³⁰

Essential questions of identity are posed to the *self* and *other*, an *otherness*—personally and individually—situating enquiry in difference as proffer of an irrefutable basis for an

²⁹ Derrida's life experience as a French lad in a Jewish family would prepare the fertile ground for *unconditional hospitality* addressing metaphysical threads of place, identity, subjectivity, and the relation between *self* and *other*.

³⁰ David Carroll's memoriam of Derrida illuminates fundamental questions of the subjectivity of subjectivity with its direct consequences for identity. For further elaboration, see (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/inmemoriam/JacquesDerrida.htm>)

embracing humanitas nurtured in the fertile soil of Derrida's philosophical quests born in a question of citizenship.³¹

What is "learned" from the loss of citizenship, without ever understanding exactly what is meant by the term, is the precarious, arbitrary, artificial nature of citizenship and national identity, that they are not in any sense "natural." What is experienced are the destructive effects of exclusion, of being put in the place of the other, the outsider who is declared by law *not to be in his proper place even in the place where he has always been*, the indigenous alien who is not granted the same basic rights as others who inhabit the same place. It is to learn what it is to be "hostage" to others in one's own home, in the case, hostage to the French in one's native land [*pays*]. This is something Derrida admits, that always remained with him. (Carroll, 2006, p. 908, emphasis added)

The spectral voice of Derrida continues to haunt, calling for an *ethical justice* that must embrace the *other*, bound within borders of *socio-political* constructions beyond the limits of coded metanarratives seeking to disenfranchise *being* and preclude social identity or citizenship. Within this act or enfoldment of power, both rights and status are subjugated into a periphery of non-*being* that would elide *aporetic* connections and identity across communities. Yet the disruption

³¹ In *Monolingualism of the Other*, Derrida (1998) meticulously clarifies the issue of, and connection between identity and *otherness* stating, "Our question is still identity. What is identity, this concept of which the transparent identity to itself is always dogmatically presupposed by so many debates on monoculturalism or multiculturalism, nationality, citizenship, and in general, belonging?" (p. 14). For Derrida the loss of the mark or sign of "citizenship" is egregious—a purposed, dis-placing of *being* as he continues unpacking the act of non-*being* in the moment of removal from the only community he had known, a supposedly "ethnic" or "religious" group that finds itself one day deprived, as a group, of its citizenship by a state that, with the brutality of a unilateral decision, withdraws it without asking for their opinion, and *without the said group gaining back any other citizenship. No other.* Now I have experienced that. Along with others, I lost and then gained back French citizenship. I lost it for years without having another. You see, not a single one. I did not ask for anything. I hardly knew, at the time, that it had been taken away from me, not, at any rate, in the legal and objective form of knowledge in which I am explaining it here (for, alas, I got to know it in another way). And then, one day, one "fine day," without, once again, my asking for anything, and still too young to know it in a properly political way, I found the aforementioned citizenship again. The state, to which I never spoke, had given it back to me. (pp. 15-16, emphasis in original)

of fixed ascriptions coded in ontological trace, re-writes the power of ascription, freeing subjectivity in a re-ordering of relation between the *other* and the *self* on another plane in difference. *Ethical justice*, the enactment of an *embracing humanitas*, is best understood on Derridean terms as the performative engagement of a *socialis aequitas* enfolding a critique of meta-physical violence which may be best interpreted as **any** or **all** violence against the *other(s)*.

Taking up the intellectual and philosophical challenge of *thinking, thinking through* peace in education is at once a question of ethico-political inter-pretation as posit-ed in many of Derrida's latter queries. In the joining of the ideas of (im)possibility, de-construction, hospitality, and response to the *other* at the moment of the limit—the only moment, the moment of (im)possibility and therefore, the only possibility for the relationship of the *self* and *other* that acknowledges each in the *Other*, peace is re-conceptualized beyond teleological axiomatics in epistemic release exceeding onto-logics. A hospitality without condition weighs

the *tension* built into “hospitality,” this “aporia” or “paralysis”—how can I graciously welcome the other while still retaining my sovereignty, my mastery of the house? How can I limit my gift?—is not negative. On the contrary, it is the condition of possibility (and impossibility) of hospitality. Like everything else in deconstruction, the possibility of hospitality is sustained by its impossibility; hospitality really starts to get under way only when we “experience” . . . this paralysis . . . Hospitality *is* impossible, what Derrida calls *the* impossible (the impossibility of hostility), which is not the same as a simple logical contradiction. Hospitality really starts to happen when I push against this limit, this threshold, this paralysis, inviting hospitality to cross its own threshold and limit, its own self-limitation, to become a gift *beyond hospitality*. Thus, for hospitality to occur, it is necessary for hospitality to go beyond hospitality. (Caputo, 1997, p. 111, emphasis in original)

The possibility of justice in peace, or peace in justice, arrives in the *aporetic other*, always, already present in *presence*. Re-reading then the inscription,

hospitality, if there is such a thing, is beyond hospitality. Hospitality, “if there is such a thing”: that means it never “exists,” is not “present,” is always *to come*. Hospitality is what is always demanded of me, that to which I have never

measured up I am never hospitable and I do not know what hospitality is.
(Caputo, 1997, p. 111–112, emphasis in original)

Hospitality without conditions, or deconstruction is the notion of arrival, an arrival unexpected, uncalculable, and disconcerting because this arrival is the arrival of our awareness of our limit—the limit of the *self* as host and simultaneously guest (pp. 112–113). Notwithstanding, a concern remains in the equation of hospitality and deconstruction whereby each concept may be a welcoming of the *other* as *other*, but the limit in the moment of the arrival of my response and responsibility may be considered of a different degree, or kind. Hospitality, the welcoming of the *other*, proposes response/non-response, welcome/unwelcome, and awareness/unawareness as binary conditions obtaining in the moment. On the *other* hand, deconstruction, as non-concept, a process, a way of re-reading, dis-inscription, carries an affirmative obligation to the *otherness* of *being*, state, understanding. A hospitality without conditions necessarily enacts the opening to difference and to peace in the *other* that is *Other*.

Unconditionally responding to the *other* that is *Other* re-positions subjectivity itself out of nominalism. In the absolute arrival of the *other* the question of our response is unequivocal. We must respond. But will we offer, graciously, without pretense, expectation, or constraint, our hospitality; or, shall we withdraw and seek to protect our “place?” It follows that this is the original question of peace. Now the question of peace is such that “peace implies within its concept of peace the promise of eternity. Otherwise it is not peacethe very structure of the concept of peace, which implies a promise of indefinite, and therefore eternal renewal” (Derrida, 2000a, p. 6). The eternity implied within peace refers to the very ontology represented in human social relationality. Eternity would represent the eternal renewal to the *face of the face* of the *other* as a constant demand. For peace to be peace, for peace to mean peace, for peace to exist, it must be an expression of receptivity to the *third* without reservation, or hesitation. If peace is not

eternal, it is not peace because as such, peace would only be a conditional relationship of privilege between the *self*/subject and the *third*. Peace invokes eternity in its demand for relationality that is not subordinated to any *self* or *other*, while presenting itself as the unknown. An *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* for peace, or post-critical education for peace would open to and welcome all that is *Other*—within all realms of human sentience and *otherwise*.

The fundamental question of peace, rooted in the relation or between-ness of the *self* and *other* compels an interest in subjectivity as construction in phenomenological affect. *Embracing humanitas* reorders moral obligation limited to *other* in ontological bounds, to unanticipated *others* and finally, in extension, to the whole of humanity. The unchaining of ontological bonds is afforded in deconstruction of the *self*, re-writing and re-reading subjectivity through the eyes of the *other* in transperformative engagement. Engaging in this course of inquiry across the noetic realms of thinking, reasoning, knowing, and learning offers a fecund ground and grounding for an *ethico-philosophical* examination of peace in an evolving field.

The question of *self*: the subjectivity of subjectivity

It is especially in the deep roots of the notion of subjectivity freighted in *onto-theological trace* that a quintessential concern of the question, and the question of difference and thereby questions of peace and peace education arise as previously explored under the names of Emmanuel Lévinas, Jacques Derrida, and Peter Trifonas. The idea of a subjectivity of subjectivity remains as an irridentist critique of metaphysics bearing traces within the de-ontological realms of revisionist postModern thought weighing immanence. Consequently, our interest in disambiguating the subjectivity of the *self*/subject as manifestation of difference, arises along this philosophical journey into and through education towards peace as a question of existentiality, rationality, and gnosis, given

metaphysical thought, where a finite has the idea of infinity—where radical separation and relationship with the other are produced simultaneously . . . [an] attention to speech or welcome of the face, hospitality and not thematization [where] self-consciousness is not a dialectical rejoinder of the metaphysical consciousness that I have of the other. Nor is its relation with itself a *representation* of itself. Prior to every vision of self it is accomplished by holding *oneself* up [se tient] in its interiority, in its home. It thus accomplishes separation positively, without being reducible to a negation of the being from which it separates. But thus precisely it can welcome that being. The subject is host.

Subjective existence derives its features from separation. Individuation—an inner *identification* of a being whose essence is exhausted in identity, an identification of the same—does not come to strike the terms of some relation called separation. Separation is the very act of individuation, the possibility in general for an entity which is posited in being to be posited not by being defined by its references to a whole, by its place within a system, but starting from itself. The fact of starting from oneself is equivalent to separation. But the act of starting from oneself and separation itself can be produced in being only by opening the dimension of interiority. (Lévinas, 1969, pp. 299–300, emphasis in original).

The subject and subjectivity are casually thought and interpreted in the manner of origin, but the performative instance as source of engagement deserves consideration along with a thorough interrogation of the subject within this key tenet. In the mapping of the processural movement of subjectivity as separation from others—an embodiment³² of identity itself as exteriority is discovered whereby the *self* is confronted in *self* as exteriority, belying the metaphysical limit where “the dimension of interiority” remains a manifestation of exteriority or infinity. The *self* becomes *other*.

Obligation and responsibility to the *other* enfolds subjectivity and its invention. The invention of the *other* is the only possible invention in Derridean reformulation in-form-ing the question of hospitality. In this counter-intuitive move, Derridean mapping of the passage from the *self* to the *other* is a preeminent ethical concern subsequently extending the question of

³² Embodiment here is not used in the sense of common usage in feminist or critical pedagogy of a re-cognition of presence-in, but rather drawing the implicit assumption of identity as an exteriorized, isolated *self*/subject.

subjectivity *qua* subjectivity as a freeing of the *self* bound in interiority in an opening to the *Other*. The invention of the *other* re-presents a *meta-physical* act in exteriority as attempt to *self*-identity within the interiority of *being* as con-scribed in the *onto-theo-logical telos* of an impossibility “capturing” infinity and the expanse of difference. But this act remains incomplete in a false gesture eliding alterity in essence. It is not possible for the gesture to sublimate difference to the same for as I re-inscribe Derridean (2007) *logos*, “the other is indeed what is not inventable, and it is therefore the only invention in the world, the only invention of the world, *our* invention that invents *us*” (p. 45, emphasis in original) as the affective con-struction of *oneself*'s subjectivity, or the *self*/subject. Invention presupposes the meta-physical *other* isolated and captured in the *self*; rather than *presence* of the non-*self*. Still difference remains, exceeding the limit of cognition and structuration within *phoné*, *langue*, and *grapheme* bearing directly on disrupted functions of identity founding responsibility to *others*. Our struggle then, as reflexive, (post-)critical peace educators and critical pedagogues is to refuse the invention of the *other*, cognizant of the presupposition of a meta-physical *other* isolated and captured in the *self*; rather than presence of the non-*self*.

One oft confused or conflated conceptualization with subjectivity is the notion of identity. Identity in this sense cannot stand in as the mark or marker of subjectivity, but rather identit(y)ies comprise elements of psychological and socio-psychological “knowing” and representation. Such markers or mark, (e.g. sex (other/asexual/bi-/lesbian/gay/trans-/questioning), societal “role”/position/status (child, adult, other, worker, professional, etc.), natality (birth origin/cultural upbringing/socialization)) serve as de-script-ors and psychic knowing and communication; however, de-description and knowing arise and arrive following the quasi-

transcendent state of subjectivity through meta-structuration. The idea of identity, a construction, is framed largely within cultural identity based on difference, or perceptions thereof, where

the people who fight for their identity must pay attention to the fact that identity is not the self-identity of a thing, this glass, for instance, this microphone, but implies a difference within identity. That is, the identity of a culture is a way of being different from itself; a culture is different from itself; language is different from itself; the person is different from itself. Once you take into account this inner and other difference, then you pay attention to the other and you understand that fighting for your own identity is not exclusive of another identity, is open to another identity. (Caputo, 1997, p. 13)

It becomes a fundamental concern for an *embracing humanitas* that elisions of difference underwritten in (cultural/ethnic/social/national) identity be exposed *ontologically* and *epistemologically* along the interstitial passages of intra- *and* inter-subjectivity. Consequently, prudence indicates that in this analysis of cultural construction, identity be measured cautiously in a manner that “prevents totalitarianism, nationalism, egocentrism, and so on” (pp. 12–13). The move dissociates a difference of kind—as aggregation—between the *self* and *Other* as community, for the idea of community (deriving from the aggregation of individual *self*/subject to a collectivization) remains *athetical* within subjectivity (of the one).

Subjectivity implies the *Other* in *Being*, often confused in the *other* (or non-*self*, a singularity). The metaphysical trace in the *other* connotes a state of otherness that is given; contrapuntally though, the state is dissociation—an unbridgeable separation of *otherness* as acknowledgment of the fundamental alterity of the *other* in *Other*. Dissociation represents and is represented in this construction as the *emphatic distance between two* never to be crossed.

Community, in Derridean parlance, is the state of conditional unity across the divide of subjectivity wherein the *self* **is** *other*, and the *other* **is** *other*, **and** the *other* **is** *other* to itself in dissociation. Moral inclusion as a central tenet of peace education enacts the transperformative

possibility in the transitive movement of a *self* be-coming, becoming *other* not through consumption, assimilation, or erasure, but in a deliberate re-ordering of the subject position (subjectivity) within. Notions of community are infused with the idea(s) of the *Same*; however, particularly here, we see how conflating across kind confuses understanding with an impact on and through, *onto-epistemological* cognition and its envelopment in academe. I find this approach re-visioning secular meta-ethics through a de-ontological lens refreshing and the point of a new departure towards a future of possibility through difference. A possibility of community in difference, a possibility of peace.

Re-newing our collective humanity in an *embracing humanitas* acknowledges *trace* and *supplementarity* within the question of difference, the question of justice between the *self* and the *other*. The subject is rehabilitated primarily in re-posit-ioning its genealogical authorial strains, exceeding the limits of a Nietzschean poststructuralism such that the subject may be seen or recognized in “its multiple genealogy within the history of modern philosophy and its active reinterpretation and reinscription” (Peters, 2003, p. 322). *Embracing humanitas* as transperformative tenet advances the question of the *other* in the *self* in an instance of balance on the spectrum of dissociation/separation and association/community, abiding transcendence while simultaneously holding alterity in fullness given the notion of the subject compels “knowing where it comes from and how it functions” (p. 324). And it is precisely this difficult “knowing”, a knowing of the *other* in *Other* that constitutes morality in the ontological frame with its consequences for inclusion/exclusion along the arc of constructed *onto-theo-logy*. The question is a matter of the moment or location that marks the trace of subjectivity in difference re-posit-ioning the *Self* as *Other*, not as a re-writing—inscription or coding—but rather as a movement that spatio-temporally bridges, where

this line of argument de-centers the subject, brings it out of the shell of the Cartesian *cogito* that shelters its attempt at realizing the security of a self-discourse with itself . . . because in the equating of self-hood with self-presence, the Other is effaced to the point where an inner-monologue with one's "Self" is not really an instance of transmissibility at all, but the self-deceptive verification of the desire for auto-affection. Or an attempt at the reduction of *différance*. In order to ascertain the existence of itself, a subject must refer outside of itself to the *world of the signs of the Other* using the resources of what does not begin "within" itself, therefore striving to refrain from obliterating itself just as it seems to have authenticated its existence. It is this relational aspect that Derrida makes us aware of about the ethical grounding of *différance* by referring to the constitutive function of the *sign-trace* of the Other; the deferring difference between presence and repetition, self and non-self, reveals itself as undecidability at the proliferative core of identity. (Trifonas, 2000a, p 42, emphasis in original)

The subject/*self*'s deception is a denial of the *other* that is *Other* that must, and always already precedes subjectivity, but imagines the inventive moment of the *other* as one's own invention/event, an imag(e)ination contra-difference. *Embracing humanitas* serves as an essential tenet of peace education bridging the *metaphysical* in the transforming presence of postfoundational futures. Heeding Trifonas' prescient indictment of the educational endeavour, the emergent field of peace education must continually navigate the uncharted seas of essentiality and de-con-text-ualized subjectivity in an effort to emerge from the false consciousness of the closure of metaphysics wherein the arrival of *another*, an openness to *being-present-in-being* connects the trace of "Otherness".

This may seem a strange and perhaps scandalous indictment, especially to those who have struggled in good faith, yet blindly, to overturn universalism for the purpose of instating particularity, only to find that via the cultural/material space of an inscription of identity for its own sake, essentialism quickly dissipates the ethical necessity of recognizing and responding to the alterity of an Other with/in the Selfsame. The struggle to escape metaphysics, however precautionary its measures and forthrightness of purpose (good faith, ethiccity, openness), will always fail outright because its closure is by definition interminable, a process of repeated repetitions, alterity, a variegation without ending or end. (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 139)

Subjectivity becomes the en-actment of a false consciousness of exteriority eliding difference in form and manifestation, in vain attempt to define *being* within, as closure and completeness wherein the *self*/subject appears as reflection only, as a moment of the impossibility of the erasure of difference “masque”ing an infinite human social relationality—*another* approach to peace.

An *embracing humanitas* unconditionally re-leases the *other* in *self* displacing the adjudicatory impulse of an arriving *self*/subject in transformation. Likewise, the post-metaphysical shift manifest in this tenet affirming anew hospitality without conditions can reclaim positivist socialization through (peace) education in affirming discourse with the *other* beyond the bounds of a cautious, consuming, objectifying, and tokenistic approach engendering *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* in an abiding transperformative *positivist socio-constructivism* with the *other*.

Positivist socio-constructivism

The academic pursuit of education for peace, originally concerned with socialization and the inculcation of values and norms within learners/students, has recently become more critically attuned in response to the demand from the *other*—the other as academic field/discipline, the other spatio-temporally located across institutional and physical geography. Contemporary peace education traces a shared *ethos* (shared world) or *universala* originating in positivist engagement through an expansive notion of psychological groundedness whereby attitudes are massaged and learned through educative *socio-constructivism* inducing societal transformation. The syncretic nature of *positivist, socio-constructivism* in education for peace, based on a systematic methodology through empiricity as political pedagogy, elides a heteroglossia of difference propounded in transdisciplinary intellectual perspective. *Positivist socio-constructivism* as

transperformative tenet substantively moves the field of peace education beyond mere socialization into the arena of the question and consequently, exposes its *raison d'être* as pedagogic endeavour. This transperformative tenet engenders a critically reflexive *ethico-pedagogy*, engaging the question of peace on planes of difference, while purposively contributing to perennial efforts that would re-found the institute of rationality on a reflexive, critical ground open to unbounded enquiry concerning gnosis, rationality, difference, and *epistémè*.

I posit the responsibility of this poietic engagement in peace education (a performativity-to-come) lies squarely on the shoulders of the professoriate³³ as an open engagement with *différance* in the nexus of the cosmopolitical frame of our inter-subjectivity.

We live in a world where the foundation of a new law [*droit*]³³—in particular a new university law—is necessary. To call it *necessary* is to say in this case *at one and the same time* that one has to take responsibility for it, a new kind of responsibility, that this foundation is already well on the way, and irresistibly so, beyond any representation, any consciousness, any acts of individual subjects or corporate bodies, beyond any interfaculty or interdepartmental limits, beyond the limits between the institution and the political places of its inscription. (Derrida, 2004, p. 110, emphasis in original)

Educators for peace are inheritors and one of the responsible bearers of this new law ushered in the *university-to-come* eschewing facile notions of idealized education for social (world) order for a nuanced and complex understanding of difference, justice, and peace in/through education. Deconstructing the foundation of the university by envisioning the new Humanities re-structures discipline and field re-mapping the pedagogical endeavour of peace education towards ethical purpose in service to the *other* re-writing *epistémè* in new orders. Our two-fold engagement as reflexive, (post-)critical peace educators requires an acknowledgment of the *telic* coursings of

³³ Deweyan re-form of education sought to join pedagogical praxis and theory in the educational arena through the performative consideration and evaluation of function, purpose, and rationality.

positivism in the developing curriculum of the field, augmented with consideration of the intricate threads of constructivism woven through the hidden curriculum of peace education evidenced across institutional settings. Indeed, this difficult task arrives at the limit of inscription of the university as we know it in the passing postModern age. It is a performative response to the re-cognition and apperception of difference within and between *being*, compelled. The transformation of teaching, learning, and education founded in Derridean *logos* exceeds all previous con-ceptions and convictions, yet other visionaries have offered keen insight for the journey. The ontological and epistemological roots of educational systems fundamentally frame the question at hand, simultaneously eliding and illuminating normative codes within the manifest function of the institution of education through processes of socialization. *Positivist socio-constructivism*, as reconfiguration of socialization through education, would (re)imag(e)ine the role of education in peace, interrogating all presuppositions founding purpose (of/in education) and troubling philosopheme in rationality. Thinkers, reformers, and philosophers of educational endeavour have repeatedly challenged the notions of fixed or rigid *epistémè*, calling forth a pragmatic turn in primary and secondary education as in Dewey below.

Emergent Roles and Performativity: Education & Peace

Educational theory and democracy as branches of the human quest for gnosis, rationality, and *epistémè* have had particular import for peace and education since Dewey's (1916) seminal work entitled *Democracy and Education* mapping a direct pedagogical connection to the lived experience of the student in curricula. Educational praxis and theory are joined in hermeneutical reform through a performative demand (as *other*) compelling a response to the subject (*epistémè*) in relation to the subject (*self*, student) through an evaluation of function, purpose, and rationality, enhancing the developing lens for *peace education-to-come*. Further, the

“*unconstructive*” nature and development of approaches and purposes serving and founding educational theory (Hansen, 2006, emphasis in the original), reconstructing the educational lens of the early twentieth century in North America while contributing to positivist notions of peace in education in an age of “global” conflict. *Peace education-for-the-future* becomes in the moment of interrogation of idealized *historico-narrativities* constructed and constructing ontological frameworks structuring epistemolog(y)ies in a renewal of democratic criterion obliging “continuous reconstruction or reorganizing of experience, of such a nature as to increase its recognized meaning or social content . . . to increase the capacity of individuals to act as directive guardians of this reorganization” (Dewey, 1916, p. 376) in education. The task before the formal educational institutions of each age, indicative of Dewey’s quest for theoretical foundation supporting the needs of all peoples and societies in the postModern age as a move beyond Rousseau and Plato, is to re-construct the purpose and praxelological effect of rational engagement spanning noetic realms, for all questions of difference and especially the question of peace.

Re-writing educational purpose in *positivist socio-constructivism* deconstructs the epistemological bases inculcating values and beliefs as (a) given normativit(y)ies within respective cultural/ethno/socio-political groups through language and its formations. Our obligation as reflexive, post-critical educators and keen peace educators traverses the semiotic landscape signifying meaning in *langue* at once traveling through the Deweyan plane intersecting Derridean interpretation. Formative structuration of language implies the reification of separate worlds based upon distinctions derived through the use of linguistic tools (subject, verb, predicate) suggesting an illusory realm unsustainable in postModern educational theory (Hansen, 2006) that inevitably informs curriculum development, effecting praxis. The subject

and verb (as linguistic tools) are joined in the referent frame, thereby constituting the relationality observed or imputed to the *self* and its response to the *other*. It is then in this moment that the relationality of the *self*, as construct, is refigured in the moral[/ethical] response demanded by the *third* (Dewey, 1916) as premised in *ethicus obligatus* and *embracing humanitas*. Dewey's posthumous demand as *third* or *other*, would be to command action or the re-con-struction of educational theory, and thereby curriculum, pedagogy, and praxis fully acknowledging and accounting for our respective obligations to, in, and for education. Re-cognizing the realm of educational endeavor as consonant with responsibility and performativity, "moral and . . . social quality of conduct are, in the last analysis, identical with each other . . . [such that] the social function of education" (p. 415) must be judged by the degree of social responsibility manifest in relation between. Simplistically, the final chapter "Theories of Morals," claims a

narrow and moralistic view of morals is responsible for the failure to recognize that all the aims and values which are desirable in education are themselves moral. Discipline, natural development, culture, social efficiency, are moral traits—marks of a person who is a worthy member of that society which it is the business of education to further . . . Discipline, culture, social efficiency, personal refinement, improvement of character are but phases of the growth of capacity nobly to share in . . . a balanced experience. And education is not a mere means to such a life. Education is such a life. To maintain capacity for such education is the essence of morals. For conscious life is a continual beginning afresh. (Dewey, 1916, p. 417)

Following the educational pioneer, morality is rightly implicated in educational theory as a necessary conditional element in critical education and a key to human social relationality; yet insufficiency remains in the exception of the ethical summons of the aporetic *other* nurtured in unfettered access to/through the unconditional university. An arriving peace education would encompass Dewey's moral image of the world wherein a "person becomes a self, a realized human being, through education" (Hansen, 2006, p. 185) and re-framed in *another* subjectivity

distinguished in Derridean *logos* pondering *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* engaging difference and peace.

Reconstructing educational theory and the theory of peace education in Deweyan perspective is made possible in the age of presence through *différance* as the nonconceptual space (Trifonas, 2003) afforded within the unconditional university. *Différance*, as the most recognized (non)concept of Derrida, can be understood as the capacity or conduit affording new re-con-structions of educational theory, obtaining curricular theoretical development (Hansen, 2006) proffering anew formations and possibilities within the educational arena of the university. Consequently, performative engagement in the cause of peace within the institute of rationality in open-mindedness is consummate with Dewey's philosophy and egalitarianism, positioning the field of peace education in good stead. The work proposed herein, the laying of an informed philosophical or theoretical grounding for peace education built upon the ideal of plurivocity in an open inquiry on difference pursuant to social justice is in response to the unanswered clarion call for the re-construction of educational theory, issued nearly a century ago. Recasting the question of philosophy within *l'avenir* of the *Other* posing difference presupposes

the reconstruction of philosophy, of education, and of social ideals and methods thus go hand in hand. If there is especial need of educational reconstruction at the present time, if this need makes urgent a reconsideration of the basic ideas of traditional philosophic systems, it is because of the thoroughgoing change in social life Such practical changes cannot take place without demanding an educational re-formation to meet them, and without leading [women and] men to ask what ideas and ideals are implicit in these social changes, and what revisions they require of the ideas and ideals which are inherited from older and unlike cultures. (Dewey, 1916, p. 386)

These “ideas and ideals,” always, already, must presume a multiplicity of voice for within this multiplicity that is *other* and possibly, fundamentally *other*³⁴ our compelling quest and inquiry in difference unfolds revealing conceptualizations of peace. Consequently, the compelling nature of this demand for recognition of the *other*, by *other*, inherent in the multiplicity of voice of the *other* (whether the external *other* or *inner third*), calls for a reframing of educational theory and curriculum given the positivist, postModern purposes and missional ethos of peace education. However, it was not until the latter part of the past century that critical theorists exposed normative notions of many of these same idea[l]s of culture and society concerning the relationships of power, difference, justice, and education weighing social import through a more rigorous critical examination in a journey largely unimagined in the arenas of peace education until the past decade.

Peace and education, inseparably linked in the realm of tertiary education, enfold anew peace literacy in the passage of deconstruction opening the archive of reason within (re)imag(e)(ine)d institutions of higher learning as “[d]econstruction integrates semiological difference within the radical irreducibility of the infrastructurality of *différance* marking the *arche-trace of the Other* to expose how the telepathy of the *logos* is deferred by the self-effacement, erosion, *phthora*, of the plentitude of the *eidos* of presence” (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 46, emphasis in original). The deconstructive maneuver liberating reason from the successive chaining of historical *trace* unexamined boldly opens the question of education to its elemental nature, revealing the ontico-philosophical limits framing reason in *and* as education, critically

³⁴ Here I am considering the way, or manner in which *other* may comprise some commonality as a *thinking-through* or idea[l]s of universality (given the *a priori*) and the possibility of complete strangeness, or lack of commonality which I have addressed evoking Derrida earlier on subjectivity and shall further consider under the headings of singularity within a deeper exposition of *eco-logical presencing-in-consciousness*.

disrupting a simplistic ethos of education as (mere) socialisation (beyond Bourdieu's claims or Burns and Aspeslagh's condensed analysis). Hence,

deconstruction convenes post-structural interventions into topical variations of the educational problematic (origins, mimesis, nature, "primitivism," childhood, reason, etc.) around the issue of the paradoxical stricture of supplementarity, the middle-ground between the *fullness* of presence and the *lack* of absence, to show that there is no neutral or apolitical safe haven of language or representivity, an unmediated, "un-policed" point of decidable exteriority, from which to approach the horizon of intersubjective violence, the linearist techniques of the repetition of impressionability. (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 46, emphasis in original)

Adequately disturbing *ethos* as ground in *positivist socio-constructivism* realigns the field of peace education in the critique of education as institution, an Institution of Reason inadequately con-ceiving and con-ceived in the limit of *epistemo-logical* constructions with a failing apperspectivity appropriating questionable prominence. Consequently, as the *epistemo-theo-logical* foundations of the institution of rationality are exposed in deconstruction as philosophical critique, the limits of language and representation present another avenue of passage, a passage in education through difference to the fundamental *Other* towards human social relationality or peace in *peace education-to-come*.

Philosophy and education mutually constitute the other entwining academic endeavour within realms of division and discipline. Yet Philosophy's role as a discipline in higher education is more than the limit of its bounds as host and *other* within the institute of rationality, positing fundamental critique within and on the role of philosophy in education, (re)imag(e)(in)ing the violence of language in the sublation of difference and its subordinate role in all teaching-learning. Pausing in reflection, philosophy is dually charged in task and responsible to the *other* and the *other* of the *Other* as a matter of pre-ordinate or aporetic justice fashioning a peace conceived beyond metaphysical limits within a certainty of

symbolic violence . . . *in-forms* the conceptual-metaphorical schemata of the psyche for dealing with everyday reality.¹¹⁶ It is within the mastery of the rhetoricized heart of the institution's disciplinarity that the in-grained *habitus* of one's own subjectivity is subject to, and a subjectification of, the flux of language expended upon the ideology of a free-will.¹¹⁷ Derrida is succinct: "There is no neutral or natural place in education (*l'enseignement*). Here, for example, is not an indifferent place."¹¹⁸ (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 78, footnote in original, emphasis in original)

Our subsequent task in transperformative *positivist socio-constructivism* is to reimagine education beyond the bounds of such meta-physical violence that would openly engage the de-ontic nature of *being-with* in the realm of a new education—an education that no longer represents *onto-theological* scripts and *historico-narrativities*, but, acknowledges the presencing of the fundamental *other* before adjudicatory response. As an act of interiorisation, Reason's inward focus can only be reflective (and the reflection) of its exteriority and *otherness* tracing the *Other* as *arrivant*. Reason then, must inwardly address its standing within the academy and an arriving peace education for the future, be-come a *reason-to-come*, pliant and fortified. Consequently, the educational endeavour manifest in the Western Academy faces greater scrutiny today in an age of incremental vacuity where accountability is equated as reformation. The possibility of another *reason-to-come* presages future *epistemologico-philosophical* dilemmas confronting academe in the "post-" age wherein the question of difference perpetually supplants *onto-theo-logical* enquiry given

the applicability of the general principles of deconstruction to the historical contextuality of the pedagogical institution is due to the fact that the educational bodies comprising the material scene of teaching are themselves mediated by the constructions of discourse. Or of a pervading textuality effectively determinant, as such, of the subjectivation of experience. The discourse infusing the (inter)disciplinarity of this educational site is a fertile ethical and political ground for deconstruction because the "actual" circumstances of a particular pedagogy (e.g., a "philosophical" one) implies the institutional privileging of a set of ideological assumptions toward teaching and learning, the logic of which underlies and guides the prescriptive implementation of a hierarchical frameworking of knowledge in the concrete form of a curriculum. On this point,

Derrida is concise: “The university . . . is philosophy, a university is always the construction of a philosophy.”¹²⁹ (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 80, footnote in original)

Positivist socio-constructivism effaces the historical tropes of institution that necessarily inhere in the institution of Reason and its disciplinary quests such as peace education seeking to exemplify reason as consistent interrogative practice with fundamental concern for instituting practices surfacing a broader “search for *truth*” as transperformative tenet. Further de-scriptions of the course of dis-course within the Western academy, and the particular discourse of an evolving field of peace education, necessarily traverse the rocky shoals of foundations and founding within the self-instituting prerogative of the very institute of Rationality. Hence the fundamental quest for the *other* towards a *being-with Other* grounds anew, performative response within the field and the academy deconstructing metaphysical regimes ensconced affording ethico-theoretical discourses on/of difference with/in conceptualization(s) of peace itself.

As transperformative tenet, *positivist socio-constructivism* responsive to Lévinasian secular meta-ethics, re-sounds in major accord through Derridean performativity as a deliberate re-framing of responsibility to the *other* with origins in Austinian (1980) speech act theory. Responsivity to the *other* as *Other* re-positions language and speech expanding John L. Austin’s construction of language beyond early theorization into a new performativity openly and adequately addressing difference without consuming or erasing distinction, acknowledging subjectivity within the question. Though language and speech enact through multiple subjectivit(y)ies a responsibility to the *trace* already present structuring presence in *epistémè* while obliterating apperception, a reflexive, positivist educational engagement weighing peace, social justice, and difference relieves the constative limits marking pedagogies of oppression. A *positivist socio-constructivism* imbibes deconstruction seeking inter-phasic presence (spatio-

temporally) elucidating truth in reason for/in an *ethico-pedagogy-to-come*. Countersigning the performative demand of the *other*, the tenet performs a tri-functional purpose in the peace education of the future under the auspices of the *university-to-come*: a) acknowledging subjectivity, bridging academic divisions/disciplinarity spatio-temporally; b) disrupting ordained ontolog(y)ies; and c) re-configuring epistemolog(y)ies presupposing *presence-in*. The new order invokes

the performative . . . as a response made to a demand made on me by the “wholly other” [*le tout autre*], a response that, far from depending on preexisting rules or laws, on a preexisting ego, I, or self, or on preexisting circumstances or “context,” creates the self, the context, and new rules or laws Derridean performatives are essentially linked to his special concept of time as “out of joint,” as *différance*. A Derridean performative creates an absolute rupture between the present and the past. It inaugurates a future that Derrida calls a future anterior, or an unpredictable “à-venir,” as in Derrida’s iterated phrase in his late work: “la démocratie à venir,” the democracy to come. My response to the call made on me is essentially reciprocal performative saying “yes” to a performative demand issued initially by the wholly other. My “yes” is a performative countersigning or the validating of a performative command that comes from outside me (Miller, 2007, p. 231, emphasis in original)

The demand-countersigning-response, based on ethics as first philosophy, constitutes the act of the action embodied in ethical response. It is more than a constative notion presented in action as possibly framed in a more narrow reading of Miller on Austin and Derrida. Within this ethical framing of responsivity to the *other*, and *other other* or *third*, rests a critical aspect of an engaged *ethico-pedagogy for peace education-for-the-future*—the indissociability of response compelled in the nexical elasticity of *aspatiality-atemporality* comprising (post-)critical pedagogy.

The call to responsibility as ensconced within the academy is a summons to explore, acknowledge, and understand the quintessential “role of the question” (Trifonas, 2002) in our academic endeavor performatively engaging all questions of difference as individual scholars, thinkers, and researchers. Academic responsibility (of the professoriate), key to sustaining

vigorous *epistémè*, situates oursel(*f*)ves in the world as readers, authors, actors, and students and would pose the questions urgently poised at the edge of our understanding(s) concerning cognizance, rationality, and peace, or human social relationality. Compelled forward, our individual and institutional responsibility to the question exudes an ethicity of the moment. *Positivist socio-constructivism* as a core tenet of peace education must deconstruct *theoria* and the ontic nature of *Being-as-being* in consonance with “the inescapable summons to responsibility demanded of an intellectual undertaking thoroughly inscribed by and inscriptive of the conditional effects of a gradual, though steady, intensification of the ethico-political maturation of the states of theory” (p. 3) that compels my maximal, though only limited response.

Our academic responsibility, or the performativity of academe as (post-)critical educators interrogating questions of peace and of difference, represents the moment of transformativity wherein the notion of openness to the *Other* is both the nexus and kinetic point of relation doubly deconstructing the theoretical/constative nature of pedagogy in *epistémè* and its instituting foundation as structure. Summarizing, *as if* that is possible, the fundamental questions of philosophy, difference, education, and peace along with their interstitiality—or the threads of interconnectivity between and among these notions—through Trifonas, re-imagines the role of Education from the ashes of a metaphysical past and a *presencing present* interrogating *historico-narrativity* in

the ethical moment of this opening of location and locality, the space and place, *khorismos* and *khora*, from which to engage and facilitate a return to questions of academic responsibility in hopes of transforming the ground of thinking and practice, is vital in its importance for what is at stake—that is, for the future of philosophy itself. Despite its wanting “to reach the point of a certain exteriority [non-closure, alterity or otherness] in relation to the totality of the age of logocentrism,”²⁶ deconstruction nevertheless must remain hopelessly and forever tied to the normative discourse of metaphysics. But it perseveres at taking an

affirmative line of questioning with respect to the reductive formulizability of binaric thought and its hyper-simplistic, teleo-idiomatic construction of the ontological difference of identity in both conceptual and empirical terms. Deconstruction, whether it wants to or not, redefines the conditional determinacy of the axiological limits to thinking that it meets and will ultimately test, so as to converge upon uncharted destinations of thinking, teaching, and learning without the confines of a ready-made (*etymon*), contextualized map, an inalterable archive of “what knowledge is of most worth.” Its duty to question what is held sacred, taken for granted as **TRUTH** (always in boldly capital letters), even venerated, risks both *all* and *nothing* because of its open responsibility to the Other whose effects on the formation of the subject and subjectivity are incalculable. (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 141, footnote in original, emphasis in original)

In the allusion of the phoenix rising from the onto-theological ashes, the Institution of Pedagogy and educators as the *other* of the *Other*, are emboldened, again adducing emergent realms of academic subjectivity, rationality, and possibility exceeding old structures of binary construction formulizing cognition within teaching-learning realms. The opening of a cosmological pluriverse materializes in new passages across uncharted mappings comprising the educative endeavor for peace education realizing new truths. New truths emanating from the fundamental alterity of the *Other* illuminating limit towards a new peace literacy.

But these ashes are more revealing in another way, given apperception and the specificity of *historico-narrativities* concerning questions of peace subsuming difference. Crucial questions arise regarding the role of reason as Reason, and the role of philosophy in pedagogical pursuits within the moment that reflects and is reflective of a tran-scription of *phallogocentrism*, where the teleology of metaphysics is exposed offering a fundamental critique of the pedagogical function of the institution and the institutionalization of pedagogy itself. reason as Reason³⁵ must be-come different, it must be-come difference in order to engage the *other* that is *Other* to be unconditionally welcomed into human social relationality, as peace. Once more, we are cautioned:

³⁵ reason as Reason:semio-grapheme.

what counter-acts the irresponsibilizing drive of metaphysics to secure a teleological trajectory of the subject for its “just completion” along the lines of a teaching of a normative ethics, a normative ethics of teaching, is the deconstructive obligation to grant a vertiginous plurivocity to the re-tracing of semiological difference as the deferral of the self-presence of the sign, the law of an open-ended justice always already set beyond the divisibility of nature and culture in the order of *différance* and the impossibility of gaining access to a single and determinate Truth. (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 46, emphasis in original)

The ethical pursuit of Truth always rejects normative ethics prescribing meaning within the *onto-theological* universe of thought conscribing *epistémè* in academic response to the *Other*, while remaining beholden to the structure of foundations structuring institutions of pedagogy in natality, as a marking or re-marking of the very subject position in the responsible educator for peace. And, in this performative move, the engaged academic presences *another* pedagogy in *différance* towards ethical realization(s) of *spatio-temporal-socio-political* difference within a reflexive *socio-constructivist* lens focused on questions of peace revealing our subjectivit(y)ies.

An incomplete reflexivity remains sustaining this tenet of education for peace within the academic arena. The question of performativity always, already impels a response to the panoply of interests and concerns of the *other* whether (re)presented across proximal boundaries or otherwise realigning *epistémè* in and for the responsible academic. Recall, briefly Lévinas’ proposition that while proximity does factor in the *self*’s adjudicatory response to the *other* as we ethically read earlier, proximity attenuates justice such that the obligation to the fundamental alterity of the *other* is not dis-missed. Now, taking up this compelling claim regarding proximity and response of the engaged academic and peace educator, the responsibility to the *other*, to all *others*, entails an attenuation to voice(s) across the auditory spectrum of *socio-ethno-politico-historical narrativities* and visual landscape of presence. Our performative re-action or response necessarily regards (or re-guards) the *present other* as arrivant within our sphere of cognition.

Ethico-philosophico-pedagogy as transperformative response to metaphysical trace re-founds education for peace in the post-critical era proffering a plurivocity of meaning-making within the academic arena as a propaedeutic opening to an engendered theory of praxis honoring the presencing of the *Other* in fundamental alterity re-cog-nizing cognition in a doubling of presence in present—as a present in presence and presence in past. Possible futures arrive as

deconstruction traverses the ethics and the politics of the logic of the Same to introduce from beyond the horizon of its impossibility the transcendence of a teaching/writing of the Other. It upsets the surety of the “phenomeno-semiological” foundation of the institutional history of Western epistemology at the level of its theorizing about the value of the sign, reproducibility and representation, or what is the heart of the educational future of all philosophy and science as indicative of the empirical foundation of the certainty of truth. For nothing can be taught or learned other than what is believed to be known and understood. (Trifonas, 2000a, pp. 172–173)

If we are to take this appellation seriously, and indeed we must as an engaged professoriate and concerned body of educators traversing planes of difference (and peace), then, the challenge of the future-present is our challenge and the only passage by which we can tread responsibly.

Positivist socio-constructivism deconstructs the epistemological limits of the sign of peace and its “present” constructions, *aspatially*, *atemporally*. Abiding the impossible path of transcendence of the arriving *other*, we—you and I, *Self* and *other*—are liberated from stultified traces of past constructions of meaning, purpose, and most importantly, *being*, into a cosmological plane of presence fluidly co-con-structing *futures-of-presence* in the moment of arrival (*à venir*) that is the *other* of *Other*. The disruptive state present in the arrival of the voice of the *other* presages *another* state, *another* normativity-to-come within *ethico-pedagogy* in *différance*, since

the deconstruction of the phonocentric normativity of the laws governing the intersubjective violence of the unspeakable trace of the writing of the Other, the possibility, *the hope*, through which we can and must learn to reflect upon the ethnicity of our own thinking and practices of representation is situated in the

in(de)terminable unfolding of *différance* The irreducibility of *différance* “shows up” the infinite exteriority of the *arche-trace of the Other* through the *symploke*, or a weaving together of the diverse strands, of deconstruction, e.g., the yoking of undecidability with the heterology of its transcendental preconditions. (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 175, emphasis in original)

Such a reflective transformation as *symploke* within the pedagogical institution manifests a *peace education-for-the-future* actively engaging the question of difference in peace as the opening to *Other* transversing nexical *spatio-temporality* across teaching-learning frameworks in late postModernity. Renewing our

focus of attention . . . on finding a more “neutral” and less contentious site from which to interrogate the axiomatics of the apparatus of teaching and learning, one that effaces the tensions of the historico-political codification of the academic/bureaucratic dualism tranquilizing . . . [its] cooperative processes. (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 178)

Re-grounding philosophy within the university as educational institution re-grounds the pedagogical endeavour of a teaching/learning *other*, and re-imagines a new dis-course of discourse itself towards ethical obligation through deconstruction as justice (Trifonas, 2002), welcoming the *other* through transparent scholarship. In a close re-reading of Derrida’s “The Principle of Reason: The University in the Eyes of Its Pupils,” a *topos*, if you will, of discursive intraconnections across the *thetic* terrain of an *ethico-philosophical peace pedagogy* emerges, at once capable and challenged, engaging human thinking, reasoning, teaching, and learning for a new millennia. *Positivist socio-constructivism* as transperformative tenet is posited on

the question of responsibility and what is “proper” and “right,” of “the law” and “the political”: not to raise fears about the unjustifiable eradication of the university, an institution old and dear, as ancient as philosophy itself, *a traditional knowledge structure that is the structure of knowledge*, very much in need of painstaking reconstitution, but to allay them in the well-meaning desire to rejuvenate serious exchange on the reason for its being. (Trifonas, 2003a, p. 179, emphasis in original)

Indeed it is only in the realm of “the ethicity of our own thinking” (p. 175) and our equi(po)sitional reflectivity within the professoriate, manifesting educational re-form for the new millennium that the invention of collaborative performativity arrives within the institution of pedagogy. The question herein is the question of our incomplete ethical response in pre-sence, as reader, author, reader as author, and critical (peace) educator.

