

Volume 5 Number 1 (2011): 1-14

<http://www.infactispax.org/journal/>

Reflective Pedagogy, Cosmopolitanism, and Critical Peace Education for Political Efficacy: A Discussion of Betty A. Reardon's Assessment of the Field

Betty A. Reardon
International Institute on Peace Education

and

Dale T. Snauwaert
The University of Toledo
Dale.snauwaert@utoledo.edu

In a recent publication entitled "Concerns, Cautions and Possibilities for Peace Education for Political Efficacy" Betty Reardon reflects on the state of peace education and offers a brilliant reaffirmation and further elaboration of the central importance and nature of a pedagogy of reflective inquiry for a comprehensive/critical peace education.¹ Betty Reardon is an internationally renowned peace scholar and peace educator. She has been instrumental in the establishment of peace education institutions and programs around the world. Her work has defined the fields of peace studies and peace education.²

¹ Betty A. Reardon, "Concerns, Cautions and Possibilities for Peace Education for Political Efficacy," in *Critical Peace Education: Difficult Dialogue*, ed. Bryan Wright and Peter Trifonas (Springer, 2011).

² Reardon's Collected papers is housed at The University of Toledo – see <http://www.utoledo.edu/library/canaday/guidepages/education.html> The following are examples of her work: Betty Reardon, *Comprehensive Peace Education: Educating for Global Responsibility* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988); Betty Reardon, *Educating for Global Responsibility: Teacher-Designed Curricula for Peace Education, K-12* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988); Betty Reardon, *Educating for Human Dignity: Learning About Rights and Responsibilities, Pennsylvania Studies in Human Rights* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995); Betty Reardon, *Sexism and the War System*, 1st Syracuse University Press ed., *Syracuse Studies on Peace and Conflict Resolution* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1996); Betty A. Reardon, "Peace Education: A Review and Projection," (Sweden: School of Education, Malmo University, 1999).

The purpose of this paper is to discuss her recent assessment and elaboration. In particular, the connection between cosmopolitanism and reflective pedagogy will be explored in greater detail, in addition to the posing of further questions for inquiry related to the relationship between dialogue, conceptual clarity, philosophical frameworks, diversity and reflective pedagogy.

Snauwaert's Reflections

Reardon situates peace education within the broader issue of citizenship and argues that peace education should be fundamentally concerned with the development of the *political efficacy* of future citizens. She writes:

Starting from the long held premise that peace education is education for responsible global citizenship, our task in general terms is educating toward political efficacy in the formation and pursuit of citizen action and public policy intended to move the world toward the achievement of a more just and less violent global order.³

Political efficacy is not necessarily a matter *per se* of *what* to think; it is more fundamentally about *how* to think. In other words, political efficacy is dependent upon “sound political thinking,” “for inquiry into obstacles and possibilities for transformation should form the core of peace pedagogy, so as to provide learning in how to think and to act for political efficacy in peace politics . . .”⁴ Learning how to think concerns conceptual clarity, thinking within conceptual frameworks, posing questions, rationality, and most importantly reflective inquiry.

From an ethical perspective, political efficacy is grounded in the normative framework of *cosmopolitanism*, defined by Reardon as the value of “universal moral inclusion”⁵ grounded in respect for human dignity. She maintains that cosmopolitanism “best articulates the normative goals of our evolving field . . . the vision of universal moral inclusion that inspires the normative goals of peace education; a vision in which all human beings are accorded respect of their fundamental human dignity.”⁶ From this perspective, political efficacy is driven by the values of universal human dignity and moral inclusion.

Political efficacy thus involves “complex learning that requires pedagogies of multiple forms of reflective inquiry.”⁷ Peace learning and thus reflective practice is both cognitive and normative, pertaining to both the discernment of the sociopolitical world and value-based ethical assessment. Reardon’s basic presupposition is that political

³ *ibid.*, 2

⁴ *ibid.*, 3

⁵ *ibid.*, 3

⁶ *ibid.*, 3

⁷ *ibid.*, 3

efficacy, the capacity to engage in transformative political action, is contingent upon the cognitive, ethical, and self-reflective capacities of citizens. Transformative action is a reflective-practice. Being a reflective practice it requires both the capacity and space for authentic open reflective inquiry in dialogue with the diverse range of other citizens. It requires “authentic open inquiry.” Reardon writes: “All peace learning at whatever academic level in whatever learning setting should be directed toward developing a range of reflective capacities relevant to political efficacy.”⁸

Reardon articulates three forms of reflective inquiry: critical/analytic; moral/ethical; and contemplative/ruminative. *Critical/analytic reflection* pertains to the discernment of power, an understanding and critique of the functioning of social institutions, knowledge and analysis of the structural dimensions of social life, and the impact of power, institutions, and structures on the quality of life. Reardon writes: “It is more directly political than the other two as its primary inquiry is into the nature, functions and distribution of power, the political institutions and social structures through which it is mediated and the consequences of these circumstances to human lives and relationships.”⁹