Heeding the troubling critique of our responsibility as (post-)critical (peace) educators today propounded in Trifonasian (2000a) inscription re-positions peace pedagogy within the umbrella of peace knowledges effecting peace literacy for the future. Within *The Ethics of Writing: Derrida, Deconstruction, and Pedagogy*, a performative reinterpretation of the question of ethics and inscription paradigmatically shifts the fundamental question before education as institution illuminating the critical passage through deconstruction of the question of peace before us as individual scholars and educators in an age marked in presence. Peace codified in *historico-narrativities* is reconstructed on planes of difference transversing the chiasmic divide of Modernity/postModernity and Metaphysics play as *différance* disjoins originary constructions spatio-temporally, while realizing understandings as movement across difference (p. 41). Imbibing the clever erudition of the notion of deconstruction as idea and *différance* as capacity and kinesis, peace education is poised on the precipice of novel pedagogical possibilities adduced in this lengthy passage as

deconstruction [has] already . . . given form in itself to a *species of non-species marking the un-namable in the alterity of a philosophical subject metaphysics cannot stomach or mouth*. And here it would be tempting . . . to consider *différance* an operating principle, to criticize it as the ambi-valent counterpart to a philosophy of origin upon which the Other must rely or fall. But this would also be to mis-understand, not to do justice to the interpretative formativity of a “doubling commentary” Derrida has said is possible at some minimal parameters of signification,²⁰⁰ by representing *différance* as external to identity instead of it being always already within the non-indicative self-relation of the being written of Being, modifying the *here* and *now* “at the zero-point of the subjective

origin.”²⁰¹ What it is that it does to the sign—for our purposes the trace of *the writing of the Self as Other*—is evident in the semiological prospectus of signification: the structural necessity of its repeatability, or re-iteration, beyond a single, unitary point of expression. If we acknowledge, as we should, that a “sign” can signify *only through the force of repetition*, the consequences of *différance* render the sign relational rather than identical (e.g. not the selfsame, or “iconic,” possessing the properties of its “referent”), thus bringing indication into line with the expression to undo the Husserlian idea of a “pre-expressive intentionality” of pure consciousness. This line of argument de-centers the subject, brings it out of the shell of the Cartesian *cogito* that shelters its attempt at realizing the security of a self-discourse with itself—what Derrida shows to be an instance of non-communication, because in the equating of self-hood with self-presence, the Other is effaced to the point where an inner-monologue with one’s “Self” is not really an instance of transmissibility at all, but the self-deceptive verification of the desire for auto-affection. Or an attempt at the reduction of *différance*. In order to ascertain the existence of itself, a subject must refer outside of itself to the *world of the signs of the Other* using the resources of what does not begin “within” itself, therefore striving to refrain from obliterating itself just as it seems to have authenticated its existence. It is this relational aspect that Derrida makes us aware of about the ethical grounding of *différance* by referring to the constitutive function of the *sign-trace* of the Other; the deferring difference between presence and repetition, self and non-self, reveals itself as undecidability at the proliferative core of identity. (Trifonas, 2000a, pp. 41–42, footnotes in original, emphasis in original)

Another reading of signification in the fluidity of *différance* must re-write the presence of peace, past effacing as-cription in act or by force of *being*, through constitution disrupting in deconstruction static notions of the concept and its conceptualisation. This performative demand is both the source and re-constitution of the evolving field effaced in limit to-wards evincing peace literacy. Given this broad understanding of deconstruction and *différance* illustrated in the logos, we can proceed to examine some of the fundamental understandings of notions of peace and education along with the academic endeavor of education for peace or Peace Education constrained within Occidental frameworks through this tenet. Revisioning peace education on new theoretical terrain affords the opening of the question of peace beyond the limits of metaphysics exposing the pillars supporting Modernity’s edifices bequeathed in ages past, now deteriorating under the scrutiny of postModernity’s (*another*) gaze (p. 42). However, delimited

academic visual acuity presents a significant barrier to future peace education poised within the *university-to-come*.

Acknowledging future(s) of transdisciplinarity towards efficacious endeavor

Transdisciplinary notions are valent in the re-writing of the pedagogical institution. A new *topos* of a new pedagogy for peace and peace education exceeds the limits of codified thinking of the onto-theological frame through deconstruction.

a “deconstructive” rereading of the discursive archive of pedagogy to locate its institutional inclusions/exclusions, its orderings/disorderings, its valuations/devaluations, and so on, must precede the “reconstructive” phase(s) of a rewriting of the existing subdivisions configuring the disciplinarity of epistemological foundations, for a “critical reelaboration of this hierarchy and of this problematic of hierarchy must not be restricted to new ‘theorems’ in the same language (*langage*).”¹³⁶ It requires the heteroglossia of a fresh writing that inscribes and is inscribed by the rules of an unborrowed code following “an other logic,”¹³⁷ one that can self-consciously evade the conceits of the metaphysical arrangements it is reacting to or may use in the performance of critique. This would presuppose: firstly, the inversion of the argumentative logics, the hierarchy of which privileges a normative arrangement of concepts from a binarization of terms (good/bad, right/wrong, etc.); and, secondly, a displacement of the epistemological groundwork coordinating the ethical acceptance of the formal structuring of its concepts that organize the “essential” possibilities of thought itself.

Deconstruction is wary of origins. It does not account for them because it does not believe in reinstating them nor in reinforcing their legitimizing vale to celebrate their privileging of an immutable foundation. Yet deconstruction derives its critical force from the differential markings of the chains of signification that emanate from the search for a definitive finality; that last link, always so near, but forever out of sight (Trifonas, 2000a, pp. 81–82, footnotes in original)

Infinite threads of inquiry arise in fruitful *ethico-pedagogical* approaches engendered within the walls of the Western Academy, through close examinations of the performativity of academe, and through peace educators in particular who would normalize a responsibility to interrogate the numerous questions of difference, human social relationality, and the notion of peace as well as engage multidisciplinary approaches to education for peace. A perpetual wariness must watch

over peace education, thwarting phantasmatic attempts to codify through reification concept and conceptualisation (i.e. peace through strength, peace through democracy, peace through development), demonstrating ethical academic responsibility and an indissociable obligation to the *Other* through *positivist socio-constructivism*. The *impossible* obligation due the *Other* enchainning the university foretold in Derrida's 1983 Cornell lecture creates: 1) relationships anew,³⁶ 2) an impetus for deconstruction,³⁷ and 3) an imperative for uncompromising responsibility.³⁸ In this creative moment of introspection and circumspection of duty, responsibility, and opening, the elements of renewal are engendered in and through engagement(s) with emergent philosophemes affording *another* approach within, for, and by the

³⁶ Trifonas (2000a) deconstructively re-writes academic responsibility in his reading of the text and context of the prescient presentation "The Principle of Reason: The University in the Eyes of Its Pupils," regarding an infinite obligation to the fundamental alterity of the *Other* as a duty to honor the relationship between the *ethico-historico-politico-foundation(s)* of institution, being and Being. He re-marks "[t]he deconstructive incentive (motivation) of the discourse, 'of such force and desire as it may have [being neither *on* the side of 'right' nor simply *against* it], is a certain experience of the impossible,²⁶ an infinite *aporia* of the possible that increases the responsibility of the obligation to the Other *as Other* (p. 93, footnote in original)." This obligation towards justice would be a "deconstructive re-newing of the infinite responsibility owed to the alterity of the Other, the reverse would, at the same time, also be true of a response to obligation, *to be just, above all, in the language of the Other*" (p. 94, emphasis in original).

³⁷ Just as Derrida's questions arose in the contemplation and presentation of the university (Cornell), addressing questions of the grounding and reason for the institution *qua* institution, con-text-ualizes meaning. In Trifonas (2000a), a response to the irrepressive question of "[w]hat is the essence of the university?"⁵⁴ What . . . is inextricable from the institution's [Cornell University, we may read others as well] vision of its own historicity, *the reason for its being and the pursuant ambitions of its destination scoping-out the pragmatological parameters of its destiny.*"⁵⁵ Trifonas' bold response, "to search out the *essence* of the university from the reason of *its* ground is to avoid questioning the *value* of the rationality presupposing the organization of the institution" (p. 96, footnote in original, emphasis in original) reveals the edifice of reason and exposes its institution.

³⁸ Such an uncompromising responsibility within a *university-to-come* is both an answer to the fundamental alterity of the *Other* and simultaneously a call for an unequivocal presencing—attenuation towards Other—of the *other* in *ethico-pedagogical* engagement. Academic responsibility is ethics according to Trifonas and thus, the notion of an uncompromising responsibility within the Western Academy must necessarily engage "*a questioning of the ethics of its [the university's] ethics*" (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 98, emphasis in original).

larger university more generally and the field of Peace Education specifically. Indeed such a fundamental challenge to the institution of pedagogy, while necessary, would seek to bridge the metaphorical abyss (as in Derrida's Cornell lecture) between the constative and performative realms re-inscribing the institution. *Peace education-for-the-future* would then acknowledge the past presence of *trace* while seeking new planes of meaning welcoming the *other*, spatially, temporally, across geo-physical and institutional divides. Deconstruction spans the narrative of inscription through a deferring of the prejudicial instantiation of disciplinary segregation in the realm of a fundamental rewriting of the voice of the *other* that is *Other* as critical engagement wholly informed within historico-political *trace(s)* re-marking the terrain of *positivist socio-constructivism* as transperformative tenet within the academic field seeking justice, bridging disciplinary divides. An evolving peace education for the future—sustained on unbounded, intersecting planes of enquiry elaborated in the core tenets of *ethicus obligatus*, *embracing humanitas*, and *positivist socio-constructivism*—be-comes the manifestation of social equity and justice through deconstruction as captured in the coming transperformative tenet developing the field.

Socialis aequitas enfolding non-violence

Meta-physics always infuses our philosophic concerns under the previous headings of morality, ethics, and obligation due the *other* and the *other other*, or the *third*, transversing psychic and educational plateaus weighing thetic formulations of *socialis aequitas* on the scales of difference. *Socialis aequitas enfolding non-violence* as a core transperformative tenet, acknowledges a limit of law and right [*droit*] constraining capacity for ameliorative action in the service of *other(s)* across shifting planes of presence marked in an emergent globalized world. *Peace education-to-come*, manifest in the unconditional university, entrains *socialis aequitas*

pursuing a *justice-to-come* that necessarily challenges negative philosophies previously supporting the nascent academic field from the nineteenth and early twentieth Centuries (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996; Stomfay-Stitz, 1993). Demonstrating double performativity, *socialis aequitas* as transperformative tenet embarks on an infinite journey spanning chiastic philosophemes of pedagogy as institution within universes of instituting rationality. *Socialis aequitas enfolding non-violence* marks the performative act of the privileged ethico-pedagogue (a perform-ing the performative) in posing the *philosophico-theoretical* discourse engaging the questions of peace and difference concurrently within a transformational ethos inuring justice in the eyes of the *other*. Built on the Lévinasian opening transforming moral responsibility and ethical obligation forming the previous tenets, *socialis aequitas* re-orders justice in deconstruction performatively shifting the expectation of the Rule of Law (*droit*) beyond provincial design in an expansion encompassing a *demos* of the people, no longer exclusive to narrower, individual, communities/societies/nations in a (re)imagination of ethical justice beyond coded metanarratives, or ontologies. Linking philosopheme, langue, and semiotic *topoi* in metaphysical *trace*, *socialis aequitas* would transform received notions of a performative demand silenced in cacophonous rationalities of exclusion eliding difference, writing a *peace of the same*, yet

the Law of “the Same” is the reason of injustice: for the inclusion of a subject *that belongs* and the exclusion of an Other *that does not*. But the auto-present logic of the Idea of the old architecturality of the university cannot defend against the radical re-translatibility of the encoded signs of the institutional system achieved from the iterability of the difference of interpretative reconstructions of ambiguity. That is, for the progressive degradation of the “right” of the meaning of its officious “babble” as it tries to decree the law of the full-form univocity of its *reason for being*. The institution of the university can account neither for the ineluctability of the deferred traces of the signs of knowledge differing at the fundamental ontology of the truth of their origin, nor for the explanation of their deconstructability, *différance*. (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 106, emphasis in original)

Notably the university, or institute of rationality is unable to mark its exclusion in a presumption of inclusion in erasure producing a further theoretical challenge to peace education both as a transdisciplinary field and performative endeavour within institution. However, the fundamental aspect of justice lies with *another*, as arrivant. The notion of a peace signified, encompassing *self* as autotelic subject is re-written, preferring an epistemological emphasis deconstructing the exclusivity of a social justice of privilege. Furthermore, the transperformative nature of this tenet transforms ego-rationality as apperception (social justice of/for the Same) in acknowledgment of the limit of law and right (*droit*) balancing subjectivity in *other*.

Another trans-per-form-ation marking *socialis aequitas* is captured in the deliberate consideration of right (*droit*) pertaining to the privileging of the individual will (as structured in worldview) over the *other* as it constrains ameliorative capacity towards *others*. Such ontological privileging emanating from staid architectures of institution, privilege, and institutional privileging belie “deferred traces of [*other*]” (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 106) signifieds within specific epistemological constructions in an invention of *other*, *another* presumed to be minimally harmed/injured (read as violence) through cooptation and/or assimilation. Consequently, *socialis aequitas enfolding non-violence* engenders a metacriticality addressing the limit of hospitality and compassion and its projection of a decrease in injury, or violence (e.g. physical, psychic, emotional, sexual violence, etc.) suffered, seeking a “justice of thought” (Derrida, 2001a, p. 29). Indeed, this transperformative tenet serves an iterative *ratio-performativity* emanating through *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* in possible futures.

The very act of *écriture* itself comes under scrutiny here in transperformative maneuver within this tenet as both the reader and author *write on* the *other* a subjectivity given, embedded in presupposition and captured in phallogocentrism, yet deconstruction looses those chains of

signification bringing into prominence the meta-physical question of justice as the question of peace imbricated in our engagement with reason, knowing, teaching, and learning (Trifonas, 2000a). The reduction or silencing of the *Other*—the fundamental *other* in alterity—represents the quintessential question of justice and thereby the question of peace *and* necessarily serves as the basis of a questioning in/of/”for” peace education through the veil of metaphysical violence. A reflexive (post-)critical peace education begins in an examination of the *self* and her/his relation to *other* and the *Other* presupposing an aporea undefinable and infinitely complex while navigating the “*cultural politics of the sign*” (p. 173, emphasis in original). *Socialis aequitas* enfolding a critique of violence necessarily absorbs the post-metaphysical critique of the instantiation of the institution of Rationality, given its purview before the immutable questions of difference and peace addressed in the dynamic evolving academic field as an engagement of presence across spatio-temporal rationalities constructed and constructing *socio-ethno-politico-historical narratives*. Re-writing Reason as reason in its instituting structure quintessentially reveals the il-logic of the instituting function of the Institution of Reason in an opening to another logic or the logic of the *other* wherein originary notions of truth (as peace) standing-in as Truth revealed in/through *another* deconstructive reading, lead to justice and the incipit moment of justice arriving through the fundamental respect for the *third*, or *other other*. Justice (as obligation), de-construction (as re-reading or non-inscriptive), and peace (as (im)possibility) are indissociably linked through an *ethico-pedagogy-to-come* enacted herewith under the auspices of this transperformative tenet, engaging the performative demand in Derrida (1992) inscribed in “Force of Law: The Metaphysical Foundation of Authority.”

Deconstruction is justice. It is perhaps because law (*droit*) (which I will consistently try to distinguish from justice) is constructible, in a sense that goes beyond the opposition between convention and nature, it is perhaps insofar as it goes beyond this opposition that it is constructible and so deconstructible and,

what's more, that it makes deconstruction possible, or at least the practice of a deconstruction that, fundamentally, always proceeds to questions of *droit* and to the subject of *droit*. (1) The deconstructibility of law (*droit*), of legality, legitimacy or legitimation (for example) makes deconstruction possible. (2) The undeconstructibility of justice also makes deconstruction possible, indeed inseparable from it. (3) The result: deconstruction takes place in the interval that separates the undeconstructibility of justice from the deconstructibility of *droit* (authority, legitimacy, and so on). It is possible as an experience of the impossible, there where, even if it does not exist (or does not yet exist, or never does exist), *there is* justice. (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 15, emphasis in original)

Within the equation, the embodiment of assignation, a peace through the eyes of the other reconnects *socio-ethno-politico-historical* discourses within the instituting function of the university re-linking the realms of meaning and *being* across *epistémè*, rationality, and social structure on planes of difference. Thus, building on the *ethos* of Derridean in-scription and the promise of Trifonasian engagement in difference, human social relationality be-comes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{Deconstruction} & = & \text{Justice} \\
 \\
 \text{(Social) Justice} & = & \text{Human Social Relationality} \\
 \\
 \text{Human Social Relationality} & = & \text{Peace} \\
 \\
 \text{Peace} & = & \text{Deconstruction}
 \end{array}$$

A helical relationality infuses the meaning of these core elements emerging in seas of rationality. The interstitiality of these different points (of meaning) enjoin our understanding(s) and thereby our conceptualizations of peace and justice such that the connections between exceed full elaboration within *semio-linguistic* re(v/f)erence as

justice is always directed towards the other. Justice, Derrida has argued, is “the relation to the other.” Saying, therefore, that something is just or that one is just is

a betrayal of the very idea of justice to the extent to which it forecloses the possibility for the other to decide whether justice has indeed been rendered. If justice is a concern for the other as other, for the otherness of the other, for an otherness that, by definition, we can neither foresee nor totalize, if justice, in short, always address itself to the singularity of the other (Derrida, 1992a: 20), we are obliged—in the very name of justice—to keep the unforeseen possibility of the incoming of the other, the surprise of the “invention” of the other open . . . (Biesta, 2009, p. 31, citation in original) [emphasis added]

Justice then, is not justice, cannot be justice, extant *other* in presence—justice is only justice in the eyes of the *other*. And by the transitive property, peace is only peace in the eyes of the *other*. In this revelation, the reader (reader as writer) is cautioned regarding notions of presence and *other*, of difference in *différance* as I am not saying that justice is the act of a *self* upon the *other*. Justice, like peace, requires the presence of *other* without exclusion, expectation, closure for it must bear witness of the *trace* forward(ed).

Socialis aequitas enfolding non-violence begins in a critique of misappropriated presence in a *logos* received, whereby the engaged peace pedagogue apprehends another view spanning the chiasm of praxelological intentionality manifested in negative philosoph(y)ies of peace education. Beyond the question of accessibility (read language and style) of the text, deconstruction of the very core of thinking and knowing as inscribed in the archives of a growing disciplinary field becomes imperative for a reflexive post-critical peace education. The metacriticality of deconstruction (Trifonas, 2003b, p. 289) bridges the interstices of disciplinarity while spanning pedagogical, curricular, and praxeological boundaries in transparent and just scholarship envisioning a *peace education-for-the-future* thought through. As transperformative tenet, *socialis aequitas* becomes sufficiently critical in an open, hospitable response to the *other* and the *Other* in ecologies of presence, assiduously weighing *ethico-philosophical* discourse on questions of difference and peace across semio-linguistic terrain.

Eco-logical presencing in consciousness

Arriving at the last transperformative tenet of future peace education enframing peace literacy, our journey becomes a (re)joining or bridging across *phenomeno-meta-physical* chiasms constructing human social relationality as subjectivity, in subjectivity. *Eco-logical presencing-in-consciousness* re-posit-ions a limited scope or framing (ontology) of ecological concern regenerating one's *self-in-world* as a new *presence-in-world* beyond a significant anthropocentric bias towards the exclusion of all *other* sentience and non-human life. Eco-logical presencing steps beyond the boundaries of prescribed ideological limits in (pre)Modern *trace* that constrain perspectivit(y)ies in/through (pre)rationality. A play of poietic tensions suffuse this transperformative tenet in consciousness raising, (re)cog-nising *being* in an interweaving, or *putting-in-with other(s)* that would acknowledge *Other*, welcome in hospitality (unconditional acceptance), and attend to the summons of the *other* (adjudication, response, justice) arising across the whole of humanity. *Eco-logical presencing* interrogates onto-theo-logical limit inscribing *presence-past* while expecting a supplemental *trace* infused in de-ontological perspective(s). Originary cupere, or desire for ecological bondedness, as previously explored under numerous veins in philosophy from Plato to Kant and recent academic scholarship including global, area, and environmental studies, as well as in *eschato-theo-logical* narratives of transcendence mark the many early steps along the passage to futures in presence. Early ecological concern in the naissance of an emergent field of peace education remained the province of the auto-telic subject captured in onto-theological worldviews limited by affinity (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996) manufactured in epistemologies of a constructed utilitarianism of privilege through the inculcation of values/beliefs/norms. Nurtured in an *onto-theological* exceptionalism (marked with periodic revelry), early ecological concern emerged in a rising consciousness for the detritus of militarism within certain religious traditions (Stomfay-Stitz,

1993) and grew over the decades in the mark of annihilation through Oppenheimer's revelation. However, the call for an environmental emphasis with/in peace education remained fairly muted until the latter decades of the twentieth Century with the linking of social justice and education exemplified in Freire's *conscientization*.³⁹ Indeed academic concern for ecological awareness only grew in the *socio-ethno-political* milieu of a globalizing world comprised in difference subsequently arising as a central tenet of peace education.

Eco-logical presencing-in-consciousness is the transperformative enactment of a future peace education unfolding in the *university-to-come* as it re-frames facile and dogmatic imperialism guised in neo-colonial democratisation under the aegis of transpiring patriarchal governance as dominance. The notion of a *democracy-to-come* challenges the façade of "peace through democracy" as doctrinaire edict abiding the subjugation and absolute dismissal of the *other*, in an opening to peace in the eyes of the *other*, according to the law of singularity.⁴⁰ An *eco-logical presencing-in-consciousness* enfolds the notion of singularity, acknowledging the *otherness-of-the-other* such that in the arrival of the always present *other*, my uniqueness is incomplete and called into question as delimited apperception (Lévinas, 2000). This *self*, an "I," be-comes through *another* that must call for my death within the imminent state of singularity, an interplay, wherein

I can make an attempt on others' life—in its singularity—only in risking my own. To posit oneself (*sich setzen*) as consciousness supposes exposure to death, engagement, pawning, putting in play [*en jeu*] or at pawn [*en gage*]. "When I go

³⁹ Paulo Freire's (1970/2005) educational reform bore the intent of a paradigmatic and epistematic change through empowerment of the people. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* may be understood as Freire's manifesto re-inscribing the power of voice and presence in the liberative struggle of education for the individual and society as an act of will.

⁴⁰ Derrida cautions that the historical remains as the irreducible moment, which he posits as the "singularity" of the "event." The past or historical moment inscribed in text and memory becomes the telling of the event as the capturing of time/place/perspectivity (un)(re)vealed (See Caputo, 1997, p. 176 for a deeper reading of his exegesis).

for his death, I expose myself to death (*setze ich mich selbst dem Tode aus*), I put in play my own proper life (*wage ich mein eignes Leben*).” This putting (in play, at pawn) must, as every investment, amortize itself and produce a profit; it works at my recognition by or through the other, at the posit(ion)ing of my living consciousness, my living freedom, my living mastery. (p. 352, emphasis in original)

Peace through the eyes of the *Other*, in transperformative proclamation, is the putting at pawn, *myself*, the treasure of my own subjectivity. In the move toward *other*, “I” am rewritten as Derrida exclaims, mindful of the scepter lying in wait.⁴¹ But a thinking, or a re-thinking of the possibility of connection across difference, on planes of difference, illuminated within the notion of singularity, is the re-ordering of meta-physical cannons desiccated in the presence of (past) futures (present). Through trifoci, this transperformative tenet engages the presence of the past (*meta-theo-physical*) imbued in socio-ethno-politico-historical narrativities structuring perceptivity (and apperception of the *other*), while welcoming *another*’s rationality, and honouring *telic* coursings of the *other*, bridging spatio-temporal divides of perception, rationality, and space and time. The focus or acuity of a *peace education-for-the-future* captured in apperceptivity and perspectivity effects a deliberate, intimate movement across the onto-theo-meta-physical chasm tracing our present in presence, forthrightly acknowledging *trace* (aporea) in a performative unmasking of singularity in singularity, for a

singularity is not a particular that we are able to classify under a general concept. No mental representation can be formed of it, although a singularity is not alien to a representation. A singularity cannot be translated, although translation is not alien to it. A singularity is informal, although formalization is not alien to it. A singularity is not external to repeatability; it is the outside of repeatability. A singularity is a “boiling point,” as Deleuze would say, or it is a “statement,” as Foucault would say. Here is a statement: “I am afraid to die.” Every time anyone

⁴¹ For Derrida, the scepter of the spectre is always at hand in the encounter between the *self* and *other*, “now death being in the program, since I must *actually* risk it, I can always lose the profit of the operation: if I die, but just as well if I live. Life cannot endure in the incessant imminence of death. So I lose every time, with every blow, with every throw [*à tous les coups*]” (Derrida, 1991, p. 352, emphasis in original).

utters or gestures toward the fear of death, we have a statement. A singularity is an event, a “once and for all.” It is a discontinuity. A singularity is irreplaceable, and there can be no substitute for it, as Derrida would say. (Lawlor, 2007, p. 4)

As a de-script-ion of the place (spatiality) or moment (temporality), singularity notions the irruptive plane between the *self* and *other* that is always occupied, as “each is for the other immediately an absolute singular (*ein absolut Einzelner*), each posits itself (*setzt sich*) in the consciousness of the other, relieves (*hebt . . . auf*) the singularity of the other, or each posits the other in its consciousness as an absolute singularity of consciousness” (Derrida, 1991, p. 350). For the spatio-temporal nexus is always already occupied by the *other* whether the *other*, is another being or socio-ethno-politico-historical narrative constructing meaning, suffusing aporetic constructions of gnosis, rationality, and *epistémè*. Peace as notion, idea, concept herewith is de-scripted on planes of difference affording impossible renderings in a hermeneutic elicitive of *Other*, as if humanity were, humane. Peace education, recast in consciousness—a consciousness of the *singular*—engages the diachronicity of modal planes of difference wherein *other*, *self*, and historical narrativity intersect.

Trans(per)formative *eco-logical presencing-in-consciousness* is a be-coming of the subject, the *self*/subject transformed in ethical moment. It is an instantly eidetic and genitive maneuver, wherein such reflection occurs as a moment of indissociability of presence and presencing of the *other*—an ocular transaction (perceptivity) spoken in the sense of a listening expression of experience while acknowledging the auditorial imagery generated across spatio-temporal planes of understanding (witnessing)⁴² unfolding another opening always already

⁴² Roger Simon’s critical work on traumatic witnessing is key to our careful, compassionate understanding of the *other* within an *ecological presencing-in-consciousness*. His compassionate witness elucidated in “Remembering obligation: Pedagogy and the witnessing of testimony of historical trauma” re-calls the reader into a state of performative presence as responsibility. (See Simon & Eppert, 1997 for further reference of this linkage.)

exceeding the limit of our investiture. Thereby, peace education becomes *other* to itself perceiving in witness the *arrivant (Other)* in the ethical moment of pedagogy. *Eco-logical presencing* enacts a critical, reflectivity and reflexivity in pedagogical arenas of peace transversing the metaphysical divide through *trace* inflecting *socio-ethno-politico-historical narrativities* in the present. Hence caution is imperative in the face of a *transcendental violence* perpetually occurring in *semio-linguistic* transactions within the aporea comprising the field of peace education within the university as the condition of singularity obtains in the *meta-physical* exchange between the *other* and *self*. This violence to be sure, occurring in the instant of a knowing the *other* is a risk that is always involved in the transaction, “a risk that is both violent and necessary—no justice can possibly be done to the singularity of the other” (Biesta, 2009, p. 29). Singularity then, in the guise of the fundamental *other*, must put to rout the *self* identity constructed in iso-“loc”-ation recasting the performative role of peace educators anew in *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* consonant through presence. *Peace education-to-come* proposes another approach as ethical epistemology gauging the import of transcendental violence within transperformative possibilities imag(e)ined across tertiary academe. Finally, *eco-logical presencing-in-consciousness* as reconfigured tenet enfolds deconstruction differently as processural pedagogical engagement in the question of difference and justice in a fundamental challenge to anthropocentrism opening to transformative peace literac(y)ies.

Peace education for our future through deconstruction re-opens the notion of difference in the arrival of the *other*, *another* as existent, a singularity in the moment of event. Singularity represents the *other* to itself as excess in an instant, an excess marked in singularity (Derrida, 1991), where the ethical transverses the metaphysical chasm tracing difference. Our meta-cognitive response as reflexive, (post-)critical pedagogues and peace educators to the summons

of the aporetic *other* exceeds onto-theo-logical limits constructing peace in/for the past, re-visioning academic peace education *as if* our commitment was manifest. I proffer that the moment of event (and the arrival of peace education for the future) re-presents in singularity wherein the pointing towards is a new multiplicity of arrival (*l'avenir*) that must be simultaneously founded in and on re-presentation(s) of past-futures and future-pasts while presenting at the moment the un-anticipated, unexpected, and perhaps, unwelcomed guest of the *Other*. A *peace education-for-the-future* as singularity is poised in *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* through a re-writing of its presence in the aporea of the university, on new planes of engagement with difference, pedagogy, and praxis. Singularity expresses through deconstruction foreclosed notions of the empiricity of the *sign* of an auto-telic *self* ascribed to *being*; thereby re-leasing the bonds of meaning captured in the moment of *cloture*.

Engaging education on planes of difference, re-posit(ion)s each of the central concepts of peace education beyond the provinciality of a narcissistic *self* re-fashioning the fundamental questions comprised in human understanding, rationality, meaning, and learning into transperformative tenets of a *peace education-to-come*. An ethics-for-the-other performatively shifts the subject position of the discourse within the field (from the *self* to the *other*) engendering:

1. *Humanus existentialis* beyond the limits of provincialized human security and world order concerns to an apprehension for all *being* exceeding insular *self*;
2. *Ethicus obligatus* conceiving relationships with the *other* beyond con(de)fined *onto-theo-logical* limits as autotelic subjectivity structuring responsibility in affinity;

3. *Universala* reposing utopic elision of difference in/to a world elicitive of presence within, among, and between persons;
4. *Socialis aequitas enfolding non-violence* re-cognizing the limit of law and right (*droit*) constraining capacity for ameliorative action in the service of *other(s)* on planes of difference in pursuit of a *justice-to-come*;
5. *Positivist socio-constructivism* re-founding the institute of rationality on a reflexive, critical ground open to unbounded enquiry concerning gnosis, rationality, and *epistémè*. Re-imag(e)ined educational purpose in this academic field necessarily engages all questions of difference and justice, effecting *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy-for-peace*;
6. *Embracing humanitas* beyond defined and confined moral inclusion abiding prescribed worldview to *another* rationality that would consider all aspects of social, cultural, educational, political, and physical life; and
7. *Ecological presencing-in-consciousness* beyond the narcissistic *self* (perspectivity) re-posit(ion)ing ecological concern in a regeneration of one's *self-in-world* as a new *presence-in-world* exceeding anthropocentric bias excluding all (*other*) sentience and non-human life.

(Post-)critical pedagogy performatively engages the precipice of transpiring phallogocentrism poised in diachronous affirmation of the *other*, opening the question of peace on planes of difference in an arriving peace education-to-come in presence. We must then as responsible educators consider our discourse, our rationality, *onto-meta-epistemo-logical* engagement(s), and

the interrelatedness of each element comprising our *ethico-pedagogical* task imagining anew, peace literacy.

My project in this chapter has been to build upon the metaphysical foundation of Lévinasian secular meta-ethics and Derridean deconstruction a theoretical framework that could open to the possibility of an exploration of the question of peace, as peace in difference through de-construction. In a postStructural (re)reading of the onto-theo-logical *telos* of the institute of Rationality, an opening through the question of peace and difference in/to education for peace is fashioned utilizing the Derridean *mochlos* as an initial *re-posit*-ioning of the academic field, remapping the terrain of a *peace education-to-come*. Peace, as the operant concept within the field, reconfigured in Derridean deconstruction, entrains an infinite complexity that is difference across *socio-ethno-politico-historical* structures grounded in and grounding the nature of our *being* and respective onto-epistemo-theo-log(y)ies. In a perpetual search for the Archimedean point encompassing the concept of peace, notable attempts to inscribe a meaning in meaning to *metaphysics* itself are imbricated in a false logic rooted in the semiotic code of *phallogocentrism*, appearing to de-scribe the singularity peace within a plane of understanding yet to come or become, a *peace-to-come*. Consequently, peace as concept always exceeds the limits of the transcendental signified in the *supplement* of the *aporetic other* as peace becomes enframed (with)in the traces of other signifieds, perceived and incorporated within meaning and rationality offering anew theoretical terrain upon which to (re)imag(e)ine *peace education-for-the-future*. Next I invite the reader into *another* mapping of the ideoscape of the field of peace education through a performative, archival reading of the academic roots and theoretical strands of a dynamic field.

Chapter Three: What We Think (we) Know—Mapping the ideoscape of Peace (Education)

If there is a university responsibility, it at least begins the moment when a need to hear these questions, to take them upon oneself and respond to them, imposes itself. This imperative of the response is the initial form and minimal requirement of responsibility. One can always not respond and refuse the summons, the call to responsibility. One can even do so without necessarily keeping silent. But the structure of this call to responsibility is such—so anterior to any possible response, so independent, so dissymmetrical in its coming from the other within us—that even a nonresponse a priori assumes responsibility.

(Derrida, 2004, p. 83)

If a more peaceful and just world is to become a reality, the input of hundreds of thousands, if not millions of human beings, and their humane visions of world order, must replace those presently being acted upon by these anachronistic decision-makers.

(Mendlovitz & Weiss, 1974, p. 21)

Peace education as an idea and academic field in Western academe comprises an intricately woven tapestry of concepts, approaches, and (moral) values instantiated in and instantiating curricular and pedagogical programs within disparate university settings across the landscape of Canada, Europe, and the United States. As such, peace education is frequently framed as a normative ideal constructed through positivism within higher education in the pursuit of an amorphic ideal of peace; however, the concept of peace remains troubled within the academic arena and beyond (Haavelsrud, 2008; Reardon, 2013; Wisler, 2010; Wright, 2013).

The concept of peace is infinitely complex given our individual understandings of difference influencing and en-framing meaning, reason, learning, and knowledge. Furthermore, peace *itself* be-comes the working out, or working through(out) of the human social relationship between persons or *beings*.

In this preparatory phase of the journey to-wards peace literacy in/through peace education nurturing a re-newed human literacy, I will be examining the developmental stages of Peace Education beginning in the lives and commitments of individuals commencing at the turn of the nineteenth century both on North American and European shores. Received wisdom of historians and educators of Peace Education in academic institutions place the nascence of the field in the labours of individual humanitarians founding peace movements to challenge instituted and colonising powers. Subsequently, given the receptivity of these movements and the failure of (individual) governments to staunch armed conflict, “global organs” (e.g. United Nations and UNESCO) were established in 1946 followed by non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs). A third element of *ethico-philosophico-theoretical* grounding is slowly emerging as a concern over the last few decades for the evolving academic field of peace education following the fervor of critical theory and pedagogy in the latter decades of the twentieth century (Butler, 2006, 2011; Giroux, 2005; Lather, 2008).

This chapter opens tracing *historico-narratives* of germinal antecedents to Peace Education drawing on two authoritative volumes that intricately sketch human endeavours to effect peace blossoming in the development of the academic field of Peace Education from/through Peace Research through Peace Studies. Aline M. Stomfay-Stitz (1993), *Peace Education in America, 1828-1990: A Sourcebook for Education and Research* pre-sents a narrative discourse of the field through the re-pre-sentations of progressivist actors, scholars, and

activists guided in moral duty. The other primary text *Three Decades of Peace Education Around the World: An Anthology* composed over the course of a decade by Robin J. Burns and Robert Aspeslagh (1996) is revealing in its positivist narrative mapping the maturation of a complex and shifting academic field through a strong *socio-constructivist* reading. Both texts bear the markings of positivism's *telic* courings as desire for societal reorganisation, which is furthered evidenced in Ian Harris and Mary Lee Morrison's (2013) historical depiction of the changing field. Chapter three further unfolds examining the evolution of international (or global) organisations for peace with their respective humanitarian ethos. Eventually in the mid twentieth century, the academic endeavour that is peace education arrives (*à venir*) on the precipice of the quintessential question of theory, the role of theory, and the question of ground for the field in an exposure to the fundamental quest of all academic engagement. The second section of the chapter re-pre-sents the desire for and design of nomenclature "defining" (the structure) of peace education. In the third part of this chapter "I" am located, in the text in de-constructive manoeuver as a *post-meta-philosophical* approach to reading/in-scription/reading of in-scription on/in *spatio-temporal* planes of *epistémè*. Herein, Derridean de-construction opens the question of authorship, readership, in-scription, and performatic responsibility affording a reconceptualisation of peace through difference—a thinking difference, differently.

Tracings of Peace (Education)

The intellectual history of the field of Peace Education deeply rooted in Peace Research and influenced by a developing Peace Studies is intertwined and sustained in the early traditions of human social understanding(s) arising in and through intense periods of human struggle and violence and captured with varying degrees of accuracy within academe over the past two

hundred years.⁴³ Yet these understandings grasp only an incomplete perspective that may ignore or even dismiss more holistic ways of knowing and being. While it is not the purpose of this dissertation to examine the breadth and depth of human understanding or rationality spatio-temporally, my task is to acknowledge and consider collective understandings in relation to the academic pursuit of questions of peace and difference as confined in an evolving *socio-politico-historical telos* captured in the Western paradigm dating from ancient Greek civilization.⁴⁴

Diverse historical narratives are captured in libraries that house broad bodies of literature spanning the breadth of human relationship and contestation over the ages (e.g. Social Science disciplines including Sociology, Psychology, Political Science, Geography, and Economics) yielding further insights leading to new curricular and pedagogical approaches to rationality, meaning-making, teaching, and learning. Situating the myriad historical traces of the study of peace (and conflict, as well as war) and education for peace is not an uncontested proposition however. Recently two authoritative volumes and an early reference text in the field of peace education⁴⁵ offer valuable connections mapping greater understanding. I will limit my discussion

⁴³ The fervent age of discontent following the Renaissance (1450-1650) and the Age of Enlightenment (1650-1800) reflected and was reflective of an ongoing paradigmatic shift in power culminating in many struggles and wars in the 18th and 19th Centuries. It was this period of fervor manifesting in fresh critiques (e.g. Kant's transcendent reconstruction of Reason) that came to nurture the arriving subject. Here I am denoting subject as the new consciousness *coming-into-being* that would challenge the ground of a previously unquestioned metaphysical or onto-theological world.

⁴⁴ It is problematic to trace Western history solely via Socratic/Greco roots, forming and conforming to developing philosophical traditions. The traces of heritage dominate mappings, which have influenced recent understandings in the postModern era. See D'Souza (1992)—Philosophy, philosophy of education, and the education of teachers; Gur-Ze'ev (2005)—Adorno and Horkheimer: Diasporic philosophy, negative theology, and counter-education; Bruner (2006)—Rationality, reason and the history of thought; and Burik (2009)—Opening philosophy to the world: Derrida and education in philosophy.

⁴⁵ Christoph Wulf's *Handbook on Peace Education* (1974) represents a broad snapshot and important reference point marking the natality of peace education as an academic field within

to the question of peace as it pertains to education, initially introducing each volume before examining the points of development in academic discourse based on individual actors and movements.

One of the primary resources linking the academic fields of Peace Education and Peace Studies emerged as an edited volume compiled over nearly a decade by Robin J. Burns and Robert Aspeslagh (1996), two early contributors to the Peace Education Commission and scholars in their own right.⁴⁶ *Three Decades of Peace Education Around the World: An Anthology* [hereafter *Anthology*] creates a transformative image of academia in the “post-war” era of the latter half of the twentieth century under a central thesis that “education, and the generation and transmission of knowledge which challenges dominant thinking and puts forward alternatives, can contribute to the realization of a peaceful, just and sustainable future” (p. 7). Yet this task is inordinately complicated as the term “peace” subsumes interiority/exteriority, identit(y)ies, difference, and relationship(s) with and between the *self* and *other* as promulgated in the previous chapter.⁴⁷ For Robin J. Burns and Robert Aspeslagh, peace may be more clearly

tertiary education, including the founding of the Peace Education Commission (PEC) of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) in 1964.

⁴⁶ Robin J. Burns (Australia) has a background in psychology and anthropology and served in the executive of the Peace Education Commission during the 1980s. Her work bridges critical areas of human understanding, international comparative education, and Women’s Studies, where she currently teaches at La Trobe University, Melbourne.

Robert Aspeslagh (The Netherlands) is also a past executive member of the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA). His academic interests have spanned international relations, with a particular focus on the relationships between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Netherlands.

⁴⁷ Emmanuel Lévinas frames the nature of human relationship between the *self*/subject and the *other* as one of precedent. That is, *other* precedes the arrival of the *self*. I have previously addressed this notion of relationship in Chapter two and further develop the idea through Derridean thought as the quintessential basis for all relationship. See Lévinas’ *Totality and Infinity* (1961/1969) for the initial development of this framing of relationship, and *Otherwise than Being* (1974/2000) wherein he develops a secular meta-ethics, carefully re-considering justice.

understood as a metaphor of inequality, whereby interpretation and metaphor *be-come* (read constitute) peace education as it has emerged over the past century in Western academe. Burns and Aspeslagh (1996) acknowledge this integral connectivity:

Concern about inequality and justice, as metaphors for radical peace education, are integral to the change program, which is bound up in peace education. Change of culture, structures and consciousness alike will only enable the realization of the participatory and just visions of the peace educators and their companions, when constructed categories such as race, creed, gender, affluence or age cease to be the basis for the distribution of educational opportunities, in turn releasing the possibility of empowerment through education. And further, the world for which peace educators act, is one which addresses the issues of inequality, so that they must at some level be concerned with access to knowledge and the kind of knowledge, which they, too, are transmitting. Perhaps the major difference between the transformative or radical and the reform paradigms for peace education today is the extent to which the program for change is directed at a structural program or one of individual change. (p. 7)

It is then this metaphor of inequality embedded in the representational view of peace education where I, the reader and translator of this particular inscription, find the space and place for a transformational imperative often espoused within the field of peace education, supporting structural changes in the socio-political arenas of life through transperformative tenets. Yet numerous questions arise concerning transformational ethos in the onto-meta-physical chiasm as I have previously addressed through deconstruction in Chapter two. The inherent supposition of an unexamined onto-theological ground built on a moralizing positivism complicates our understanding(s) within the field. A radical peace education, grounded in a justice in the eyes of the *other* is bound in (or at) the limit of con-ception, such that an authorizing *ethos* based in the rationality of the one (as moral justification) imputed to the subjected *other* through curricular-pedagogical programming (positivism) remains problematic for *peace education-to-come* within the institute of rationality.

The *Anthology* offers an essentialist or reductive analysis of the field of peace education, given that the very act of inscription becomes the signification of meaning. I must hesitantly read this inscription, pausing to re-cog-nize the force of meaning borne in the aspiring, utopian text with an overly reductive elision of difference and its apperception, re-presentation, translation, and inter-pretation. In the reductive description of the actors in the field, the editors ascribe intention:

most peace educators['] claim[s of] a supranational rather than national or sub-national sectional order [may be interpreted] as the basis for conceptualizing [peace] The claim is made in different ways, from a concept of world order to normative appeals to justice, a common humanity and survival of the planet. Survival is the key underlying concern, and the focus is on averting war, and on alternatives to war, which is considered a major threat to human life. And the advocates of education for peace see education as central to efforts to change actions and consciousness in order to stop war and to bring about a more desirable human and ecological state. (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, pp. 9–10)

However, there is a significant risk inherent within the inscriptive move of drafting such a volume that potentially dismisses spatio-temporal influences contributing to ideological formations as con-structed within socio-political narratives. The editors' consolidated description of a field of individual political actors and scholars, notions towards socio-constructivist transformative goals while potentially eliding the difference of difference in motivational and theoretical terrain both geographically and across time. Hence, as this *Anthology* asserts, "there is a great diversity within this over-arching set of ideas" (p. 10).⁴⁸ The introductory chapter "Peace Education and the Comparative Study of Education" reframes the role of education for peace through a quasi-positivist, socio-constructivist⁴⁹ view reasoning that "since education is the core

⁴⁸ Peace educators and other scholars began to construct both distinct and cross-cutting typologies during the 1970s and 1980s in an effort to describe the theoretical and/or philosophical bases of the evolving field of Peace Education.

⁴⁹ A quasi-positivist, socio-constructivist view as aspirational social design emanates in the performative realm of *being* towards a desirable future for global communities of difference. In

of cultural transmission . . . [peace education or education *for* peace] . . . can shape the conditions for a peace culture” (p. 20) that would “promote education as an agent of peace” (p. 20–21).

While Robert Aspeslagh’s recommendation that peace education be embedded in the heart of education towards a vision of a pluralist society (p. 20) continues as a central tenet for the field, the nature and scope of such *ethico-pedagogy* as mapped in the previous chapter demands a deconstructive reading of the nature of peace itself—in the eyes of the *other*. Such reading is a response to the summons of the *Other* as performative engagement or embrace of *humanitas*, re-framing of relationship between *other(s)* inverting the normative paradigm and destabilizing received notions of community.

A second authoritative volume on peace education offers further analysis of the question of peace with a greater focus on education as progenitor of peace, which traces the development of the idea of education for peace to the early 19th century arising in the dissipating heat of the post-Enlightenment era after the Napoleonic Wars through a predominantly United States-centric perspective. In *Peace Education in America, 1828-1990: A Sourcebook for Education and Research*, [hereafter *Sourcebook*], Aline M. Stomfay-Stitz (1993) writes about the emergence of the field from a transcendental Modernist worldview promulgated and propagated through individual citizens, educators, humanitarians, and activists including such luminaries as John Dewey, Jane Addams, Fannie Fern Andrews, Horace Mann, Lucia Ames Mead and Edwin Mead (p. 3). Within the ontic frame of transcendental modernism, the stage for a new perspective in

this dissertation, I posit a merging of disparate sociological theoretical constructions drawn from Émile Durkheim and Max Weber, whereby the understandings of the respective sociological theorists illuminate the organizational nature of society through empiricism. Durkheim published *The Rules of Sociological Method* at the turn of the 20th century, seeking to scientifically describe society. See Weber (1904)—*The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*; Kim (2012); Durkheim (1893)—*De la division du travail social: étude sur l'organisation des sociétés supérieures* and (1895/1982)—*Les Règles de la méthode sociologique/The Rules of sociological method*.

peace education was arriving, coincident with a shift in ethical obligation from the *self*-referent to consideration of the *other*. The narrative of this chapter unfolds illuminating rays of perceptivity and perspectivity to-wards *ethicus obligatus* in revelation. Stomfay-Stitz describes each leader's attempt to address the multi-faceted dimensions of "peace and social justice, economic well-being, political participation, nonviolence, conflict resolution, and concern for the environment" (p. 3). Stomfay-Stitz paints an engaging image of the developing field of peace education through its actors, and thereby elaborates many of the emergent points of connection for the nascent academic concern.

Both volumes represent a chronicling of engagement, passion, challenge, and evolving pursuit that speaks truths discovered and visions manifest, while only cursorily addressing fundamental bases of individual and collective understanding of peace as a concept. This fissure exposes the theoretical terrain of peace education as a field revealing its loose foundational tethers. As peace education issues forth in numerous guises around the world, unique to *spatio-temporalities* and *historico-narrativities*, a quest to move beyond an ethos of a hegemonic "democratization" through education poised in critical pedagogy reopens the debate across educational philosophies.⁵⁰ Peace education as a field has continually evolved through the collaboration of individual scholars, educators, and activists in conjunction with social movements across the years. However, the notions of democratizing education in relation to peace and subjectivity linked to such visionaries as John Dewey and Paulo Freire, along with the more recent contributions of Seyla Benhabib (2006) on cosmopolitical democratic iterations;

⁵⁰ Noted Israeli peace scholar Ilan Gur-Ze'ev (2010), recently from the University of Haifa, proffers a stinging critique of uncritical peace education as a mere manifestation of a neo-colonialism under the guise of benign globalism. This well-taken critique however, may overreach in its further masquing of repurposed onto-theology, or a repositioned diasporic metaphysics, in the postModern era that fails to interrogate the philosophical natality of any respective grouping(s) of conflicting people(s)/ideolog(y)ies.

Henry Giroux (2005) on the politics of education; Julia Kristeva (1991) addressing notions of identity and spatiality particularly in the rubicon of hospitality, and Peter Trifonas (2003a) on the intersections of difference and pedagogy have rarely entered the radar of the greater community of scholars in the field.

The naissance of peace education arose from activists' concerns for inter-societal and inter-national relations impacting the peoples of the world. It came to prominence in the post World War (II) era with particular emphasis on “nuclear issues and the specter of global nuclear holocaust, [whether] accidental through the spread of nuclear power or deliberate within the context of nuclear weapon stockpiling and the possibility of their use in regional conflicts on the one hand, and inequalities, neo-colonialism and the growing rich-poor gap on the other” (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 10). During this era of heightened tensions between two world “superpowers”—the rising United States of America and the waning Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the mid 20th century—much of the rest of the world served as the strategic chessboard of these two nations. With the development of a proxy war in Southeast Asia, Vietnam came to signify the epitome of US fear of spreading communism and desire to manipulate tactical pieces (nations) in the game.⁵¹ The long social upheaval of the Vietnam era ushered in another shift in peace education towards the examination of human structural concerns in relation to questions of peace during the 1960s and 70s. New bodies of activists and academics were organized to challenge the assumptions embedded in cultural and societal contest and conquest as manifest in the bloodiest century. The inception of the International

⁵¹ I am neither suggesting, nor agreeing with, either the US propaganda of the day emnifying the peoples of the nation of Vietnam or the subsequent rationalizations of this tragic engagement. These political perspectives have been debated extensively throughout the latter quarter of the 20th century (e.g. Logevall's (1999) *Choosing War: The lost chance for peace and the escalation of war in Vietnam*); but rather, I interpret the global moves of an imperial United States of America to be simply and only that.

Peace Research Association (IPRA) in 1964 helped facilitate a new distinctiveness emerging in the field of peace education in the groundbreaking work of Johan Galtung on violence and Paulo Freire on conscientization (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 10). Many of the emphases in the field charted in the *Anthology* reflected a sometimes wholly unreflective positivist approach to peace as a question in society and the world, seriously eliding the question of difference. Burns and Aspeslagh represent the period:

efforts to form a strong and positive peace education to overcome violence in its various forms built up in the early 1980s. Emphases differed and disarmament education was a distinct strand, but positive peace was more and more clearly enunciated as the goal: more than the absence of war, the *attainment of certain forms of human coexistence*. And from this position *peace educators entered into dialogue with educators* with related central concerns: development, human rights, international understanding, racism, sexism. Analysis of the underlying structural conditions and the social formations which affect human interaction was a common element of all these issue-oriented concerns and educational approaches. Peace education clearly emerged as a concern for “one world, or none,” from its early concerns with personal peace to an overriding concern with societal peace issues. (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 11, emphasis added)

An undertone of essentialism as reduction of difference in utopic yearning is notable within the editors’ positivist portrayal of the developing field during the Cold War era. Peace education documented in the editors’ reading reflects a shift in *telos* to the cultural while retaining the provinciality of the *self*/subject with a slowly developing concern for the *other*. Yet, the basis of this dis-location of interest promises further movement and the germ of *embracing humanitas* in open dialogue with critical educators. Burns and Aspeslagh also crucially note that disarmament education as developed in the bodies of disparate peace organizations was both a source and desired effect:

the ongoing concern with internationalism which gives rise to peace education conceived as embracing all aspects of social, and increasingly cultural, life . . . [while maintaining] the focus on disarmament as the critical means to achieve peace and therefore the objective of peace education (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 28)

The focus of disarmament education as one form of peace education reached its apex in the United States during the 1970s before the impending decline of the Soviet Union in the following decade acceding to rising ethno/socio-political demands for global development.⁵² With a considered focus on the rise of a doctrinaire fear framing “assured mutual destruction,” peace educators, peace researchers, and peace activists collaboratively began to appeal for scrutiny of the global nuclear actors/nation-states with a piercing interest in the nuclear arms race. Each of these focal points of research, activism, and scholarly inquiry pursued by emergent peace educators reflects particular and sometimes unique foundational bases within a divergent field of academic study finding institutional affiliation within disparate disciplines in academe. During this stage of development, the field of Peace Education began to slowly coalesce in the latter 20th Century, arising from a growing collective concern for all peoples’ well being (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, pp. 27–28) upon witnessing the age of industrial killing couched within parochial concerns of domination originating with Euro-Anglos and their progeny, the maturing United States. The field of peace education arriving on the cusp of critical theoretical imagination was challenged in parochialism and would soon come to be driven by key questions of difference codified and adjudicated in the langue of the *socio-econo-political* discourse through growing arenas like foreign direct investment and the dominance of world powers.

⁵² Burns and Aspeslagh (1996) represent the shift in the focus of academic peace education claiming “[b]y the end of the 1970s, disarmament education had grown specifically to deal with issues of nuclear weapons, which were seen as the greatest threat; other issues were being canvassed in response to inequality, especially that between rich and poor nations, more usually under the terms ‘development education’ and ‘global development studies’” (p. 10). These developments in area and field studies within the Western academy coincident with heightened concerns for global/regional divides socio-politically and economically initiate greater *socialis aequitas* concerns, in the milieu of postStructuralism’s critique of social organization, rationality, and understanding, along with the resurgent influence of Critical Theory and the Frankfurt School lead to reimagined curriculum and pedagogy in the late 20th century in Canada, the United States and parts of Europe.

Moreover, a partial turn to *other* through narrowly conceived ecological responsibility and obligation within given “national interests” and proxy alignments of governance among/between nation-states and the United Nations begins to trace tentative steps in a journey of peace to the *third* and the *other*.

Certain markers along the paths towards peace education as it may be conceived today in the Western academy effect traces of attenuation, awareness, action, and educative endeavour. The intellectual history of peace education from an Occidental perspective reveals a Eurocentric “internationalism” created a vacuum into which emergent peace societies began to develop educational programs on the international stage during the early part of the 20th century. Burns and Aspeslagh (1996) describe these educational programs for peace as creators of “long-term goals . . . challeng[ing] the acceptance of war and . . . build[ing] attitudes for peace” (p. 26), as well as promoting “international understanding” (as cited in Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 27). One such organization, the Société d’Education Pacifique—founded in 1901—sought to create “a network of teachers who would bring peace education to the classrooms of Europe” (as cited in Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 27). Eurocentrism as bias became reflective of the growing global prominence of a dominating region of power with a hegemonic narrative of human progress. Despite the important contributions of many of the great thinkers/philosophers of the late Modern age grappling with evolving positivist notions of humanity (e.g. Kantian rationality, Hegelian idealism, Husserlian phenomenology, Heideggerian existentialism), the human condition arrived at a new existential precipice of total annihilation with the 1945 atomic bombings of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, Japan by the rising United States of America as a world power. Oppenheimer’s revelation came to reinforce the prison of our collective mind(s) in the construction of a re-newed metaphysics positing justification as cause. In the past decade, the

course of Western military domination (trumpeted in the US march to a Global War on Terrorism) evidenced a re-authoring of the same.⁵³

As peace education evolved in the face of existential crises, its early positivist foundations acclaiming social transformation grew through educational endeavours promulgating a moral normativity “of hope: through empowerment and transformation, children and teachers can effect changes in values and attitudes” (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993, p. 4). However the undercurrent of moralism resident in an evolving ethos for the field linked to *onto-theo-teleology* remains and has been critiqued philosophically (Wisler, 2010; Wright, 2011) and educationally (Trifonas, 2011). This argument against normative moralism and my proposal for *positivist socio-constructivism* as transperformative tenet of peace education-to-come has been previously addressed in detail in Chapter two and is invoked in a deconstructive reading of the archive. Stomfay-Stitz traces the early strains of the field of peace education originating in peace societies or peace organizations.

Following the Napoleonic Wars in 1815, fifty different peace societies were founded. The official journals, *The American Advocate of Peace*, *The Calumet*, and *The Harbinger of Peace*, preached a message that children could be educated as disciples of peace. Young people were invited to join the societies. Separate groups for women were founded in New England in the 1820s. (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993, p. 4)

⁵³ The US response to the 9/11 attack was paved in the toxic mixture of onto-theological justifications processed through globalized rationalism in the United Nations. The extent of rationalised exceptionalism couched in a meta-physical trope of violence was well elaborated within certain, limited academic (con)text(s). For more in depth critique of the marshalling of opinion in the run up to the US (led) response see Giroux (2004)—*War on Terror: The militarising of the public space and culture in the United States*, and (2002)—*Democracy and the Politics of Terrorism: Community, fear, and the suppression of dissent*; Derrida (2001b)—*On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*, and (2003)—*Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*; Seymour M. Hersh’s March 31, 2003 exposé on WMD in the run up to the war on Iraq in *The New Yorker*, as well as the Pulitzer Prize winning journalist’s *Chain of Command: The road from 9/11 to Abu Ghraib*.

In these formative efforts and the activists' responses which begin to confront the politics of conflict, I adduce the notion of a more progressive humanity emerges that would attempt greater human understanding through education and community connections. Within Aline Stomfay-Stitz's narrative of an emergent field born on the cusp of an arriving postModern age following the zeal of the Enlightenment, the fervor of Reformation, and the institutionalization of Education-for-all, we see a reflectivity of *being* ensconced within metaphysical trope. The *trans-formation* and *transcendence* of the past induced in an age of unchaining *onto-theology*, yet to be realized, continues into the 21st Century while the spectre of Modernity haunts. And it is precisely in this moment of haunting the axiomatic nature of interpretation is displayed, but *inter-pretation* (read between perception(s)) of *spatio-temporality*, or *historico-narrativity*, can only be and thus, must remain, interpretation.

Peace education historian and prominent scholar in the field, Ian Harris (2010), likewise interprets the nascent European and USA peace movements of the early 19th century as the progenitor of USA peace education.

Indigenous peace organizations sprung up in Great Britain, Belgium, and France. Progressive intellectuals and politicians formed serious societies to study the threats of war and propagate arguments against the buildup of armaments. The second wave of 19th-century peace movements was closely associated with workingmen's associations and socialist political groupings. The last segment of the 19th-century peace movement preceded World War I. Peace organizations were formed in nearly all European nations during these decades, spreading into the United States and the newly formed states of Italy and Germany. As the 19th century drew to a close, groups of teachers, students, and university professors formed peace societies to educate the general public about the dangers of war. (Harris, 2010, pp. 12–13)

In his descriptive narrative on the history of Peace Education as academic endeavour, Harris drapes a reductive shroud emanating from virtue/care ethics while eliding the base. Yet, the reader and reader as author, is well advised to think through the arguments for and against

armaments and their engagement through acts of violence and the adjudification of conflict excluding discourse.⁵⁴ Harris offers a description of the field shaped in progressivism that remains rooted in an uncritical positivism based on moralizing values as impetus for desired change through the socialization and acculturation within edifices of teaching and learning. Harris, following Stomfay-Stitz's mural of an emergent peace education movement, marks the underlying philosophical base of the field with the pedagogical and curricular efforts of the age.

Social studies teachers started teaching international relations so that their *students wouldn't want to wage war against foreigners*. Here the emphasis was on teaching certain international content, such as an understanding of peoples in the world that would develop in the minds of citizens an outlook of tolerance that would contribute to peace. Educators used global awareness to help students realize a more cooperative peaceful world. Convinced that schools had encouraged and enabled war by indoctrinating youth into nationalism, *peace educators contributed to a progressive education reform* where schools were seen as a means to promote social progress by providing students with an awareness of common humanity that helped break down national barriers that lead to war. (Harris, 2010, p. 13, emphasis added)

Capturing the influence of doctrinal socialization through education is particularly sententious in the North American context during the genocidal silencing of First Nations peoples and reveals a dogmatic strain in early education for peace rooted in onto-theo-telology. Despite genuine pedagogico-curricular efforts towards transformation, which may have contributed to increased tolerance and advanced understanding of the other as possibly an early entrée to difference as difference, the field of peace education necessarily remained bound within un-de-constructed notions of the *other* while examining (human) relations largely conceived in socio-political

⁵⁴ I cautiously read Harris' (2004) descriptive narrative of the archive of the emergent field of peace education and question the justifications employed to support **and** deny armaments in the cause of political commitments by other means than discourse, be it conflict resolution, diplomacy, conflict transformation or any precursor of structured political cross engagement. Such arguments may have a basis in a concern for justice and violence opening discourse with the *other* narrowly conscribed, still the (im)possibility of true *socialis aequitas* arrives at the limit of our conceptions and enmifications.

constructions framing categorizations (i.e. ethnic, race, social, national) of socio-political groupings. Revealing the fundamental nature of *being* and the *other* in a path to *ethicus obligatus* was yet to come in the remains of humanity's utter metaphysical dissolution during the Shoah.

Early in the 20th century, the interbellum period coincided with the rise of a new form of ethnonationalism in the United States of America catalyzing another stage of adolescence in the evolution of peace education. The strain of ethnocentrism prevalent in the United States of America in the early 20th Century reductively erased differences of culture and nationalisms along lines of inclusion/exclusion for differing immigrant classes within a hotbed of animosity and suspicion. And indeed, upon the pyre of fear many formerly received immigrant classes and peoples were denied entrance to the young nation emerging on the global stage following the turn of the century. The fear of the *other* and the marked difference of different bodies arriving and contesting "place" in a growing immigrant society increasingly impacted the young field of peace education turning to the plight of the socio-politically disadvantaged. Consequently, peace educators faced

suspicion and claims of unpatriotism . . . throughout the twentieth century, up to the present. Especially misunderstood were their efforts to alleviate poverty or attack the social or economic causes of war as a necessary first step toward social and economic justice. Many of the reforms advocated by peace educators were enacted in subsequent years, such as Social Security and child-labor legislation. The strands of social and economic justice have become contemporary objectives in peace education. (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993, pp. 63–64)

The pattern of the developments appertaining to *socialis aequitus*, mapped in education for peace, became strikingly present in the lives of individuals as apperception of possible futures collided with perceived realities. I read this narrative of struggle for voice and standing as indicative of the internalized displacement of identity in assimilation and the push for acculturation masking difference; consequently, the period begins in an openness to the *other*

masqued in the *same*. The connection to an arriving embodiment of a critique of violence within the field would not be evident until decades later, post Civil Rights. Stomfay-Stitz (1993) continues, painting the threads of an emerging tapestry revealing “an early awareness in America that a more peaceful society was possible” (p. 4). One of the leading peace educators of the day and exemplar of such a movement was Fannie Fern Andrews, who

began her campaign for peace education in America’s schools at the Stockholm Peace Conference in 1910. She envisioned an umbrella organization, the American School Peace League, with a dream of involving a half million school teachers and their children, from kindergarten to the college campus. (p. 5)

Andrews, a pioneer in international education, sought to advance international understanding, education, and peace, envisioning an “international library, a translation division, and an educational journal” (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993, p. 83). Working with Ministries of Education and heads of state across willing nations, her leadership lead to the establishment of the International Bureau of Education in 1929, (which subsequently became affiliated with UNESCO). Ms. Andrews’ vision of citizenship education for democracy is particularly noteworthy as she was appointed to serve as delegate by President Roosevelt to international conferences on education in both 1934 and 1936.⁵⁵ Her life as a genuine educator for peace (p. 85) marks a significant development in the path to education for peace.

Another early 20th century peace educator and social activist, Jane Addams, received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1931 for her life’s dedication and work towards peace, proffering an early slogan of societal harmony, *Peace and Bread*, and clearly articulating her personal philosophy that “poverty and deprivation were the primary causes of war” (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993, p. 51) in a

⁵⁵ Ms. Andrews was an early feminist political educator, receiving a Ph.D. in international relations addressing the mandatory system of private property at sea during a time of war. For more information see <http://www.swarthmore.edu/library/peace/CDGA.A-L/andrews.htm>. The American School Peace League, under her direction published the first comprehensive peace education curriculum in 1914 (Zeiger, 2000).

moralized rationality. She demonstrated in her luminous writing at the Rockford Female Seminary, an interweaving of idealism with pragmatism by exploring and promoting women's suffrage,⁵⁶ founding Hull House,⁵⁷ and advocating for humanity through education and service in the promotion of world peace (p. 53). Addams' service towards *others* was fervently grounded in a transcendental positivism that grew from an age of strife and desire for justice, wherein theological metaphysics constructed ontological and epistemological beliefs and subsequent actions.

Suffragists and female educators continued to pose fundamental questions to the patriarchal structures of the day arguing for social justice early in the past century. Carrie Chapman Catt, as ardent anti-warrior may properly be cast as a pioneering exemplar of the transperformative tenet *socialis aequitas enfolding non-violence*. She tirelessly sought enfranchisement through educating and informing citizenry challenging stereotypes and provincial beliefs relegating the female *other* in democracy to non-presence (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993, pp. 101–102). But a turn in political fortunes began with greater efforts to educate for peace that also intersected with the Deweyan turn against war in the 1920s and 1930s. Catt, campaigning for the Outlawry of War Crusade, along with strong advocacy for the World Court, rightly confronted nationalism in the Oval Offices of President Calvin Coolidge, President Herbert Hoover, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt (pp. 102–103). Like Addams and Andrews before her, Catt sought structural change in a land (United States of America) that espoused equality as definition and excluded the *other* under the guise of “democracy” (for a few). This

⁵⁶ Stomfay-Stitz (1993) presents Addams as an insightful woman who patently understood the connection of “education for world citizenship” and the “brotherhood [and I must add, sisterhood] of [hu]man[ity]” (p. 54).

⁵⁷ Jane Addams founded Hull House at the age of 29 (in 1889) to which she dedicated “her life working and teaching in order to improve the lives of tenement dwellers in the Chicago slums” (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993, p. 55).

ageless struggle continues; however, the critical resources brought to bear in the analysis may only inadequately reveal the true nature of the circumstance(s) or situation(s), missing or avoiding fundamental questions conceived in/through *ontic* and *ontological* understanding(s). Peace education, while slowly developing greater understanding of human social relationality and purpose over the past two centuries, still faces the fundamental challenge of adequately conceiving its philosophical foundation(s) affording deeper insight into the question of difference and its critical importance to questions such as those raised by early feminists, suffragists, and peace activists to be further illuminated in transperformative *positivist socio-constructivism* and an open embrace or unconditional hospitality for *humanitas*. The opportunity presented in my exploration of rationality itself opens many unassailable questions concerning peace, difference, and peace education as previously conceived and currently considered within academe today and framed more than a century earlier by John Dewey.

Educator, reformer, and philosopher John Dewey offers a legacy of critical concern for the role of education in/on society. His abiding interest in an early pedagogy of the learner influenced a critique of the institution of education itself, preferring a positivist interpretation that would be inscribed throughout a number of his texts including: *My Pedagogic Creed* (1897), *School and Society* (1915), and *Democracy and Education* (1916) among others. Stomfay-Stitz lauds Dewey's evolution towards pacifism traced in Charles F. Howlett's (1977) *Troubled Philosopher: John Dewey and the struggle for world peace* as the source of Dewey's call for "the dignity of labor in which idealism and pragmatism were joined [in the desirable aim of] educating young people for world citizenship" (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993, p. 57), a precursor to the reconfigured transperformative tenet, *positivist socio-constructivism*. Deweyan re-form envisions *anew, another* teaching of history and geography cultivating a "socialized intelligence . . .

[constituting] moral significance” (pp. 57–58). The imperative of change for society and education was integrally linked such that

we may desire abolition of war, industrial justice, greater opportunity for all. But no amount of preaching good will or the golden rule . . . will accomplish the results There must be change in the arrangements and institutions. We must work on the environment, not merely on the hearts of men. (Dewey, 1922, p. 29 quoted in Stomfay-Stitz, 1993, p. 58)

Dewey, a reformer, understood the indissociable nature of education and its role in *and* on society. His efforts challenging the institutionalization of the military (i.e. ROTC—Reserve Officers’ Training Corps) within public education was consonant with a strengthening peace movement in the early 20th Century and a slow turn to an *embracing humanitas*. Dewey’s turn to an informed, democratic education in pedagogy and praxis evinces an arc of continual growth and Dewey’s own education. John Dewey’s philosophy of education was continually informed by exposure to the *Other* (i.e. Bolshevik ideology) shaping his scholarly and service engagements during an age of existential angst (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993, p. 58).

The narrative of the development of education for peace reflects the lives of these important women and men searching for a more desirable condition of human relations that would acknowledge *being* as conceived in this metaphysical age through *onto-theological* transformation. As I note here, trans-formational change is bound within the *ethico-philosophical* imag(e)inings of an epochal shift. The force of women’s voice played a strategic role in the course of development of a young academic field particularly in the early 20th century with perpetual echoes reverberating now in the new millennium. The interwoven skeins of purposefully lived lives like those of Addams, Dewey, and Andrews are reflective of the intricate weavings of peace woven with the threads of justice in the lives of peoples, cultures, societies, and nations across time. Each of these vital threads variously captured in the work of individuals,

peace societies, and movements laid the foundation for the development of Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) initially on a local/regional scale and, later on the international level.

The emergence of socially-purposed national organizations targeting and serving specific, largely humanitarian needs as “the forerunners of international as well as national advocates for peace education” (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 27) preceded the precipitous founding of the United Nations, which is largely credited with the creation of NGOs. Such organized bodies of concern spawned and were the progeny of peace movements developing growing influence on the world stage promulgating increasing social justice. Earlier international efforts of these different peace movements had sought influence with the League of Nations as well with a focus on improving international relations during the interbellum period between World War I and World War II through the training of younger generations. However, the emphasis of peace movements and peace scholars would change shortly from a “pacifist strand” (p. 27) critiquing the use of violence as implement of the State to a broader internationalist understanding of peace education.⁵⁸ A further shift in focus of pro-peace NGOs like the International Peace Campaign (IPC) “saw the consolidation of peace education as an action-oriented movement whose aim was

⁵⁸ Elly Hermon maps the development of peace education during the inter-war period as one of location, responsibility, and power with the rise of nationalistic memes becoming embedded in education in many countries in the 1930s both in Europe and North America with the rise of fascism in the face of a retreat from internationalism (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 27). The caution in Hermon’s apperception of nationalism has been echoed even more frequently in the late 20th Century and into our present moment given socio-political and economic pressures manifesting the recent global economic slump and an increasing refutation of multiculturalism. See Judith Butler (2009)—Performativity, precarity, and sexual politics; Henry Giroux (2010)—Zombie politics, democracy, and the threat of authoritarianism-part 1 in *Zombie Politics and Culture in the Age of Casino Capitalism* for prescient analysis of rising nationalism.

Another important moment has arrived in the expansion *to-*towards the *other*—those named “international(s),” yet in this moment of arrival, or apperceptivity of peace movements and larger international bodies of social concern, a doubling of concern *to-*towards an-*other* is opened and quickly closed in the rising ethnic strife of European turmoil. The reduction of difference in narrow examinations of *other* peoples, societies, cultures, and nations from the externalized position of the *other* enfolds *difference as same* and thereby stultifies opening.

to change public opinion both on short-term conflicts and long-term goals relating to the underlying causes of conflict” (p. 28). Still, the strategy of change captured in the transformational ethos of these movements, while gaining adherents during peak moments of human crisis, apparently fails to deconstruct the nature of the same proposal ignoring the existential bounds of *socio-ethno-politico-historical* narratives in unexamined *onto-theology*. I argue further that unexamined *onto-theo-teleology* suffusing philosophico-theoretical bases of the academic field of peace education effectively obscures the reflective lens of an engaged field of discourse, particularly within the realm of *ethicus obligatus*, or the obligation to all *others* in the aporea of the university. Pursuing a weaker analysis of political relationships merely within the arena of International Relations neglects the depth of difference in singularity captured in ethno/cultural socio-political groupings manifested in and manifesting historical bondedness. The limit of political analysis exclusive of deep historical, social, and economic rootedness elides the very question of difference subsuming the *other* in the *Same*. Yet, another key movement in the era would advance beyond the political realm into social psychology.

The movement towards Moral Disarmament, considered overt belligerence rooted in nationalism to be an effort toward the response or obligation one owes *another*. Moral Disarmament directly connected education, peace, international understanding and the medium of communication (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 27). The Moral Disarmament movement freshly exposed the psychic disconnection between the *self* and *other(s)* borne of metaphysical conceptions; nevertheless, the Nuclear Disarmament movement, following Oppenheimer’s weaponization of matter a few years later, would existentially reveal human nature. Such exposition, however, remains shrouded before an adequate critique of reason and meaning in relation to human social relationality argued in the second chapter.

Each of the peace societies, peace movements, and socially-purposed (inter)national organizations, along with individual visionaries were able to accretively influence the global conversation around issues of peace and the idea of education for peace. The conversation on peace and international responsibility turned with the institution of the United Nations in 1946 and its enactment of UNESCO later the same year. In the formation of UNESCO, emphasis was placed “on education as a task for intergovernmental action” (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 28) and as a primary Western aspiration following the nadir of human conflict. UNESCO’s (1974) drafting of an educational framework, the *Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and fundamental Freedoms* forms a mandate to bridge education and human existence. This lengthy document proposes an integrated programme for the educational purpose of the organ that explicitly connects pedagogic and curricular efforts across the natural sciences, the social sciences, humanities, and culture for the benefit of the peoples of the world. Under the section heading “Social sciences, humanities and culture” of the *Recommendation*, philosophical research is constitutive of UNESCO’s organizational raison d’être to pursue “the fundamental concepts and the ultimate aims of education, science and technology, social sciences, culture and communication” (p. 42). As such, the UNESCO directorate envisioned the philosophical initiative would

- contribute to the critical inquiry into the philosophy and aims of education;
- offer a deeper analysis of the impact of science and technology on the evolution of cultural values in the modern world;
- continue the study of the relationships between cultures with reference to the concepts of time and history;

- summarize and draw conclusions of the study on the main trends of research in the social sciences and humanities; and analyze differing interpretations of experience by and through the mass media. (p. 42)

In this direct connection between philosophy and education, UNESCO re-(in)scribes the interminable linkage of Reason with education, charging imagination for a new era of humanity. The deep resonances of such visioning portend transperformative possibilities across the human landscape sounding throughout my dissertation, affording guidance and telic foreshadowing.

Robin J. Burns and Robert Aspeslagh (1996) explicitly tie the educational interests of peace movements directly to the field of peace education, given the respective orientations of the movements “to introducing peace education and its like in formal education systems” further they claim “[o]ther movements, too, in related fields, have an educational interest and may include peace issues in their conceptual bases and processes” (p. 36). These editors claim a foundational relation that is dismissed at our peril. Burns and Aspeslagh imagine cross-disciplinary and even possible trans-disciplinary connections as I have previously addressed in Chapter two comprising part of my (re)theorization of the field of peace education. Additionally, I incorporate the notion in the forthcoming performative critique of my field study. However, the fluidity and connections between peace movements and an ever-emergent academic field are problematic in the following ways with pedagogico-curricular implications. First, as Burns (1996) notes, the question of academic legitimacy for the field of Peace Education arises within institutions of higher education given contested notions of motivation and foundation. Second, the field of study is challenged on epistemological grounds concerned with rigor and ontological

receptivity.⁵⁹ Third, perceptivity of rationality is untroubled within the field. Finally, and perhaps more importantly, different approaches to rationality lie largely unexamined in the discourse on peace education, or its parochial investiture.

Curricular and pedagogical approaches to peace education in tertiary education continue to be a “challenging agenda for investigation” (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 36) two decades later as we enter a new millennium as the (im)possibility of a *peace education-to-come* coalesces in the imagination of engaged post-critical peace educators and reflective critical pedagogues.

The editors of the *Anthology* highlight a problematic of choice for peace educators

which might be enlightened by knowledge of what happens when particular choices are made under certain contextual conditions. The areas which have been least examined and which may be more interesting again to educators are the pedagogical approaches and their outcomes. Research into the effects on learners of different types of peace education is in its infancy. (p. 38)

As critical educators concerned with the question(s) of peace within the Institution of Rationality, it is incumbent upon us to engage these *socio-historical* threads and re-imag(e)ine the connections between our pedagogical endeavors and the pursuit of peace. Peace education, as manifest in different approaches and locales within higher education still faces one of its biggest challenges—to thoroughly divest its hierarchal patriarchal roots in phallogocentrism while engaging fully in feminist theoretical approaches within a question of difference. Stomfay-Stitz illuminates this charge:

⁵⁹ I want to carefully note that peace education in the early 21st Century has largely overcome many of the hurdles of legitimacy, both in North American and European contexts according to the recent scholarship on the field (Bar-Tal (2002)—*The Elusive Nature of Peace Education*; Kupermintz & Salomon (2005)—*Lessons to Be Learned from Research on Peace Education in the Context of Intractable Conflict*). However, the second concern or challenge for the field as a whole relating to academic rigor and ontological receptivity perdures with indeterminate ontological and epistemological grounds. (See Gur-Ze’ev (2001)—*Philosophy of Peace Education in a Postmodern Era*; Cabezudo & Haavelsrud (2006)—*Rethinking Peace Education*; Wright (2011)—*Deconstructing the Other: Opening Peace*).

It seems that there is more recognition among peace educators of the need for intercultural dialogue than there is for feminist contributions to the development of peace and peace education! Issues of sexism have been dismissed as distractions from the main task of averting war, cogent cases to the contrary notwithstanding [offered by feminist peace scholars including Brigit Brock-Utne, Robin J. Burns, Celina García, Corrine Kumar-D'Souza, and Betty Reardon] . . . as have other issues which do not directly deal with the attainment of peace, however limited that concept is (Wiberg, 1974). Yet without debate over the nature of peace, the parallel one between peace researchers and peace educators about process as well as content (Young, 1981) and the critical examination of the assumptions and biases in the selection of content and methods, peace education may simply reinforce the status quo (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993, p. 39, citations in original)

This critique of patriarchy in education resonates through the differing registers of Pierre Bourdieu's concern for social reproduction via education,⁶⁰ Paulo Freire's conscientization,⁶¹ and Judith Butler's continental feminism.⁶² Yet third generation critical theorists like Butler, Henry Giroux, Patti Lather, and Peter Trifonas remind us that the process of educational inquiry necessarily encompasses a deeper understanding of the methods and modes of rationality

⁶⁰ Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron's (1990) reconceptualization of educational purpose significantly reframed contemporary understanding of the socio-educational institution in *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture, 2nd ed.* For further inquiry into his theorization of the educative role of schooling in society see Arum, Beattie, & Ford (2011)—*The Structures of Schooling: Readings in the Sociology of Education*; William Pinar (2006)—*Race, Religion, and a Curriculum of Reparation*; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman (1995).

⁶¹ Paulo Freire (2005) is widely known for his liberation theory of education that repositions the question of education within society as one of emancipatory engagement. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* he states "No pedagogy which is truly liberating can remain distant from the oppressed by treating them as unfortunates and by presenting for their emulation models from among the oppressors. The oppressed must be their own example in the struggle for their redemption" (p. 54). Freire is not pleading for compassion or understanding here, but rather, like Lévinas and Derrida after, inverting the subjectivity of *being* in the pedagogical arena effecting and affecting *socialis aequitas*.

⁶² Judith Butler critiques and eschews the limits of the continental tradition conscribing the phenomenological in the metaphysical narrative of division. She proffers another continental approach that interprets power and gendered relations as violable constructs. For Butler, sexual difference is a fundamental part of a conceptual system that creates and perpetuates unequal power relations (Hansen, J., 2013). (See Butler's *Gender Trouble* (2006) and *Bodies That Matter* (2011) for exposition). As reader and author, we, you and I, are challenged in Butler's proclamation to re-conceive rationality structured in gendered normativity. I would argue further that our obligation as critical pedagogues is to re-frame the edifices of our obeisance beyond the fallow ground of a *rationalis exclusionis*.

employed within disparate onto-epistemological perspectives and de-ontic responsibility notioned in contemporary post-critical pedagogy, which I have previously addressed as a primary subject in the preceding chapter. For it is in the development of a deeper understanding of the methods and modes of rationality through transperformative engagement that new possibilities at the limit, in the unconditional university are borne effecting futures of *presence* through *positivist socio-constructivism*, *embracing humanitas*, and *ecological presencing*. As such, the spatio-temporal realities of theory and practice impact the course of peace education in new ways forcing greater reflexivity and awareness while guiding the pedagogico-curricular impulse across a divergent field.

A search for connection between research, action, and education with relation to the questions of peace anticipated the founding of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) in 1964 and its Peace Education Commission (PEC) in 1972. With this synergistic evolution of peace knowledges, a renewed focus on peace education emerged in the Western academy. Early concerns for IPRA centred on socio-political divides along lines of domination: East-West issues raised, focused on the nature or onto-epistemology of peace education and peace action, while North-South issues raised involved a critique of post-colonial progressivism in relation to the hegemony of imperial “democratization” and the State (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 40). Subsequently, the dualism resident in the approach to these prominent concerns of the PEC evolved into greater interest in academic inquiry over action, indicative of

a new movement in the 1980s of professional academic educators into PEC, in addition to the teachers and members of nonformal education associations and groups. For the new professionals, consideration of action has less salience except in the sense of how to enact peace education programs that are capable of changing the behaviour and attitudes of participants (well illustrated in the contents of the PEC journal, *Peace, Environment and Education*). Research has become a more pragmatic tool, too, though the research of peace educators into

attitudes and the evaluation of particular pedagogical processes is more at the forefront than substantive debates. (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 40)

The Peace Education Commission's shift towards a more implicit academic approach and inquiry with less emphasis on activism augured well for greater understanding of the *ethico-pedagogical* endeavour within, given spatio-temporal constraints, and planted the seeds of further epistemological questioning over the next thirty years into the present. Counterintuitively, while the field of peace education was originally cast as a re-visioning of curricular-pedagogical approaches to education for peace and indeed, peace through education informed through peace research to challenge normative education, this was not an opening to difference, as an opening in/to the deeper, fundamental questions of peace, its nature, and conception(s) through thorough de-construction of unexamined normativit(y)ies. Peace education, in the vision of the PEC was reflective of efforts to

involve an intensification of cooperation between peace researchers and educators interested in peace education. However, this cooperation should not only concern questions of content, such as deciding on relevant objectives and educational content on *a large and a small scale*, it must also cover the specific problems of peace education teaching and educational processes and contribute to a more complex understanding of peace education on the basis of the variety of different regional viewpoints Because, as wide experience has shown, the *complexity of educational processes* is all too easily reduced to specialized questions and thus corrupts the aim of peace education which cannot be made equivalent to the teaching of certain goals and contents but which also covers the necessary *non-violent, participatory learning and education processes*. Therefore, for peace education the question of *ways of conveying contents and strategies of implementation* is just as important as the question of *content and goals*. For this reason an international exchange of views on different approaches, concepts and methods is necessary in both areas. (Wulf, 1974, pp. ix-x, emphasis in original)

The formative stages of academic field development were shaped in the expanse of the interrogatory approach to the socio-political nature of human relationships as gleaned through

peace research.⁶³ Wulf's narrative and editorial task briefly traces the connection between (peace) education and teaching opening a key discourse for the field. Despite recent attempts to develop a broader critical pedagogy within the field in the last decade, the consideration of an *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* compels deeper inquiry into the *pedagogico-praxelological* in/to/through each question of difference. Heeding Wulf's prescriptive inscription, peace education today as academic endeavour in the institute of rationality would be well advised to consider all questions of difference posed in *socialis aequitas enfolding non-violence* informed in *positivist socio-constructivism*.

Håkan Wiberg (1974) astutely cautions in the *Handbook on Peace Education* that the merging of peace researchers and educators in the young field of peace education was weighted with metaphysical concerns and the beginning of deeper inquiry.

If peace education means teaching peace research, what is taught will depend on the political preferences of those defining the curriculum. These preferences will be formulated as an interpretation of the words "peace" and "social justice". Still, it is possible to have some ideas about the task that lies ahead in the developed countries: The secondary school level. If peace education means education for peace, everything will depend entirely on the political preferences of teacher, unless a lot more peace research goes into finding out what kind of education does actually lead to peace. (p. 149, emphasis in original)

With Wiberg's scripting of the emerging role of peace educators and peace education itself, certain barriers to an emergent critical peace education are re-con-stituted in the institutionality of the very institution of rationality, preferring a reified division in epistemology and praxiology

⁶³ "Peace" research was problematic within tertiary education given many of the founding *onto-theological* bases establishing the field within the academy. Michael Banks (1974) frames the opening of peace and conflict resolution within academe in a paper originally prepared for the UNESCO Advisory Meeting of Experts on Research and Teaching on Problems of Peace and Conflict Resolution. Therein he tentatively marks the terrain of the new field of Peace and Conflict Resolution adopting an inclusive approach to peace research itself claiming a(n): (1) focus on the processes of conflict, violence, oppression and peaceful relationships at all social levels; (2) humanistic, progressive values; (3) systematic methodology through empiricity; (4) interdisciplinary intellectual perspective (p. 37).

as structure for the field. At that moment, nearly forty years ago, the joining of peace and education “contributes to a certain amount of confusion” (p. 139) centering on the role of researcher and educator where

on the one hand, one frequently finds “peace education” to mean “teaching the findings of peace research”, quite analogously with “natural science education”, etc. There may be reasons for using a slightly more vague general translation, say, “transmission of findings from peace research”; for the word “teaching” is not so crucial in this context.

The other meaning of the phrase “peace education” that appears to be fairly current can be given as “education for peace”, i.e. education somehow aiming at changing attitudes to peace (to social justice, etc.), at preparing people for peace actions, and in general at having the effect of increasing (the likelihood of) peace in some system. (p. 139, emphasis in original)

In the latter case, education for peace is conceived in the train of the positivist school founded in moralism with a transformative lens to be honed in the socio-constructivist frame, bearing a similar philosophical ethos as we shall soon see in Galtung. Furthermore, in this early conception, the demarcation of researcher and educator is problematic given an *ethico-pedagogical* approach to peace within the environs of the university founded on an arriving notion of *différance* non-reductively *re-cog-nizing difference*.

Christoph Wulf’s (1974) avocative melding of praxis, practice, pedagogy, and curriculum in the aforementioned passage presages the emergence of a genuine critical peace education still forming today as evidenced in a recent topical special issue of the *Journal of Peace Education* examining critical peace education. In the nexus of the existential and phenomenal, our human social relationality is manifest conscribing spheres of *being* in cosmological presence; similarly, I find the arena of peace education, like Wulf, necessarily encompasses *nature-of-being*, presence, (*ecological presencing*) experience, and our individual and “collectivized” rational processes (*ethicus obligatus*) constituted in ethnic/social norms. Our pursuit of this lofty idea[1]

both reflects and is reflective of our responsibility as critical peace educators compelling comprehensive inquiry evidenced in Galtung's work.

Johan Galtung (1974), the father of peace (and conflict) studies, argues that the structural impediments to peace are bound in the hierarchy of domination in his chapter of the original *Handbook on Peace Education*. Galtung claims that peace education itself is a challenge to the provinciality and hierarchal nature of the institution of Education in society itself that may be

seen as antithetical to vertical social relations and hierarchies in any form. Hence, *peace education would be seen as a way of achieving, individually and collectively, a higher level of consciousness*, of awareness of social reality—not as a mechanism for achievement and social classification. (p. 156, emphasis added)

Galtung's early challenge captured in this formative text of the field, argues for the fundamental connection between human social relationality and education in society by linking consciousness, or *presence-in* to the process of socialization through learning and teaching that I propose in transperformative *positivist socio-constructivism* evincing *ecological presencing*. His cogent critique echoes certain critical pedagogues who have explicitly challenged the fundamental role of education in society and its rationality (e.g. Bourdieu, Derrida, Horkheimer and Adorno, Giroux, Lather, McLaren, and Trifonas). Galtung, like Dewey before him, conceives a positivist approach to educational reform towards an endeavour to bring peace education, peace research, and peace action together thereby facilitating greater possibilities for positive change. In an early text, Johan Galtung argues for peace education with the empirical, critical, and constructivist approaches to the social sciences with a positivist twist—transformation. Positivism serves as the basis for *epistémè* and therefore, peace research as I have previously posed in *précis* following Galtung. He argues

the first point is what everybody would assume will be included in a peace education program: analysis of our present, real world, describing its basic facts to the extent that they are relevant for peace problems, and at the same time pointing to major trends. The analysis would be dynamic in the sense of presenting a time perspective, as well as static in the sense of giving an image of the present situation—with regard to such major factors as the war system and the preparation for it, and everything related to problems of equity and freedom—both of them antonyms of dominance, but with different ideological traditions. Thus, this is the place where relevant facts will be presented, and also theoretically explained—always having in mind that there is more than one theory for the same collection of data. (Galtung, 1974, p. 167)

While Galtung certainly builds on difference in many manifestations in this text, there remains an inherent risk given the degree peace education is conceived in the *same*, the constructivist limits of *pedagogico-curricular* frameworks may become overly reductive and exclusory. The reader might be cautioned in relation to the apprehension of Johan Galtung's positivism and its telic influence, but due care requires *myself* as reader and inscriber to not supplant my own suppositions for a brief exposition on this critical matter of peace education and philosophy as engagement.

Continuing on, a second aspect of peace education in this formative stage, would for Galtung (1974) begin to lay the foundation for the transformational ethos of his work:

goal-formulation is an indispensable part of peace education. There has to be some concreteness, some explicitness in the idea of peace. It is not enough to say that peace is absence of something or other; much more concrete images must be given. Peace research, being born inside the traditional empiristic tradition, whether of the conservative or progressive varieties, has not been good at this point. Rather, analysis has prevailed at the expense of goal formulation, the latter being rejected rather summarily as “utopianism”. (p. 168)

However, the telic nature of such a peace education program is con-scribed in the nexus of existentiality as provocatively framed by questioning whether “is it possible to have both absence of direct violence, equity in social interaction, and freedom for a considerable degree of human self-expression or self-realization” (p. 168). Crucially, Galtung pre-sents the fundamental

question that has perennially provoked endless discourse and debates on the nature of human social relationality, difference, and the essential responsibility of the *self* to the *other* and *others*, as *ethicus obligatus*.

The *topos* of Galtung's program of engaged peace pedagogy maps the terrain of education for peace in the 20th century and serves as a precursor to the Transcend movement he later instituted in the Transcend Peace University in 2003. Transcend Peace University serves as an open educational arena outside of formal affiliations with any established university offering a solutions-oriented approach to working out peace. The Kantian traces of right decision, or critical reasoning woven in the transcend movement envision such a compelling narrative written in a dystopian present transformed (or *transcend-ed*) and producing the preferred or desirable world—utopia or splendor. Galtung proffers

any successful peace education program would be one where the participants really would feel the tension between the preferred and the real world, and the danger threatening from the rejected world—feeling it so intensely that proposal-making becomes a necessity. (Galtung, 2004, p. 55)

This ethical imperative harkens to the Kantian categorical imperative, but would seemingly overwrite *self* by default rather than volitional condition and thus presents a challenge to the positivist notion contained. Furthermore, other resonances of the theme espoused in an engaged peace education/pedagogy will continue to resound within the discourse of my dissertation and I shall return to the positivist proposal later.

In an-*other* consideration of the growing consensus for a vital and meaningful peace education, Gerda von Staehr (1974) offers in the same *Handbook on Peace Education*, an exploration of the normative questions of peace and *socialis aequitas* through a political lens critiquing the *ontic* constraints of unexamined rationality that I have reframed in Chapter two

in/to *ethicus obligatus*. The theme of the first international conference on peace education in Europe held in 1972 was “Education for Peace and Social Justice” and held in Bad Nauheim, Germany.⁶⁴ The assemblage of peace researchers, scholars, teachers, social workers, and students, comprised persons from around the world arriving at three primarily philosophical positions, con-structing knowledge and purpose in the nascent academic field. von Staehr’s narrative offered the normative supposition that

education for peace is always part of pedagogical concepts because peace as a norm—with a concrete content in each individual case—is one aspect of every valid ideal conception of society. In this context, education for peace has been successful if the belief in the rightness of this norm is sufficiently strong and if people have satisfactorily internalized it as a basis for their behavior orientation. Therefore, the question arises which persons or groups in a society have the power or legitimation to define the concept of peace valid in this society for the time being. (von Staehr, 1974, p. 296, emphasis in original)

Building on this supposition, von Staehr suggests dogmatic *onto-epistemological* conceptions of peace are anti-thetical to the *con-cept* of peace: “If a conception of peace deduced from a theory of society is fixed dogmatically, this bears the germ of non-peace because the belief in its rightness may pretendedly (sic) legitimize the enforcement of this concept of peace” (p. 297).