“*Moral/ethical reflection* addresses questions of fairness and moral inclusion with queries focused on issues of the goodness, distribution of advantage and harm, the justice and potential detriments and benefits of relationships, effects upon quality of life and the biosphere. Transformative moral/ethical reflection is guided by normative principles consistent with the values designated as the indicators of what is considered to be socially good and humanly enhancing.”¹⁰ Moral/ethical reflection involves the principled application of practical reason to the many moral and ethical issues inherent in the political and social realms. She makes an important distinction between the moral as precepts to guide life and the ethical, as principled practical reason. It is the latter that is most fundamental to political efficacy and the education of cosmopolitan citizens.

“*Contemplative/ruminative reflection* is a process consistent with the breadth of thought inspired by a cosmopolitan view. It is a wider sphere of reflection, which facilitates perception of the full scope of the complex systemic, dynamic interrelationships comprising our natural and humanly constructed environments. It makes space for affect and intuition as more complex forms of reason. It is the deeper thought through which persons gain the forms of self awareness from which to develop capacities to lead not only humanly fulfilling lives, but even more to the point, to live personally, socially and politically so as to be agents of social and political transformation.”¹¹ Contemplative reflection is thus conceived as critical self-examination regarding our internal motivations and moral capacities. It pertains to a reflection on

⁸ *ibid.*, 6

⁹ *ibid.*, 8

¹⁰ *ibid.*, 8

¹¹ *ibid.*, 9-10

what is meaningful and valuable. It is essential for ethical commitment and for the empathic moral response to the dignity of other persons.

Although Reardon does clearly posit the interconnection between the three forms of reflective inquiry and cosmopolitanism, arguing that they constitute capacities that make possible the transformative action necessary for the actualization of the cosmopolitan ideal, I believe that the relationship between cosmopolitanism runs even deeper than Reardon suggests. Reflective inquiry is not only a means to the actualization of cosmopolitanism; reflective inquiry is an *ethical requirement*, and thus a *constitutive element*, of cosmopolitanism. It can be argued that the cosmopolitan ideal of universal respect for human dignity and moral inclusion *itself necessitates* open reflective inquiry and in turn its reflective capacities, and that the three forms of reflective inquiry mirror the three dimensions of cosmopolitanism.

The ethical dimension of cosmopolitanism consists of universal respect for human dignity and moral inclusion. This ethic proclaims the equal inherent dignity and value of each and every human being as a human being. This value of universal moral equality in turn bestows moral *standing* to each person. Each person is a morally equal member of the human moral community and thus each person has a right to equal moral consideration. As a matter of basic justice, moral consideration includes Recognition (recognition of all persons as moral equals, regardless of difference), Fairness (impartial treatment and respect for persons), and Inclusion (all persons have *equal standing* (membership) in the moral and political community). The ethical imperative of cosmopolitanism mandates that we see the other as a person; it demands that we transcend the objectification of persons in favor of the recognition of their humanity. Thus, woven into this dimension is the ethical requirement of reflective inquiry into the moral standing of persons and the forces of objectification that deny them their humanity and rightful standing in the moral community.

The political dimension logically follows from the ethical. If all human beings are morally equal, then they possess a right to have their interests equally considered in the political process as well as the right to participate equally in that process. The rights to equal political consideration and equal political participation constitute political equality. The aim of political equality is the institutionalization of individual political empowerment. Critical/analytic reflection is a constitutive imperative of political equality and thus of cosmopolitanism, for the sustainable institutionalization of individual political empowerment is based upon individual awareness and knowledge of one's rights to consideration and participation and the internal capacities to effectively participate in the political process.

The self-reflective, contemplative dimension of cosmopolitanism consists of the internal moral resources of the individual that provides the consciousness and capacity to be aware of and to ethically respond to the inherent dignity of every human being. Cosmopolitanism thus entails an internal disposition and capacity to respond to others

empathetically with respect and care. It also entails a moral commitment to the ideals of human dignity and inclusion, which makes cosmopolitanism a deliberative choice. These dispositions emerge out of critical self-examination and contemplative reflection wherein their meaning and value are contemplated and affirmed by each individual citizen.¹²

In addition, if we take into consideration the almost incomprehensible scope of human diversity, the ideals of universal human dignity and moral inclusion, including the principles of recognition, inclusion, and fairness as well as equal political consideration and participation, require open impartial public deliberation.¹³ It requires that everyone submit their values and ideas to open impartial scrutiny as a test of their objectivity, value, and validity. Given that our perspectives tend to be confined, exposing our positions to open impartial scrutiny is a means of transcending our positional confinement. This call for impartial scrutiny is central to Reardon's advocacy of reflective inquiry and her critique of the narrowness and partiality of the positioning of critical, reflective pedagogies as *ideologies* rather than as *methods* of inquiry and educational liberation.