The argument continues within an explicit understanding and interpretation of the power dynamics in the relationship between the two parties, as aporetic responsibility to-ward *other* and *self* where

non-peace is . . . found—either as personal violence or war, or in the sublimated form of structural violence. The fewer the number of equivalent partners who

⁶⁴ The hosts of the conference included: (1) the Society for the Advancement of Educational Research, (2) the Education Committee of IPRA, (3) the *German Institute* for International Educational Research, (4) the German Society for Peace and Conflict Research, and (5) the Institute for World Order. Specific invitees were well-known peace researchers as Galtung (Norway), Senghaas (FRG), Boulding and Mendolovitz (USA), Mazrui (Uganda), Kothari (India), Dasgupta (India), Apostol (Rumania); educational researchers Becker, Eisner, Gamm, von Hentig, Husen, Klafki (von Staehr, 1974, p. 295).

cooperate in defining the valid concept of peace, the more dominance or political power is necessary to maintain it. (von Staehr, 1974, p. 297)

Noting the importance of balance among *demos*, *polis*, and *ethnos*, von Staehr acknowledges the role of structural violence and its effect. Following Kenneth Boulding's intellectual framework that "distinguishes a structural, a dialectical and an evolutionary approach, each . . . sub-divided depending on whether or not they imply a prior taboo on violence" (cited in Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 43), von Staehr acknowledges the connections between peace, education, and conflict/violence within the human condition linking education (*positivist socio-constructivism*) and *socialis aequitas*. She astutely adduces

peace as social justice causes a process of liberation only then, if autonomy, democracy, and international understanding are . . . [re-balanced]. Education for peace and social justice is concentrated on the effort to initiate and to adhere to processes like this together with the pupils. Therefore, the corresponding pedagogy must be understood as political pedagogy. (von Staehr, 1974, p. 297)

von Staehr's intuition, frames education in the political which is consonant with Derridean deconstruction, Reardon's political efficacy through education, and Trifonasian *justice-to-come*.

The role of education in society rises within our purview here in von Staehr along with a deeper consideration of the praxeological and didactic implications within the rationale suggested. Evoking an emancipatory ethos, *a la* Freirean *conscientization* and Derridean *deconstruction*, the liberatory nature of an education for peace and social justice as *socialis aequitas enfolding non-violence* would reduce

superfluous violence and establish . . . new freedom that enables actions transcending the existing system by information and interpretation. This presupposes the ability to think analytically about self-imposed subject matters on the one hand, and a communicative group interaction on the other side. If education for peace and social justice is conceived in this sense as part of a political process, the question about the dialectical relation between goals and means, between theory and practice, must arise. (von Staehr, 1974, p. 298)

Ethico-pedagogical implications arise here in our consideration of Gerda von Staehr's (1974) juxtaposition of received notions of theory and practice in education as contrasted with an emancipatory peace education, positivist in derivation and socio-constructivist in purpose as transperformative *positivist socio-constructivism* engendering human social relationality or peace in/through difference (p. 298). Our task then as critical educators remains to deconstruct the implications for peace education imbedded in the theory and practice debate while simultaneously examining the rationality of an emancipatory peace education idea(I). But such a difficult task requires further clarification of the *onto-epistemological* roots of peace education and a cogent interpretation and synthesis of the central tenets and themes of the field to which I shall turn.

During the interbellum period in the United States of America, education as institution was in moral (and ethical) crisis in the chiasmata of the *onto-metaphysico-logical*, refusing through apperception the fundamental alterity of the *other*, while anguishing and even languishing over its fundamental role in society as witnessed in the life of educational reformer and professor John Dewey. It was during the historical era of the 1930s following the socio-political strife of World War I that a growing thrust of isolationism coincident with rising interest in international friendship and goodwill became a prominent concern for education. During the torturous economic recovery in the United States and Europe along with the coincident rise of Hitler in Germany a snapshot of the pivotal moment reveals "a renewed interest in internationalism and a reinforcement of aspirations for a global perspective strengthened education for peace between the two world wars" (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993, p. 99). The *Sourcebook* captures an educational era embroiled in global and regional contestations of interlinked *socio-*

political and onto-theological challenge and distills central themes in the field of peace education:

1. *The interdependence of the nations of the world and a knowledge base in geography and history as a reflection of the importance of world trade.* Educators devised curriculum units for public and religious-based programs that included an embryonic global perspective.
2. *World citizenship—a precept carried over from the previous decade—was recommended as an adjunct to citizenship education for newly enfranchised women.* The American School Citizenship League in particular continued to write and disseminate its four textbooks for citizenship education and added units in each for world citizenship. These goals had been promoted by Fannie Fern Andrews since . . . [1874] and by Lucia and Edwin Mead from as far back as the 1920s.
3. *“The brotherhood of man”—expressed as international friendship and good will for humanity.* This was considered more than a slogan by the peace educators of the nineteenth century supported by a 1930s research study confirming the concept’s curricular base. Progressive educators viewed this area as the logical evolution and destiny for American education.
4. *Examination of the role of education in a democracy, especially the inclusion of character education helped to expand sentiment favoring an ethical, value-based education.* Moral education was often translated into character development and became a focus of several educational yearbooks. (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993, p. 100, emphasis in original)

Elements of each of these central tenets would be continually woven into the fabric of peace education, a chiastic draping of an *ontic* chasm as continually revealed in the frailty of our collective human will to ethically respond to the haunting proclamation “Never Again” at the limit of postModernity (always capitalized in grapheme, focusing the reader’s perceptivity). The metaphysical roots of each tenet however, ontologically continue to privilege a subjectivity of *self* over *other* preferring extant patriarchal models. Such moralizing educative endeavours founded on positivist ideologies are both ubiquitous and transformational for persons so inclined, yet the continuing task of reflective, critical pedagogues and post-critical peace educators today is to de-construct the individualized elements and components of peace in a globalized

communities of difference that simultaneously reveals and de-constructs the terrain of our (post-)meta-physical world. In the arriving coalescence of thematic pedagogic aspiration, these themes simultaneously bear the source of their semio-linguistic construction(s) while partially illuminating the abyss dividing post/Modernity as I have extensively detailed in the previous chapter.

Another aspect of a synthesis entails geo-historical influences, as offered in the descriptive image of the emergent field as archipelago. Magnus Haavelsrud and Mario Borrelli trace the germinal roots of peace education as a primary academic concern and present a vision of the *archipelago* of peace research. Haavelsrud and Borrelli describe

two geo-cultural “poles” . . . played a key role in the development of formal peace research and the formation of IPRA: the Anglo-Saxon (with two sub-poles, the Canadian and the American, and several “satellites”: Dutch, English, Japanese and Australian). The second “pole” consisted of the Scandinavians, with a Norwegian and a Danish sub-pole There is also an Indian “trail,” represented by the Gandhi Peace Foundation founded in 1958 and brought to the attention of peace researchers by the work of the Norwegian Johan Galtung. It also represents an important influence on the pacifist, non-violent organizations of which some peace researchers have been members. Other international organizations and movements which influenced the development of formal peace research are UNESCO, the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), which together with the Friends’ Service Committee and Pugwash Conference Continuing Committee were instrumental in the actual founding of IPRA. (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 41)

With these perspectives enveloping many aspects of difference and the different approaches to peace, as well as *education for peace*, we can see the incremental steps laid towards a more comprehensive and budding critical peace education, as I have previously written (Wright, 2013). Difference as difference in approach to the question(s) of peace would come to be reflective of a range including “people working within human rights education, development education, ecological education, disarmament education, intercultural and multicultural education and world studies and so on” (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 43). Each of these

different themes frame peace education differently by emphases and illuminate the transperformative tenets that I have deconstructed earlier. Other manifestations of such difference might capture global citizenship education and democratic citizenship education today. These paradigms are pointedly illustrative of specific *onto-epistemological* and even *onto-theological* difference(s) founding respective disciplines in academe undertaking such vital inquiry. Haavelsrud and Borrelli, building on Kenneth Boulding's pioneering work, offer a framework re-positioning violence in relation to approaches to peace wherein each approach

gives rise to different visions of society, and different issues which can be developed into an approach to peace. The first can be used for an analysis of the underlying structures which support violence, the second focuses particularly on social class as the key to violence, which the third approach sees peace as a relative concept which emerges in the course of interaction and the flow of balances and imbalances. (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 43)

Peace studies began with the consideration of the dynamic of violence within educational pedagogy and curricula examining the role of conflict in society, while the subject of violence became embedded in early discourse. The institutionalisation of this ethos began in the United States with the establishment of a bachelor's program in Peace Studies in 1948 at Manchester University offering of the first program to academically engage contested notions of human relationships, conflict, and peace.

Another four decades would pass after the founding of US peace studies before the field of peace education began serious academic inquiry into its ethical and philosophical grounds. Åke Bjerstedt, a professor of sociology in Norway,⁶⁵ undertook some of the earliest work compiling the historical narratives of peace education as it became ensconced further in academe

⁶⁵ Åke Bjerstedt served as executive secretary of the Peace Education Commission (PEC), which led to his deeper inquiry into the effect and status of the field of Peace Education. He published the first research of the field investigating the perceived foundational elements as communicated in surveys of PEC members in 1990.

within European and North American contexts during the Cold War between the United States and the then former Soviet Union. He examined the reflexivity of the field in its different approaches and understandings in his early research on peace education initially revealing a typology of ambitions whereby peace educators sought to

- give children and young people an opportunity to express their feelings;
- give knowledge of an important sector of today's reality;
- make them optimally prepared to function "peacefully" in their relations with other people, and
- make them optimally prepared to be willing and able to work for peaceful solutions and against violent solutions at all levels as future citizens. (as cited in Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 38)

This formative study focusing on PEC membership and their enactments of education for peace reflect the positivist leanings of the developing academic field in Modernist moralism. The third and fourth ambitions of respective peace educators however, open in re-conception performative possibilities in trans-formation through the aforementioned deconstructive tenets: *embracing humanitas* and *positivist socio-constructivism*. Yet I argue that making sense of the differing approaches to peace education continues to be problematic given theoretical vicissitudes across the field.

At least three typologies of peace traditions have been compiled with relation to peace education in order to make sense of the core ideas and ideals guiding missional zeal for peace in the age of the rise and decline of capitalist empire during recent centuries. One such typology frames work for peace as "religious pacifism, liberal internationalism, anti-conscriptionism, socialist war-resistance, socialist internationalism, feminist anti-militarism, radical pacifism, 'cominternationalism' and nuclear pacifism" (cited in Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 33). Such a typology can aggregate the actions of individuals and groups, yet miss or even mask individual

desire and motivational concern: a passionate radical pacifist may be greatly concerned with equanimity and anthropocentrism, eschewing violence in all forms, while still holding ethnocentric values framing and framed by specific or narrower, ontological perspectives, ignoring or remaining oblivious to the summons of the *other* in *ethicus obligatus*. Thematic bridges span the typological plane(s) of peace education and have become reflective in the subsequent modeling of the imagery of a maturing academic field.

Each of the early central tenets and themes of the field of peace education emanated from the *socio-politico-historical topos* of the early visionaries and pioneers of the field and have continued to be informed throughout the latter 20th century into the late postModern age. Therefore, designing the nomenclature of the structure of peace education is a difficult proposition considering the range of subjects, ideas, and issues connecting across difference germinating certain notion(s) of peace together from our diverse experiences as *self* and *other*. Robin J. Burns and Magnus Haavelsrud presented one of the earliest constructions of the field of peace education in the latter Cold War period framed in/by intent or motivation. It consists of three groups:

1. Those who advocate the introduction of a new subject which all students should take, and those who see the need to add a new dimension to already existing courses and disciplines[.]
2. The “globalists” on the one hand and the “regionalists” on the other, who stress the global dimension of particular processes and problems and the uniqueness of society and its culture respectively[.]
3. Those who do not link the way in which knowledge is conveyed and the effects on the learner of that knowledge, and those who emphasize the educational process with the content playing a relatively secondary role. (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 55)

While each of the respective groupings of peace educators may share some similar ethical, philosophical, pedagogical, and curricular perspectives, specific *onto-epistemological*

interpretations on and of education for peace structure the camps of each group. The discourses on educational purpose and efficacy of area and field studies within the Western academy affected the conversations in the peace education debate in the 1980s and 1990s, as an *other* “subject” area to be embedded within curriculum or offered independently. Hence, efforts to resolve the debate largely avoided deeper philosophical and educational inquiry into the founding of the disparate peace education programs masquing the quintessential question of social and philosophical foundation itself. Each of the respective debates on offer in Burns and Haavelsrud’s framing of peace education may be informed through greater connections with current debates in the educational sciences. The varying foundations of the grouped peace educators reflect

the concepts of conscientization and of participation . . . seen as important keys to the educational processes which each approach has in common, whether or not these concepts are centrally affirmed or opposed. It should also be added that *each approach has its own history in terms of its origins*, and each group of individuals or international agency brings its own interests to the subject matter and the issues it advocates most strongly. (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 55, emphasis added)

In this joining of educators within the field of peace education, the nature of rationality is posed with its link to the educational endeavour evoking Horkheimer and Adorno’s (2002) critique in the *Dialectic of Enlightenment* as consideration of the role of education in society continues to unfold. Necessarily, originary questions surface in *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* engendering anew rationality beyond the limits of epistemological linearity structuring field and discipline, posing unassailable possibility on further planes of inquiry. The role of education in society frames and structures the discourse on and between “the dialectical relationships among such issues as peace, development, human rights, the environment and so on” (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 57) linking the socio-political across phenomenological and noumenological perspectivity. In these linkages the promise of the transperformative tenets open, and in the

opening posited in/through/by the *unconditional university*, the arrival (*à venir*) of future peace education. Robin J. Burns and Robert Aspeslagh (1996) re-cog-nize and *conceive* a compilation of the structuring models of peace education challenging education and the institution of rationality itself as descriptive construct:

1. *The tolerant world*: The five educations found here are civic, moral, human rights, intercultural and peace education. Human rights and intercultural organizations predominate, and the underlying theories are largely derived from psychology.
2. *The non-violent world*: Environmental education and peace education are the major components here, but it draws from peace movements, feminist movements and the “new” education movement, with theoretical contributions from peace research, natural sciences and some psychology, sociology and anthropology.
3. *The just world*: Development education, peace education, world studies or global education, education for justice and education for liberation are central to this model, which has affiliations with Third World movements and peace movements, and draws from critical peace and development research, and from the social sciences (while being critical of paradigms within these such as modernization theory).
4. *A shared world*: This concept transforms tolerance into an active concept, based on non-sexist education, peace, development and global education, and environmental education. Its affiliations are with the movements of similar names and with solidarity groups, and draws from feminist theory in particular and from theologies and worldviews.
5. *A sustainable world*: This concept is not clearly separate from the previous one, the shared world. However, it has an added urgency and is action-oriented, drawing particularly on environmental education, radical peace and development education, and anti-discrimination educations. Natural sciences are included in its sources, suitably critiqued, and especially those with an emphasis on inter-disciplinarity so that the interactions affecting sustainability in its many facets can be explored. (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996, p. 58)

The bridging of various disciplines of the Western academy under the umbrella of respective *onto-theological* views generates a much richer discourse within the field and contributes transformative *epistémè*. These metaphysical approaches, founded on positivist and

constructivist philosophies, may facilitate deeper recognition of human social relationality, while sublimating rationality to the same. With a broader apperception of adjacent social science fields, these models may enrich the field of peace education as well as the other disciplines so engaged. Moreover, the fundamental constructions of each of the philosophical bases supporting the respective models require greater consideration and study. I argue the inter-section among these key arenas of (dis)course compels an integral approach to the respective subject matter towards a *ethico-philosophico-pedagogical* endeavour in tertiary education that be-comes the embodiment of transperformative possibility. The position of each model within the pantheon of the postModern Western academy remains problematic, given competing foundational narratives and philosophies in the respective disciplines, which I have recently addressed within the notion of the cosmopolitical and its correlation to peace and education (Wright, 2013); however, the excellent opening in the unconditional university portends deeper inquiry in/to/through *ethicus obligatus, socialis aequitas, positivist socio-constructivism, embracing humanitas, and ecological presencing* in a focus through founding philosophemes in a burgeoning field.

Deconstruction as a *post-meta-philosophical* approach to reading, inscription, and the reading of inscription re-frames the subject nature of meaning across spatio-temporal planes of *epistémè* affording another in-ter-pretation of the foundation of rationality, meaning, and subjectivity. In this strategic move, the bonds of inscription are loosed opening the processural conceptualization(s) to the *Other* in non-possession—an opening to difference that is an opening to-ward the *other* and to-ward peace anew.

Before continuing on this intriguing journey further emphasis is imperative, for I, the author, writer, and speaker acknowledge certain perspectivities herein: (a) the breadth and scope of historical indebtedness, especially within philosophy, is and must remain incomplete for I, an

individual “I,” cannot speak the *other* that enfolds notions of onto-epistemological meaning atemporally or aspatially (Derrida, 1973, 1978; Trifonas, 2002)⁶⁶; (b) conceptualizations of meaning,⁶⁷ transference,⁶⁸ and translation⁶⁹ necessarily delimit understanding with particular effect for the question of peace education with and in the situatedness of academic arenas; and (c) the limit of *langue*, and concept(s) themselves conscribe imagined boundaries, futures, and possibilities (Derrida, 1967, 1978).

Each of these perspectivities is necessarily a de/limiting factor in the conversation—particularly, within this discourse or dissertation—consequently, opening and foreclosing notions of definitive understanding on this journey. These musings on the limit of my perspective(s) in this work should only be construed as a de-descriptive lens into which we—you and I, co-constructors of meaning engage one another in the question of peace and peace education. In this reading, your reading, you too engage in authorial functions imagining and interpreting meaning (an inescapable responsibility), imputed to language and logocentric in-scription. In a text to a

⁶⁶ The incomplete nature of communication in/through/by *langue* will always remain so as communication is partial in any mode within the limit of consumption or erasure of the *other*. Derrida (1973) takes up this paradox in his groundbreaking response to Husserl in *Speech and Phenomena* re-marking the limit.

⁶⁷ I have specifically examined the question of meaning and its relation to rationality, philosophy, and education in Chapter two considering key issues of supplementarity, *trace*, invention.

⁶⁸ Transference is a complicated notion related to pedagogy and curriculum today. I am using the concept here to indicate the metacognitive perception of the individual co-learner regarding the processes of trans-mission of meaning and thereby knowledge in an engaged learning environment. For further consideration of this idea, see Vermunt (1996).

⁶⁹ The notion of translation has been troubled over recent decades as critical pedagogues have sought to confront the erasure of voice and the reduction of *other* in the trans-literative movement. This concern is paramount for our excursion into the *ethico-philosophical* and the role of Education itself with particular regard to peace and education for peace. For deeper reading and consideration see Walter Benjamin (1923/2012)—*Forschungsbericht*, “The Task of the Translator”; Roger Simon (1992)—*Teaching Against the Grain*; Mario Di Paolantonio & Roger Simon (2005)—*Re-Staging public memory in the Space of the Spectacle: The project of an historiographic poetics*; as well as Derrida (1985)—*Des Tours de Babel* and (2004) “Theology of Translation” in *Eyes of the University: Right to philosophy 2*.

friend Emmanuel Lévinas, Derrida (2007)⁷⁰ wrote “At this very moment in this work here I am” wherein the authorial functions of inscription and reading are re-written challenging “a return to the same”

but the same could just as well, already, be the other, that of the second “at this very moment,” which is—probably—the one of responsibility. It follows that the responsibility in question is not merely said, named, thematized, in one or the other occurrence of “this moment”; it [*elle*] is first of all yours, the one of reading to which “this moment” is given, confided, or delivered over. Your reading is thus no longer a simple reading that deciphers the sense of what is already found in the text; it has a limitless (ethical) initiative. It [*Elle*] obligates itself freely starting from the text of the Other, which today one might say, wrongly, it *produces* or *invents*. But that it obligates itself freely in no way signifies an auto-nomy. To be sure, you are the author of the text you read here, that can be said, but you are still in an absolute heteronomy. You are responsible for the other, who makes you responsible. *Who will have obligated you.* (p. 161, emphasis in original)

Derrida’s reading of the Lévinasian *other*, is both *another* reading from the authorial position of reader responsible to the trace of *other* in Lévinasian inscription.⁷¹ Our reading, that is your reading and my reading respectively, re-authors the subject in presence and the “subject matter”—or content/topic—as the *trace* in the aporea of metaphysical narrative even again through perceptivity as deconstructive event. A (re)imag(e)(in)ing in the aporea of the university. It is a strategic move away from closure (*clôture*) towards *another* understanding not present in the *selfsame* inscriptive act sublimating the fundamental alterity of the *other(s)*. Recall in Chapter two I explored the nature of subjectivity *itself* (a *subjectivity of subjectivity*), in relation to a subjectivity of peace, as subject/concept as a critical void often elided in academic discourse bearing particular relevance to the field of peace education. Derrida marks the moment offering

⁷⁰ Derrida’s letter to Emmanuel Lévinas represents part of the rich discourse between the two thinkers and friends in conversation with thought. The letter was originally published in 1980 in *Texts pour Emmanuel Lévinas* and subsequently translated and published in 2007.

⁷¹ The trace of *other* marked in the signature of Emmanuel Lévinas is necessarily a moment of inter-pretation for Jacques Derrida of the presence re-called and the *trace* itself.

even if you don't read *as one must* [comme il faut], as EL [Emmanuel Lévinas] says one must read, still, beyond the dominant interpretation (that of domination) that is one with the philosophy of grammar and the grammar of philosophy, the Relation of dislocation *will have taken place*, there is nothing you can do about it any longer, and without knowing it, you will have read what will have made only possible, starting from the Other, what is happening: "at this very moment." (Derrida, 2007, p. 161, emphasis in original)

The "present" act of reading subsumes difference here for Derrida in the ellipse of the infinitely un-knowable as *other* which I suggest is the movement of *other* in *self*—an avenue to-ward human social relationality or peace as re-cog-nition of difference. Here we, you and I as readers are cautioned in the instance of what can only be a mis-reading of incompleteness. Yet, such incompleteness in the moment re-positions the reader in/to responsibility to *other* re-positioning the *self*/subject towards *Other*.

My initial perspective noted above would seek to position this effort of *écriture* within the plurivocity of philosophical thought, deliberately and critically through the discourse of difference and peace. The telic coursings of philosophies in the postModern era have largely examined the experiential nature of a being in the world rather than *being-in-the-world* offering philosophemes of Utilitarianism, Positivism, Objectivism, Secular Humanism, Nihilism, and Existentialism among others. Yet another approach to thought and *being*—Phenomenology—presents in different forms as "the study of structures of consciousness as experienced in the first-person point of view" (Smith, 2011). Despite the interesting work of contemporary phenomenologists rooted in and developing out of the history of Husserlean thought, the work of Martin Heidegger, Simone de Beauvoir, Jean-Paul Sartre, and Maurice Merleau-Ponty earlier and the recent perspectives of Jürgen Habermas, Julia Kristeva, and Luce Irigaray among others make a case for immanence that ecstatically excludes the *other* that is history and particularly histories of the *other as Other*, concluding a non-condition of state or being—anathematic to

human relationship. In this Gordian knot of knowledge constructions, the connections between, among and *other-wise* are silenced, and thereby erased posing critical problems for an excursus between and on the *self* and *other*. Moreover, in the mere mention of the notion and scope of historical indebtedness, the myriad traces inflecting and informing this particular narrative as discourse is and can only be infinitely limited and a singular expression of my *being*. But *otherwise*, our responsibility to the *other(s)* envelops a challenging of foreclosed notions of *historico-narrativity* as a question of rational construction that offers plateaus of interpretation recasting *a priori* understanding and meaning unfolding other knowledges into a unique present through a sign and langue that reaches out to the *other*, tracing the concept of peace and its implicated-ness in the academic endeavour of the field.

Regarding the use, delimited understanding, and limit of langue, Derrida (1978) cautions “language bears within itself the necessity of its own critique. Now this critique may be undertaken along two paths, in two ‘manners.’ Once the limit of the nature/culture opposition makes itself felt, one might want to question systematically and rigorously the history of these concepts” (p. 284). The dual manner of this critique that opens concept *qua* concept in meanings and representations of peace simultaneously limits understanding within the constructions of langue as *trace* and application. In this pause, an instant of deconstruction, the *trace* of historical narrative(s), I have traced filters through, influencing the manner and use of language contemporaneously affecting and effecting *socio-ethno-politico-historical* interpretations and conceptualizations of peace and thereby peace education as the praxis of peace in action emanating within the institute of Rationality. Moreover, just as this occurs in the lives of individuals and cultures with regard to quotidian ideas (e.g. contemporary music tastes, fusion cuisine, modern meanings in language), the *trace* captured in historical narrative(s) regarding

fundamental notions of concepts (and therefore meaning) such as human social relationality and peace may mark the path to different understandings of possible futures constrained within respective narrative(s) or (re)imag(e)(ine)d through critical awareness of one's place, or *being-in-the-world*.

Mindful of the elemental and evolving philosophemes traced in the archive of the field of peace education in this passage in *différance* as inscription, I invite the reader to step across the metaphorical pond of a constructivist moralism predominantly founding US peace education into the post-conflict setting of Northern Ireland. In the incremental exposure of the snapshot of Northern Irish academe, Chapter four reveals deep impressionistic layers of presence, meaning, and rationality in (a) (con)text(s) of demand that may properly be considered categorically different within the parameters of proximity.

Chapter Four: A thinking through—Performative Critique

The children were experiencing violent deaths of relatives, friends. They were witnessing bombs, they were just surrounded by violence. And the particular school in which I was teaching, a number of the young men who had very poor educational prospects were being recruited directly in the Loyalist Paramilitary organisations, which gave them some kind of kudos and peer privilege I suppose.

B5—professor

Deconstruction, in questioning the ground of institutions and the reason of their institutionality, engages the real-world effects produced by the performative force of epistemological discourses and their responsibility as instances of founding and therefore of foundation.

(Trifonas, 2000a, p. 143)

Écriture as reduction and the encapsulation of meaning opens interpretation into further realms of possibility, especially verdant in the garden of deconstructive reading as writing. My purpose and intent in this chapter is to reflect through the voice of the *other* foundational bases that constitute meaning itself for the *self* as expression to and for the *other* in this narrative witnessing of the *trace of footprints in the archive*. Following Derridean deconstruction and Trifonasian performative critique, I offer a short story written in the lives of some of the faculty and graduate students at prominent sites of tertiary education in Northern Ireland and one site in the Republic of Ireland as I came to encounter them throughout the course of the academic year of 2009-2010 in an attempt to re-con-struct the archival and historico-narrativizing process encapsulating post-conflict peace education.

Chapter four will necessarily be a passage on two fronts drawn toward the iterative spiral of the *ethico-philosophical* aspiration of the field of peace education and the inter-phasic realm (read transistioning) of meaning within the Institution of Rationality. I begin the chapter introducing the performative analytical framework applied followed by an ethnographic snapshot of the institutional and social settings structuring faculty and graduate students' lives in my study as a notably brief *socio-ethno-politico-historical* sketch through a re-telling attenuating voice within cultural strains that also positions my subjectivity in the design of the research inquiry. Next, I focus on and locate the layers of meaning in the impression of the footprint as a tracing of ontico-epistemological ground and grounding traversing the inner layers of meaning conceived in ontology, theology, and epistemology and spiraling out through diverging philosophical constructions (e.g. positivist socio-constructivism, instrumental rationality) into ethical realms (re)imag(e)(in)ing new *ethico-pedagogico-curricular* approaches surfacing heterological difference. I apply deconstruction in performative critique to re-think the question of difference within education for peace in the post-conflict setting of Northern Ireland across diverse institutions of Rationality and subsequently, examine the discourse(s) of/on peace for respective *ethico-philosophical* bearing in the field as implicated within tertiary education.

My journey to Northern Ireland was born in an exploratory ontico-epistemological quest to deconstruct notions of meaning framed in the conceptualization(s) of peace within a post-conflict setting. As I have already written, the “conceptualization” of core concepts of human social relationality or peace, is at once a philosophical question bound between the constative and performative as expression and meaning. With this idea at the forefront, the *philosophico-methodological* approach I will take as an analytical framework interrogating the question of peace in education, or peace education, encapsulates the double movement of a *listening to the*

voice of the other and a *reading as writing* drawing on the Trifonasian (2000a) performative critique as an interpretative lens deconstructing the narrative of the question of pedagogy and praxis. Performative critique is

an *actively interpretative instance of the moment of reading as writing*. That is, the “formativity” of the textual production to be presented is attuned to the complexity of the *thinking-through* and *working-out*, a *thinking-working-through-out*, of the act of interpretation itself. Respecting what Derrida has called the “exigencies” of a classical protocol of reading, the modality of the writing I will use—its philosophical focus and style—integrates and establishes associative links to deconstruction to come to terms with an understanding of the significance of these texts for actualizing a positive transformation of the institution of pedagogy. It forces reflection on the objectifiable value of its own ground by enacting within the form of its structures an interpretative resistance to the decidability of meaning at the threshold of its own sense, in that, it compels “the reader”—as it does “the writer”—to push at the outer limits of subjective frames of knowledge and reference relative to conventions always already within the confinement of a normative parameter of reflexivity. The philosophico-stylistic results of the *working through* . . . must be articulated then as part of the “eccentricities” of *reading as writing* wherein the ideas drawn from these texts are turned back upon themselves and “*worked over*” within the intertextual schematism of the ideologies, norms, frames, within which the interpretative psyche operates. In the complexity of such a context, what I shall seek to show through and by example is *how the radical polemics of deconstruction has value for analyzing the ethical and political implications of pedagogical contingencies of theory and practice*. (pp. 6–7, emphasis in original)

In my examination of the *ethical and political implications* of a plurivocity of meaning contained in and containing conceptualizations of peace located in the strategically selected post-conflict setting of the Western Academy,⁷² I offer *another* interpretation for peace as idea, notion; yea, even unbounded concept informed in the contingencies of theory and practice. And in this offering, I must remain mindful of an

⁷² Approaching the question of peace in and through difference, I believe, requires entering the question in and through a plane of heterological difference founded on and founding metanarratives that are contested, thus my early selection of the setting of Northern Ireland to engage a multiplicity of questions of peace education, as later confirmed in the discourse of the interviews.

“empirical facticity”—the perlocutionary aspects of this constative discourse that are indispensable to achieving the performativity of its illocutionary presentation. Said another way, the text must needs *say what it does* and *do what it says* to counteract its “wearing off” or its “giving way” to the invasive excrescence of conditional detractors that would impinge on the residual impact of its expression. (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 101, emphasis in original)

Such a caution constitutes *another* discourse that necessarily applies to core values structuring human relationships as evidenced in the unfolding story lines below whether evidenced in pre-sence or ab-sence. The process of negotiating meaning in the voice of the *other* in the realm of peace and difference is the *thinking-working-through-out* outlined in Trifonas above. While each of these story lines independently re-present an individual *self* as *other* to the *OTHER*, woven together they present a tapestry rich in connection and meaning for our careful, or mindful consideration; still the interwoven cloth is one that may appear as merely representative of larger weavings conceived across spatio-temporalit(y)ies inflecting pneumatic strains in rationality, ontology, and *epistémè*. The nature of the interwoven storylines intersect through, in, and across innumerable *socio-politico-historico-philosophical* traces recorded in the lives of disparate peoples seeking greater meaning and purpose within the constraints of socio-geo-graphical limits. How we understand the *trace* of narrative moving over and around topological constructions of peoples, societies, cultures, and nations is key to the way or ways in which we make meaning rationalizing our individual presence/absence and auto-telic nature. The understandings we may draw from this footprint in the archive must forever remain embedded in the narratives of the respective persons sharing but the briefest snapshot of infinite complexity. Each of the stories shared through this lens in an instant is but a mere reflection of the *other* of *Other* that always escapes capture; yet in my kaleidoscopic academic inquiry, the epistemic challenge draws us—you and I—the reader/writer and the reader *as* writer, into further planes of interpretative, de-ontic (re)imag(e)ining(s) in chiasmic comm-union.

I offer a deconstructive reading as performative analysis of the discourse, or the narrative of the *other* that must fail to presume a definitive knowing, and subsequent saying that would sublimate difference, or the position of the *other* in fundamental alterity (Gilbert-Walsh, 2007). Such deconstructive analysis examines the non-coherence of the narrative offered and thus explores meanings embedded within the context of the saying in relation to temporality and spatiality and further in relation to the *atemporality* and *aspatiality* comprised in narrative. In this critical move, the radical perplexity of narrative is under review in a notion of radical wherein the presumption of coherent narrative/discourse is debunked in the moment of the question of narrative itself as a formed, coalesced, story outside the play of spatio-temporal frameworks.

The depth and richness of the archives and historico-narratives of the peoples of the Isle of Ireland (contemporarily comprised as Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland) compel such radical reading within the “canon” of Western academe, re-posit-ing a narrative of difference in *différance*, affording a telling or re-telling that must remain incomplete and inadequate as a story en-capsulating difference under any name, label, grouping, or cultural/ethnic/religious con-ception and captured in the following snapshot.

Ethnographic snapshot(s)

Numerous scholars and academics within Western academia have inquired into the convergences, as well as divergences of the histories of the peoples of the Isle of Ireland as inhabitants emigrating and immigrating, communities of being, and cultural travelers across eras of conflicting historical scriptography and have written volumes on the Northern Irish conflict as possibly the “most heavily research[ed] area on earth” (Whyte, 1990, p. *viii*)⁷³ relative to its size.

⁷³ The claim presenting the volume of academic study on the Northern Irish conflict is not without its critics, as Chris Gilligan (n.d.) draws out in “The place of Northern Ireland in Ethnic and Racial Studies in Britain: what place?” Gilligan’s claim is that the weight of academic

This fact was confirmed multiple times to me as I met with individual faculty members, administrators, and graduate students of the three prominent universities of Northern Ireland (Queen’s University Belfast; University of Ulster—Derry and Coleraine campuses, Trinity College in Belfast) and Trinity College Dublin in the Republic of Ireland during the course of a year’s field research. One particularly poignant comment reflects such worn terrain revealing sensitivity to the complexity of lives lived divided.

There’s no consensus really at all in Northern Ireland about the state of Northern Ireland before 1969. And the political parties, if they talk about it at all, (and they usually don’t,) but they just end up trading arguments that are (in some ways it’s frightening) sort of the same now as it would have been in the late 1960s about the nature of society. That makes it very difficult to get clear tramlines as to how people sort of move things. It makes attempts to sort of promote reconciliation or any sort of engagement with the past very, very difficult. [B12—professor]⁷⁴

The social, political, historical, and religious complexity of Northern Ireland as a region offers a verdant, unique setting that is simultaneously im/possibly weighted in disparate and distinct notions of human social relationality impacting both the Catholic and Protestant communities differently, effecting social consciousness. Whether the origin of the conflict is interpreted/understood/considered/pre-sented as an ethnic/cultural/(*socio-political*)/religious with/in disparate and specific meta-narratives is, largely genitive of/in difference. Another professor’s perspective recasts our concern, stating

there is certainly a feeling, I think, amongst both communities here of being relatively isolated. There used to be a saying, in a way, “Northern Protestants and Catholics know each other better than their counter parts if you like, in the other jurisdictions that they would aspire to be a part of.” So I think certainly, whatever, at the height of the violence and [during] violent times there was that sense, well, and it was also at a time, I mean, it was before the Cold War and before a lot of

research on Northern Ireland is substantive, but may not have been adequately positioned broadly enough as an area of research in the context of human agonistics, temporally or spatially. See <http://www.teachingrace.bham.ac.uk/media/document/Place-of-NI-in-ERS.pdf>.

⁷⁴ Academic perspectivity across the spectrum of temporality is particularly noteworthy given the background and influence on the political agreement structured fifteen years earlier.

other world events [such as] ending of Apartheid and all the rest of it. I think, it was also characterised as a conflict which was very idiosyncratic, almost impenetrable. It was characterised in that way and people were made to feel that they were somehow barbaric because they were . . . particularly in . . . being part of a European continent. It's very racist and pejorative to be framed in this way to sort of say well, the rest of Europe is at peace. It's come through world wars and its . . . [so,] "why are you people still fighting and using violence in this *barbaric* way?" [B2—professor]

In this telling quote the sense of isolation and ostracization of the two peoples, Protestants and Catholics, is foregrounded revealing critical markings of difference, constructed and policed carefully, particularly in periods of heightened crises (as the beginning of the Troubles in 1969 intensifying through 1976, and again in the late 1980s through 1993) often coinciding with the (commemorative) parading or marching season. This narrative evokes a larger quasi-singularized Northern Irish identity impugned even within the constative proclamation of divided communities. He continues in the interview characterising the

formative contexts that people grow up in . . . [are suggestive of, and] I would include myself in that . . . having grow[n] . . . up in that relatively segregated neighborhood but [having] had some limited contact with Catholics when I was a child but they were always antagonistic or oppositional sort of and always characterising Catholics as—objectification of them—there was no kind of humanised, maybe apart from one family that lived in the street or something like that. [B2—professor]

Such characterisation of the different peoples subject to and the subject of historical tropes as meta-narratives, would erase the difference of difference in diversity within the *self* and *other* in a process eliding fundamental alterity as posited in Lévinas and de-constructed in Derridean and Trifonasian *logos*; for it is in the very con-struction of (meta-)narrative(s) that identity becomes structured and subsequently in-scribed, *as if* from *being* itself. In these crucial con-structions re-formed and re-framed temporally and spatially, the question of difference rises to the fore as considered within the transperformative possibility presented in *embracing humanitas*. One example of the structuring of difference is observed in the words of a professor brushing the

canvas and offering an important critical awareness, “You were so constrained in terms of where you could go, in terms of what you could say, in terms of who you could speak to, in terms of safety” [B8—professor], reflecting critical meta-narratives interplaying in an iterative cycle structuring and maintaining discrimination and prejudice within and between both larger communities. The challenges of living in a divided society are further reflected in this more lengthy communication bringing out the flavour of hardship felt, the *othering* enacted in normativity and its received impact.

I suppose my experience was growing up in a family where there were members of . . . [the] family [who] were in the police and army. And where we were . . . well, we did experience loss in terms of the conflict and where as a student . . . and growing up in Northern Ireland just the context that we had here as a teenager we didn't understand it—it was our normal. So we didn't understand it as being a kind of anything abnormal, it was normal for us—the conflict. You were so constrained in terms of where you could go, in terms of what you could say, in terms of who you could speak to, in terms of safety, in terms of even going into the City Centre on a Saturday to shop where you were searched going into every shop—your life was just very, very constrained. And then . . . you know, I lived in an area where there were quite a number of paramilitaries as well [and was] from a working class background as well.

To come out of that and into university and to meet with people from the other community and to understand they weren't as . . . they weren't the people that I was . . . not [that] my family wouldn't have been prejudiced against Catholics but the community that I grew up in would have been afraid of them. So to come into the university context and to find that actually they were alright and that they were pretty much like the rest of us. And that they did have different political views and perspectives, I suppose was hugely important just in terms of my own development and my own views and the kind of motivation to work towards . . . where I can make any kind of small contribution to better understanding this conflict and what makes people tick in it. And how in understanding that how we can start to build mechanisms for ameliorating prejudice and negative social attitudes that's kind of been a driver. [B8—professor]

As reader, author, and reader as writer, I submit for your careful consideration, whose narrative serves a critical, pre-sent understanding as inflected within an *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* valuing *presence*? How can such judgments be considered, openly and honestly in an embracing

of humanity in presence? What are the risks in this pursuit for the *self* and *other* on varied planes of rationality, interpretation, understanding, meaning? In what ways do these probing thoughts inform our consideration of the questions of difference and peace, at this juncture, at a moment of/in future(s)? Let us continue bearing/baring these queries within the (con)text(s) of Northern Ireland.

The Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report of 2012 (Nolan, 2012, 2013) acknowledges many of the different meta-narratives constructing *onto-epistemologies* in play within the larger academic inquiry. Notions of (conflict) origin are not resolved with strong political interests influencing the discourse, (i.e. the Troubles began with civil rights marches against inequality (1960s), or the with the plantations (1600s), or Easter Uprising (1916)). The subsequent radicalisation of the Catholic population was accompanied by a belief held by some that equality could only be obtained in a united Ireland;⁷⁵ a strong position held that suggests the basis of the conflict is one of struggle for *self*-determination of governance, or *another* “demo(s)”cracy. Despite the multiple narratives dis-covered or read, collaborative engagements across communities continue in an effort to make sense of the Troubles in Northern Ireland both during the conflict and more recently in 1998 following the Good Friday Agreement/Belfast Agreement (GFA/BA), potentially evolving in/through an arriving *positivist socio-constructivism* opening futures of possibility for the respective peoples of the region. Often such collaboration between academe and journalism has been revealing and even shocking.

David McKittrick (2000), noted Northern Ireland journalist, authored a definitive volume, *Making Sense of the Troubles* carefully examining the intersections of history of the disparate peoples astutely remarks on the Troubles saying “the heart of the Northern Ireland

⁷⁵ Different framings of the conflict often elide *other* narratives that find or establish different historical traces. (See http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/events/peace/docs/nipmr_2012-02.pdf).

problem lies in this clash between two competing national aspirations” (McKittrick, 2000, p. 2), weighted in issues of territory, power, and justice. In McKittrick’s careful examination we witness the delicate balancing of narrative and meaning as *trace* where

the two communities, especially in the north-east, continued down through the years to regard themselves as largely separate entities. The Protestant settler community enjoyed political and economic ascendancy. The communities were differentiated primarily on the basis of conflicting national identities, but the various other important points of difference kept communal divisions fresh and potent. (pp. 2–3)

With the shifting engagement of the British government over centuries in the territories of the Isle of Ireland and following a war for independence, the Irish Free State was created by treaty in 1921.⁷⁶ As we read in the previous footnote, the mis-use of power directly impacted the

⁷⁶ Volume upon volume inscribes the history of the ages (of peoples of the Isle) differently with specific germinal antecedents founding identity and purpose. For a brief encapsulation of the history see Chapter one of McKittrick’s (2000), *Making Sense of the Troubles*. He describes a metaphorical heating of the cauldron in the new state of “Northern Ireland . . . born of violence. From the first months of its existence there were occasional IRA [Irish Republican Army] raids from across the new border as well as major outbreaks of sectarian violence, especially in Belfast. In the two years from June 1920 until June 1922, 428 people were killed, two-thirds of them Catholic, fourteen people dying in one weekend. The communal violence in Belfast, which was on a scale and ferocity not equaled until August 1969, left a deep and bitter imprint on many in both communities.

“The creation of Northern Ireland did not bring security for the Protestants despite their comfortable majority, for it was clear that London was never as committed to the Union as they were. They lived in a state of political nervousness, constantly fearing British policy might move to support a united Ireland. They also remained deeply suspicious of the half-million Catholics who found themselves within the boundaries of the new Northern Ireland.

“Those Catholics considered themselves trapped in this new state, denied their Irish identity, cut off from their co-religionists in the Free State and politically powerless. To this was quickly added another complaint: that the Unionist establishment, which was to run the state on the basis of Protestant majority rule for the following half-century, actively discriminated against Catholics in the allocation of jobs and housing, over political rights and in other areas” (p. 4-5).

With the viability of the new state in question, the interests of Protestants and Catholics were simultaneously divergent and connected, largely without the support of Westminster (p. 6) as tensions mounted and moral inclusion markedly proscribed in worldview. McKittrick captures the static society stating,

“[the] system survived for so long because of Unionism’s monolithic strength, aided by divisions within nationalism and by Westminster indifference. It turned out not to be a fair

lives of most peoples of Northern Ireland with particular devastating effect for Catholic communities through gerrymandering and other political ploys structuring “citizenship” after partition and thereby livelihood. In this moment of history, obligation due the *other* was confined in affiliative relations. McKittrick chronicles the institution of the Orange Order dating back to 1795 and its increasing oppression of the *other* as perceived existential threat.⁷⁷ Catholics were isolated and “clearly regarded [along with nationalists] as second-class citizens, as intrinsically dangerous to the state, and as being less deserving of houses and jobs than their Protestant neighbours,” (McKittrick, 2000, p. 16) in exclusionary *polis*—an effective “institutionalized partiality” (p. 17), encoding dis-enfranchisement, limiting (ethical) obligation to the *other*, and ensuring a vital response by a structured, exposed minority. Institutionalised segregation became entrenched in governance at Stormont ensuring

such patterns would continue. The two communities mixed in some fields, but in their housing, education, and very often in their employment they kept apart. The

arrangement, but in London’s terms it worked, and a potentially vexatious state remained reasonably quiet.

“The collective self-image of Unionists today is not far removed from that of their ancestors as they arrived in Ireland, or from that of the founding fathers of Northern Ireland [British settlers sent to establish a bulwark against Spanish aggression in the 17th century]. They saw themselves as a frontier community facing wily and violent enemies, and backed by only half-hearted friends. Unionists were for the most part an inward-looking people, conservative, cautious and suspicious of change. In this they followed the model of their forebears who, moving from England and Scotland and given territory in a hostile land, developed a defensive attitude evident in the later Unionist slogans of ‘No Surrender’ and ‘What we have we hold’ and ‘Not an inch’. Socially Unionists could be warm-hearted and tremendously hospitable: politically they were fated to be eternally on the defensive.

“The government system put in place in the 1920s is one of the keys to explaining the later troubles, since there was such extraordinary continuity in its workings over the decades, and since the outbreak of the troubles was so directly related to it. The Catholic civil rights movement would take to the streets in 1968 with complaints which related directly to the arrangements of the 1920s. (McKittrick, 2000, pp. 6–7)

⁷⁷ The Orange Order is “a Protestant organisation viewed by Catholics as bigoted and anti-Catholic but regarded by most Protestants as an important guardian of their heritage” (McKittrick, 2000, p. 13). As such, the Order has served as a sign of connection and separation in the context of struggle.

situation was summed up in 1971 by a Catholic observer who said: “If there is one thing which I have learned in my 30–40 odd years as a community social worker it is this: that, broadly speaking, two communities have lived side by side in Northern Ireland without really knowing each other, or without making any real honest, sincere and conscious effort to bridge the communications gap.” (McKittrick, 2000, p. 18)

Catholic disenfranchisement extended beyond the ballot to all manner of daily life. Sinn Féin served as a weak voice for the Catholic community in attempts to seek redress before the civil rights efforts mounted in the late 1960s, but would gain prominence later in the 1980s in a politics of defiance. The rising militant wing of Sinn Féin, the IRA—Irish Republican Army—would fight for “the people” but were not largely supported given “the judgment of the Catholic population as a whole that [the IRA’s] . . . violence was futile. Although most Catholics held the aspiration to one day see a united Ireland, this did not extend to enthusiasm for the bomb and the bullet” (p. 19). However, these sentiments did not dissuade many individuals who would become involved with paramilitaries on both sides to struggle for rights, heritage, truth, difference, and justice; a justice that seemed unattainable amidst years of ensuing violence.

Levels of violence waxed and waned during the thirty-year “civil” war taking the lives of nearly thirty-six hundred people (portrayed as primarily “combatants”—men). While the tensions have markedly decreased between the communities following the GFA/BA, there have been significant flare-ups in violence during the summer marching season as noted, largely due to dissident activity. A welcomed, but somewhat cold truce was drawn in the GFA/BA that established a consociational structure—divided government—largely matching the societal division but ensuring greater equality and access to livelihood and culture through a stated respect for the *other* embodied through agreement.⁷⁸ The agreement, forged in the crucible of

⁷⁸ The Good Friday Agreement/Belfast Agreement may be accessed online at <http://www.nio.gov.uk/agreement.pdf>. “Citizenship” and birthright were in-scribed in the

violence and the existential desire for a future where a “culture of tolerance” would be developed was fashioned in labour and negotiation between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of Ireland with decisive support from the *other* outside.

The European Union Peace Programme along with Great Britain, the International Fund for Ireland, and the Irish Government contributed substantial resources over the past couple of decades, enabling the Peace Processes—a resolving of the persistent socio-ethno-politico-religious conflict embroiling the lives and communities of Northern Ireland as a moving-forward-towards-peace through political will and many funding schemes including the later Peace funding tranche closing in 2013.⁷⁹ President Clinton, a strong advocate for peace in Northern Ireland invested political capital in the Peace Process of the 1990s with significant impact as perceptively noted,

I think the other thing that happened was that because of the involvement of so many international actors, in which the Clinton Administration took on a big interest also changed people’s perception that, well the world is interested in what’s happening here. Whether people felt that the United States was only going to engage in the interests of the Nationalist’s communities, what would be the most . . . and there was a lot of that from the Protestant community, [which meant] that you’re [the United States was] not a credible broker because of their leanings would be towards the Nationalist community. But I think the Clinton Administration’s work overcame some of that, won over, if you like. I suppose

GFA/BA, “The two Governments recognise the birthright of all the people of Northern Ireland to identify themselves and be accepted as Irish or British, or both, as they may so choose, and accordingly confirm that their right to hold both British and Irish citizenship is accepted by both Governments and would not be affected by any future change in the status of Northern Ireland” (Article 1, p. *vi*).

⁷⁹ For greater details on the aggregate contributions exceeding nearly £2.5 billion pounds (UK) made during the Peace Process of the 1990s and the years of transition following the agreement see the Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report online, specifically charts 179 and 180 (Nolan, 2012, pp. 173-174) available at http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/events/peace/docs/nipmr_2012-02.pdf. Also see Byrne, Standish, Arnold, Fissuh, & Irwin (2009) and Byrne, Fissuh, Thiessen, Irvin, & Tennent (2010) for further analysis of the breadth of economic aid supporting sustainable peacebuilding in Northern Ireland.

the main thing that I'm saying is that the involvement of international attention and European as well through peace funding and other things, suddenly made people realise that they weren't being left on their own. Also that there was addressed in this (and it wasn't so idiosyncratic either I think [it] allowed people to begin to realise . . . I think also if I'm being asked, that there was a bit of, just simple "vanity" or something. The fact that the world attention is on such a small place with a conflict played to people's need for attention or something. [B2—professor]

The process of internationalizing the conflict in Northern Ireland repositioned both the communities of the region and larger world in consideration of an obligation to the *other* that would slowly pursue *ethicus obligatus* and a significant stride towards *socialis aequitas*. The EU, the US, and other Commonwealth nations including Canada and Australia made significant commitments to the peoples of Northern Ireland creating a plane, negotiating difference for possible understanding and resolution of the Troubles as observed.⁸⁰

The support of the European Commission, the European Union, and the United States in particular, [with] Bill Clinton[’s leadership] was very important at different points. There was money put in from Canada, New Zealand, Australia. All of that was the internationalization of the problem was crucial to solving it because it took people away from the sort of fixed lines of conflict, which had been there for the previous twenty years. So *external intervention, external involvement was absolutely essential in sort of broadening the repertoire of the possible*. That was really important. I think there was a mistake made, but it was a mistake made not just in Northern Ireland, it was made in other, most notably in Bosnia, where the priority was to stop the violence in the hope that if you stopped the violence, the rest would sort itself out. But what was done in Northern Ireland and what was done in Bosnia to stop the violence was essentially to reward the ethnic champions. [B12—professor, emphasis added]

⁸⁰ While these commitments should not be interpreted as merely trying to “solve” the problem of conflict for (an)*other* people(s), the nearly £2.5 billion dedicated and given to Northern Ireland over the last two decades supported a deeper resolve of the peoples of the region to move into a better future for both communities. (Extensive details on the changes in attitudes and vision are demonstrated in the 2012 Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report (Nolan, 2012) online http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/events/peace/docs/nipmr_2012-02.pdf with a followup report Nolan (2013) available online at http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/events/peace/docs/nipmr_2013-04_full.pdf).

Internationalization of the problem required a deeper understanding of the humanity of the *other*, poignantly captured in the comparative description notioning a movement in perspicuity—an *embracing humanitas*, in a consideration of the needs of the respective communities towards a cross-communal solution, which would be worked out in the latter stages of the Peace Processes to become known as the Good Friday Agreement or Belfast Agreement as a move to-wards (im)possibility. The GFA/BA gave a renewed emphasis to the larger peace process in Northern Ireland while continuing to build on earlier approaches to cross-communal peace. Various collaborative approaches to conflict resolution at the societal level and even early reconciliation across communities had been developed and implemented (e.g. Good Relations, Education for Mutual Understanding, and Shared Future)⁸¹ with a modicum of success in different locations of the region which may be seen as integral to the Peace Processes; however, the complex nature of the conflict, as it is constructed continues to drive the receptivity of the individual programmes since the agreement while constraining *socialis aequitas* for both communities. But the desire to address the question of how to implement policy and foster a shared community was fraught with the weight of history and an apperception of needs, soon to be trapped across the political stalemate as witnessed in the eyes of one Northern Irish professor adducing

⁸¹ Efforts to engender good relations have existed over time with a renewed interest during the Peace Processes of the 1990s into the present. The Good Relations programme was a precursor to the second attempt to facilitate better cross-community relations—Education for Mutual Understanding (EMU)—which was legislated in 1989 and implemented during the initial statutory years (1992–95). EMU was an attempt through cross-curricular themes to create the possibility that students may “learn to respect and value themselves and others; to appreciate the interdependence of people within society; to know about and understand what is shared as well as what is different about their cultural traditions; and to appreciate how conflict may be handled in non-violent ways (NICC [Northern Ireland Curriculum Council], 1990)” (Smith, 1994). The third approach towards a better possible future was called Shared Future and was developed and implemented in 2005. The Shared Future Programme’s success is limited at best (see Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report, 2012 and 2013) and the enactment of a new programme, Together: Building a United Community recently commenced in May 2013.

there was a debate around these sorts of issues about ten years ago now when the Community Relations policy was reviewed and on the whole what eventually emerged was the notion of a Shared Future, which was very direct and sort of explicit about this notion of building a more interconnected society. And I think there's plenty of empirical evidence from other places that this sort of thing is a route to the future. But as soon as this sort of politics re-intervened, local politics re-intervened, Sinn Fein and the DUP became the dominant parties. They indulged in some rhetoric around some of these issues, but they appeared to me not to have any interest in a shared future and that sort of sense. Duncan Morrow describes as them actually wanting a shared-out future—DUP have their bits and Sinn Fein have their bits—and politics is actually about the two of them sort of trying to bounce each other or block each other in different things rather than actually moving anything forward. So what we have at the moment is that sectarianism isn't being addressed. We have ethnically-led politics. The political system to me appears dysfunctional. And so at the moment, sort of parts of my work in education and at the NGO level, the goal is to try and do something to change politics. [B12—professor]

Each of these approaches begins with a positivist notion to engender improved cross-community relations in attempts to uncover some of the layers of sectarianism perpetuating a dysfunctional politics freighted in history. We would be well re-minded as framed in McKittrick's (2000) "prologue" or perspective, (con)text-ualising the weight of the past in a new subjectivity, bearing on the future where

[t]he very real sense is that the worst of the troubles is over and that Northern Ireland is moving slowly but inexorably towards a more peaceful time. The feeling in almost every quarter is that violence will never again approach the levels of the 1970s or even those of the 1990s. Yet the fact that so many sharp political divisions remain and that while they persist the major paramilitary groups are unlikely to disband, means it will be many years before the troubles can be confidently declared to be over.

It is obvious enough that they had their roots centuries earlier, stretching back at least to the plantations and the patterns established then. (p. 230)⁸²

⁸² The enfoldment of the *socio-political* within the *historico-narrative* is intimately embedded within identity, purpose, and *being*, for many of the peoples of Northern Ireland as noted in McKittrick (2000), "[t]he Protestants of Northern Ireland have long been pilloried for their siege mentality, their resistance to change and for what their critics characterise as an unsavoury mixture of reactionary instincts and religious bigotry. The British encouraged them to move to Ireland essentially as a garrison community for Britain's own defensive purposes. Those

In this continual reification of difference as difference marked in an excluded *other*, the Northern Irish were emboldened and defined in in/calculable difference masquing the diversity of *other-in-being* presenting an *embracing humanitas*, but further questions arise in de-constructive re-readings of these discourses to which I shall turn in the final chapter.

The complexity and historical weight borne of this marking is poignantly captured in a presentation by Alan Smith, the UNESCO Chair of the School of Education on the Coleraine campus of the University of Ulster, presented to the American Education Research Association conference held in Montreal in April 1999. Smith (1999) concisely frames the interwoven narratives of the *socio-ethno-politico-religio-historical* conflict stating

there have always been competing arguments about the underlying roots and nature of the conflict in Northern Ireland. The different political aspirations of Nationalists and Unionists are undoubtedly central to the conflict, but these map closely on to the labels of Catholic and Protestant which are often used to suggest that it is a religious dispute and this has led some to concentrate on the contribution which the churches might make toward a resolution of the conflict. Others have interpreted the Catholic and Protestant labels as indicative of two groups which differ in terms of culture and traditions and this emphasizes an ethnic interpretation. Social differentiation, areas of deprivation and differentials in employment opportunity add an economic dimension and there are many who believe that if solutions in these areas could be found then conflict along the other fault lines would be ameliorated. The conflict in Northern Ireland is therefore a complex mixture of such interrelated issues. (n.p.)

The competing arguments traced in narrative are both the source and promulgation of the different political aspirations held in an instance of reserve or *ethicus obligatus* in limit. Smith (2003) goes on to say in a later article, *Citizenship Education in Northern Ireland: beyond national identity?* that the GFA/BA served to help create a possibility through curriculum in a commitment to democratic politics honouring difference. The curriculum established by the

settlers were bound to develop a siege mentality given that they experienced actual sieges, most famously Londonderry in 1689. The settlers valued the British connection, and their differences with the Catholic Irish were continuously sharpened by the fact that the two sides competed for territory and power, setting patterns which endured through the generations” (pp. 230–231).

Northern Ireland Curriculum Council (NICC) empowered in the Agreement, would enable access, support (funding/governmental/administrative), guidance, and constituent cross-community involvement for the region. Smith notes

despite these worthy aims, it is widely accepted that the educational themes have had limited impact for a number of reasons. The cross curricular model, whereby the aims of the themes are meant to infuse other subject areas, has had limited impact in practice. There is a tendency to avoid more controversial issues related to sectarianism and violence. Teachers lack adequate training and professional development and in many cases there is a lack of institutional ownership and commitment which has resulted in many schools adopting a “minimalist” approach (cited in Smith, 2003, p. 24).

A deconstructive reading of the Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report 2012 (Nolan, 2012), reflects some improvement in the Education sector regarding the aims of the GFA/BA for expanding integrated education for Northern Irish pupils nearly a decade on from Smith’s earlier evaluation. In his challenging critique of a proposal of educating for citizenship, the scope of diversity as difference contested in Northern Irish meta-narratives reflects a dystopic unitary nature of citizenship “although ethnicity is commonly cited as a major cause of conflict” (p. 24), while academics and analysts invert the causal chain citing the mobilisation and politicisation of ethnicity (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000). As Smith contests the conceptualisation of citizenship itself proffering a *positivist socio-constructivist* approach, we, you and I, the reader, and author (and reader as author) may heed his cautionary reading where identity by affiliation as Irish/British/Northern Irish is marked within *self AND other*.

Since there is no consensus on nationality in Northern Ireland, or indeed the legitimacy of the state itself, this means that the concept of citizenship must be regarded as problematic and contested from the outset. Any civic or citizenship education curriculum must go beyond simple “patriotic” models, defined solely in terms of national identity and requiring uncritical loyalty to the nation state. But what alternative concept of citizenship might be viable in a deeply divided society such as Northern Ireland? (Smith, 2003, p. 24)

Provocatively, one response might be that citizenship can and only will exist at the moment of a transcendence of cultural/ethnic “desire” for sovereignty to a valuing of difference as difference in *ethicus obligatus* engendering an *embracing humanitas*. But will this suffice? Can it suffice? How is desire constructed within the rubric of sovereignty, identity, and being? What further questions need be considered in regards to difference and subjectivity weighing the “two nationalisms” and their “deep roots” (Smith, 2003, p. 25)? How can two peoples living lives divided, respect their respective socio-political heritages and begin to honour, in open embrace the *other* in humanity? Citizenship as belonging and social group identity must then confront, “moderate, transcend or displace identity politics and concepts of nationality” (p. 30) engaging (im)possibility in *positivist socio-constructivism* in order to read and think through a past of division and isolation as will be shared in the discourse of other collaborators (interviewees) in the remainder of this chapter.

An infinite, immanent *other* haunts epistemological grounding in conception, design, and implementation of programs seeking to bridge the fortified divide of two societies living separately together. Duncan Morrow, the past chief executive of the Community Relations Council in Northern Ireland from 2002-2011, has interpreted this fundamental challenge facing Northern Ireland as a question of justice, of difference. In a key lecture at the inaugural conference of the Centre for Research in Political Psychology, held at Queen’s University Belfast on 14th–16th April 2010, Morrow makes the case for re-framing academic imagination around contested *socio-ethno-politico-historical* narratives re-coding justice. The mission of the Community Relations Council is “Promoting a peaceful and fair society based on reconciliation and mutual trust” seeking to transform two separate societies divided into a nation built on a

Shared Future. Morrow's lecture offered keen insight into the coding of peace as "justice" within the climate of post-conflict Northern Ireland claiming

violence constitutes the shared experience of the community and we have our identity in our victims and in those who defend us. History becomes a story of "what they did to us and what we had to do to resist." And memory is constructed under those conditions, so the informal notions of what is known as reality—the sense making process—is the sense making process from within that story. And its under conditions of antagonism and it becomes inevitably shaped as a story of *us* and *them*. So everything is shaped in antagonism and asymmetry, with words which take on a generic consent and form and other things.

Justice, what's justice mean? Justice depends on where you're sitting here. Justice means they stop discriminating against me. Justice means they stop threatening to kill me. Which side are you on? (Morrow, 2010, lecture notes)

Justice, in Morrow's wisdom, "is the ability of my community to define the future of my oppressor. Justice is victory as defined by my community" (Morrow, 2010, lecture notes). Social justice then, bound in metaphysical limit sublates the *other* whose future I pre-scribe, whereas *socialis aequitas enfolding non-violence* re-marks subjectivity in the present in the opening of the question of the *other*, transforming discourse. Hence, the opening constructed in *onto-theo-teleology* resides on an illusionary plane awaiting trans-per-formative shift upon further planes of difference in/through *peace education-to-come*. The underlying essentialism of pre-scriptive justice manifests identity and a rationale for the disparate communities as captured in the lengthy footnote below.⁸³ Morrow captures the agonism and antipathy embedded in *socio-ethno-politico-*

⁸³ Morrow's (2010) profound insight into the power of meta-narrative construction in the Northern Irish (con)text is telling as seen in this longer transcription of my recording and lecture notes.

"'We will give you your rights when we can trust you.' That's essentially a Loyalist common sense [idea]. Common sense from a resistant point of view is always, 'until we get our rights there's no way.' And it is a zero-sum game. Essentially the dynamics of politics is to create two communities, two groups of people in which there is an internal dialogue. [But a] struggle for authority, legitimacy, and power [exists]; and so, the centrality of antagonism, underpinned by violence [is evidenced in a] circular polarity :: them and us.

“The dominant group sees a necessity to strategic inequality, because to be equal would be to be equal with people who’s ultimate purpose is to destroy you; and therefore, the common sense of inequality in ethnic frontiers needs to be understood as a dynamic that emerged out of sense that we cannot afford to be equal because if we are equal, they will destroy us. The dynamic which is understood from the Catholic Nationalist population, as a history of systemic discrimination, looks like a history of discrimination which was a necessity in order to ensure that we’re not politically and culturally destroyed.

“The reality of that is that the law then starts to enforce, to reinforce those decisions around strategic inequality and the law itself is no longer [valid] . . . the law itself belongs to one side of that process. It creates what’s called a hierarchy of victims, those people who deserve to die, or unfortunately had to die in order to protect the greater good. And those people who didn’t . . . people who were innocent victims, we understand to have been simply attacked for no other reason to create a sense of distinction.

“Here’s the biggest problem, justice in this context, how this justice looks like may mean making a deal with the people who have systematically destroyed me over the years or who sought to destroy me. The only justice in this situation as they can see—justice is victory. And therefore peace which is not the same as victory is potentially attackable as an unjust circumstance. Everybody seeking to make peace on any other basis other than victory is essentially a betrayer and sellout. And that allegation can be made against anybody who tries to make a gesture, which is essentially anything other than victory. So it puts people who are trying to find compromise or accommodation into a position of always looking like the compromise you are trying to make it’s with people who are essentially unjust and don’t have a cause, don’t have a reason. The consequence of all this inside Northern Ireland is that when antagonism, not citizenship is the dominant experience of life, then suspicion and fear are not simply a bit practical, they are not irrational. It is the old saying “just cause you’re paranoid doesn’t mean they aren’t out to get you.” The bottom line is they are not trying to stab you in the back, they might stab you in the front. It’s not that we think they are going to kill us, they are going to kill us, they tell us . . . they are going to destroy at least our culture. That’s on all sides.

“In particular, by political preferences, Northern Ireland became normal [or normalised], it is assumed that you have to take this into account even when there isn’t an active dynamic in the public space. You still have to take . . . [this] into account, which trust me, you won’t think so. And that, is what is passed intergenerationally. It’s what counts as common sense.

“Violence constitutes the shared experience of the community and we have our identity in our victims and in those who defend us. History becomes a story of “what they did to us and what we had to do to resist.” And memory is constructed under those conditions, so the informal notions of what is know as reality—the sense making process—is the sense making process from within that story. And its under conditions of antagonism and it becomes inevitably shaped as a story of *us* and *them*. So everything is shaped in antagonism and asymmetry, with words which take on a generic consent and form and other things.

historical narrativities tracing putative response and responsibility as a path through, through historical narrativities imagined.

Conflicting metanarratives, or socio-ethno-politico-histories derivative of unique *onto-theo-teleologies* reify history as difference inflecting continual pneumatic strains since the culminating event of the peace processes, the GFA/BA into the present. Yet a (re)imag(e)(in)ing through *ethicus obligatus* and considered commitment to non-violence in *socialis aequitus* reframes the question of law (*droit*) in justice as previously manifest on planes of contested presence. Unilateral or imposed resolution becomes symptomatology in invention codifying obligation in limit. Yet the invention of the *other*, latent in *onto-theology* preorders justice resounding in fundamental chords of a resonant refrain, since

if you come from a Free Presbyterian background, if you come from a fundamentalist religious background, then that's not necessarily the way that you've been brought up. You've been brought up with fixed views, and build a corral around those views. . . . I think this is when the emotion kicks in, when somebody triggers [difficult conversations or discourses like] Creationism or whatever. It's not about . . . yeah, I can reason about whatever, [such as the] causes of the first World War [etc.] [B1—professor]

I'm not saying . . . [Protestants and Catholics] are fighting a holy war or anything. It's not that. What I'm saying is that their formative influences have been of that kind of culture almost, or tradition or way of thinking [an] interpretation of values [such that] its more Old Testament—eye for an eye, tooth for tooth. It's about, you know; it's not about fudging an apology. It's about if you're admitting . . . it's

“Justice, what's justice mean? Justice depends on where you're sitting here. Justice means they stop discriminating against me. Justice means they stop threatening to kill me. Which side are you on?

“Freedom. What's freedom? Freedom means we get liberated from this imperial yoke. Freedom means, actually and at last it has to be democracy, it means majority. What's majority?

“All of these words essentially disintegrate and paradoxically, every aspect of the war, conflict, Troubles, whatever you want to call it, in this place Ireland, Northern Ireland, North of Ireland . . . has essentially [must concern] justice, freedom, and democracy. (Morrow, 2010, lecture notes)

about the admission of your sins; there's a born-again dimension. Which is why people I think like (name removed) for example, who kind of represents the mindset for me would . . . still have a lot of difficulty about being in government with Sinn Fein because until they acknowledge and say what they did was wrong, not that they regret it's consequences . . . maybe he does want them to use the sorry word. I don't know whether that it's more that they admit that what they did was sinful and wrong. So it's that mentality [which] is really what I'm saying feeding into that. And I think you have to contrast that then with a kind of Catholic culture which is kind of a little more conservative, communitarian, probably more tolerant of ambiguity, you know, transgression—what people do if they do—their sins can always be forgiven.

I think there's something there about those two discourses, which goes deeply back into the past because of the segregation that we've had there's been very little interaction and engagement between those kinds of mindsets and ways of thinking about the world. I think that's one thing that kind of runs through the society and I suppose it's most visible perhaps in our elected politicians, you know. [B2—professor]

Coding of meta-narratives through *onto-theo-teleology* in stains of eschatology serves to reinforce social group narratives and identity with direct impact for the *other* as *Other* re-presented in the community of exclusion. In an ellipsis of rationality, suspicion and fear (human security and world order concerns) serve to delimit moral responsibility and ethical obligation within socio-ethno-politically justified barricades. These *meta-narratives* both structure and maintain community in the referent with *socio-political* histories marking difference beyond the limit of possibility, while precluding the interiority of difference, as subjectivity, presencing in the *self* as *other* (within). One particular coding of such *meta-narrative* is evidenced in discourse on the Shankill bombing reflected in the two communities impacted given the contentious issue of victim(s)/survivor(s):

You were talking about Milltown [cemetery, where] you could stand in the Republican plot in Milltown at the grave of Thomas Begley, the guy who was involved in the Shankill Bomb and you can get in a car and in ten minutes you can be at a memorial of the people who were killed in the Shankill Bomb. And the two communities, the people that died from [the bombing] and [the community] that he came from are indistinguishable and that's the sort of thing that people should be talking about. This happened . . . *communities that have shared many . .*

. *social and other circumstances and were very close to one another geographically*, but were 100 miles apart politically and psychologically because of all these sorts of, sometimes physical boundaries, sometimes mental boundaries that we put between ourselves. If we can start to kind of break through some of these we can, maybe try to make sure that nothing like that ever happens again. [B12—professor, emphasis added]

Boundaries are coded in difference, as difference, which is most notably the case for the Northern Irish of all communities sustained in exclusion by/through/in essentialism evidenced in deconstructive readings of the aggregated research on the *Troubles*. The untroubled reception of the common, as community may be too easily mis-read outside of the (con)text of lives lived divided in *socio-politico-psychological* terrain.

Indeed it was due in part to external attention given to the *Troubles* that manifest a “resolution” for the respective, segregated Catholic and Protestant communities following the accord in 1998. Consequently, extensive volumes and data resources have been accumulated through the work of many people and made available through the Conflict Archive on the INternet (CAIN) and Access Research Knowledge (ARK), both housed and maintained through International Conflict Research Institute (INCORE) in association with the University of Ulster in Derry~Londonderry.⁸⁴ These repositories are replete with extensive scholarly and journalistic articles as well as archives of imagery and years of administrative and different governmental reports detailing the events, analyses, governance, and extensive struggle for life (and its irrecoverable loss) over the course of the years with a significant focus on the nearly thirty year

⁸⁴ Conflict Archive on the INternet (CAIN), as an academic and historical resource comprises information on the *Troubles* and politics in Northern Ireland and is located at URL <http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/index.html> as part of Access Research Knowledge (ARK) on social and political issues of Northern Ireland and located at URL <http://www.incore.ulst.ac.uk/about/specialist/ark.html>. The International Conflict Research Institute (INCORE) houses both web based resources offering key insights into many internecine conflicts around our world with a particular focus on international excellence in the study of peace and conflict. INCORE’s webpresence is <http://www.incore.ulst.ac.uk/>.

period of the *Troubles*. University libraries, primarily including the University of Ulster—Derry~Londonderry and Queen’s University Belfast as well as the Belfast Linen Hall library⁸⁵ house exclusive archives and volume upon volume of scholarly analysis and thinking on the conflict and the impact of and on the respective internal and external parties contributing to the Peace Processes of the 1990s which lead to the contentious agreement of 1998.

Spatio-temporality and the course of history

The struggle over *socio-ethno-politico-historical* narratives continues to inflect difference differently in Northern Ireland as whose history is history? A history informed through familial, communal, cultural, and/or societal narrative(s) in one perspective or *another’s*. Whose history matters when considering the story or re-telling of the story of Northern Ireland? The *Troubles*? In Northern Ireland difference is difference in the ascription of *another* label marking the *other* in a terrain of heterologies of homological identity rooted in existential *trace*. One manifestation of this divide is marked poignantly in aspiration:

[what] politics should be about is to try and encourage all these connections to happen. Politicians if they were really pushing these sorts of issues would be making the connections. There’s good work done in Education. There’s good work done in Social Services. Poverty doesn’t help in these sorts of issues at all. There’s a whole series of things like that we could as a society to try to, I mean, the main challenge for me and the main failure of politics here is, and it relates exactly to this notion of sectarian silos, is that we have, absolutely no concept of sort of the notion of the Common Good. We don’t have any set of arguments, or discourses, or assumptions around a sense of the Common Good. [B12—professor]

This isolation within “sectarian silos” reifies difference as de facto segregation transducing the meta-phorical divide of the phenomenal (in)to the noumenal denying greater possibilities of the

⁸⁵ The Belfast Linen Hall library holds more than 250,000 items in the Northern Ireland Political Collection, listed as the definitive archive of the recent *Troubles*. See <http://www.linenhall.com/> for further details and inquiry.

common—or common good—as institutional commitments to openly address difference in Northern Ireland face the limit of subjectivity (with)in. Disparate *meta-narratives* serving each of the grouped, though not homogenous communities of the nationalist, republican, Catholic peoples; and the Protestant, unionist, loyalist peoples nurtured in the deep roots of historical *trace* serve to mediate any larger institutional cross-commitments, or unfolding of *ethicus obligatus*. The very approach to education is a crucially important political question in Northern Ireland and remains so even with ongoing integrated schooling at a mere six point five percent, representing only a two per cent change over the fifteen years since the GFA/BA. Expectations about incorporating peace and difference in the curriculum and for peace are strongly contested as documented in the discourse of the interviews where

politicians and . . . political discourse that we have . . . I think it does have its roots in some of this religious discourse, distinctions, and values and ways of thinking. I think the other thing . . . [which] is more an absence in the political discourse of our politicians is that any real sense that there is a, I'm not sure of the words—desire, or even conception of the possibility, and this would be much more what I would expect if we . . . [were looking] at the peace in a peaceful society, the idea of being able to conceptualise of jointly owned institutions and the way the political arrangement itself is testing that out and continually finding it to be wanting. But if you look throughout the rest of society, and I'm not just talking about schooling here, but I'm talking about, there doesn't seem to be anything in the discourse which is about how do we get to a point where the institutions serve everyone? Rather than a current discourse which is about the protection of the existing separate institutional structures within their society. I don't really think there's an engagement about that which is why I sort of characterise where we're at as being . . . happy with peaceful coexistence and that's a very narrow definition of peaceful—what they mean is non-violent coexistence through separate institutional development, separate institutions. [B2—professor]

Pursuit of the common, or common good remains a challenge in the isolation of sectarianism that would enshrine division of services and institutions in perpetuity in a normativity of silence and separation; consequently, the challenge for (post-)critical (peace) educators becomes a

negotiation of such pock filled terrain while dispelling distorted illusions of coexistence and the spectres haunting our present-futures.

A social grammar (of silence)

Maintaining a divided society requires capacity and distinction enacted in the lives of the respective community members. Northern Ireland, like other divided societies has developed distinct social codes to police social group boundaries. One professor at the University of Ulster, Coleraine acknowledged the social code prioritizing ethical obligation through affiliative relations as commonly recognized among the community of school-based practitioners, stating

we understand the culture of silence that there is in Northern Ireland. I think children as young as five and six understand the culture of scripts, let's call them, around the need to maintain a silence in company with other people around the most difficult issues [in] Northern Ireland to do with politics and religion.

Some of the work that I've done leads me to understand that young people that [are as young as] four and five and six understand that culture—what's called the culture of silence. I think Leakey and other people have called it by other names, but it's one of those discourses in society that we all come to, that regulates our life which says that *you don't talk about sensitive issues to do with other people and their religious background and political ideas in company, you avoid that*, those sorts of things. I think probably it's a particularly it's amongst middle class communities that those aspects of life in Northern Ireland, life can go on, maintains itself if you avoid those sorts of things. And actually it was a position taken by schools in the 60s and early 70s by school leaders who felt as if they needed to protect their school life from the terrible things going on around outside them. In the 60s and 70s, early 70s, work in the field of Community Relations was determined by this *view that we keep all this stuff outside the school gates*. Better not to talk about it. Let's protect children from that discourse and do lots of other things like build up their self-esteem, build up their confidence, build up their personal identities, but leave aspects of their social identities at the gate. [B10—professor, emphasis added].

Such a double-edged intention serves or masques difference within a homological chain of identity substituting difference as the *same* within the group eliding the fundamental alterity comprised in *other* and maintained in policed comportment within the educational arena.

This code of silence, or social grammar as social construction was also understood differently with specific political overtones in the words of *another* professor framing

the way we've generally coped in this place, and I'm sure we're not the only place like this, the way we've generally coped with the past and with sort of the awfulness of what happened during the years of the violence is not to talk about it, to wrap it all in silence. Implicitly, I think the position of most politicians is pretty much the same—if we just sort of act like it never happened, or pretend it never happened. Or just don't talk about it then eventually it will just sort of fade away from memory. And one of the challenges for this sort of—implications for peace education work is this sort of implicit—I want to say explicit as well I suppose, principle that you can't do that because it's the sort of elephant in the room that's going to come back and bite you at some point. But you've got to try and find some sort of safe way and bringing these issues to the fore and talking about them and that can be interesting but difficult. [B12—professor]

In such codified, socially policed grammar, difference itself is defined axiologically and reinforced in tradition, policy, and governance. Differentiated socio-constructivism serves as a strong reason and thus logic of both the foundation and maintenance of the divided society facing its future(s). In the interrogation of these onto-epistemological frames the arrival of an opportunity to explore difference emerges in and through *positivist socio-constructivism* in transformative possibility and is cautiously guarded.

People don't realize . . . [the] sort of sectarian mindsets they're working with and that's really the challenge to try and find ways to get people to try and break out of that. And part of the reason that we don't do that is because of the whole processes of silence. *We don't have critical conversations. We don't have conversations with people who think differently than us, that make us pause for thought as to why we think about certain things.*

The social grammar whereby, we tell each other apart is there so that *we avoid these difficult conversations.* [B12—professor, emphasis added]

Within normative construction, avoidance becomes the social grammar in the mark of difference that inhibits the opportunity to engage and respect the presence of the *other* in the province. The institute of rationality, or tertiary education in Northern Ireland too carries many of the same inhibitions and struggles to address the roots of division though specific efforts continue to

critically engage in the difficult dialogues required in/among/between the communities of a divided society. Such reticence re-marked by a member of the Faculty of Education at Queen's University Belfast acknowledges possibility in perspectivit(y)ies as performative transformation through *embracing humanitas*.

We would see ourselves maybe as making a contribution . . . [towards a] better understanding of both the causes of division and the mechanisms that can help to build the peace. I think there are difficulties and maybe things that we haven't given enough attention to and that is the kind of elephant in the room where we all come from different perspectives, but we don't talk about them openly and maybe that's something that we do need to think about.

That said, I think the opportunity that we have for listening to others and for exploration within that slightly abstract context, a seminar on separate schools in the plural society will raise lots of interesting questions and will bring out into the open some of the issues that we really need to grapple with in Northern Ireland. [B8—professor]

Grappling with issues of difference and the *other* in Northern Ireland is continually a dance across spatio-temporality between the partners of past-futures and future-pasts as con-ceived in a moment representing a de-ontic challenge for the institution of Education in society itself, governing bodies, and citizens as demos and polity. In the highly segregated region of Northern Ireland, educational matters remain divided today and politically influenced at both the provincial level and within the respective Controlled Schools (primarily Protestant) managed by the Education and Library Board for the region as well as separate Catholic maintained schools managed by the Council for Catholic Maintained Schools (CCMS).⁸⁶

⁸⁶ Control of the individual school boards is codified in the Educational Reform (Northern Ireland) Order 1989. Each board is charged with “promoting the spiritual, moral, cultural, intellectual and physical development of all pupils at the school and thereby society; and prepares such pupils for the opportunities and experiences of adult life.” A brief summary of the division of education systems in Northern Ireland indicates a changing system that is moving incrementally (if slowly) towards the future where still a majority of students attend Catholic schools in Northern Ireland. See http://www.rsc.org/images/NIeducationsystem_tcm18-55030.pdf.

I think it's incredibly difficult, incredibly difficult [to address the questions of self, other, and difference]. And I think you know, we have a culture of avoidance in Northern Ireland and it's well documented where when we're in mixed company, we have sophisticated ways of working out what the other person is so that allows us to tailor our conversation so as not to offend them.

So we have these kind of shared cultural norms of politeness and a concern not to offend, which means that we very seldom in mixed company, unless we're very familiar or on a more intimate basis with people from the other tradition will we ever discuss issues of division. And if you bring that into the workplace, I can't ever actually see us ever sitting down as a group in a Divided Society Cluster⁸⁷ and talking directly about ourselves, our background and the views that we have. Now that's not to say that that they're not apparent in the work that we do. And there are actually tensions and there are tensions within the cluster because not everyone, because people have different perspectives, but there's never any open challenge. So the way in which you might see it, you might see some of those tensions articulated is when we have a seminar and the questions that people ask are obviously informed by the perspective that they bring or by the views that they have, and that, to some extent, allows discussion around those issues. But for the most part, I think this stuff is probably easier done in other contexts and probably easier done with children. [B8—professor]

Opening the questions of difference, or justice and the issue(s) of cultural normativity constructing barriers to education for peace becomes an *impossible* task in *onto-theo-teleological* limits of imagination; moreover, the syncretic manifestation of bridging understanding and reason across positivist, socio-constructivist, utilitarian, and instrumental foundations re-frames the foundation of (a) possible future(s) towards human social relationality or peace in the sieve of meaning, difference, and enactment.

My initial path of inquiry into the conceptualization(s) of peace within post-conflict tertiary education was shaped in an ethos of openness to the *other*. As I have stated above, the *other* of the *Other* is what is not understood, translatable, reducible, consumable and thus an inquiry into peace as *other* within the Western paradigm re-presents an *impossible* task as

⁸⁷ The Divided Society Cluster comprise a number of education faculty and some other departments at Queen's University Belfast examining some of the issues of division and their impact on education itself towards a working-through on/in questions of difference. I joined this group upon invitation as a Visiting Research Fellow for a few sessions during my time abroad.

measurement or empirical facticity; remaining forever a task approached only at the far limits of possibility. Nevertheless, peace as human social relationality is an encounter with difference, in difference, with the *other*. Designing a research process that encounters the *other* in openness required a crucial deconstructive assessment of various research designs including ethnography, narrative inquiry, and qualitative in-depth semi-structured interviews. Each isolated approach to inquiry was inadequate to the type of query I envisioned towards an examination of fundamental human relationality, difference, and subjectivity. My approach required *another* approach to an idea[l] (of) methodology, one consonant in the post-structural style of the larger dissertation through an incorporation of the transformative paradigm cogently framed and recently inscribed over the last decade by Donna Mertens. I integrated the interrogative gaze of ethnography as cultural perspectivity (Cortazzi, 2001); adding the dimensionality of temporality/spatiality and sociality through a deconstructive, ethnographic, narrative inquiry/analysis (Lather, 2001; St. Pierre, 2011); and opened the possibility of deep discourse on planes of difference by engaging in in-depth semi-structured dialogue to approach the *other*. At this moment in our journey together as reader, author, and reader as writer, I pause to reiterate three key aporeas in the university constraining knowledge and its construction through research and method in a post-structural vein.

Patti Lather (2001) re-frames the epistemological quest in academe in *Postmodernism, post-structuralism and post(critical) ethnography: of ruins, aporias and angels*. Arguing through a de-constructive rendering of truth-making within the university, Lather, deploys Derrida's "logic of the aporia", which re-posit-ions "the very order of knowledge" (Derrida as cited in Lather, 2001, p. 478) on planes of difference that refuse a definitiveness in structural (or linear) *epistémè* shoring the Institute of Rationality. Her bold approach interprets post-structural

engagement in the realm of research methodology beyond the narrow disciplinary debates animating academic research recently. Lather re-marks the post-structural re-form-ation of research as always, already a task in/to/through *langue*, and consequently, an examination of “the historical, philosophical and cultural constructions of frames . . . which invests with patterns of belief and habit” (p. 479) as an opening to (im)possibility. My deconstructive approach to underlying questions of difference, justice, and peace in this inscription is necessarily bound in language and the meaning(s) attached thereto, whence the extra-ordinary cautionary scrim before the reader/author entering the snapshot “capturing” a unique perspective in peace education. Chapter four and Appendix A: Thinking a Methodology present a particular narrative of perspectivity in “method” that is not to be confused with any knowing, or consumption of the *other*. But rather, the snapshot of peace education in (con)text, presents a brief image of a broader narrative addressing anew possibility, “given the end of the value-free notion of science and the resultant troubling of confidence in the scientific project” (p. 480) beyond a schematism of methodological *epistémè*. The threshold of renewed confidence in *epistémè* passes through *another* rationality partially illuminating the meta-theo-physical abyss as

the task becomes to throw ourselves against the stubborn materiality of others, willing to risk loss, relishing the power of others to constrain our interpretative “will to know”, saving us from narcissism and its melancholy through the very positivities that cannot be exhausted by us, by the otherness that always exceeds us. (Lather, 2001, p. 482)

Thinking through the chiasmus of meta-physics re-presents a “thrown-ness” towards accountability and towards complexity, a “thinking the limit” (p. 482) throughout the aporias of practice according to Lather.

Approaching the “stubborn materiality of others”, I must be ready to be lost in the unknowing, immeasurable in the limit through the revelation of ethics, representation, and

interpretation. Ethics as the first aporia of practice, outlined in responsibility as *ethicus obligatus*, is the demand of the *other* already present calling for a reflexive, self-reflexivity (Lather, 2001, p. 482) in all engagements of surveillance or research within the “politics of knowing and being known” (p. 483). The challenge of ethics subordinates research methodology within paradigms of possession and con-ception refitting academic purpose and fundamental pursuit. Within the aporia of representation, primary concern for authenticity and voice of the *other* arises as I have pointedly spoken earlier in both Chapters two and three. Heeding Lather’s pro-scription in risk: “a romance of the speaking subject and a metaphysics of presence [is forever] complicated by the identity and experience claims of insider/outsider tensions. From the perspective of the turn to epistemological indeterminism, authenticity and voice are reinscriptions of some unproblematic real” (p. 483). As we wade into the pool of difference via inscription in this specific chapter, perception and the “real” collide in the “overturning and displacing . . . [of] conceptual order, as well as the nonconceptual order with which the conceptual order is articulated” (Derrida cited in St. Pierre, 2011, p. 613). The subjectivity of each will not be captured in any labeling, de-scription, or categorization in methodology and therefore, remains fluid as Elizabeth A. St. Pierre re-minds the reader, composer, and author after the displacement of conceptual order(ing), “we are in play as we radically de-naturalize what we’ve taken for granted. Here, we refuse alternatives and pursue the *supplement*, what always already escapes structure” (p. 613, original emphasis).

Ergo, the task as reader and composer of the snapshot set in post-conflict peace education in Northern Ireland is to refuse the “seductions of the mimetic in order to [continually] work against consumption and voyeurism” (Lather, 2001, p. 482) within the design and early stages of implementation of the field study as methodological narrative detailed and inscribed in Appendix

A: Thinking a Methodology and in the complex weavings portrayed in the balance of this present chapter. That is, any descriptive characteristics concerning the temporal-spatiality of the *other* re-presented in the body of the chapter or appendix ~~may be~~, neigh must be, read through a multiplicity of lenses posed in both past-futures and future-pasts filtered through deconstruction. It is a “science of *différance*, not repetition” (St. Pierre, 2011, p. 613), an invitation through *another thinking* in the *aporea of the university*.

A third and final aporia of practice centred i/on interpretation and its complicities informs my approach to research and methodological design. Herein lies the fundamental concern for any research endeavour indeed, for I as researcher, author, and post-structural scholar (must) remain cognizant of the violence of metaphysics and be hesitant to as-cribe meaning and *presence* to the *other-who-is-Other*. I, a *self, il*, do not imbue the *other*, by any measure, any language, sign, or form. Consequently, as Derrida and Lather would caution, and Trifonas (2009) declaims in paradigms lost, my research approach, design, and analysis is a searching for consonance re-framing the narratives that “work within and against terrain[s] of controllable knowledge” (Spivak, as cited in Lather, 2001, p. 486) as a rupturing of received narratives unfolding. The entanglement of philosophy and science (as method, research, analysis) already begun continues in the *trace* of a *presence* always absent.

Tracing the footprint: Locating layers of meaning

The agon: research design and subjectivity in the field

Social justice and peace are complex, intricately woven, value-laden concepts in society that require a research approach that is equally multifaceted and involved. The transformative paradigm enunciated by Donna Mertens (2003, 2007, 2010) offers such complexity for a simultaneous *rethinking* of research, design, implementation, and analysis of core questions of

humanity and the human condition on planes of difference. Our individual apperception of subjectivity always already shapes both the *being-nature* and *subject-nature* pre-sented to the larger community, society, or world. My specific inquiry into the conceptualization(s) of peace through the question of difference begins with this fundamental re-cognition of meaning, rationality, understanding, and re-presentation as outlined in the preceding chapters.

Furthermore, in this early conception, the demarcation of researcher, “participant,” and educator is problematic given an *ethico-philosophico-pedagogical* approach to peace within the environs of the university founded on an arriving notion of *différance* non-reductively re-cog-nizing *difference*.

My fieldwork was strategically situated in Northern Ireland as an evolving educational endeavour engaging critical issues of human social relationality in a post-conflict, divided society. This rationale was affirmatively supported and confirmed by specific faculty members who interpret their respective work as peace education. The academic home of the majority of the faculty members interviewed was in Education, with others located across the four institutions in social science disciplines including History, Politics, Psychology, and English.

As I outline for the reader my negotiation of methodological concerns in Appendix A, my inquiry into peace and thereby peace education would be re-formed in the nexus of larger postStructural imagination(s) of the ethical. I approached my inquiry in *ethicus obligatus* and examined two primary research questions focusing on conceptualisation(s) of peace within tertiary education. The first research question centered on peace: How is peace conceptualised among/by students and faculty (in post-conflict societies/settings) in the area of Peace Education? And an expansive followup focused on difference in education: What does it mean to educate for peace? How do these conceptualisations lead to conflicting conceptions of

educational purpose(s) and (curriculum) programs within the arenas of Peace Education? I examined how peace is conceptualised in the eyes of the *other* through these questions presented in in-depth interviews generating a discourse on difference, peace, justice, and education to examine fundamental questions of construction, and meaning.

Inner layers of meaning

Onto-epistemological meaning(s)—discoursing ethicus obligatus

Education as a societal endeavour is an interminable struggle between *ontology* and *epistemology* that structures thought within the institution of rationality. At the nexus of *onto-epistemology*—a problematic space of transfer, disruption, and power—differing approaches to the institutional role and purpose of education become strikingly apparent. This fact is particularly relevant within the context of Northern Ireland with regard to the peace processes and education for peace following the GFA/BA, *reflecting a valuing of difference, differently*, such that difference is held as a signifier of the mark of the *other* codified in ascription. Difference as ascription may be understood in the following observation through the eyes of a professor in a Peace and Conflict Studies program, where

at the undergraduate level we were getting . . . a lot of mature students and they tend to be more articulate. The tradition in Northern Ireland, in terms of how you deal with the *Troubles* was not to discuss politics. So it could be very hard [to engender deeply reflective discussions] because of the segregated residential structure and because of the segregated education system.⁸⁸ We were getting students at eighteen or nineteen, or near there, who maybe had never had a

⁸⁸ The 2012 Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report (Nolan, 2012) reflects that housing segregation is still ninety percent while segregation in educational institutions (primary and secondary) remains at only six point five percent. (See http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/events/peace/docs/nipmr_2012-02.pdf). Further incremental improvements on socio-political status of the differing communities are marked in the 2013 Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report (Nolan, 2013) available at http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/events/peace/docs/nipmr_2013-04_full.pdf).

meaningful discussion about the Northern Ireland conflict with someone from the other community. And as I say the social rule was because it was too potentially conflictual to start discussing politics, the norm was if you were in a mixed setting, you avoided discussing politics, you avoided discussing religion and that's the way that people got on.