My main point is that open reflective inquiry in general, and the three forms of reflective inquiry in particular, are constitutive elements of the cosmopolitan ethic. The cosmopolitan ethic is instantiated educationally through the pedagogical application of the three forms of reflection. From this perspective, peace education is the enactment of the cosmopolitan ethic. By enacting it pedagogically the school becomes the incubator, and the peace educator the midwife, of a cosmopolitan society.

Reardon offers a very insightful analysis of the nature of reflective inquiry, however, further questions into the nature of reflective inquiry can be posed as a means of further developing a reflective perspective:

- a. What is the general methodological orientation of reflective inquiry? Is reflective inquiry a process of discovery, invention, or interpretation?
- b. What is the place of dialogue in reflective inquiry? Is reflective inquiry dialogical?
- c. Is mastery of conceptual frameworks necessary for conceptual clarity and critical thinking? Is a substantial degree of background knowledge necessary for reflective inquiry?

¹² Dale Snauwaert, "Human Rights and Cosmopolitan Democratic Education," *Philosophical Studies in Education* 40 (2009); Dale Snauwaert, "The Ethics and Ontology of Cosmopolitanism: Education for a Shared Humanity," *Current Issues in Comparative Education* 12 (2009).

¹³ Martha C. Nussbaum, *Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006); John Rawls and Erin Kelly, *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001); Amartya Sen, *The Idea of Justice* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009).

- d. Can justice and peace be defined, and can reflective inquiry proceed, without the adoption of a political and moral philosophy? Can an exposure to a variety of philosophies be sufficient for reflective inquiry?

Reardon's Responses to Snauwaert's Queries on Reflective Inquiry

Dale Snauwaert has offered an excellent and incisive encapsulation of my proposals for reflective inquiry as an appropriate and effective pedagogy through which to pursue the political/social purposes of comprehensive critical peace education. This encapsulation prefaces some very significant challenges for the further explication and development of the proposals and arguments put forward in "Concerns, Cautions and Possibilities for Peace Education for Political Efficacy". Snauwaert, an education philosopher has been a ground-breaker in articulating the moral and ethical dimensions of peace education and has situated the field within the philosophy of cosmopolitanism. His reflections deepening the inquiry into these dimensions offer a particularly provocative extension of the discussion I sought to open about current problems and possibilities in the pedagogies of peace education.

The following responses to his challenging queries attempt to bring further clarification and put a bit of meat on the bones of my propositions concerning reflective inquiry as peace pedagogy. The responses are represented in the order in which Prof. Snauwaert posed questions as means to explore further the pedagogic characteristics of reflective inquiry, and are articulated in thematic fashion around the core concepts of his questions.

I need to note here that these responses - as are the assertions in the original essay - are subjectively based on my own experience as a practitioner supplemented by observations of current practice. Judgment on the degree to which my assertions and suggestions are transferable to the practice of others, is left to the readers.

Methodological Orientation: a Purposeful Interrogatory Process

The general methodological orientation of reflective inquiry is the nurture and development of the human curiosity and wonderment that is the font of learning. The starting point of authentic learning is not an instruction, but a question. The task of education is to guide the human attributes of curiosity and wonderment toward the achievement of the complementary, mutually reinforcing purposes of development of the self and of socially relevant knowledge and humanly enhancing skills and values. Reflective inquiry comprises a pedagogy of questions and queries as tools of learning facilitation. The art of this pedagogy is in the formation of the questions and queries that instigate reflective responses from learners. Instruction is designed to meet the needs of learners to develop skills for the interpretation of questions, to establish the relationship of the subject of the question to the social and learning environment in which a peace learning inquiry is pursued, and to illuminate particular dimensions of the subject of the

inquiry or problem being addressed. The sequence and mode of instruction most effectively emerge from the learners' question, "What does this subject have to do with me, my life and the society in which I live?" In a peace learning inquiry that question will ultimately evolve to the query, "What has the subject to do with us as a community, our common welfare and the kind of society in which we would prefer to live?" The great need in the implementation of reflective pedagogy is to elicit and refine the capacities for such question formation and modes of posing those questions of teachers at all levels and of the learners whom they guide.

In that reflective inquiry can be pursued in analytic, ethical and contemplative modes, it is practiced through various thinking processes including discovery, invention, interpretation, explication and others. Reflection can lead to discovery in the sense of revealing elements of a subject of study not perceivable through surface observation. Reflection in the sense of careful and detailed thinking to fully examine all elements and aspects of a subject of study that can be "seen" as through a kind of intellectual magnification is, in fact, an effective route to learning as discovery or as in deductive reasoning. Reflection toward discovery is elicited by questions specifically designed to reveal the less obvious aspects of the subject, questions rather than queries as per the distinctions made in the original essay - questions about specific aspects of the subject to which there are answers in the form of particular material attributes of the subject that can be observed by closer more thoughtful examination.