Even when you got eighteen and nineteen year olds into a classroom, it was quite hard to overcome the deeply embedded kind of thing that we don't want to discuss those issues—they're too controversial. I think at the MA level it was easier to have good discussions about the local situation, in part because we had a part time option, so we were actually, [well] initially, the Masters was designed I have to say as a program that would primarily attract part time people working in Northern Ireland who want to develop their interest in Peace Studies. [B11—professor]

One of the fundamental concerns with a compartmentalisation of difference as (affective) difference in education whether it be along cultural/ethnic lines reified in *socio-ethno-politico-historical* narratives, or sexual/gender/orientation strata, or socio-economic privilege, lies in the volitional engagement with the subject matter as evidenced in the imposed limits of discourse in the moment of arrival of the *other* (student) that is not prepared to examine *self*/subjectivity and relation with/to the *other* or *Other*.

In the post-conflict climate of Northern Ireland, native students of the province may have had fewer opportunities to explore their own subject positions within a cultural milieu of silence when compared to some of their counterparts in other universities located abroad.⁸⁹ However, such perspectives are derivative of master narratives formed in *positivistic constructivism* rooted in an essentialist *onto-theo-logy*. Avoidance, or a social grammar of silence serves to protect against a doubled threat eliding *other* truth, *other socio-ethno-politico-historical*

⁸⁹ Care should be taken in reading this claim as I am not dismissing the individual *self*/subject and her/his lived experience, but rather I am suggesting perspectivity itself is a process of apperception from a point of view informed in/through ontology. Similarly situated post-conflict societies indeed may have taken a parallel journey into their present through societal coping mechanisms and social group behaviour policing, however, I wish to acknowledge that levels of denial and deliberate re-writing(s) of history have occurred in many other national contexts (e.g. Canadian residential schools, United States slavery, etc.).

narratives that may disrupt subjectivity itself within *self*, within *other* (as viewed/observed/considered/thought). I found a strong disjuncture between the unwritten or hidden curriculum embedded in a culture or grammar of silence as acknowledged by one Queen's University Belfast professor. As we were discussing education and a desire to engender social change for a different world through education, she shared

If I get my students thinking, I generally think that maybe I'm doing my job properly. And yet, why is it that we find that as such a difficult idea? I mean, I agree with you. I think it is completely unrealistically altruistic. And yet constantly when we're thinking of formal education and children—yes, these are the leaders of tomorrow and if we do this with them, they're going to come out as this product. And we talk about it as if it's totally unproblematic that formal statutory education can produce this, that, or the other. And yet, of course, when we start to think about it with people our own age, about adults, we know of course, that we can't possibly achieve that. [B5—professor]

Her profound recognition inherently challenges the role of the teacher and university professor, implicating them in the received discourse of division. Yet she also challenges the status quo suggesting the engaged educators' role is to provide a safe, stimulating environment open to queries of/on difference, demonstrating possibility beyond two of the major constraints of educational endeavour—subjectivity and conceptualisation—foreclosing discourse and particularly discourse on difference, about difference. Furthermore, one of the primary tasks of any education system that would seek higher missional purpose beyond re-production, must necessarily allow for, even encourage, a critique of the ontological frame constituting, and framing *epistémè*. As readers (and writers) of matters educational, the imperative arrives: What are the possible impacts of a fixed (rigid) onto-epistemology that presents critique, yet denies its engagement when on tenuous terrain? What is communicated to the learner/student, expected to represent *self* within the constraint of identity while instructed to sublimate the *other* (to the *same*)? The axiological form of our inquiry will dictate both response and outcome; however, a

deconstructive approach to such questions releases any limit on difference and reopens discourse anew revealing elements of power within the structure of the *self*/subject.

Power and its enactment is one of the fundamental paradoxes of education and the university as institution of rationality that becomes, through a production of subjectivity as adduced in Foucault's excellent discourse on the subject and power.⁹⁰ Like Foucault, we observe the tethers of power constraining choice and subjectivity of those students who are denied the subject nature of being, in the liminal state of non-majority structuring society through the maintenance of

the status quo because all of the pressure is on the next generation who of course, has no power to bring around any kind of structural change and yet our aspirations go with that generation. And you know of course, things stay pretty much where they are. And those that have the power, maintain the power. [B5—professor]

But the role of power in the construction of subjectivity and *epistémè* remains largely unexamined masquing deeper understandings and conceptions of difference itself within academe. Foucault's treatise on this structure elucidates the entanglement shrouding knowledge still today given a limited awareness of this intimate relationship.

Another view on power and the limit on discourse are framed in the perspective of the professor striving to open the conversation of/on difference, through consideration and reflexivity in *another* reading of subjectivity within any educational pursuit of peace. Unique possibilities emerge as this professor comes to *embrace humanitas* and the *other's* perspectivity

⁹⁰ The role of power in constructions of knowledge is integrally linked in Foucault's seminal text. How we understand *epistémè* as foundation and founding reveals the permanency of this linkage. For a deeper inquiry, see Michel Foucault (1982), *The Subject and Power*. Foucault's oeuvre engages the intricacies of power, knowledge, and relation in a manner that re-frames these concepts offering fresh perspectives in/through education as endeavour linking "a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects . . . deal[ing] with three modes of objectification which transform human beings into subjects" (p. 777).

in obligation. A particularly poignant example of perspectivity is voiced in the following lengthy re-telling illustrative of the intimate link between *onto-epistemology* and rationality within the academy.⁹¹ The status of *other* is strategically marked for the former teacher, now university professor.

Now the teaching was very, very interesting. My secondary school teaching . . . formed me in many ways because I was the only Catholic teaching in an all boys Protestant school in Belfast between 1972 and 1974, which was the height of the sectarian assassinations. And if anything came out of that, it was, *I discovered what empathy meant* . . . I had to put myself in their shoes. I would go in there with huge prejudices, but also with a huge sense that I needed to protect myself. I remember a huge cultural shock that occurred to me very early on in that school. It occurred when we had an open night for the parents to come in and see the work that the boys did. And [in] the history room, their work was around the walls and I could see in a corner there was a portrait of a man called Roger Casement. Casement was [thought of as] an Irish patriot, the way I'd been brought up. Casement had run guns in 1916—running guns from Germany, etc. And my first thought was, “isn't this wonderful, doesn't this just show how progressive this school is?” And the school was progressive, the fact that they took me on in itself; and it was largely working class, but it had an enlightened head master and I thought this was tremendous. And when I went up and really looked at the portrait—and the subtitle was “Portrait of Treason.”

I had never, in my upbringing had ever to consider that Casement was guilty of treason, was a traitor. To us he was a hero. He also was strongly practicing homosexual, which in a pietistic, conservative Catholic background . . . but we denied that and all as just British propaganda. So you know, we had this view of this man and suddenly I'm confronted with this portrait of treason. That's when the penny dropped for me and *I suddenly realised that I'm dealing with people with a completely different outlook*. I also had to establish from the beginning my credentials. I had a couple of things going for me, one was my name—it's neutral, it's certainly not a Catholic name. [B9—professor, emphasis added]

⁹¹ The location of institutions of education are uniquely marked in and through respective *onto-epistemologies* and geographically located within sympathetic regions of the province that conscribe the bounds of the endeavour in rationality. One marking of locationality as noted, interestingly reveals “the problem with academia and [the Northern Irish] society on the whole is this whole sort of role of academics as actors versus academics as neutral creators of knowledge is still at a pretty archaic form in this society . . . people still firmly believe that they are objective scientists” (B3—professor).

The gentleman teacher, professor, becomes both participant/witness and subject in the instant of *l'avenir* or the arrival of the *other* re-pre-senting another *onto-epistemo-teleology* as *onto-theo-teleology* in a master narrative of/on difference. In the moment of the arrival, and the welcoming of the *other*—hospitality—an accepted *socio-ethno-politico-historical* narrative is brought into question for both the teacher and co-learners in the classroom creating an excellent opportunity for the further inquiry into the paths marking and eliding difference as engagement with and through the eyes of the *other*.

Onto-theological meaning(s)

Our collective understandings of Western metaphysics are rarely surfaced in postModern societies under the cover of more commonly accepted values and beliefs that often serve to elide the very *onto-theological* base *as* the same. We as the reader, author, and reader as author bear an obligation in re-cognising the very structural nature of the metaphysical chain elucidated in Kant, Heidegger, Derrida, and Trifonas of a performative, de-ontic response to the *other* opening in a discourse of difference “read” in the words of another professor at Queen’s University Belfast:

what we’re doing in Education is to try and find ways of getting people to break through some of those barriers and actually talk about some of those things. And at this point, it’s more about trying to create some sort of a safe space where people can engage with difference and recognise that a lot of the sort of myths and perceptions that are around are just that. But also *to get people to realise that some people do just think differently and they think deeply differently about some things*. There’s absolutely no guarantee that by engaging them in dialogue you are going to find a simple way out. But the fact that you’re aware of that is in itself an advance because before you say something or you do something, hopefully you will think of the possible reactions that others might have. [B12—professor, emphasis added]

Consequently, in this re-cognition, a *thinking deeply differently* has many possible trajectories which may foreclose openings ahead within *onto-theo-teleologies* structuring *meta-narratives* of

us and *them* as evidenced below framed in eschatological discourse. It is a thinking through proffered in the transperformative *positivist socio-constructivism* of a re-framed educational purpose. The discourse identifies the influence of *telos* guiding communitarian response within *onto-socio-political* construction.

What I'm saying is that their formative influences have been of that kind of culture almost, or tradition or way of thinking [or] interpretation of values [such that] it's more Old Testament—eye for an eye, tooth for tooth. It's about, you know, it's not about fudging an apology. It's about if your admitting, it's about the admission of your sins, there's a born-again dimension. Which is why people I think like (name removed) for example, who kind of represents the mindset for me would still have a lot of difficulty about being in government with Sinn Fein because until they acknowledge and say what they did was wrong, not that they regret it's consequences. Not that they even maybe he does want them to use the sorry word. I don't know whether that it's more that they admit that what they did was sinful and wrong. So it's that mentality is really what I'm saying feeding into that. And I think you have to contrast that then with a kind of Catholic culture which is kind of a little more conservative, communitarian, probably more tolerant of ambiguity, you know, transgression—what people do if they do—their sins can always be forgiven. [B2—professor]

Within a notion of penitence oblige, some people in the Protestant community would define a path of cross-community governance (or even simple co-operation) through due penitence and admission of guilt by paramilitaries in keeping with religious norms enacted in civil society. Such policing of norms for one community (largely Protestant) resembles a similar approach within the *other* community (largely Catholic) as each respective group would seek to address issues of social justice for their community through respective *socio-culturo-religious onto-theo-teleology* grounding normativity. Consequently, the fundamental challenge to education for peace in Northern Ireland surfaces in the question of difference facing fortified narrativities in overt denial of the *other* and *socialis aequitas*. The normative discourses of the respective Catholic and Protestant communities entrain theological discourse in such a manner to significantly impact the *socio-political* futures of the peoples of the region, whereby an opening

to *difference* in *différance* is shunted into and along narrower tracts only mapped within academic terrain shrouded in a cloak of essentialism.

Exceeding easy essentialism—embracing humanitas

The marking of difference in Northern Ireland has distinct essentialist roots nurtured in the soils of socio-political sectarianism, historico-religious narratives, and existential threat signified as the *other*. Centuries and decades of antagonism reify the inscription of difference as difference beyond a cursory concern for the *other* that is not *self*—self as individuated subject, self as segregated community eliding composition as structure, as *self* in *other*. The oppositional nature of such subjectivity is captured in one view where

in my early childhood it was easy to operate just within the norms of us and them paradigm of thinking. That got challenged a little bit in kind of second level schooling during teenage years where there's maybe a little bit more exposure to people from Catholic backgrounds but also a bit more realisation of the level of sectarianism within the society. Within my own peer group, for example, [sometimes the] . . . language that's used, or people lapsing back into the singing of sectarian songs or jokes, or whatever—all those kind of things. It's not just about contact across these lines, it's also about realising the depth of the nature of the thinking, I suppose, that's within your own group. [B2—professor]

A process of *othering* must begin at the exclusory limit between the *self*/subject and the *other* through the ascriptive channel of social group dynamics inter-phased through *socio-ethno-politico-historical* resonances in normative exchange within social groups mediating cross-community relations and common understanding. In this fluid process differing resonances are held within different communities as more salient and therefore, structure the discourse regarding the *other*, manifesting in strategic as well as more banal, distrust addressed in the following interpretation

some of our own research would suggest that, it's sort of like you distrust that they will do *x*, *y*, and *z* and so it's not only that you talk about the conflict, you also don't talk about yourself. You tend to talk about the other. And that comes

from I suppose living in those environments where there's that sort of distrust.
[B3—professor]

I suggest that this distrust generates a different *other* than the *other* that is *self*, or one's community (as contrasted to *another* community) in its proscriptive limitation as a deliberate circum-scription denying and eliding difference in the *other* as label. Such distrust overplays an essentialism through erasure of alterity serving the goals of membership in an exclusive collective. The *other* that is *other* remains at or beyond the periphery thwarting dialogue and connection across communities.

Both the intrinsic and extrinsic markers of division effect difference in the region of Northern Ireland wherein individuals, families, and groups reinforce difference rigorously, maintaining social group boundaries. Unchaining the metaphysical bonds underwriting scripts and coded narratives in Northern Ireland begins in the limit of epistemological constructions unexamined within institutional education. However, the arrival (*à venir*) of the *other* presages *another* passage to an *embracing humanitas* re-leasing proscriptive moral codes in discourse beyond provinciality. Some striking examples in the limit, follow in the words of persons situated across the spatio-temporal, socio-ethno-politico-historical divide.

[I am f]rom a Protestant, middle-class background, I suppose. Brought up for the first 8-9 years of my life on the Springfield Road in Belfast, which prior to the conflict, was an area with very obvious identifications. But it was in one of those periods in the . . .50s & 60s when things were in abeyance to a degree. People knew exactly who everyone else was, but there was a measure of mixing and live and let live. The area after we moved became a peace land and our house was actually demolished in the course of the conflict. So, I'm very aware of the divisions in this society from a very early age—almost intuitively aware of the divisions. [We] moved to another area which was still in North Belfast and was less of an interface, but then again, was quite close to interfaces again, and when the violence broke out, it became very obvious where the dividing lines were.
[B1]

Such construction of identity and particularly social group identity through essentialism or essentialist philosopheme, plays a key role in inter-pretations of *socio-ethno-politico-historical* narratives in Northern Ireland as continually expressed in the voice of the individuals comprising this snapshot. Re-telling my personal journey through identity earlier noted in the précis, I was confronted in my own subjectivity to the degree that

if I was living in this culture, there's no reason for me to believe necessarily that I would be above the ground or below the ground. And that had a deep impact on me, it still does. I suppose it's like, what's taking place in society, in the societies that I've been a part of, what's taking place in the society that looks differently or impacts differently in this context? But the idea of how we handle and understand and need to connect with our social group identity is very important in various contexts and it's most important where the risk is higher, or the perceived risk is higher. (Author's personal journal, September 2009)

My personal construction in subjectivity was starkly and nakedly revealed. As I chose to share my intimate transformational moment with a couple of interlocutors and faculty members, one member of the Faculty of Education at Queen's thoughtfully added

Absolutely. And because of the way the Troubles have evolved here, the only way to develop a positive identity of your own in-group is to have a negative identity of the out-group. So the positive affirmation that comes about because of *your sense of belonging and your sense of commonality with those who have the same label as yourself has so often here been at the expense of the other group*. So you can only portray yourself in a positive way if you diminish or dehumanise the other. There's so much of that going on here.

But I think what you're saying is "would I be above the ground or below the ground" is absolutely powerful. A number of the young men that I taught when I first started teaching are below the ground because they weren't particularly intelligent, they weren't brought up in particularly supportive families. The power, the prestige that was offered to them as involvement in what was going on here, the chance for glory. [B5—professor, emphasis added]

In the normative marking of difference, through community bonding and affiliation, the *self* as subject, or *self*/subject is confined within the trajectory of subjectivity, a subjectivity defined in the moment—as I posit, a moment of creation. The creation of difference, or the

marking of difference in ascription—Protestant, Catholic—through social group identity and its maintenance entails an act of cognition exceeding phenomenological re-presentation(s). Difference is difference because of the aporetic *other* affecting my subjectivity evincing individual and collective understandings while effecting difference that is difference to us as *self*/subject. For the metaphysics of our institutions of rationality prefer normative constructions presupposing form, order; while, a reading, thinking through difference poses *other* in epistemological purview in a new reading of the *semio-linguistic* terrain upon planes of difference embracing humanity in *ab/pre-sence* at once. In the case of Northern Ireland, the creation of difference is intimately linked to the socio-psychological realm of the subject position of a *self* with its ramifications for the divided society as

conflict has to start with demography and history, and all these things, but then the last level that sort of starts to spin with all of these things is the psychological level. But when all of these other supports start to drop away, it takes on a volition of it's own and goes on spinning on it's own.

And I think that's what's happening in Northern Ireland. We've got this psychological element that isn't being underpinned by all these other things anymore, but that hasn't caused it to collapse, if you see what I mean.

[Interviewer: In that frame, when these other aspects collapse—history and demography, etc.—the energy that had resided in those, does it get taken into psychology?] . . . Yes, and then it maintains [a vortex that becomes] the creation of difference. People do this to keep it going. [B6—professor]

Herein, the phenomenological evinces *another* in presence whereby difference is the mark rather than metaphysical structure supporting *onto-epistemological* rationality and we are confronted at the precipice of understanding opening educational arenas and apperceptivity in reconstituting human social relationality. Another example of difference as creation offered later in the same interview by the professor at the University of Ulster—Coleraine was reflected in a study of

names given to children wherein an inscriptive act occurs in the transliterative marking of children. He suggests

one of the first things I started to study was names, whether children could tell the difference between Protestant and Catholic names . . . a lot of sort of simple stuff like that. Now the thing that I'm pretty sure of, but once again have to quantify is that names have changed in Northern Ireland as . . . [I've grown] up, particularly among Catholics.

This could be seen as a matter of self-confidence, you could say this is a good thing. There were no Sineads and Aoifes and all of these sort of Irish names around when I was growing up. Now there were some stereotypical Catholic names, but they were a very small subset because in a way, if you think about how this is a divided society and there's discrimination and everything you'd think one of the last things you might do is give you child a name that marks it as coming from a particular side, but that's what people are doing. And I think that's partly to do with the creation of difference and the maintenance of your ethnic group and all of this. [B6—professor]

In this elaboration on the creation of difference and the psychological process involved in construction, there is further support for broadening our capacity, willingness, and openness to questions of difference, with particular respect to the role of educator impelled in performative response to the *other* of the *Other en socialis aequitas enfolding non-violence*.⁹²

⁹² Academic approaches to the question of difference, often narrower in scope than the representative breadth contained in any (re)cog-nition of diversity within, are poised in an understanding of *différance* to bridge the fortified chasms of disciplinarity as proffered: “I think Psychology can help us bring some of that not just in the strict, sort of post-modern sense of construction[ism] and all of that sort of self reflection and all of that. I think a certain type of psychology brings you to that because you're having those sorts of debates all of the time about your own place in the process, about bias, about what you bring, about independence—those sorts things which, maybe I'm talking a little bit more psycho-analytically or psycho-dynamically. You know, as a psycho-therapist you are always confronted with that—what are you doing? Why are you doing it in this limited way, rather than changing the world. Where are you sitting in relation to the person who's sitting in front of you? You know, so I think that knowledge can bring something, but as I said, it depends on the typology. And I still in my own process of trying to define what my psychology, not my personal psychology, but what my work is and where it sort of locates itself.” [B3—professor]

However, any academic response is always, already a con-struction (mis)apprehending the nature of difference and its pre-ordinal affect within *ethico-pedagogical* curriculum and educational endeavours. These affects, when unexamined serve to elide the very nature of constructions and structures of difference in our communities and societies as we see in the *socio-economic* realm. Class as economic marker plays a role in maintaining the social and cultural divide in Northern Ireland through the idea of blaming or scapegoating the *other* as perpetrator or actor in the context of *socio-historical* narratives justifying particular *positivistic constructivist* philosophemes. An *ethico-philosophico-pedagogical* approach to peace education-to-come interrogates philosopheme in rationality and the rationality founding institution as entre to specific inter-communal agonism. Indeed the procession of enquiry remains fundamentally important in academic concern within the context of contested historical futures marked in difference tracing a key element of the transperformative tenet of *positivist socio-constructivism*. The subject of class, its construction, policing, and maintenance serves as a perennial critique of institutions, power, and presence. How the subject of class is interrogated within Northern Ireland in tertiary education is deeply implicated within current efforts towards an *ethico-pedagogy* that would pursue a more equitable future for all citizens of the province, as witnessed in the words of another professor:

I am a product of evolution. I sort of compare and contrast . . . [my work experiences before in the region] . . . before coming into the university. I was working with a lot of very marginalised communities. And in Northern Ireland terms, those are the communities that have been most deeply affected by the conflict. These were communities where there's been lots of para-military activity. People who have been victimised by para-militaries. People who've been in para-militaries. People who've been in prison. People who've been indirect victims of violence, that whole range. But if I compare that experience with my very first teaching experience in the grammar school, with 16-18 year olds, I suppose the thing that strikes me the most and has probably the biggest impact on making me interested in what I'm interested in, is that of all of the people that I've worked with, I would say that the most sectarian, the most racist group were

the kids in that grammar school and that includes the ex-para-militaries, the ex-prisoners—very uneducated people in working class communities with lots of prejudices, but actually those people were the nastiest in terms of their looking down on people.

That has really hugely influenced me and it has led me to be interested in education. I knew that so many people are interested in the religious divide in education here, but I would assert that the class divide in education here is a far bigger problem in this society and it's an even bigger problem because hardly anybody seems to be addressing it. [B4—professor]

In this moment of voicing marginalisation, there is an instant of hospitality that exceeds defined normative values as a choice to think through thinking division. Through her approach, the professor enfold her experiential knowledge prior to her current engagement in the university as she re-presents a sensitivity to the subjectivity of the *other* and the *other-in-self* in *ethicus obligatus* re-vealing a-new, the possibility in a questioning of difference through difference as con-structed in *philosophemes*, enacted in memes of normativity.

Spiraling out – Philosophical groundings

Positivist socio-constructivism

One of the significant hurdles in educating for peace in a divided society lies in the nature of *positivist socio-constructivism* as a guiding philosopheme for structuring institutions of rationality. The roots of the tertiary education lie in the *socio-political ethos* founding the germinal institution. How education is structured, offered, and received in the eyes of the *other* may be fundamentally marked as difference itself leading individual *self*/subject(s) to question for who and whom is a particular educational program or even institution (in the aggregate) serving? Such positivistic, socio-constructivist barriers in a post-conflict divided society like Northern Ireland may buttress perceived (unexamined) sectarian lines while extending into and through the university system.

It was never so much a problem at the post-graduate level, partly because it was only a one year program and I suppose, graduates are a little bit more mature in how they approach these things. It was very hard to attract Protestants, and particularly Protestants from kind of the Belfast area, to come here. So we didn't quite, I suppose, if you're sort of translating theory into practice, we were never quite able to develop that kind of critical mass of students from both communities to engage in any kind of discussions. It did happen on a one to one basis. We tended to attract more English students to be honest than local Protestant students. But there was nothing we could do about it. I suppose we could have moved the program to Belfast but that would have raised other issues. [B11—professor]

With the effects of sectarian division permeating social, political, and religious structures in Northern Ireland, all structures of education are (in)directly impacted from the Department of Education, to universities, to Controlled and Catholic School Boards, to communities, families, children, and the students who attend various programmes. Consequently, I suggest the impact on teacher education as an extension of the work of faculties of education is critical to any approach that would envision a shared future for all peoples across Northern Ireland.

Teacher education through its academic base in the Faculty of Education has come to play a crucial role in peace education within Northern Ireland as the socio-political climate has shifted somewhat since the 1998 accord from marked verboten topics concerning politics/religion and division to a partial level of acceptance of difference within tertiary education.⁹³ Two different teacher educators acknowledge an element of *positivist socio-constructivism* in the mandate of primary and secondary teacher education where student teachers have more recently begun to respond performatively to the demand of the *other*

⁹³ In a Derridean vein, I would propose an *as if* regarding the influence of Education Studies, teacher training and teacher education in Northern Ireland over the distinct periods and enactments of governments, thinking through the nature of any change “in purpose” or mission that could be directly linked to the education received by constituents. My field research did not address this question directly, though I find it very curious in light of critical pedagogy's influence since post Structuralism. How the question is approached with regard to difference could be highly illuminating. The closest connection I may offer is in the discourse of a couple of the faculty members speaking directly to their student's receptivity to questions of difference as subsequently inscribed.

engaging some of the important questions of difference within their training weighing social justice and obligation elicitive of the transperformative tenets proffered in Chapter two—*socialis aequitus* and *ethicus obligatus*.

I would see that in my own students. You're looking for those students who see education as something more than (not to devalue the discipline from which they come), but I certainly would be looking for teacher candidates who clearly have some sort of sense that they want to bring about change. And in this society, that change was a fairly obvious one, was about transforming the society, not simply to help to diminish the levels of violence, but clearly, the violence was predicated on other structural, attitudinal aspects of the society and the way people thought. So what you were trying to do there was to bring about some change in people's thinking, which in turn, would have an impact on their behaviour. [B1—professor]

A second professor and teacher educator, with decades of experience in both secondary and post-secondary education, proffers an encouraging insight, highlighting a shift in some student teachers' receptivity towards difference centred on critical thinking, modeling *socialis aequitas* for each student. She proclaims

I certainly see a change even now in the student teachers that I'm teaching [in comparison] to those I taught maybe seven or eight years ago. And those that I taught seven or eight years ago didn't want to go even near any of these issues [of difference/division/exclusion] in the classroom. The teachers that I now have coming in as student teachers are much more easily convinced that this is part of their role. Obviously it's helped by the revised curriculum, but there are shifts in attitudes that occur over a long period of time. And I think, if we can do nothing else, we have to encourage thinking around these issues. But I think, it's very much the case that we have to appreciate that education is not the panacea, it's not the salve for everything. You know that without the structural change, there is a limit to what we can do. Maybe we create or we help develop one or two strong leaders who will make change. I don't know. I don't know that I would want to claim that. [B5—professor]

A receptivity towards the *other* however is not the manifestation of curriculum or pedagogy within an engaged university community, rather such receptivity, a necessary condition for a hospitality towards the *other* as an *embracing humanitas*, requiring an examination of *ontic-epistemo-teleology* constituting an emergent subjectivity within the teacher candidate,

illuminates the role of *thinking* in a *thinking-through* obligation and response. Creating an *ethico-pedagogy* that provides an opening into the *self* and the *self-as-subject* affords re-newals of perspective and connection, even across fortified walls of division. A critical awareness of one's performative expectation and role within academe infuses our purpose and commitment to all students to whom we have an ultimate responsibility with a deliberate, acknowledgment of de-ontic rationale and positivist, *socio-constructivist* purpose in thinking as inscribed in the discourse,

what I suppose I'm looking for, if I want to look for success indicators, I suppose of what we're doing in this work at this level, is I am looking for evidence, not just in change in thinking, but in change in practice whether it's at the level of relationships, or the educational interventions that they're working with themselves. It almost seems self-indulgent just to think about development and thinking. I don't mean that in any way as an argument with the academy, but I think again, that relates very much to my own biography and the place in which I'm living and working as well. That the work that I'm doing in the field, in higher education at Queen's, for me, must have some kind of practical implications, some sense of working for the common good, or for improving the situation for people in some way. [B5—professor]

As critical educators and educators for peace, we are well advised to heed her caution with regard to the privilege of thinking, a *thinking-through* that compels engagement beyond indulgence—toward the *other* in fundamental alterity. The notion of a re-newal of subjectivity itself, becomes, or arises in our consideration of difference, of peace (re)pre-senting the question of how we engage the journey becomes paramount, as

the way that I sell this to them and I seem to be able to convince them that this is a very important part of their role as educators is to get them to think about it [by] coming at it from another angle. And the angle that I come at it is, first of all, I will set the scene in terms of the social context. I'll set the scene in terms of the policy context in terms of equal opportunity, Shared Future, whatever else there in terms of the segregated education system. But more importantly, I get them first and foremost to think about the diversity of children that they are going to meet in the classroom. I get them to think of . . .and I do, constantly get them to problematise it because I'm very nervous putting labels on children, to think about all of the different dimensions of difference that there might be such as

gender, such as socio-economic background, which is of course probably to biggest predictor of achievement, such as religion, such as culture, such as travelers, such as children with mental health issues. All of the difference. And we brainstorm around that. [B5—professor]

Thinking, *thinking-through* is deconstruction in Trifonasian idiom. It is *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* re-posing rationality in presence, questioning subjectivity, difference, and justice as pillars of peace into perpetuity. Our challenge in the pre-sent age of infinite past-futures and future-pasts is to invoke the performative in a world of the constative in-scription lived, while transforming the subject positions we individually hold through critical and post-critical engagement with all *other(s)* in reflexivity. I posit then that critical educators and peace educators remain constantly challenged in subject position to reveal the constructions of constative foundations framing pedagogical force.

I think that would be my critique of some of the school program, and that is that somehow, they're trying to teach people values and ways of being that—maybe this is the psychological stuff that I think only happens (I don't believe I'm about to say this, but) that somehow cognitively when you understand things in a certain way, you start to behave in a certain way. Now maybe that's a very poor [way to interpret our awareness, but] I'm not really a cognitive type of psychology person, so that's a little bit why I'm surprised I'm saying this, but I think that's what we do. You try and develop a conceptual, critical, radical way of thinking about the world. And once you have that, your actions will be different. But somehow I don't think, but obviously you have to do both and that for me is why I think the debate about Peace Education is interesting because I'm not (and it's a good topic for PhD), I do think that some peace educators think they are trying to educate values and ways of being in the world. Others are not. Obviously, as you know, there are [some] within Peace Education, in that narrow definition . . . [who] subscribe more to the critical faculties [approach to] . . . develop a "critical" understanding of the world and you will behave in a certain way. [B3—professor]

In the similar vein of positivism, the discourse of educating for peace, as transperformative engagement in *positivistic socio-constructivism*, becomes primarily about opening the

conversation on difference, in difference, through *différance*.⁹⁴ Dialogue and engagement are fundamental to a discourse on difference as difference in *différance* through critical apperception and in the instant of engagement the *other* enters, beckoning us onward onto further planes of difference and possibility at the limit.

Thinking education differently, through critical faculties is engagement in notions of difference and identity that would celebrate difference in diversity within a common system while engaging in difficult dialogues between and among constituents/individuals within engaged *ethico-pedagogy*.

I suppose that's coming out of an historical experience . . . [relating to] power, something about protecting yourself from disadvantage and discrimination. So it's almost like a positive and negative peace on this, but defending yourself from the other is actually trying to secure greater access to resources and power and that kind of a thing. So we're very much coming out of a long tradition of the benefits of sharing resources, not really being convincing enough for people to leave the old discourses behind, where the way to make sure that you maintained your influence, [where] your community benefitted was to maintain your own institutions.

I don't think it's not just a matter of discourse, not just a matter of an intellectual thing, *I think there's something deep in people's fear and distrust* and maybe lack of experience in how different institutions operate for people with kind of different identity values, frameworks. [B2—professor, emphasis added]

There is perhaps a fundamental risk buried in these essentialist notions of community/society related to the risk of a loss of power between, “in a society where I guess if there's been . . . a certain amount of nepotism . . . [as] part of the historical experience as well. How would the new

⁹⁴ This critical engagement reflects an emphasis on changing the dialogue through “advocacy because we want to change the system because that's really what it's about. It's not about saying it's trying to create a Northern Ireland that's going to be a particular type of place but it's trying to create sets of relationships between communities, between young people, between the social institutions that encourage dialogue and engagement rather than separation. My priority is just to create dialogue around [difference], get people talking about it.” [B12—professor]

institutions change that—is that for your benefit or not?” (B2—professor) bearing resonance in Foucauldian strains of subjectivity and power.⁹⁵ Reading this risk, laden with essentialist roots compels deeper questions of the underlying philosophemes structuring education within *socio-politico-historical* milieu and the Western academy with its impact on questions of difference and peace within respective con-text notioning another possibility open to, and embracing humanity. The next professor suggests an engaging celebratory *ethico-pedagogical* approach to all questions of difference and diversity within a common system, acknowledging

in recent times I have had to get teachers to think about the nature of difference and how you think about difference through the special educational needs context. That’s the one I’ve been most working through in recent times, but there we get away . . .there I have an objective of trying to overcome deficit views of human beings. Where human beings who have difficulties or children who have difficulties with learning are seen to be the ones who need their heads sorted out and the collections within their heads changed as opposed to looking at how we as teachers can change the conditions that we are presenting children with. So, in that sphere of influence that I’m involved with them in, I suppose I’m deeply involved in thinking about difference, diversity, how we can celebrate difference and diversity within a common system. And all the objectives . . .if you look and take an example of any of the programs I’m involved with, you will see the number one objective is to critique deficit views of human beings and take a more social view of the nature of human beings. I’ll bring this back to where we see that human beings are much more determined, but yet there is room for human autonomy to come through. But not [in] Northern Ireland, frankly at the moment is full of the language of decision-making—the human being as autonomous, if we only had these thinking skills we’ll be able to change the world. My courses on teaching and learning critique that view of the human being just as much as we are going to critique a very deterministic [view] that human beings can’t overcome . . .I take up a position there [is] a social constructionist view to the world whereby which is about the importance of discourse and power about the way in which humans have a certain amount of autonomy within the discourses that disempower us. I suppose I take a critical deconstructionist view so I help

⁹⁵ For more on Michel Foucault’s (1982) critique of critical pedagogy’s analysis of power see “The Subject and Power” and his (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. In the former work, Foucault is deeply concerned with the nature of subjectivity as construction and the nature of power in rationality and its construction. Critical pedagogues traverse these planes despite perceptivity captured in the spatio-temporality of changing paradigms and apperception within the institution of rationality itself.

teachers to try and deconstruct some of these things that we're involved with.
[B10—professor]

I think we can go further here in a critical deconstructionist perspective and strive to overcome the limits of *positivist socio-constructivism* as guiding philosopheme within Education as social institution by creating the environment for difficult dialogues that suspend the direct and overt judgments within discourse that limit, silence, erase, consume, or *otherwise* overwrite the fundamental alterity of the *other*. While this will remain a difficult task of (post-)critical (peace) education, and perhaps be even *impossible*, our performative responsibility to one *another* as *beings* demands engagement beyond the comforts of traditional curricular and pedagogical approaches manifest in *socialis aequitas* (Derrida, 2000c). The discourse revealed *another* approach reflecting

that there has to be a very strong inter-subjective dimension of peace and that can only come about from people talking to each other. And it has to be, to use the jargon, it has to be dialogic not monologic. It's how you integrate that into teaching peace is quite difficult partly because if students don't want to talk about it, it's very hard to make them do it. We claim as educators to be developing skills of communication, listening and all of those things, but I'm not sure that we do it that well to be honest with you. It's [that] you can have a class of very highly motivated people that will discuss these things with very little prompting from you, [whereas], in other occasions, it can be very, very difficult to get people to discuss this in a kind of formal classroom setting and that may be part of the problem. I think over the years, my sense is that students come in now less prepared than ever to have discussions and debates, and see themselves as part of a kind of process by which they just want to get a degree by the end of it and are, to say to do the minimum is probably a bit unfair but kind of regard the discussion bit as optional . . . [they] come to the lectures and take down notes because that will help them with the exams, but don't really want to engage in the seminars and very often don't even attend the seminars. And that's partly our fault because we need to develop more interesting, more exciting ways of provoking discussion.
[B11—professor]

Still *another* approach to taking up questions of difference is frequently the result of reflexivity and perspective that opens in the *self* to the *other*. A female graduate student speaks of empowerment and the role of education as a conscious engagement in the lives of the *other* as

transformational *ethos* in a positivist approach to human suffering along avenues of understanding difference, social justice, and peace.

I think my work with women . . . I did work with women who are being abused, women and children are being abused in their own home—it's an extreme imbalance of power relationships in a very personal and intimate space. If you can't [protect yourself or your children], you don't feel safe in your own home. I suppose that's what attracted me, that real sense of injustice. And you know, you have violence. If you're living with violence . . . and the threat of violence everyday, you know that's trying to work to do something in some way to empower women, to support women to say no to violence and maybe in some way to change the behavior and attitudes of men who use violence that's probably a good thing in some way. [A5—graduate student]

As re-marked in Trifonas (2000a, 2003a), Giroux (2005, 2011), Peters (2003), and others earlier, the path to-wards understanding the *other* is constructed in the footsteps of diversity re-presenting difference differently within academic endeavours through engagement. Such avenues of understanding elicit *other-thinking*, or a *thinking-for-ward-to-the-other* with/in new planes of existence where *meta-narratives* of exclusion, isolation, and segregation are re-vealed in *other* perspective. Within the instant of this thinking through, or *thinking-throughout*, disparate *socio-ethno-politico-historical* narratives are recast and re-presented in measures of greater fullness.

One important acknowledgment of recasting occurs as certain remembrances of the struggle on both sides is experienced in directed, open discourse in explorations of glamourised notions of commitment and service in partisan cause. In an effort at peace building through education the importance of genuine narratives can serve to counterpose the glorification of violence and conflict whereby the listener, observer, reader, student may encounter *another* truth that effaces limited understanding(s) or discourse. At Queen's University Belfast the glamourisation of the conflict and violence can be challenged

in thinking about peace building . . . [through] innovative work with ex-prisoners . . . [who] come and tell their stories where they present the reality of war as

opposed to a glamorised nature of it. There are some people [such as] Leslie McEvoy involved in some work around that. Interestingly that's one of the areas where there are maybe some tensions in the [Education] Cluster between some people where there are those who would be—maybe we shouldn't be doing any work with those guys because they took up arms and killed people. And those who think that if we're going to have a better future, you know, we have to recognise that everybody was involved in our past and that you know, they have a contribution to make to a better future.

But I do think that story telling or that self-disclosure is important and finding ways that we can do that and maybe building that into the curriculum. [B8—professor]

However, countering the metanarrative of the noble cause as validation becomes a particular challenge for tertiary education in a commonly conceived post-conflict region. The approach taken in such peace building efforts through education compels a deeper examination of the role of difference within communities and indeed across communities towards greater disclosure and recognition of the extreme burden or debt borne of violence. Embedded in a socio-psychological drive to valourize the struggle lies the unique *onto-theo-teleological* basis for justifications of individual and group actions creating and marking difference itself as key rationale for violence. Since the completion of my field research in Northern Ireland in 2010, there have continued to be outbursts of terrorizing events primarily targeting individuals with significant escalations during the marching or parade season in the province.⁹⁶ One example of such metaphysical and real violence had occurred the previous night as re-presented by the professor the following afternoon.

The real problem that we face at the moment is dissident organisations, where, I mean, there was a bomb in Hollywood last night. And the IMC—International Monitoring Committee—reports have stopped reporting now, but their reports

⁹⁶ Numerous incidents of violence are recorded by the Police Service in Northern Ireland (PSNI) in the last few summers related or grouped with regards to the marching season, often due to the influence of dissident groups. This is also documented in the 2012 Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report (Nolan, 2012), see the second and third key points in the report (pp. 7–8) at http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/events/peace/docs/nipmr_2012-02.pdf

until recently were documenting the increase in particularly young men who were joining up. And I think part of that [is] there is a glamorisation of a conflict that they've not experienced and where you have a situation of kind of economic disadvantage, where you know there are no jobs and some people will see no future. The *idea of getting involved in a war is sort of sexy* and that's been nurtured by these guys who are unhappy with the way that things have gone. That's hugely worrying. [B8—professor, emphasis added]

In the moment of a glamorisation or romanticization of the past, the reality of conflict is too frequently elided in a preference for a narrative of power over the *other* as dictation of justice. Critically approaching the crucial questions of difference offered across the discourse within peace education necessitates a performative commitment and response to issues of *othering* across all realms of the metaphysical, phenomenal, and nomenal through an *ethico-pedagogy* of difference, (re)founding perspectivity and awareness on *another* plane.

Perspectivity and critical awareness re-frame questions of victimhood and the blame game evident in the many struggles of a divided society that necessarily must negotiate a future involving the *other*, the *other* as neighbor. However, this negotiation is oft shortsighted in the impulse to blame the *other* for real and grievous injury and harm to one's *self*, family, community. One marker of this process lies in the very label of who is a victim with respect to the *Troubles*. During 2010, this was a challenge acknowledged by the Community Relations Council who sought to facilitate a cross-community panel on victimhood as a step towards a Shared Future. Yet the challenge became particularly fraught with significant socio-political hurdles erected in the service of historical narratives of the respective communities regarding paramilitaries and their roles in the conflict borne in the claim,

there's a huge culture in this society that blames para-militaries and working class communities for everything that's wrong in this society. Middle class communities tend to be a little bit self-congratulatory, that it's nothing to do with them and so they can look down at this other lot and it would all be okay if it wasn't for them. [B5—professor]

In her claim, the professor adduces that the middle class of Northern Ireland desires to cast *itself* as *other* to the *other*, and thus, outside of the present concerns with particular regard to the past role(s) and even possible complicity of one's own community. An illusion of neutrality may often exist *as if* academic arenas would/could offer a subject position outside of the context to be explored, experienced, or examined. Counterpuntally, such an illusion cannot be maintained the moment *oneself* enters the realm of the *other*. Our performative response and responsibility as academics re-cog-nizes social equity re-reading illusory neutrality since

you can't be . . . [neutral]. So I'm trying to be on both sides at the same time. I think that is an extreme . . . challenge. And it's been the same here in Northern Ireland, if you showed any empathy, (I'm a Protestant guy) if you showed any empathy for [a] Catholic position, almost immediately you come against the challenge of you're a trai . . . people wouldn't actually use the word traitor now days . . . [they'd] probably say you've been mixing with them too much. You've been listening to their lies, blah, blah, blah. So . . . that's not an academic thing, it's a personal thing but I do think it is a personal thing . . . [and] it is a problem. [B6—professor]

A vulnerable desensitvity to the *other* is core to an essentialist approach to the *other* within the academic endeavour despite efforts to counter the construction of difference around walls of division and identity. The capacity to challenge these essentialist roots lies within the peoples of the respective communities and is cautiously nurtured in the promise of a new millennial future of transformation that would welcome the *other*, unequivocally, and without reservation, as poignantly reflected in the challenge facing engaged peace educators today.

My priority is just to create dialogue around it, get people talking about it. I remember . . . [during] a training course I was doing for teachers here, I sort of suggested an appropriate criterion for teachers to judge themselves was to . . . this was in the period just after the ceasefires when there was a lot of stuff around the Orange marches, I was saying "any teacher, in any Catholic school should be able to get up in front of their class and defend the right of the Orange Order to march anywhere in Northern Ireland, to offer reasons why they should be able to do that. And any teacher at a Protestant school should be able to get up in front of their class and offer a reasonable case why a resident group in Northern Ireland should be able to try and stop them." And close to the same issue, I've got people sort of

sufficiently connected that they can tell each other these accounts and it's up to the teachers to try and ensure those other perspectives are there. That was an interesting challenge because there's a lot of teachers in the room who balked at the start of that most of them just couldn't think of any case. It was not that they wouldn't do it [rather] most teachers in Catholic schools couldn't think of an argument, couldn't think of any reason why the Orange Order should be allowed to march or visa versa. And that's the problem because there has never been any dialogue around these things, people, in that sort of full sense, *actually don't understand what drives the other community*. And I'm convinced that that was important in the political process. When the politicians were engaging each other in negotiations, they continually talk across one another. There's no sort of engagement on language or sort of basic concepts and that's why so much political discourse is antagonistic and angry and aggressive, and sort of barky and shouty because they don't listen to one another. They don't try and figure out where the other guy is coming from and why is he so upset about that. The interesting thing is that in private they are often not like that. They are more civil to each other. [B12—professor, emphasis added]

Saying I “*actually don't understand what drives the other community*” encapsulates the challenge. Full stop. A post-critical peace education can engage in the questions of difference differently by acknowledging the voice of the *other* at the moment of admission while exploring *meta-physical* narratives conscribing normativity itself in an effort to generate productive discourse between the *self and other*. Such transformations arise within an empowering *ethico-pedagogy* performatively enacting *socialis aequitas* and *embracing humanitas* within the arriving unconditional university as proposed in Derridean *logos*.

Moving forward beyond the impasse of entrenched normative coding of Protestant or Catholic interests will only happen with leadership from both citizens and political leaders envisioning greater futures; however, an integral challenge for peace education in Northern Ireland is interwoven in the *socio-political* nexus deeply marked within entrenched interests given different and differing *socio-ethno-politico-historical* narratives. Efforts to address the often strident and marked lines of division are lead by visionaries in tertiary education and less

frequently by politicians beholden to particular parties or camps. How this challenge as interpreted remains the question a short fifteen years, post-GFA/BA as

Education at the moment in Northern Ireland, in policy terms, is in utter chaos because there's an essentially a Unionist/Nationalist split on most issues that is literally beyond reason. It just doesn't make sense apart from this sort of totally, antagonistic relationship between the key players. But as a consequence of all of this, the education system is just melting away. It's just insane. You know . . . politics should be better than that. Peace should be better than that it should be more interesting than that. It shouldn't be just sort of trying to prosecute the old arguments in non-violent ways, it should go beyond that.

[Interviewer: So then how does . . . since peace isn't the lingua franca here practically in nearly any sense, how does it get taken up in Education, particularly?]

Well, what we're trying to do is to get people to engage with one another about how Northern Ireland could be different and better. [B12—professor]

A possible path bridging the divide lies along a course of true heterological difference. Notions of heterological difference have surfaced before with regards to seemingly intractable conflicts, yet the approach often lacks complete acceptance from the former disputing parties as the constituting element of difference—fundamental alterity—is frequently ignored, dismissed, erased, or sublated in some fashion in the course of designing a “resolution” to the conflict. Thinking difference differently poses *another* subject position for both the *self* and *other* through transformative education for peace beyond the limit at *impossibility*.⁹⁷

⁹⁷ For an example of *another* thinking in the moment of individual *ontic* awareness, perspectivity, and genuine connections with the *other*:

“[I was a part of a] group of teachers . . . [who] met very regularly and we did what teachers do—we produced materials. But it was in that producing those materials and the encounter with teachers from . . . particularly from Derry, teachers who'd been in on the Bloody Sunday March, teachers who had not been in the Civil Rights Movement. Teachers you build up trust with in a working environment and you realised when a teacher came in on a Friday morning to the workshop here and was saying ‘Sorry I'm a bit late, I got picked up last night because I was a bit gruff at a road block and I didn't get out of Ft. George ‘til 2 o'clock so I thought I'd have a bit of a lie in.’ You began to get . . . your understanding of the other and the other side became much more nuanced.” [B1—professor]

Peace education is poised to engage the triangle of difference, peace, and deconstruction in the moment of the arrival (*à venir*) of the *other* re-presented in the new student entering tertiary education whom elects to examine his/her *onto-epistemological* foundation(s) and perspective in a response to the fundamental demand of the *other* in presence recoding obligation. In this opportunity, engaged peace educators serve as interlocutors in

the classroom [where] to some extent, we don't have a huge amount of choice [regarding pedagogy and curriculum] because even though it's . . . which is a good thing, because of the diversity of the student body the student's bring their own perspectives and their own stories both around kind of peace and conflict-related issues specifically, but also around a range of development issues, or Human Rights issues and so on. . . .we have had students from the Irish Army for instance, but also from the American Army as well as people who have probably engaged in non-violent direct action against military installations of some type and everybody in between. So, the diversity of the student body really means that you have to be open to different perspectives on issues and I mean that's a healthy thing because it reinforces this notion that Peace is a kind of contested concept . . . that Peace [for] some people peace means security, for other people it means pacifism and non-violence.

Critical engagement with the issues requires being open to multiple perspectives on those issues. [B7—professor]

Creating the environment and educational realm for such critical engagement demands a deliberate approach to the question(s) of difference, a *thinking-through* of difference differently in an examination of the sign force weighting discourse. Thinking peace differently, in difference, through *différance* shifts difficult dialogues borne in divergent *socio-ethno-politico-historical* narratives unfolding new planes of possibility as relayed in professorial voice,

I taught at Stranmillis for example, during the Science Methods work and when the topic of evolution came up, they would turn their back on the lecturer as . . . to demonstrate their abhorrence of the topic and their absolute rejection of it. And you know, that is the reality. To give you the opposite end of it, we are working with Catholic student teachers who believe very strongly that there is something very unique and very special that is offered by going to a Christian school, to a Catholic school for a Catholic pupil. So getting these people who are very

entrenched to think about difference is a real challenge. But in many ways, the linguistic difference of the newcomers [different economic immigrants from Europe], I think, is actually helping to catalise some of that debate and some of that discussion. [B5—professor]

The complicated nature of peace as notion, idea(l), concept, and difference remains poignant in the Northern Irish (con)text, “you begin to realize the complicated nature of what peace is and how people think about peace. Peace for Unionists isn’t the same as for Nationalists” [B11—professor].

An opening to the question of difference necessarily engages the chiasmic divide of definition framing the void between the *self* and *other* ordered in *onto-theo-teleology* within heterological difference.⁹⁸ Crossing this chiasm (and chasm) re-posit-ions the order between the *other* and the *self* into planes of discourse honouring *Other* through an instant of hospitality as evidenced in the peace processes of the 1990s. The role of women in the course of the discourse

⁹⁸ Consider the nature of heterological difference in the following:
 “I suppose another important event was [when] I went to Israel a few years ago with paramilitaries from both Republican and Loyalist paramilitaries on a . . . Belfast—East Jerusalem Partnership. It brought together policy makers, academics, [and] community activists (all being former paramilitaries, ex-prisoners, most of them). And kind of getting to know these guys, in a kind of surreal way because these were the people we grew up in huge fear of and understanding that *they’re actually people underneath of it*. And their experiences of their communities is what led them to think the way that they did to take up arms and so on. And that, I suppose, helped me reflect on people in my community who took up arms, whether it was through . . . *and people in my family whether as we saw it legitimate . . . they saw their world as legitimate as well*. So kind of coming to understand that in a way, I suppose, deepens that sense of . . . well, you know, ‘we don’t have any choice . . . we can’t go back to that.’ We have to towards a more peaceful resolution of our conflict and the only way that we can do that is to really understand where the other’s coming from and to try to walk in their shoes, to take their perspective, and to self-disclose, to tell our stories to help others to know where we’re coming from. And those are the tools of peace building I think in terms of building relationships. And whether that sort of inter-personal, or inter-group, the mechanisms are the same and that’s verified in literature.

“I mean, Social Psychology has been . . . there’s a massive international literature now on this and all of it is pointing to the same building blocks of peace.” [B8—professor, emphasis added]

Opening to the perspective of the *other*, begins in the opening of an *embracing humanitas*, re-forming the bounds of division and separation, illuminating subjectivity itself, for the *self*.

of the conflict in Northern Ireland is indisputably strong and significant in support for families and community, and key to the drafting of the Good Friday Agreement/Belfast Agreement. The fundamental alterity of the *other* as *another* way towards human social relationality, or peace is evidenced in her passionate telling of moments during the development of the framing document where we hear, see, witness *another*:

I was involved because our approach was, we talked to everybody about everything and that, to me that was what was good. In terms of . . . I think the Women's Coalition contribution to the Talks was quite subtle but important because we were very much upfront about . . . we weren't a middle of the road party, we weren't middle ground, we were people who were drawn from all sorts of different backgrounds: Nationalists, Unionists, Loyalists, Republican, as well as some middle ground people. The working methods, we had to develop for ourselves, in a way mirrored what Northern Ireland politicians as a whole needed to do. . . . I know we were told after the agreement was reached, that Civil servants had had a bet on amongst themselves about which political party would get most of their positions into the agreement and apparently the Women's Coalition won. But okay, but in a way, that's not a surprise because so many of the parties were going in with that "this is the way it is." And we were saying, "yeah, you're both right. Actually, it's both of those ways and now you have to figure out how to accommodate." [B4—professor]

Yet fashioning such a new lens through which to examine the seemingly intractable conflict became the possible at the limit approaching impossibility affording multiple perspectivities and a plurivocity of positions re-writing possibility in equity. (Re)imag(e)(in)ing subjectivity and beginning in a willingness to engage the *other* as *Other*, the peace processes sought to bridge the chasm between lives lived divided. Seeing through the eyes of the *other* in chiasmic reflectivity as performative responsivity, pre-sents anew relations of difference across difference as the possible of *impossibility*.

One of the advantages of Northern Ireland in the context of the European Union is that the border on the island, which I'm quite happy to see go at some point—doesn't have to go if it's less consequential. We are British and we are Irish at the same time. I don't have a problem with that. If we have a political settlement which works, if there is ever a united Ireland, then the political structures should stay exactly as they are. The British and Irish governments should always be

involved as long as there are people whose sort of first affiliation is to a sense of Britishness. All these things should . . . borders shouldn't be that important, so that's why I get so upset about that. I gained that lesson from listening to people in other places who are tackling essentially the same problems and because I was looking at situations where I wasn't emotionally involved, I was able to see solutions that would never occur to me back here. So from that point of view, getting out of this place and engaging with other people was a Godsend....
[B12—professor]

Positivist socio-constructivism as transperformative endeavour affords *other* perspectivity and apperceptions. Developing perspectivity that re-cognises the *other* in non-consumption and non-invention will pose further trajectories in de-ontic responsibility which may indeed suggest heterological rationality while re-con-stituting frameworks of meaning (rationality) and the *trace(s)* of *meta-narrative(s)* (re)ordering our individual and collective lives.⁹⁹ A (re)ordering premised on difference through deconstruction opens to-ward peace as idea[I] and possible future(s).

Peace

Defining peace remains an infinite and complex endeavour in any circumstance, while (re)imag(e)(in)ing human social relationality in the aporea of the university offers infinite planes of possibility for peace educators poised on the edge of an arriving epochal shift. How we

⁹⁹ Heterological rationality presents a fundamental critique to all *telic* coursings, (*a*)spatially and (*a*)temporally; moreover, the notion is unavoidable whenever the *self* is constituted. Seeing the *other*, as noted by one graduate student is the pre-ordinal instant imbued with the weight of his(er)story.

“But I think if you have to have some kind of a peace process anywhere . . . I suppose you have to put on the table what the conflict is about and try to stand in the other person's shoes and acknowledge the reasonableness of the other person's stance, or the possible reasonableness of it and you have to compromise. Compromise is, it's not something that I like at all, but I think you have to probably have to compromise, you know. My ideas there wouldn't be a compromise, it would be one of these . . . there's right and there's justice and the person who's not giving the justice should have to do it, but in practical terms I don't think that actually works. [A2—graduate student]

approach the abyss of human (dis)connection between the *self* and *Other* will reveal our future, the range of possibilities unfolding, and our collective position in it. Given all the possibilities along the human arc of *Being* I think it is particularly telling, and I recommend for your thoughtful consideration—a *thinking, thinking through(out)*—the following conceptualisations on/to/of/“for” peace in the discourse as comprised by my research:

- A listening to the *other* with openness notioning *embracing humanitas*

Peace, to me, would be as much practice in that situation, you know as in any other. So my sense of what peace is still would have a lot to do with listening to the *other* [and] . . .reflect[ing] . . .So I . . .[would] look again. I think my level of understanding of what peace is would have to do with that and you know, kind of an open-ended understanding, you know or developing understanding in just what peace is. I that’s just as much of a question to me as I would have any answer to.

And that’s probably a lot of why I’m here to look at the conflicts that arise to come to this definition in a sense. But I think that that’s going to be a life-long process in any situation. So positive peace, negative peace . . .you know, all of these different dimensions. I would say a lot of that arises from a sense of listening. And you know, my skepticism with that arrogance that I was talking about before had to do with that component not being there within a lot of colleagues . . . Yeah, I think . . .is peace possible would be more you know . . .is my question, yes. Spiritually and all of these different things and you know pervades some days more than other on a personal level, but also I think it’s a decision with that understanding each day as it transforms the definition, moment to moment transforms one’s life you know, the principles its based off at that point to keep a sense of openness and understanding, or respect . . .to listen, not only to people, but to the greater world around you. [A6—graduate student]

- Re-cog-nising difference differently, an *ethicus obligatus*

I think my notions of peace . . .[include] it’s not the absence of conflict because conflict is a natural thing. There’s something about how we negotiate differences. And our default, our culture seems to you know, produce a way of reconciling difference, which is very negative, which is very much about separation and is very much about a power relationship quite often. So you know, the people that are the most well educated, resourced financially, you know, they hold powerful positions in society.

So it's not about you know, often right or wrong, or justice and injustice, it's about power really and the abuse of power. I suppose what would be a useful society for me would be to find ways and I know it's a bit of a cliché but to you know, to recognise difference and to try to resolve conflict in a way that's not, in a way that tries to reduce the power imbalances between different strata of society. [A5—graduate student]

- Positivist transformation as possibility within individuals through engaged *socio-constructivist* education

So my concept of peace is its sort of, a little bit contradictory. On the surface it would sound like coexistence—learning to manage and live with all the stuff. But I actually think you need a bigger goal or you probably just couldn't keep doing it. And as I say, the only place I largely see that happening is within individuals. I'm not sure if societies, completely transform themselves, [rather] they develop and change and move. I don't know if they transform in the way that I mean transformation in terms of individuals. [B2—professor]

- A sense of belonging marked in *socialis aequitas* enfolding non-violence

I think it has to do with belonging, or being a world where there's room for everybody. From the smallest society to the whole world that there's a space, a place where everybody should feel that they belong—not threatened with the denial of that identity or that space that belongs to them. So I think you can't separate it from justice, from social justice. That you can't have peace that depends on people recognising that they're not equal [or] less than other people and that some people have more of a “right to the good things of life,” or I don't think a society's at peace until people can have a life where they feel that they belong and that they can; that they don't have to be completely taken up with survival, such that it's the only thing in their life. So I think that peace, just because there's not a war going on, there's only a . . . [level of] violen[ce], . . .it's not the meaning of peace. [A2—graduate student]

- To-ward positivist transformation(s) through *thinking difference differently* as performative academic engagement with *Other*

In the absence of that trust, consociationalism or that type of ethnically led politics merely creates deep fissures within society. That's going to continue to be problematic. That's certainly the view that I take. I think we need to move to a more integrated society and to break out of those sorts of ethnic silos. So for me peace is more than just people sort of stopping the shooting, but its about trying to create different patterns of

relationships within society. Because then, we are sort of convinced that the . . . in our situation, and in many ethnic conflict situations the big problem is that relationships between communities are centered around notions of fear. And you need to try and do something, which is not simply about stopping the manifestation of fear—which is violence. But you have to do something beyond that which actually tries to change those relationships. [B12—professor]

• *Positivist socio-constructivism* towards a managing distopic presences

Obviously, there can be peace with coexistence as in people not killing each other. But for me, on the optimistic scale of it, I still believe that people can be transformed and change the way they are. And that's for me, a fundamental contradiction between what I said earlier about the pessimism and the practicalities and how things are never really quite delivered. But I sort of, in my world of peace, those two things exist with each other. The sort of impractical, never-quite-works, the grey area stuff actually exists with the expectation that transformation can happen. But for me, most of the time, I can only show that in individuals. It's quite hard to actually show that in wider processes. Some how, peace is just about managing all that stuff in a way that allows people to be more productive and cooperate and work with one another. And then the optimistic part of me is that hopefully allows transformation to happen. It changes how you see things and it changes how you see others. [B3—professor]

• Structuring peace as possibility in order through *onto-theo-teleology*

My grounding would be sort of a biblical peace in the Judeo-Christian tradition. Some sort of an equitable structure—people getting paid for what they do, or equal pay. Equality—living with enough. Right structures, right relationships that are just, equitable, and fair. Those are a little bit all, different. That would sort of be my first layer in terms of peace.

Getting into more of the peace building, my take on it would be more of the grass roots—bottom up approach. Working with peace from people on the ground level and then connecting with different levels of society sort of building and bridging, complementing each other. A big person involved in that, John Paul Lederach, his middle line approach. I would say probably that's . . . closest to my personal take on it though I know there's Marxist, post-Structural, Liberal interpretations in IR [International Relations], but that's sort of where I operate from and then sort of move into strategic peace building, just peace building. Those would be my interest areas. [A4—graduate student]

•The *as if* and personal safety/human security

For me, I guess I would still frame it in the fact that at that you don't have to fear about your personal security, your food security. For a young child, I guess just the ability to play.

In those cases where a young child has a sort of care-free existence—and I realise that's a very Western conception of childhood—to me that's something that I very much valued as a child growing up, but I feel like in situations here there isn't peace and I think of that also in terms of not much formal conflict situations where people are constrained by poverty or environmental pollution—for those people, they're not living in a situation of peace, except for a young child, that's what I'd emphasize. It's the material and your personal well-being are taken care of or provided for as avenues to work towards. [A7—graduate student]

I think peace can be equated with a person's personal security, not government's security or something. But a sense of feeling safe and at peace, [being] as whole as you possibly can . . . [with an] essence of personal security in your personal life. [One] . . . can provide for your family to the best of your ability and your children can play in your backyard, or front yard, or on your stoop safely, without fear. I think that a lack of fear would be the biggest thing to me. I think that encompasses a lot. [A8—graduate student]

•An arriving perspectivity beyond ethnocentricity acknowledging *ecological presencing-*

in-consciousness

I get this from my students of all ages, a very strong inability here to see outside of Northern Ireland. I think when people talk about peace or issues related to peace they only relate it to what is local. And for many . . . I don't think that is a criticism, I think that's probably inescapable because it has so coloured people's way of life here for so long and [it] continues by virtue of the segregation and the separation that there is. And because of the whole issue of the legacy of what happened here, the issues of victims . . . who were the victims, who were the perpetrators the whole confusion over that which was tried to be dealt with by the Eames-Bradley Commission. All of that is still terribly raw. And I think there's huge advantage for our students of all ages in actually looking at this as a global issue and looking at other places where there has been or is conflict because there is a tremendous insularity and there is a tremendous sense, and I think to a certain extent this is symptomatic of other countries where I've worked where there's conflict as well is that they [have] . . . almost an inability to comprehend that other people could be caught in such a bad situation that the experience is very particular, it's very specific. And I

don't think . . . it would be tremendously hard for you to ask somebody who has grown up in Northern Ireland about peace without them answering in a very particular sense in relation to Northern Ireland. [B5—professor]

My own answer, which arrived at, partly through looking at Northern Ireland, but engaging with, sort of theorists about “What is peace?” is that I think we should stop thinking about peace as an end state, peace as a just society, peace as an ordered society. I think we should think about peace as the capacity to manage conflict creatively. So it's an ongoing process. You never arrive at a peaceful world if you think of it as a kind of final destination. I think peace needs to be thought of as a process of how you deal with conflict and that's based partly on the influence of my old supervisor, [intentionally blank] . . . but also the recent work by Johan Galtung, peace should now be defined as non-violent and creative conflict transformation. He doesn't even use the term resolution anymore because he thinks it's too static, he uses the term transformation. So to create a peaceful society, what you have to do is to find ways to allow people to deal with their differences creatively and non-violently and not to come with your own definition of peace, I think that's very dangerous if we're too dogmatic about what we mean by peace. It's essentially what peace means for the people in the conflict that's crucial, to try and work with that. [B11—professor]

Peace Education

Differentiating Peace Education and Peace Studies as especially marked fields of study has been a difficult challenge within the university with respect to the legitimatisation of the respective areas of study as outlined in the previous chapters; yet, another element of this challenge regards pedagogical approach. Peace education as *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* has an excellent opening in and through difference to (re)examine its shifting foundation(s) and *epistemo-logical telos*, re-posit-ing education in the domain of rationality. In the course of founding a reflexive, post-critical peace education, the perspectives of multiple disciplines and fields of academic study have bearing on any engagement of human social relationality and are entwined within the very approach to rationality, meaning, questions of difference and *epistémè* as formed in *meta-physical* narratives. Institutional affiliation across the academic domains of

the university remains problematic given specific attachments to Western constructions of rationality with particular import for peace literacy and peace education born in an age of human transition from smaller tribal affiliations to a more modalised era. Peace education formed in reflective, rational discourse bears the burden of deconstructive discourses re-leasing subjectivity in the *other*. The nature of this shift is evidenced in

the challenges with academia throughout, in the sense that what I think makes Peace and Conflict Studies quite interesting is that it largely is multi-disciplinary. I would completely agree with you, it's multi-disciplinary in that it's never really defined itself. And there are a whole lot of people coming from different backgrounds doing it. So I don't really think it's like that by construction, it's like that by osmosis or whatever it is that's sort of created this thing and then you can hang a whole lot of different things on it. But at its core, it's still quite cross-disciplinary, where most departments, well there might be some who've all studied Peace and Conflict degrees or something, but like most departments, I would imagine that's not the case. You have people who are the sort of slightly hybrid creations like me and the staff here [at INCORE] who don't really [have specific degrees in Peace and Conflict Studies], everyone of our backgrounds is different and our primary degrees are different. And so outside of even the psychology stuff, I think the problem is that it creates entities that don't really fit within the way that universities are traditionally thinking about themselves as Politics and Law and all these sorts of things.

So my own work is a classic example of that. I come from a psychological background, . . . [but I would not] call that psychology . . . it's somewhere between Community, Social and Liberation Psychology. [B3—professor]

These structural challenges within academe belie an even greater challenge rooted in the *epistemo-teleology* of Western metaphysics as Derrida adduces within the chain of *phallogocentrism* binding discipline in webs of ontology. Loosing said chains requires *another* approach to *epistémè* and rationality, unfolding in de-*ontic* liberation of provincial disciplinary boundaries engendering a truly trans-disciplinary, post-critical peace education.

In the discourse of the discourse on and in the field of peace education and its academic engagement within and across academe, unique opportunities unfold re-vealing *another* approach or way through *difference-in-différance* renewing purpose.

I suppose one of the issues that has come out in many areas is the gap between policy and practice and theory and practice and policy. And I don't think that Peace Education has bridged these either despite many efforts really to, maybe connect better to the ground. I think for Peace Education in particular, there has been a gap between theory and policy and little recognition of the area of Peace Education even within academia. I suppose it's a developing field, which has made much gains over the past, probably ten, twenty years or so. But it's still a relatively tiny area, which is quite fragmented theoretically [and] in many cases not very multi-disciplinary—you've got within each discipline, your own take on peace education, so you've got the social psychological perspectives on it, you've got the educational perspectives on it which draw, in many cases, on social psychology, you've got political sciences, etc. But I think there's little cut-over between the disciplines to make this new, sub-discipline maybe of Peace Education so that's definitely an area where I find things are still lacking. [B13—professor]

Acknowledging theoretical fragmentation is a significant hurdle within any discipline or academic field with the weight of the panoptic gaze bearing down, still the opportunity to re-focus the beam through fundamental re-engagement with questions of difference in deconstruction within an evolving field is quite promising in the sense of a founding or reconstruction within the Western academy. The field of peace education may journey along the path of difference with openness to the *other* that is *Other* only on sound foundations built across difference itself while observing two cautionary elements. The first particular cautionary note reminds peace educators everywhere of the challenges inherent in this work in/on difference within the imprimatur that is the institute of rationality—the postModern university. With a healthy respect for parental rights in the discharge of their responsibilities toward the *other* (student/learner) the university's obligation to the respective student may unapologetically confront personal *onto-theo-teleologies*¹⁰⁰ in the dis-course on difference in *ethico-pedagogy*.

I think that we have to think beyond [individuals] and think of the implications for the cohesion of all society. And where it's very well to say to a parent that “You've got the right to have your child educated in this way” because they are

¹⁰⁰ Recall Derrida's thesis on the unconditional university compelling a performative response with particular regard to “saying anything” in the *as if*.

effectively making decisions for other children because they are removing their children from the mixed [integrated] schools.

I really hold out very little hope for any local or national government that is going to come forward and is going to challenge the two blocks that are there. I think that what we will see increasingly is those [blocks] shored up and the boundaries made less porous rather than more porous. In fact, there would be many commentators who actually state, particularly in the field of political science, who say that what the Good Friday Agreement has actually done is its institutionalised sectarianism [B5—professor]

At the instant of reification of difference through an “institutionalisation of sectarianism” the difference re-presented in the fundamental *other* is sublated into the *same* posing threats to the *being-nature of other-in-community*. This cautionary element enacted, challenges the (dis)course of peace in an environment seeking to bridge past futures and future pasts. Additionally, a second cautionary note concerns the performative responsibility or responsivity of educators in general and peace educators specifically to the *other* of the *Other* with particular reference to conflating the academic fields of peace knowledges while misconstruing peace literac(y)ies. Critical pedagogues and engaged, reflexive peace educators, may come to centre their concern on the respective canonization as epistémè within each overlapping field in the arena of peace knowledges that confound understanding too often, as the deconstruction of each field (within the arena of peace knowledges) founders with presumptions of auto-affectivity masquing epistemological difference itself while simultaneously fortifying isolationist pre/pro-scriptive narratives as cannon. How we approach these fundamental questions of pedagogy and curriculum is the key as noted in the discourse of the present chapter,

I suppose my personal understanding about peace education which is something I mentioned last week [though] I haven't talked about now, would be very focused as well on peace building. I would have quite an active understanding of what peace means. And that means speaking out and standing up. It also means voting—being active within society, which in an academic sense, I would connect with work on citizenship and democratic participation. Challenging prejudice . . . be it racism, sectarianism, or homophobia, or whatever it may be, is to me one of

the essential elements of any kind of peace building attempts. Reconciliation is more specifically . . . well, [in] the context of a society like Northern Ireland, where you are really trying to look at (to me) what forgiveness and reconciliation really means, how it could be promoted . . . So I think, generally, my personal understanding of peace relatively matches with what I'm doing within academia.
[B13—professor]

The breadth of peace education as a singular field currently remains problematic without fundamental reconsiderations of personal/institutional relation(s)/structure(s) and putative curricula/pedagogy.

Our journey through the archive of discourse on education for peace re-presented in a snapshot of Northern Ireland has been reflective of a passage between the *ethico-philosophico-pedagogical* aspiration of the academic field of peace education and the inter-phasic realm of meaning within the institution of rationality, or *universitas*. I have applied a *thinking, thinking throughout*, or performative critique to the discourse of *meta-narratives* pre-sented in the ethnographic snapshot of institutional and social settings structuring faculty and graduate students' lives through their individual re-pre-sentations attenuating voice and pre-sence within cultural strains. Sketching the landscape of tertiary peace education in Northern Ireland begins in the spatio-temporal nexus of indeterminacy at the confluence of *socio-ethno-politico-historical narrativities* structuring subjectivit(y)ies. In this necessarily brief snapshot tracing the footprint of a constative justice for two peoples divided, peace is revealed as a transcendental signified reframing *self* and *other* on planes of difference. Critical pedagogy as passage through, affords deeper apperception in *différance* reconfiguring the paradigmatics and possibility of a *peace education-to-come* in transperformative rendering through *ethicus obligatus, socialis aequitas enfolding non-violence, positivist socio-constructivism, embracing humanitas, and ecological presencing-in-consciousness*. Peace education remains infinitely complex with regard to respective understandings of difference, rationality, and *epistémè* bound in the metaphysics of

trace captured in the *present-of-presence*. (Re)imag(e)(in)ing engaged (post-)critical peace education is our collective journey through difference as discursis unfolding *impossibility*. In the *trace* of the footprint presented in discourse, I suggest that peace remains *other*—untetherable, adjacent, and shifting as the sands on the shoreline(s) of our con-structed metaphysical castles of *epistémè*, for peace as normative concept, idea, or notion captured within (Western) *meta-physics* remains a transcendental signified, a given notion or idea as sign with specific meaning and value in the *semio-theoretical* chain constructing human social relationality. In the final chapter, I propose *another* thinking, a thinking through *peace* that acknowledges the conditionality of the sign—(of) peace—across difference reordering assignation in Reason. I posit in Derridean vein, through the unconditional university, a performative transformation of the *meta-narrativity* of our individual and communal lives on arriving planes of difference as renewal in the enterprise of a *peace education-to-come*.

Chapter Five: Thinking Peace—Prolegomena for the Future

We no longer know therefore whether what is always presented as the derived and modified re-presentation of simple presentation, as the “supplement,” as “sign,” “writing,” “trace,” “is” not, in a sense necessarily but in a new way a-historical, “older” than sense and the senses, older than the originary donating intuition, than the actual and full perception of the “thing itself,” older than vision, hearing, touch, even before one distinguishes between their “sensible” literality and their metaphorical appearance in the scene of the entire history of philosophy.

(Derrida, 2011, p. 88)

But I guess if you wanted to find one core thing it’s that in a sense if you are teaching, whenever you are teaching in an environment where there is such division and hatred and bloodshed, then it’s part of your responsibility as an educator to do what you can to be part of the solution as opposed to being part of the problem.

B5—professor

We know that when people ignore the intrinsic dignity of particularity, forgetting our own limitations and speaking as if we were the mouthpiece of the universal, we unleash new forces of barbarism destructive of human dignity.

(Simon, 1992, p. 72)

Delimiting, re-presenting and proliferating in excess of the space allotted to it, my hope is that the text will work against itself in disavowing prescription, tidy tales and successor regimes of truth as we address how to proceed in such a moment.

(Lather, 2001, p. 478)

Thinking thinking with the *Other* necessarily poses genitive questions mapped across planes of difference captured in *semio-epistemo-logico-teleologies* constituted and constituting meaning and rationality. A thinking, thinking through with the *other* in the realm(s) of peace and education for peace, implicates the institution of rationality and its founding and foundational archetechtonics inside the structurality of *meta-physics* with its imperialist Greco-European-

North American façade, confining onto-epistemological narratives. *In extenso*, thinking thinking through with the *other-in-presence*, as an encounter in *trace*, ex-poses the discourse of discourse and (re)imag(e)(ine)s the *self* as absence with/in. A thinking, thinking through peace education for the future challenges the borders of *langue* and its guaranteed juridico-political contracts (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 105) beyond “ideological overcoding” comprising academic discourse. My dissertation examines the integral connections between Reason, the Western Academy (and its construction as Institute of Rationality), the evolving field of Peace Education, and Philosophy and its institution, revealing semiotic resonances and aporetic *socio-ethno-politico-historical narrativities* conscribing education for peace in the waning postModern age. However, the call for peace through educational endeavour to-wards peace literacy within the university, purposively disrupts the order of *phallogocentrism* and its sponsoring patriarchal institution that would sublimate a discourse on/of difference in substitution, as the *same*. Re-posit-ing the *Other* in *self* **and** *self* in *other*, unfolds another perspectivity opening through *presence*, presence in meaning, presence in spatiality, presence in temporality, in the *impossibility* of the limit. I proffer in the *presencing* present, the *self*/subject be-comes in poietic expression beyond the diachrony of the *self* and *other* inside the vital idiom of difference, effecting *peace education-to-come*.

Chapter five as conclusion, **and** non-closure (*clôture*), briefly presents the questions of difference, justice, and peace under review in my dissertation. I synthesize the philosophical inquiry of the distilled central themes of the field of peace education, which I have already transformatively deconstructed in Chapter two through a discursis of Derridean *logos* and Trifonasian *ethico-pedagogy* as *another* (con)text; subsequently affording a performative reading of the archive in the third chapter. I incorporate discursis and a transformative reading of the

archive to performatively critique the educational discourse of applied peace education related to peace (and conflict) in a Northern Ireland snapshot in Chapter four. I discuss the implications and possibilities of future research in the balance of the chapter closing my inscription.

Fundamentally the notions of peace remain constrained within the bo(u)nds of meaning constructed and constructing a “collectivized” sense of human social relationality; yet pervading notions derivative of Western academic imperialism still perdure, largely unexamined and accepted within Peace Education as academic field offering further fertile trajectories for future collaborative research in/to/through questions of difference structuring epistemologies within and across peace knowledges while sharply illuminating unwritten terrain. I posit *peace education-to-come* in the university without conditions opens *anew* peace literacy within the institute of Rationality and is reflective of a performative commitment to *positivist socio-constructivism*, an apperception of the syncretic nature of education in its positivist grounding seeking the presence of the *other*, re-reading heteroglossias of difference.

My commitment in/to the question of difference, justice, and peace led me to field research through a *philosophico-methodological* approach as I have elaborated in Chapter four and the appendix. I examined the fundamental question of human relationship permeating tertiary education in Northern Ireland in an effort to embody the philosophical quest through two research questions. My first research question was centered on peace: How is peace conceptualised among/by students and faculty (in post-conflict societies/settings) in the area of Peace Education? And the second more expansive query focused on difference in education: What does it mean to educate for peace? How do these conceptualisations lead to conflicting conceptions of educational purpose(s) and (curriculum) programs within the arenas of Peace

Education? These guiding questions informed and were informed by/in the philosophical engagement with difference in the proposition of an analytical framework.

It is then in this very inscription that I have presented an argument following three lines of flight, or possibility, at the limit of the Western canon structuring education and education for peace in the late postModern age commencing in a deconstructive re-reading of foundation(s). A secondary trajectory begins in the (re)imagination of theoretical discourse(s) opening the question of peace in/through difference, and is followed by an interpretative snapshot of post-conflict Northern Irish meta-narratives constructing discourse(s) as applied peace education. I engage this journey along the path illuminated in Derridean deconstruction, rendering (Western) *meta-physics* in limit, re-reading Trifonasian excursus of the former into a justice-to-come, and subsequently arriving through a disruptive “post-”reading in a future-present towards an ethical re-visioning of peace education as theory, as praxis. I conclude that a reflexive, (post-)critical peace educator necessarily enters the terrain of critical theory traversing questions of justice and difference, re-negotiating the foundations of rationality towards human social relationality, or peace in the presence of the *Other*. Guided in transformative enquiry, the assiduous peace educator would refuse the invention of the *other* cognizant of a narcotizing auto-telic *self*, subsuming presence. The *onto-theo-logical* invention of the *other* in critical pedagogy and the work of the field of peace education abandons *ethico-pedagogy* to the presupposition of a meta-physical *other* isolated and captured in the *self*, rather than presence of the non-self. Re-writing the educational endeavour in the very Institute of Rationality, however, affords further deconstructive readings of all bodies of literature within the arenas of peace knowledges with a particular focus beginning in peace research and continuing through peace education in the proposition of peace literacy. On this foundation, I have explored *onto-theo-epistemologies* in the

praxeological values of peace inside normative education for peace emanating epistemic violence towards an honorable purpose envisioning possible futures for the academic field of peace education.

The questions of difference, peace and (social) justice constitute the nature of meaning and rationality itself preferring another reading of inscriptive signification as closure (*clôture*) in Derridean vein, while offering a proposal of openness welcoming the *other* beyond the limit (*unconditional hospitality*) de-con-stituting assignation and rigid *epistémè*. Obliging originary compellation of the *other*, the germinal thematic and pre-positivist elements of early peace education are re-configured in transperformative tenets juxtaposing aporetic constructions of gnosis, rationality, and *epistémè*, in the question of subjectivity effecting present conceptualizations of peace within academe. Apropos the right to philosophy (Derrida, 2002), peace education for the future becomes in our re-cognizance of the *semio-theoretical* and figural maps of rationality and *epistémè* acknowledging the fundamental alterity of the *other* **and** *Other* as precursorial project in reason. Pursuing Trifonasian irruption in the wake of Derridean deconstruction, I propose *another* thinking, thinking through *peace* that would encounter the conditionality of the sign—(of) peace—across difference reordering assignation in Reason, a re-posit-ing across difference through performativity, transforming *meta-narrativity* perpetually, in the space of a renewed and renewing enterprise in *peace education-to-come*. As the university is the place and space for serious, strict engagement with the Principle of Reason and an arriving pluri-verse of critical engagement(s) with the nature of human social relationality enframed in the *beingness* of *Being*, it becomes the arena best suited for a critical engagement of the question of the question of *being*, and thus, peace through the eyes of the *Other*. Reason's role in the question of peace, difference, and justice as understood in the *ethico-pedagogico-theoretical*

space of the university provides the space for, and affords the opportunity for the literal, actual, physical, and metaphorical *other as presence* in the conversation of peace, or peace discourse beyond parochial positivistic axes subsuming will in qualified Heideggerian order.¹⁰¹ Critical reason becomes the encounter in difference demythologizing Reason in reason beyond all limits of law (*Droit*), rights (*droit*), order, and governance re-situating the question of peace as *present-in-presence*. Unfolding an *eco-logical presence-in-consciousness*, the foundational precept of human nature (*being*) is re-written in a reflexive, performative re-framing in *positivist, socio-constructivism*. Our performative engagement as peace educators and critical educators in an arriving epochal shift expiring *phallogocentrism* as compelled by the always present *other*, is the passage through reason to *another* reason as Reason for

the method of its [the university's] "Reason" as "the structure and closure of representation"¹³⁹ is not, nor could it ever be, outside the *scope of deconstruction*, but rather is a precursor of and, moreover, integral to *the necessity for a critical questioning of the grounding of the foundation of the institutional frameworking of knowledge*. The metaphysical (logocentric) assumptions behind the objective setting of the value of truth are reductive, autarchical and protective, of the *practical ends of the task of thinking*. *Reason and the technologies of Reason are not without interest, not without ground or a grounded grounding that withdraws, refracts, is concealed*. And in this solicitation of a "crossing-over" from *theoria* to *praxis* where normative levels of the "optimal performance" of ideas have to be met to the utmost satisfaction of "rationality," there is hidden the *opening of the non-ethical violence of the universal*. "Beyond all those big philosophical words—reason, truth, principle—that generally command attention," Derrida tells us, "the principle of reason also holds that reason *must be rendered*."¹⁴⁰ "Deconstruction"—and there cannot be just *one*—is not exempt from the responsibility of answering the obligation of thinking through this obdurate call to grounds *in full*, albeit in the profusive singularity of its own distinctive ways.¹⁴¹ But the issue of the "properness" of response becomes more radical in conjunction with what has become a *postModern* "crisis of representation," a suspiciousness of reference and referentiality formed as a question of the

¹⁰¹ An irruption or re-posit-ing of the sign Reason itself in *différance* liberates reason in the infrastructural movement of *différance*. Heidegger's (1996) representation of human order through the scientization of *being* present, bound in apperception, holds for an ordering of will to the cosmopolitical.

“*Question of Reason*” and its “must.” (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 109, footnote in original, emphasis in original)

Eternal vigilance must watch over Reason in an age of commoditisation of *epistémè* acknowledging the indissociable connections between social justice and thinking proffering an unconditional commitment to new and inventive reasoning honouring the *difference* of the *other* in *différance* beyond the constraints of Modernity and its *teleological* axiomatics. A constituted commitment to Reason must necessarily ever guard our cosmopolitical concern for social justice as social justice for all peoples, *beings*, and *non-beings*, living past and present in a movement of pro-tension balancing the present in past, and past in present. An honouring the *other-in-Other* in presence beyond the limits of *onto-theo-teleology* fortified in dissimulative structures of *meta-physical* constructions. Reason then, performs a multiple functionality within the very institute of Rationality, tasked with an *impossible* responsibility to itself, the institution, and the nexus of *spatio-temporality* imbibing “es-”sence in pre-sence. The Institute of Rationality, or the University as charged in performativity, be-comes of particular interest given its course of development in recent decades and the co-optation of its missional aspirations in an increasingly commodified, globalicised world. *Universitas* as domicile of Reason is obligated by the *other-in-Other* to confront its *raison d’être* in ethical response opening embedded questions of justice and peace on future planes of difference acknowledging “the principle of reason as a *fundamental principle of Being and beings*, and thence of *poiesis* and *praxis*” (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 114, emphasis in original) as the unfolding of *impossibility*. A fundamental critique of reason in Reason and its principle institutionalising institution—the Western Academy—is revealed in its dis-closure and *discursis* grounding the *ethico-philosophico-theoretical* question of peace in the burgeoning field of peace education and its opening through *positivist, socio-constructivism* in a dissimulative, fading postModernity. This key transperformative tenet borne in a reasoning of

reason in the institute of Reason, would relieve the constative limits of peace, social justice, and difference imbibing deconstruction, invoking inter-phasic presence (spatio-temporality) as a *philosophico-theoretical* engagement in peace literacy. More importantly, the exploration of another reason, a reasoning of difference in *différance*, proposed in Trifonasian in-scription, offers anew fertile ground for discourse through/on *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy* weighing *presence* of *other* **and** *self*, as well as assumptive narrative presence through abyssal origins (p. 116). Peace education-to-come, compelled in another reason shall not abide institutional scripting, truncating subjectivity as a *standing-in-for-will*; rather an arriving engaged, (post-)critical education for peace (re)imag(e)(ine)s mechanistic life (in worldview or onto-teleology) through *reconnaissance*, rehabilitating free thought, human will, and social justice as opening to a future-for-all.

Post-critical (peace) pedagogy re-cog-nizes the *philological* tether that is the university as cultural artifact, reasoning peace further among *Other* across planes of difference fostered in the *L'Université sans condition* (or *university-to-come*), even to the weighing or consideration of “irrationality” as per-ceived in the eyes of the *other*. However, the pursuit of **Truth** compels a multi-perspectival consideration of the very nature of rationality and its structuration of meaning, truth, and *epistémè* within and between paradigmatic constructions of *presence-in-world* more commonly signed as East/West, Global North/Global South, Occident/Orient, First World/Third World, etc; but even further, such binarisms deny the *other* in any form of (pre-/ab-)sence.

The question of justice, always, already in *presence*, is the question of difference as embodiment of philosophy serving knowledge without conditions or restrictions, in the *university-to-come*. Social justice as re-framed in *socialis aequitas enfolding non-violence* commences a fundamental critique of misappropriated presence entrained in *socio-ethno-*

politico-historical narrativities shunting *other* in a moment of invention. Refusing invention while deconstructing the *self*/subject is justice; for justice is not, cannot be justice extant *other* in presence, as justice is only justice in the eyes of the *other*. Our essential academic responsibility as (post-)critical pedagogues and peace educators exceeds the divisional criteria of the limit instituted in Rationality within the constructed university obliging service to all *others* through in a dis-course of justice affording an “affirmative reconciliation of the Self with the Other in the discursive arena of the civic space” (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 162) in *socialis aequitas*. The institute of rationality as primary edifice of desiccated Modernity is re-charged in purpose through the transperformative ethos of an arriving *ethico-philosophico-pedagogy-to-come* responsible to the *other* to fundamentally address the

self-limiting structure of closed governance reforc[ing] . . . the divisive criteria of inclusion and exclusion that make any decisions regarding public education void of any sense of responsibility and respectful response to the alterity of another. Such is the power of right, and the sense of its law, for it is forcefully bestowed and exercised freely and autonomously without the necessity of providing a reason, justification or explanation. (p. 162, emphasis in original)

A future thinking through is the future of the university and its role in society impacting the larger global context within the Occidental frame; hence, the *Universitas* is troubled in the limit of its understanding whereby the ethical question of the right to philosophy is tightly woven into an interlocking tapestry of *ethico-pedagogy* in our present age of re-imag(e)ination(s) (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 135). The passage of the *Other* in-to our presence—*eco-logical presencing-in-consciousness*—re-marks apperception in the lacuna of one’s *self-in-world* as a new *presence-in-world* beyond a significant anthropocentric bias, as a movement through the archive and its quintessential nature in *Being* de-marcating a leap beyond the strictures of *phallogocentrism*. An *eco-logical presencing-in-consciousness* adduces the play of poietic tensions suffusing the transperformative tenet re-cog-nising *being* in an interweaving as *putting-in-with other(s)*,

acknowledging *Other* in unconditional hospitality rewriting *presence*, spatio-temporally in expectation of supplemental *trace* infusing de-ontic perspectivity. We, the reader, (an *other*) and author, (and reader as author), are re-minded in/of the *axiomatcity* of the archive and its construction effecting meaning in the present, renewing the cosmopolitical (p. 138); for the *trace* of meta-theo-physics always remains with/in the irruptive discharge of *another* rationality questioning the limit in curricular and pedagogical constructions seeking to “give *voice*” to the *other* in synchronous death spiral while silencing the auto-nomic *other*, a perpetual silencing denying difference, denying justice, denying peace.

Peace as concept is normatively considered or thought in (Western) *meta-physics*, as transcendental signified, a given notion or idea with specific meaning and value through the imperialism of the sign. I have earlier in this dissertation (as (con)text), begun with a guiding idea[l] of peace as the way of, the space for, and the place where the human communities of difference responsibly exist in sustainable equanimity. However, consummate with my theoretical and academic field research on the question(s) of difference, peace, and social justice, peace as signified begins in a cautionary tale which necessarily opens our discursive path on the question of *peace as peace*, or as accepted signifier and thus—sign, a sign of Western imperialism in relation to the idea[l] of the “democratization of the world”. The terrain of conceptualization forged in reasoning Reason across spatio-temporal chiasmus, critically re-writes *ethicus obligatus* and *embracing humanitas* in a peace education-to-come on the *self*, superseding autotelic subjectivity constraining justice. Human social relationality or peace, fundamentally written in the arch-trace of the sign is unchained and loosed from the imperialism of the sign in presence of the *presence-of-the-other* (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 16). Ergo, the proposition facing human social relationality becomes one of re-con-struction of the *semio-*

linguo-epistemological endeavour repositioning meaning and *being* within *aspatiality-atornality* through structures of division and limit into the realm of difference differently. Peace education-to-come, materializing a subjectivity of subjectivity on/through difference pursues a “peaceful” resolution of the transcendental economy of the *self* and *other* *aspatially*, *atornally*, on future planes of difference refusing sublation in invention (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 44). The “peaceful” resolution is the only resolution. We, you and I as academics, scholars, and educators, are already captured in an economy of relation that is prescribed in the *aproe* of the university and have an opportunity to engage one *another* in difference through difference in *différance*, affording communication across the abyss of our violent metaphysical construction(s). This is an opportunity unfolding in a new literacy of peace with the potential to contribute to the body of knowledge of the field, peace knowledges, and the larger ethos of post-critical tertiary education.

I have argued that peace may only be considered as an infinitely complex notion with regard to our understanding of difference. The precipice upon which the concept of peace rests has been de-scribed earlier in Derridean and Trifonasian *logos* in the heart of this inscription in the second chapter and later in a praxeological Northern Ireland snapshot. In the search for the Archimedean point (en)compassing the concept of peace, many notable attempts to inscribe a meaning in meaning to *meta-physics* itself are imbricated in the false logic rooted in the semiotic code of *logocentrism*, appearing to de-scribe the singularity, “peace” within a plane of understanding yet to arrive or be-come—a *peace-to-come*. The trap lies in the assumption of the *transcendental signified* (peace) as self-referent sign in sophistic vortices. Within the code of *logos*, peace may refract only mere slivers of the image or imaginings of the larger concept as captured in the illuminating snapshot challenging received notions of peace, substituting for the

whole with fundamental consequences for the evolving academic field of peace education, limiting peace literacy.

The concept of peace remains ambiguous, ineffable, undefinable, and un-con-ceivable with “in” the rationality of (the) one—*self*/subject, and then *be*-comes in the moment of a transversal of the genealogical narratives of philosophemes and *onto-theo-teleologies* inflecting pneumatic strains in gestational apperception. Our collective journey to-ward peace through the *other*—or peace education itself—within the domain of the Institute of Rationality is simultaneously of an order greater than any path captured in langue and semiotics—both the phoneme and grapheme signify meaning enframed in rationality through the *onto-theological*, or metaphysical, capturing *reconnaissance* as a *presence-in-presence-in-world*. Just as there is an untranslatable aspect in meaning between idioms concerning fundamental notions of meaning itself, we may find ourselves already engaged in the guise of a *self* that is only *other*, a *present-non-presence*, interweaving threads of existence connecting modal apperceptions *aspatially* and *atemporally*. Therefore, peace through the eyes of the *other* is that condition of *being* imagined in the insularity of proximity as conception. Peace through the eyes of the *Other* is that condition of *Being* in the non-state of *spatio-temporality* as un-con-stitutable instaneity. Peace then becomes, or the *peace-to-come* arrives (*à venir*) in the unconditional welcoming of *Other* as presence **and** as absence in play, or tension (re)(de)fining meaning.¹⁰² The only peace that is

¹⁰² Derrida (1978) clearly considers meaning to be in-process, or in flux in the *play* between pre-sence and ab-sence in a move that acknowledges *supplement*. In his groundbreaking “Structure, Sign and Play” inscribed within *Writing and Difference*, he explicates the difficulty of philosophy and its attempt, or I should say, philosophers and their individual attempts (see Lévi-Strauss’s discourse on empiricism and truth) to examine the questions of meaning as notably captured in “the concepts of the sign, history, truth, and so forth” (p. 288). Derrida deconstructs the notion of totalization and introduces *play* claiming

Totalization . . . is sometimes defined as *useless*, and sometimes as *impossible*. This is no doubt due to the fact that there are two ways of conceiving the limit of totalization. And I

peace arrives (*à venir*) at the limit of the *self* effaced. Peace be-comes *other*, outside the sieve of *onto-meta-theology*, exceeding the bounds of the transcendental signified normatively structuring its conceptualisation. The fundamental nature of peace passes through the historical *trace* of the constative order bound in the *aporea* of narrative constructions, neither fully resolving, or resolved in the performative realm of the contemporary existant realized in the lives you and I have, share, and presence as *self(ves)/subject(s)* in and among the *traces* mapped by the *Other* and all *other(s)*. Peace then, or the nature of peace, be-comes in the *inter-play* between the *self* and *other*, as imputed in the question of a questioning difference through the *aporea* of the university disrupting the movement of finite constructions and thwarting the totalizing gathering of meaning around a singularised concept—a concept of peace. There is always a remainder, but not actually a remainder *as if*, and when a sum is calculated, but rather *another* addition to be made. This “movement of play, permitted by the lack or absence of a center or origin” [is] “the movement of *supplementarity*” (Derrida, 1978, p. 289) as the addition and replacement captured “with” in the concept, or con-ceptualisation.¹⁰³ The interpellative gesture of *play* in Derridean

assert once more that these two determinations coexist implicitly in Lévi-Strauss’s discourse. Totalization can be judged impossible in the classical style: one then refers to the empirical endeavor of either a subject or a finite richness, which it can never master. There is too much, more than one can say. But nontotalization can also be determined in another way: no longer from the standpoint of a concept of finitude as relegation to the empirical, but from the standpoint of the concept of *play*. If totalization no longer has any meaning, it is not because the infiniteness of a field cannot be covered by a finite glance or a finite discourse, but because the nature of the field—that is, language and a finite language—excludes totalization. This field is in effect that of *play*, that is to say, a field of infinite substitutions only because it is finite, that is to say, because instead of being an inexhaustible field, as in the classical hypothesis, instead of being too large, there is something missing from it: a center which arrests and grounds the play of substitutions (p. 289, emphasis in original).

¹⁰³ The *supplement* acts, or comes to act to add to “a lack on the part of the signified” (Derrida, 1978, p. 289) as a re-cog-nition of the *play* between pre-sence and ab-sence (p. 292). I

deconstruction, re-founds the meaning of peace in the (im)possibility an eternal search of/for origin dis-placing the citadels of **Truth** as sophistic paragons, previously held unassailable, and unchanging; still generating *another* kaleidoscopic lens (re)focusing and grounding the evolving field of peace education in a pre-sen(t)ce age in/to further planes of interpretative de-ontic (re)imag(e)(in)ing in chiastic comm-union.¹⁰⁴ Heeding Derridean inscriptive injunction, our interpretation of the (im)possibility of the metaphysical quest for full presence repositions *onto-epistemology* as a passage through to renewing meaning through con-ceptualisations in perview. The field of peace education is poised on the dynamic terrain of presence and meaning and thereby, continually negotiates its register and posit-ion within the aporea of the university. An opening to the future arrives (*à venir*) in the play and order of the sign, a perpetual, categorized disruption challenging *onto-theo-epistemo-logical* foundation(s). Actively deconstructing the foundations of the developing field in discursis affords the possibility at the limit stretching through the chasm of the metaphysical.

My doctoral research has been a *reading-thinking-through-out* the historical assignations present and presenting in the infinite moment of reconnaissance wherein the *self, other, and third* pass through the present we know, through a discourse of the “present” discourse(s) of peace

have taken up this notion of *supplementarity* earlier in Chapter two in connection with meaning, disturbing fixed notions, or con-structions, or conceptualisations of peace, and of difference.

¹⁰⁴ Derrida (1978) suggests interpretation is the “caught between” proclaiming there

are two interpretations of interpretation, of structure, of sign, of play. The one seeks to decipher, dreams of *deciphering a truth or an origin*, which escapes play and the order of the sign, and which lives the necessity of interpretation as an exile. The other, which is no longer turned toward the origin, affirms play and tries to pass beyond man and humanism, the name of man being the name that being who, throughout the history of metaphysics or of ontotheology—in other words, throughout his entire history—has dreamed of full presence, the reassuring foundation, the origin and the end of play. (p. 292, emphasis added).

education in a project (re)imag(e)(in)ing human social relationality, or peace through difference as *mochlos*. As such, my dissertation has primarily contributed to four dimensions of the discourse around education and peace in the academic field of Peace Education within the university setting reflecting:

1. Philosophical perspectivity—as deconstructed reading(s) of *onto-theo-logical meta-narratives* of foundation of the evolving field of peace education;
2. Historical perspectivity—as nominalised historical narratives (or *meta-narratives*) dominating personal concepts of peace (and conflict) structuring individual apperception;
3. Horizontal planes—as felt existential threat (by individual and community) foreclosing and/or structuring theoretical imagination (participant B3—professor); and finally reflecting
4. Performativity—as personal critical awareness delimiting discourse particularly in conflict/post-conflict settings.

A re-newed and re-newing philosophical perspectivity (re)imag(e)(ine)d within the *l'université sans condition* deconstructs meaning, rationality, and *epistémè* in critical pedagogy and peace education on planes of difference co-con-ceived within the nexical limit of the *self* and *other* bridging noumenal and phenomenal realms gestating *impossibilit(y)ies as if another* reality con-scribes manifestation as *Being-in-being*. The Northern Ireland snapshot of an applied peace education in Chapter four reflects a marking of difference in the post-conflict setting revealing (a)historical perspectivity with distinct essentialist roots nurtured in the soils of *socio-ethno-politico-historical* meta-narratives, and an existential threat signified as the *other*.

Centuries and decades of antagonism have reified the inscription of difference as difference beyond a cursory concern for the *other* that is not *self—self* as individuated subject, *self* as segregated community eliding composition as structure, and as *self* in *other*. Co-con-ceiving horizontal planes of difference from the *socio-ethno-politico-historical* meta-narratives present in Northern Ireland could “perhaps” open and/or re-structure theoretical imagination in unforeseen possibilities overcoming any felt existential threat (by individual and community), transiting divided throughways of past-futures and future-pasts. Reimagining the responsibility of the professoriate in performativity (i.e. critical pedagoges, peace educators) along with the teaching profession, *another* calling echoes across the chasms of delimited discourse(s) con-structed in near ages of upheaval silencing the voice of the *other*, reverberating and thence re-sounding in symphonies of diachronous (im)balance. This echo resounds in the tembre of *à venir peace education* engendering peace literacy through the re-engagment in noetic purpose within *universitas*. The combination of each of these dimensions offers necessary lenses through which a new apperceptual difference theory of post-critical peace education bridging the chiasmus of spatio-temporality, can re-envision the field, its role in the academy, and service to the larger world. Peace Education as an prescient academic field of difference—a thinking difference differently—can acknowledge the diversity of the ontological and epistemological cosmologies rooted in the *trace* of meta-physics that fundamentally shape individual and community/societal idea(l)s and conceptualizations of peace, towards a more transformative and truly cosmopolitan education for peace; and thereby, found the field in our present age of global bo(u)ndedness. But one may ask, in what manner and aspect(s) would the non-consumption of difference in community afford differential notions of peace that may either fall on, or off, a particular continuum of peace/conflict/war? Can this idea of *peace through the eyes of the Other* be

reconciled with instantiated ideologies of proscription? What does it mean to re-cog-nize the peace of the *other* in an open manner and in openings outside of the bounds of the onto-theological perspective(s)? The elemental core of these questions on alterity, peace, and the cosmopolitical has lately entered the discourse of educational philosophy illuminating notions of academia. Recently, I have sought to explore part of this *ethico-philosophical* arena in “Re-imag(e)ining the Cosmopolitical: Deconstructing the Other” (Wright, 2013), wherein I re-envision transdisciplinary connections exploring *ethico-socio-politico-pedagogy* engaging a philosophy of peace through difference as educational pursuit.

A poietic exploration of peace within educational arenas be-comes a (re)imag(e)(in)ing of the future in the aporea of the university affording new lines and possibilities that re-posit-ion *another* rationality while the spectre of Modernity haunts. The arriving epistemic shift in human thinking and consciousness re-positions education in a globalicized community of differences de-ontically grounded at the limit of ontology in an “affirmative ethics of *différance*” (Trifonas, 2000a, p. 64). It is in this shift, as a shift, itself that I see the double or tain in the mirror of ontology—as history, theory and being, while also re-pre-senting the immanent state of presence comprising an eminent new *being* connected in a presence-of-past. Furthermore, this presence-of-past reflects and emanates in the lives of individuals and communities (read societies/nations) honoring historical, ethnic/societal traditions, which I suggest is at once presence-in-past and past-in-presence in the *voice of the other* through deconstruction of the narrative of the question of pedagogy and praxis.

A Thinking for Peace

The nature of peace is like . . .

Where *being* melts into *being*, and into the beyond
Anew calling.

As the call of the loon is a call into the beyond . . .
Beyond the shores of our known paths
Beyond the paths of our travailed lives
Into the (im)possible future(s) of our imagination
Into the (im)possible places we've dared not tread

To a space beyond that of *self* lost in subjectivity
The knowing of only the known

The nature of peace is like the waves that lap onto the shore
Never-ending, enduring, patient
and forgetful of the patterns that once spoke the truth
only to yield to another:
Truth, knowing, being

It is a *being* beyond *Being* that silences the drones of squawking voices
merely clamouring for attention amongst the sea of endless formation(s)

References

- Anderson, G. (1985). Competing views of human nature in the politics of peace: Integrating ideas of Cobb, Galtung, Gewirth, and Tillich. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 47(02), 560. (UMI No. 8607818)
- Arum, R., Beattie, I., & Ford, K. (Eds.). (2011). *The structure of schooling: Readings in the sociology of education*. London, England: Sage.
- Austin, J. L. (1980). *How to do things with words* (2nd ed.). J. O. Urmson & M. Sbisà (Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bagnoli, C. (2011). Constructivism in metaethics. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/constructivism-metaethics/>
- Banks, M. (1974). A critical appraisal of research and teaching on problems of peace and conflict resolution. In C. Wulf (Ed.), *Handbook on peace education* (pp. 35–42). Frankfurt/Main, FRG: International Peace Research Association (Education Committee).
- Bar-Tal, D. (2002). The elusive nature of peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles and practices in the world* (pp. 27–36). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Benhabib, S. (2006). *Another cosmopolitanism*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Benjamin, W. (2012). The translator's task. (S. Rendall, Trans.) In L. Venuti (Ed.). *The translation studies reader* (3rd ed.). (pp. 75–83). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bickmore, K. (2005). Teacher development for conflict participation: Facilitating learning for 'Difficult Citizenship' education. *International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education* 1(2), 2–16. Retrieved from <http://www.citized.info/pdf/ejournal/vol%201%20number%202/007.pdf>
- Bickmore, K. (2011). Policies and programming for safer schools: Are “anti-bullying” approaches impeding education for peacebuilding? *Educational Policy* 25(4), 648–687. doi:10.1177/0895904810374849
- Biesta, G. (2009). Justice and the vocation of education. In M. Peters & G. Biesta, *Derrida, deconstruction, and the politics of pedagogy* (pp. 15–38). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Borradori, G. (2003). *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Bourdeau, M. (2011). Auguste Comte. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/comte/>
- Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.). London, England: Sage.
- Brock-Utne, B. (1989). *Feminist perspectives on peace and peace education*. Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.
- Bruner, M. (2006). Rationality, reason and the history of thought. *Argumentation* 20, 185–208. doi:10.1007/s10503-006-9008-9
- Burik, S. (2009). Opening philosophy to the world: Derrida and education in philosophy. *Educational Theory* 59(3), 297–312. doi:10.1111/j.1741-5446.2009.00320.x
- Burns, R. (1996). Problems of legitimation of peace education. In R. Burns & R. Aspeslagh (Eds.), *Three decades of peace education around the world: An anthology* (pp. 129–143). New York, NY: Garland.
- Burns, R., & Aspeslagh, R. (Eds.). (1996). *Three Decades of Peace Education Around the World: An anthology*. New York, NY: Garland.
- Burns, R. & Weber, T. (1995). Gandhi and Freire on campus: Theory and practice in tertiary peace studies programs. *Peace Education Miniprints*. Malmö, Sweden: Malmö School of Education.
- Bush, K. & Saltarelli, D. (Eds.). (2000). *The two faces of education in ethnic conflict: Towards a peacebuilding education for children*. Florence, Italy: UNICEF Innocenti Research Center. Retrieved online at <http://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/insight4.pdf>
- Butler, J. (2006). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (2009). Performativity, precarity, and sexual politics. *AIBR, Revista de Antropologia Iberoamericana* (4)3, i–xiii. Madrid, Spain: Antropologos Iberamericanos en Red.
- Butler, J. (2011). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of sex*. East Sussex, England: Taylor and Francis.
- Bryne, S., Standish, K., Arnold, J., Fissuh, E., & Irvin, C. (2009). Economic Aid: The end of Phase II and the impact on sustainable peacebuilding in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 3(3), 345–363. doi:10.1080/17502970903086743
- Byrne, S., Fissuh, E., Thiessen, C., Irvin, C., & Tennent, P. (2010). The role of the International Fund for Ireland and the European Union Peace II Fund in reducing violence and sectarianism in Northern Ireland. *International Politics* 47(2), 229–250. doi:10.1057/ip.2010.5

- Cabezudo, A. & Haavelsrud, M. (2006). Rethinking Peace Education. In C. Webel (Ed.), *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies* (pp. 279–296). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Caputo, J. (1997). *Deconstruction in a nutshell: A conversation with Jacques Derrida*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Carroll, D. (2006). “Remains” of Algeria: Justice, Hospitality, Politics. *MLN*, 121(4), 808–827. doi:10.1353/mln.2006.0088
- Cohen, T. (2001). *Jacques Derrida and the Humanities: A critical reader*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Cortazzi, M. (2001). Narrative analysis in ethnography. In P. Atkinson, et. al. (Ed.), *Handbook of ethnography* (pp. 384–395). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. doi:10.4135/9781848608337
- D’Souza, M. (1992). Philosophy, philosophy of education, and the education of teachers. *Interchange* 23(3), 255–64. doi:10.1007/BF01450186
- Derrida, J. (1967). *L’écriture et la différence*. Paris, France: Seuil.
- Derrida, J. (1973). *Speech and Phenomena: And other essays on Husserl’s theory of signs*, (D. Allison, Trans.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1978). Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences. *Writing and Difference*, (A. Bass, Trans.) (pp. 278–295). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1967)
- Derrida, J. (1985). Des Tours de Babel. In J. F. Graham (Ed., Trans.), *Difference in Translation* (pp. 165–207). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1988). *Limited Inc*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press. (Original work published 1967)
- Derrida, J. (1990). *Du droit à la philosophie*. Paris, France: Galilée. (Original work published 1967)
- Derrida, J. (1991). Glas (excerpt). In P. Kamuf (Ed.), *A Derrida reader: Between the blinds* (pp. 319–352). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1992). Force of Law: The ‘Mystical Foundation of Authority,’ (M. Quaintance, Trans.). In D. Cornell, M. Rosenfeld, & D. G. Carson (Eds.), *Deconstruction and the possibility of justice* (pp. 3–67). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Derrida, J. (1998). *Monolingualism of the other*, (P. Mensah, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1996)

- Derrida, J. (2000a). Hospitality. Angelaki: *The Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 5(3), 3–18. doi:10.1080/1353464052000321056
- Derrida, J. (2000b). *Of hospitality*, (R. Bowlby, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1997)
- Derrida, J. (2000c). Where a teaching body begins and how it ends. In P. Trifonas (Ed.), *Revolutionary pedagogies: Cultural politics, the institution of education, and the discourse of theory* (pp. 83–112). New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.
- Derrida, J. (2001a). The future of the profession or the university without condition (thanks to the “Humanities,” what *could take place* tomorrow). In T. Cohen (Ed.), *Jacques Derrida and the humanities: A critical reader* (pp. 24–57). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Derrida, J. (2001b). *On cosmopolitanism and forgiveness*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Derrida, J. (2002). *Ethics, institutions, and the right to philosophy*, (P. P. Trifonas, Trans.). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Derrida, J. (2003). *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jurgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*.
- Derrida, J. (2004). *Eyes of the university: right to philosophy 2*. (J. Plug & Others, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1990)
- Derrida, J. (2005). The Principle of Hospitality 1. (A. Thompson, Trans.). *Parallax* 11(1), 6–9. doi:10.1080/1353464052000321056
- Derrida, J. (2007). *Psyche: Inventions of the Other, Vol. I*. P. Kamuf & E. Rottenberg (Eds.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1987).
- Derrida, J. (2008). *Psyche: Inventions of the Other, vol. II*. P P. Kamuf & E. Rottenberg (Eds.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. (Original work published 2003).
- Derrida, J. (2011). *Voice and phenomenon*. (L. Lawlor, Trans.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1897). *My pedagogic creed*. Chicago, IL: E. L. Kellogg & Company.
- Dewey, J. (1915). *School and society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: The MacMillan Company.
- Di Paolantonio, M. & Simon, R. (2005). Re-staging public memory in the space of the spectacle: The project of an historiographic poetics. In *History in Words and Images: Proceedings*

- of the Conference on Historical Representation* (pp. 245–254). Turku, Finland: University of Turku.
- Durkheim, É. (1893). *De la division du travail social: étude sur l'organisation des sociétés supérieures*. Paris: Alcan. Retrieved from <http://ia600408.us.archive.org/19/items/deladivisiondu00durkuoft/deladivisiondu00durkuoft.pdf>
- Durkheim, É. (1982). *The Rules of Sociological Method*, (W. D. Halls, Trans.). New York, NY: Free Press. (Original work published 1895)
- Farley, L. (2005). *History, ethics and education: learning from Freud and Lévinas*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Fideism. (n.d.). *Merriam-Webster.com*. Retrieved September 15, 2013, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/fideism>
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry* 8(4), 777—795. doi:10.1086/448181
- Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (M. Ramos, Trans.). New York, NY: Continuum International. (Original work published 1970)
- Galtung, J. (1974). On peace education. In C. Wulf (Ed.), *Handbook on peace education* (pp. 153–171). Frankfurt/Main, FRG: International Peace Research Association (Education Committee).
- Galtung, J. (1978). *Peace and social science*. Oslo, Norway: International Peace Research Institute.
- Galtung, J. (2004). *Transcend and transform: An introduction to conflict work*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Galtung, J. (2008). Form and Content of Peace Education. In M. Bajaj (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of peace education* (pp. 49–58). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Gaston, S. (2005). *Derrida and disinterest*. NY: Continuum.
- Gilbert-Walsh, J. (2007). Deconstruction as Narrative Interruption. *Interchange* 38(4), 317–333. doi:10.1007/s10780-007-9034-z
- Gilligan, C. (n.d.). The place of Northern Ireland in Ethnic and Racial Studies in Britain: what place? Retrieved 9 September 2013 from <http://www.teachingrace.bham.ac.uk/media/document/Place-of-NI-in-ERS.pdf>

- Ginsberg, P. & Mertens, D. (2009). Frontiers in social research ethics: Fertile ground for evolution. In D. Mertens & P. Ginsberg (Eds.), *The handbook of social research ethics* (pp. 580—613). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Giroux, H. (2002). Democracy and the politics of terrorism: Community, fear, and the suppression of dissent. *Cultural Studies/Critical Methodologies* 2(3), 334–342. doi:10.1177/15308602002003003
- Giroux, H. (2004). War on Terror: The militarising of Public Space and Culture in the United States. *Third Text* 18(4), 211–221. doi:10.1080/0952882042000229827
- Giroux, H. (2005). *Border crossings: cultural workers and the politics of education* (2nd ed). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. (2010). *Zombie politics and culture in the age of casino capitalism*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Giroux, H. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury.
- Giroux, H. (2012). Zombie politics, democracy, and the threat of authoritarianism. *Zombie Politics and Culture in the Age of Casino Capitalism*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Greene, J. C. (2006). *Mixed methods in social inquiry*. Sommerset, NJ: Jossey-Bass.
- Greene, J. & Caracelli, V. (Eds.). (1997). Advances in mixed-method evaluation: The challenges and benefits of integrating diverse paradigms. *New directions for evaluation, No. 74*. Sommerset, NJ: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Gur-Ze'ev, I. (2001). Philosophy of Peace Education in a Postmodern Era. *Educational Theory* 51(3), 315–35. doi:10.1111/j.1741-5446.2001.00315.x
- Gur-Ze'ev, I. (2005). Adorno and Horkheimer: Diasporic philosophy, negative theology, and counter-education. *Educational Theory* 55(3), 343–365. doi:10.1111/j.1741-5446.2005.00007.x
- Gur-Ze'ev, I. (2010). Philosophy of peace education in a postmetaphysical era. In G. Salomon & E. Cairns (Eds.), *Handbook on Peace Education* (pp. 171–183). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Gur-Ze'ev, I. (2011). Improvisation, Violence, Peace Education. In P. Trifonas & B. Wright (Eds.), *Critical Issues in Peace and Education*. London, England: Routledge.
- Haavelsrud, M. (2008). Conceptual perspectives in peace education. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education* (pp. 59–66). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Hansen, D. (Ed.). (2006). *John Dewey and our educational prospect: a critical engagement with Dewey's democracy and education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

- Hansen, J. (2013). Continental Feminism. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/femapproach-continental/>
- Harper, D. (2001-2013). Interest. *Online etymology dictionary*. Retrieved 12 November 2012 from http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=interest&searchmode=none
- Harris, I. (2004). Peace education theory. *Journal of peace education* 1(1), 5–20. doi:10.1080/1740020032000178276
- Harris, I. (2010). History of peace education. In G. Salomon and E. Cairns (Eds.), *Handbook of peace education* (pp. 11–20). East Sussex, England: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Harris, I. and Morrison, M. (2013). *Peace education* (3rd ed). Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company.
- Hawking, S. (1998). *A brief history of time*. New York, NY: Bantam.
- Hawking, S. (2001). *The universe in a nutshell*. New York, NY: Bantam Random House.
- Hawking, S. & Mlodinow, L. (2010). *The grand design*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Heidegger, M. (1996). *Being and time*, (J. Stambaugh, Trans.). New York, NY: State University of New York Press. (Original work published 1927).
- Heidegger, M. (1999). Letter on Humanism. In D. F. Krell (Ed.), *Basic writings, revised and expanded edition*. London, England: Routledge.
- Hersh, S. (2003, March 31). “Who lied to whom?: Why did the Administration endorse a forgery about Iraq’s nuclear program?” *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2003/03/31/030331fa_fact1?currentPage=all
- Hersh, S. (2004). *Chain of command: The road from 9/11 to Abu Ghraib*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Horkheimer, M. & Adorno, T. (2002). *Dialectic of enlightenment*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Howlett, C. F. (1977). *Troubled philosopher: John Dewey and the struggle for world peace*. New York, NY: Kennikat Press.
- Jenkins, T. (2013). Foreword. In I. Harris & M. L. Morrison *Peace education*, (3rd ed.) (pp. 1–2). Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland.
- Kim, S. H. (2012). M. Weber. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2012/entries/weber/>

- Klein, J. (1996). *Crossing boundaries: Knowledge, disciplinarity, and interdisciplinarity*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.
- Kristeva, J. (1991). *Strangers to ourselves*, (L. Roudiez, Trans.). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Kupermintz, H. & Salomon, G. (2005). Lessons to be learned from research on peace education in the context of intractable conflict. *Theory into Practice* 44(4), pp. 293–302. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip4404_3
- Lather, P. (2001). Postmodernism, post-structuralism and post(critical) ethnography: of ruins, aporias, and angels. In P. Atkinson, *et. al.* (Ed.), *Handbook of ethnography* (pp. 477–493). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. doi:10.4135/9781848608337
- Lather, P. (2008). Getting lost: Critiquing across difference as methodological practice. In K. Gallagher (Ed.), *The methodological dilemma: Creative, critical and collaborative approaches to qualitative research* (pp. 219–231). London, England: Routledge.
- Lawlor, L. (2007). *This is not sufficient: An essay on animality and human nature in Derrida*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Lévinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity: an essay on exteriority*, (A. Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press. (Original work published 1961).
- Lévinas, E. (2000). *Otherwise than being or beyond essence*, (A. Lingis, Trans.). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Nijhoff. (Original work published 1974).
- Lin, J., Brantmeier, E., & Bruhn, C. (2008). *Transforming education for peace*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Logevall, F. (1999). *Choosing War: The lost chance for peace and the escalation of war in Vietnam*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Manning, R. S. (2001). *Beyond ethics to justice through Levinas and Derrida: The legacy of Levinas*. Quincy, Illinois: Franciscan Press.
- McKittrick, D. (2000) *Making sense of the troubles*. Belfast, England: Blackstaff Press.
- Mendlovitz, S. & Weiss, T. (1974). A framework for the policy studies of global peace and justice. In C. Wulf (Ed.), *Handbook on peace education* (pp. 19–34). Frankfurt/Main, FRG: International Peace Research Association (Education Committee).
- Mertens, D. (2003). Mixed Methods and the Politics of Human Research: The Transformative-emancipatory perspective. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (pp. 135–166). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Mertens, D. (2007). Transformative Paradigm: Mixed Methods and Social Justice. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 1(3), 212-25. doi:10.1177/1558689807302811
- Mertens, D. (2010). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Mertens, D. & Ginsberg, P. (Eds.). (2009). *The handbook of social research ethics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mertens, D., Holmes, H., & Harris, R. (2009). Transformative research and ethics. In D. Mertens & P. Ginsberg (Eds.), *The handbook of social research ethics* (pp. 85–102). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miller, J. H. (2007). Performativity as Performance / Performativity as Speech Act: Derrida's Special Theory of Performativity. In I. Balfour (Ed.), *Late Derrida* (pp. 219–236). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Morrow, D. (April, 2010). Revenge, Reconciliation and Resentment: The long process towards peace in Ireland. Unpublished paper presented at Centre for Research in Political Psychology, Queens University Belfast, Belfast, England.
- Moyn, S. (2005). *Origins of the other: Emmanuel Lévinas between revelation and ethics*. NY: Cornell University Press.
- Narsee, S. (2005). Navigating uncharted waters: Peace within hearts, hands & minds. *Higher education policy* 18(4), 341-351. doi:10.1057/palgrave.hep.8300098
- Noddings, N. (2008). Caring and peace education. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Peace Education* (pp. 87–94). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Nolan, P. (2012). *Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report*. Published February 2012. Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK: Community Relations Council. Retrieved from http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/events/peace/docs/nipmr_2012-02.pdf
- Nolan, P. (2013). *Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report*. Published April 2013. Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK: Community Relations Council. Retrieved from http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/events/peace/docs/nipmr_2013-04_full.pdf
- O'Conner, P. (2007). Derrida's worldly responsibility: the opening between "faith" and the "sacred." *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* 45(2), 303–34. doi:10.1111/j.2041-6962.2007.tb00054.x
- Page, J. (2008). *Peace education: Exploring ethical and philosophical foundations*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Patomäki, H. (2001). The challenge of critical theories: Peace research at the start of the new century. *Journal of Peace Research* 38(6), 723-737. doi: 10.1177/0022343301038006005

- Peters, M. (2003). Derrida, Pedagogy and the Calculation of the Subject. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 35(3), 313–32. doi:10.1111/1469-5812.00030
- Peters, M. (2004). The university and the new humanities: Professing with Derrida. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* 3(41), 41–57. doi:10.1177/1474022204039644
- Pinar, W. (2006). *Race, religion and a curriculum of reparation: Teacher education for a multicultural society*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P. & Taubman, P. M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum: an introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Rajan, T. (2007). Derrida, Foucault, and the university. *Mosaic* 40(2), 133–150.
- Reardon, B. (1988). *Comprehensive peace education: Educating for global responsibility*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Reardon, B. (1999). Peace Education: A Review and Projection. Peace education reports 17. Malmö, Sweden: Lund University, Dept. of Educational and Psychological Research.
- Reardon, B. (2001). *Education for a culture of peace in a gender perspective*. Paris, France: UNESCO Publishing, The Teacher's Library.
- Reardon, B. (2013). Mediating on the barricades: Concerns, cautions, and possibilities for peace education for political efficacy. In P. Trifonas and B. Wright (Eds.), *Critical Peace Education: Difficult Dialogues*, (pp. 1–28). New York, NY: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-90-481-3945-3 1
- Salomon, G. (2002). The nature of peace education: not all programs are created equal. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo, (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world*, (pp. 3–14). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Salomon, G. (2006). Does peace education really make a difference? *Peace and conflict: Journal of peace psychology*, 12(1), 37–48. doi: 10.1207/s15327949pac1201_3
- Salomon, G. & Nevo, B. (Eds.). (2002). *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Simon, R. (1992). *Teaching against the grain*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: OISE Press.
- Simon, R. I., & Eppert, C. (1997). Remembering obligation: Pedagogy and the witnessing of testimony of historical trauma. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 22(2), 175.
- Smith, A. (1994). *The EMU Promoting School—A Report on a Conference on Education for Mutual Understanding and Cultural Heritage*. Coleraine, Ulster, England: University of Ulster.

- Smith, A. (1999, April). *Education and the peace process of Northern Ireland*. Paper presented to the annual conference of the American Education Research Association, Montréal, Québec, Canada.
- Smith, A. (2003). Citizenship Education in Northern Ireland: beyond national identity? *Cambridge Journal of Education* 33(1), 15–31. doi:10.1080/0305764032000064631
- Smith, D. (2011). Phenomenology. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/phenomenology/>
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2011). Post qualitative research: the critique and the coming after. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, (4th ed.), (pp. 611–625). London, England: Sage.
- Stomfay-Stitz, A. (1993). *Peace Education in America, 1828–1990: Sourcebook for education and research*. Metuchen, NJ & London: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Synott, J. (2005). Peace education as an educational paradigm: review of a changing field using an old measure, *Journal of Peace Education* 2(1), 3–16. doi:10.1080/1740020052000341786
- Taskakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (2002). *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Thomas, E. (2004). *Emmanuel Lévinas: ethics, justice and the human beyond being*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Thoreau, H. (2004). *Walden*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1854)
- Trifonas, P. (2000a). *The ethics of writing: Derrida, deconstruction and pedagogy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Trifonas, P. (Ed.). (2000b). *Revolutionary pedagogies: Cultural politics, the institution of education, and the discourse of theory*. New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.
- Trifonas, P. (Ed.). (2002). Meditations on the Debt and Duty to the Right to Philosophy. In *Ethics, Institutions, and the Right to Philosophy*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Trifonas, P. (Ed.). (2003a). *Pedagogies of difference: Rethinking education for social justice*. New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.
- Trifonas, P. (2003b). The ethics of science and/as research: Deconstruction and the orientations of a new academic responsibility. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 35(3), 285–295. doi:10.1111/1469-5812.00028

- Trifonas, P. (2009). Deconstructing research: paradigms lost. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education* 32(3), 297–308. doi:10.1080/17437270903259824
- Trifonas, P. (2011). On Human Rights, Philosophy, and Education: The ethics of difference after deconstruction. In P. Trifonas & B. Wright (Eds.), *Critical Issues in Peace and Education* (pp. 71–87). New York, NY: Routledge.
- UNESCO. (n.d.a). *Agenda*. New York, NY: UNESCO. Retrieved 12 November 2012 from <http://www3.unesco.org/iycp/kits/a-55-47.pdf>
- UNESCO. (n.d.b). *There can be no UNESCO without philosophy*. New York, NY: UNESCO. Retrieved 12 November 2012 from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/philosophy/>
- Vermunt, J. (1996). Metaconitive, cognitive and affective aspects of learning styles and strategies: A phenomenographic analysis. *Higher Education* 31(1), 25–50. doi:10.1007/BF00129106
- von Staehr, G. (1974). Education for peace and social justice. In C. Wulf (Ed.), *Handbook on peace education*, (U. Zinnemann, Trans.), (pp. 295–311). Frankfurt/Main, FRG: International Peace Research Association (Education Committee).
- Weber, M. (1904–05/1992). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*, (T. Parsons, Trans.). London, England: Routledge.
- Wenden, A. (2004). *Educating for a culture of social and ecological peace*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.
- Whyte, J. (1990). *Interpreting Northern Ireland*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
- Wiberg, H. (1974). Peace research and peace education: A pessimistic note. In C. Wulf (Ed.), *Handbook on peace education*, (pp. 137–149). Frankfurt/Main, FRG: International Peace Research Association (Education Committee).
- Wisler, A. (2008). *Peace knowledge: An inquiry in post-Yugoslav higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, New York.
- Wisler, A. (2010). Portraits of peace knowledge in post-Yugoslav higher education. *Journal of Peace Education* 7(1), 15–31. doi:10.1080/17400200903370886
- Wright, B. (2008). *Educating for cultures of peace within the academy: A holistic approach to peace studies in the university for the new millennium*. Saarbrücken, Germany: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.
- Wright, B. (2011). Deconstructing the Other: Opening Peace. In P. Trifonas & B. Wright (Eds.), *Critical issues in peace and education* (pp. 178–199). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Wright, B. (2013). Re-imag(e)ining the Cosmopolitical: Deconstructing the Other. In P. Trifonas & B. Wright (Eds.), *Critical peace education: Difficult dialogues*, (pp. 45–58). Boulder, CO: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-90-481-3945-3 3
- Wulf, C. (Ed.). (1974). *Handbook on peace education*. Frankfurt/Main, FRG: International Peace Research Association (Education Committee).
- Zeiger, S. (2000). Teaching Peace: Lessons from a Peace Studies curriculum of the progressive era. *Peace & Change* 25(1), 53–70. doi:10.1111/0149-0508.0014

Appendices

Appendix A: Thinking a methodology

The organic nature of the development of my research proposal was challenging, fortuitous, and encouraging. From the beginning of my personal journey to a more critical self-awareness in my teens to the present, I have developed a number of important relationships and connections that have contributed in significant ways to shaping this research project. The Northern Ireland Study Tour in 2009 presented critical questions pertaining to the design of the study, its larger questions, and the timeliness of the study. During this tour I realized the importance of this work for a region emerging from decades and centuries of enmity and bloody conflict. The level of crisis felt within Northern Ireland concerning the outstanding issues of policing, education, history and parading, following Devolution after the Good Friday Agreement/Belfast Agreement of 1998 and flaring recently in seasonal parading is compounded with the reductions in economic support for the six provinces of NI from the United Kingdom and the European Union; consequently, there is an emerging imperative to move to a greater resolution of the past conflict. This resolution, or transformation will necessarily involve the substantive issues of victimhood and survivorship that are entrenched in ideologies of division—divisions constructed and fortified around the *self*, *other* and the *third*. These divisions will necessarily have to address the questions of difference, justice, and peace along with its conceptualisation in order to continue the peace processes and to establish an intercommunal society that could collectively choose a more peaceful future for all peoples of Northern Ireland.

Mertens' (2007) transformative paradigm, arising in feminist scholarship, reframes the role of researcher as “one who recognizes inequalities and injustices in society and strives to challenge the status quo” (p. 212) and possesses a sense of shared responsibility. This

methodological paradigm provides “a framework for examining assumptions that explicitly address power issues, social justice, and cultural complexity throughout the research process” (p. 213). My research project was originally designed as mixed methods research (MMR) to examine such assumptions related to how power informs and impacts the manner in which humans construct the *self* in relation to the *other* and the *third* concerning questions of difference and peace through in-depth interviews and surveys. I deconstruct this process through postStructural critique and its relations in the narratives and experiences of the participants to discover how enmification—or the process of constructing and defining an enemy—frames an individual’s, and subsequently, a society’s perspective in relation to the *other* and the *third*. I suggest that it is in this formative space and process that education for peace may enter.

The primary tenets of the transformative paradigm include: a) a central importance placed on the individual experiences of those who suffer from oppression or discrimination; b) acknowledgement of power differentials within the research context and expectation to promote social equity and justice; c) a description of reality within multiple contexts to include the historical, cultural, political, and economic; and d) the establishment of rapport and a trust-based interrelationship between researcher and participants (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). Each of these tenets provided further justification for the site selection of the Northern Ireland context as a very good match for my field study.

Power dynamics play a pivotal role in matters of peace as can be implicitly understood based on the transformative paradigm’s tenets. The pursuit of peace knowledges in their multiple forms of peace research, peace studies, and peace education necessitates an applied social research ethics, which Ginsberg and Mertens (2009) state “must delve into the complexities of power to advance thinking and understanding” (p. 583). Following this trajectory, I have woven

a necessary critique into the nature of embedded power in rationality with import to human social relationality, or peace. Through archival research, supplemented by questions in my interviews and surveys of faculty members and founders/administrators of educational studies and peace studies programs, the nature of these complexities of power were explored to enrich the study. Furthermore, the nature, concern for, and balance of power have direct import for the issues of peace and thereby, are implicitly understood to be constitutive of academic peace research, and subsequently, peace education. Consequently, the inquiry into peace, and thereby peace education, is an inquiry that develops and expands awareness of the *other*, the question of difference, and the relationality of social justice in a manner that transformatively shifts, or broadens, the perspective from the *self* to the *other* through *ethicus obligatus*, *positivist socio-constructivism*, and *embracing humanitas*.

Mertens (2007) positions the transformative paradigm as the best philosophical fit for academic research in social justice and this approach provides the quintessential match concerning my topic of a reflexive, post-critical peace education. Issues of *socialis aequitas*, and by extension peace, are best examined by the transformative paradigm according to *The Handbook of Social Research Ethics* given that “issues of understanding culture and building trust are paramount” (Mertens, Holmes & Harris, 2009, p. 94). The ontological assumption of the transformative paradigm concerns the nature of reality as I have previously expounded in Chapter two in the fundamental question of the institute of Rationality and thus, as Page, Galtung, and Reardon suggest, peace and peace education is understood to be intrinsically bound to the multiple realities of the constituent members of the group, society, or nation. Additionally, the ontological assumption of the transformative paradigm

stresses the acceptance of . . . differences of perceptions as equally legitimate ignores the damage done by ignoring the factors that give privilege to one version of reality over another, such as the influence of social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, gender, and disability lenses in the constructions of reality What is taken to be real needs to be critically examined via an ideological critique of its role in perpetuating oppressive social structures and policies. (Mertens, 2010, p. 32)

Therefore, my task as a researcher was to negotiate the shifting terrain of subjectivity in the course of this discourse. Further, Mertens, Holmes, and Harris (2009) present the epistemological assumption underlying the relationship of the researcher and would-be-participant as crucial to the validity of the research. This assumption clarifies the implicit expectation of trust as being critically important to success for all parties, including the researcher by centering on “the meaning of knowledge as it is defined from a prism of cultural lenses and the power issues involved in the determination of what is considered legitimate knowledge” (Mertens, 2010, p. 32). Consequently, given the nature of the *socio-ethno-politico-historical* realities concerning peace, the paramount concern of trust, essential to this study, is addressed deliberately by nurturing relationships with the respective cultural/academic informants I had at each of the specific sites of the Northern Ireland universities selected: 1) University of Ulster in Derry~Londonderry, and Coleraine; 2) Queen’s University Belfast; and 3) Trinity College in Belfast and Dublin. The self-selected faculty members were domiciled in the following academic departments at different universities: Education; Politics, History and English; Psychology; Social Sciences; Conflict Resolution; and Ecumenics. There were fourteen faculty members interviewed (five female, nine male), of which half were in the Faculty of Education; as well as eight graduate students (five female, three male). Many of these faculty members represented across the five distinct institutions have previously taught in K-12 settings, with some now engaged in Teacher Training programs.

My research project was fundamentally about the nature of human relationships, power, social justice, and community as markers of difference for peace and thereby peace education in a conscious and explicit approach to consider and “bring about social transformation” (Mertens, 2010, p. 21). As such, this inquiry required trust between the researcher and the interviewees, which can only be nurtured through socio-culturally appropriate, context-specific rapport that I continued to develop following my pre-trip to Northern Ireland in August 2009, and subsequently, as informed by emergent respective liaisons for the field study. Additionally, I continued to use the experiences gained throughout the study tour to inform and transform my own ideas about peace education to confront my perspectives and idiosyncratic views in an acknowledgment of my position as a Western academic arriving from a domineering ontological frame and remaining vigilant for the signs and cues of my participants concerning the content discussed and the process, which may be markedly different from my own throughout the course of our interactions.

The methodological assumption of the transformative paradigm concerns the choices of design, implementation, and analysis made by the researcher. I initially employed an integrated design (Greene & Caracelli, 1997) beginning in MMR, to address the exploratory nature of my research questions in the field study concerning post-critical peace education. The use of multiple, integrated phases in my field research was intended to afford the opportunity to more fully explore the breadth of individual and group conceptualizations of peace in a post-conflict academic setting; thereby, drawing insight to-wards a more cohesive approach to a philosophy of peace education. My exploration of the primary research question addresses how difference is revealed in the way each of these groups theorize and understand peace; the acknowledged and unacknowledged needs arising in/for/through the consideration of peace; as well as the questions

that remain unasked, or buried in a socio-political historical narratives of past conflict. The second research question investigates the underlying philosophical meanings attached to the concept of education for peace that respective students, and faculty/administrators held.

The objectives of this research: a) explored the philosophical roots of peace as captured in the narrative of experience; b) shared in a collaborative discovery process the degree of and motivation for being involved in an academic peace project as peace education in the university setting; c) examined the outcomes of an academic peace project as peace education in the community and university; d) explored the role of academics in education for peace; and e) transformed new learning from these particular foreign programs to Canadian and US education contexts; and thereby strengthen and more fully legitimize peace education within the North American university sector towards transformative possibilities within society and the global community.

I began my analysis of the field research simultaneously with the implementation of the design for the Northern Ireland study through an interrogative ethnographic lens shaped in cultural perspectivity, deconstructively filtered through the dimensionality of temporality/spatiality and sociality, and finally focused in deep discourse on planes of difference through in-depth dialogue with the *other*. The first phase of thematic analysis developed seventy-seven themes that were filtered in/to/through ten philosophical themes in the discourse in the second phase. These ten larger themes were then thought through to arrive at seven key philosophical and structuring themes: 1) transformation, 2) peace, 3) source of influence, 4) academic training, 5) onto-epistemology, 6) *othering*, and 7) onto-theological. Phase three of the analysis became a philosophical re-reading of the consolidated themes through discourse

analysis in de-construction as a re-configuration of the tenets of peace education, evolving philosophemes:

1. *humanus existentialis*,
2. *ethicus obligatus*,
3. *universala*,
4. *socialis aequitas enfolding critique of violence*,
5. *positivist socio-constructivism*,
6. *embracing humanitas*, and
7. *ecological presencing-in-consciousness*.

My approach to the lived experiences and realities expressed in the voice of the *other*, to me and through the research informs each aspect of the design and implementation as well as the performative analysis of the interviews as discourse (phase four), detailed and engaged in the fourth chapter. Again, a reflexive, post-critical peace education makes explicit the implicit assumption that such research regarding the multiple conceptualizations of peace necessarily be carried and represented in the voice of the *other*, honoring difference and the fundamental alterity of the *other*. Specifically, the voice of the *other* is maintained by directly quoting participants and subsequently offering any interpretation or performative critique of the transcribed interviews comprising discourse. The multiplicity of conceptualizations requires a methodology that itself incorporated multiple interpretive practices, or deconstructive readings revealing philosophemes. The transformative paradigm's greatest strength for this study is that it "draws on multiple strategies, methods, and techniques" (Mertens, Holmes, & Harris, 2009, p. 96), such as ethnographies, narratives, surveys, and interviews.

Finally, a fourth paradigmatic assumption concerns the nature of ethics. As reflected in Lather's and St. Pierre's critiques of the linearity of epistémè and its construction, *ethicus obligatus* compels a heightened perceptivity and re-cognition of responsibility to the *other*. Indeed this responsibility to the *other* and the *Other* compels a deeper reflection on/in the philosophico-theoretical foundations constructing rationality and the transcendental signified—peace—in *peace education-to-come*. The transformative paradigm frames this axiological assumption as the thread that interlaces the question of difference, social justice and post-critical peace education together with the behavior and approach of the researcher into *another* context framing the image of an applied approach to peace education in the Northern Ireland (con)text captured in the fourth chapter.