Reflective inquiry in the modes of invention and interpretation is more likely to be facilitated through queries, more open questions to which sufficient response is not one particular observable attribute or validated facts, but a range of responses revealing various possibilities in regard to how the subject might be dealt with (i.e. invention) or to its meaning to the larger realms to which the subject is or might be related (i.e. interpretation).

The Place of Dialogue: Communal Reflection Building Learning Communities

Reflective inquiry initiated by the posing of questions is deepened through the consideration of queries. In that it is in essence a process of thinking by interrogation, it is thus essentially dialogic, beginning with focusing on and encountering the subject of the inquiry as the entry point into the process of examination of what is to be further explored. In this respect, reflective inquiry begins with an inner process of confronting and questioning toward a basic understanding of the subject or issue. While it is possible for the process to remain inward and still be productive of learning, the practice of reflective inquiry as peace education - learning toward social and political change – must become outwardly dialogic in the form of a learning discourse through posing queries to elicit the individual reflections of all who comprise the learning community (or class). The social purposes of comprehensive critical peace education are best achieved through communally conducted reflective inquiry. Because it is a process of posing and considering questions, the instructional dimension – the intentional construction of

learning experiences to achieve planned objectives – must be dialogical.¹⁴ If it were simply questioning for comprehension rather than for the elicitation of multiple reflected responses, it might remain as retention of content, or in the absence of multiple views, easily slip into indoctrination, the antithesis of critical peace education. Were it to be left at the inward without the communal sharing, it might become meditative rather than ruminative, remaining personal, not becoming a social learning process, preparatory to the public political discourse for change.

Further, dialogue serves to develop conceptual clarity through communal explication of individual reflections, and contributes, as well, to honing the skills of articulation particularly necessary in the contentious discourse through which meaning is negotiated and peace and justice are pursued. In the sense of its application as intentional preparation for contentious discourse - as critical peace education pedagogy - reflective inquiry is dialogic in its confrontation of contradictions and disputations. Most essential in discussions of controversial and contentious social and political issues is to be cognizant of the need for reflected exchanges in lieu of the mutual vaulting of predigested, ideological positions. In fact, reflective inquiry is stressed as a possible antidote to the ideological reductionism that infects present political discourse.

One other aspect of the dialogic dimension of reflective inquiry is that dialogue is the process through which validation of arguments can be achieved by offering and testing of evidence, data, prior experience or related matters, and assessing its relevance to the problematic. Dialogue is the realm in which reasoning of the type Metcalfe advocated is the arbiter, the means through disputed differences are resolved. It is an outward manifestation of the reflective thinking Metcalf argued to be essential to the democratic process. The near total lack of reasoning and reasonable discourse in contemporary American politics impels me to advocate reflective inquiry as a common pedagogy in peace education.

Conceptual Frameworks: Tools for Shaping and Plotting the Inquiry

Conceptual frameworks are important to reflective inquiry as pedagogy. I hesitate to advocate that we strive for it as the measure of capacity to engage in reflective inquiry. Mastery, to me, means attaining the level of practice of the master (the teacher/facilitator).¹⁵ Within this concept of the term, there is an assumption that the master is the main – often sole - arbiter of the learning, and usually involves primary learning assessments being made by and agent or agents outside the learner, or even

¹⁴ I have written elsewhere about the functions of social purposes, educational goals and learning objectives in curriculum design, planning for the elicitation of intentional learning.

¹⁵ The concept of mastery is one that originates in such achievements under the direction of an experienced practitioner. Certainly, it is a process with social merit that has a place in comprehensive critical peace education. It is not, however, appropriate to the open quality of reflective inquiry pedagogy.

outside the learning community (i.e. education authorities.) I hold that authentic assessment of learning, its quality, significance and relevance is most truly and usefully performed by the learner, not the teacher or those who have authorized her. We as educators have the responsibility to enable learners to develop skills of assessment and encourage them to so value learning that self assessment becomes to them an integral part of the learning experience. In assessment, as well as in pedagogy, the formulation of questions and queries that are appropriately indicative of the desired learning and effective to the purposes of both learners and teachers is of prime importance.

This is not to say that educational authorities should not evaluate the learning that is acquired in our schools, but to note that such assessment would be primarily indicative of a degree of mastery as determined by an outside agent. These outside assessments are perfectly legitimate and often necessary. They do not however, substitute for autonomously assessed, personally integrated learning to which reflective inquiry as peace education aspires. The learning experiences that form the world views and citizenship capacities of learners comprise more than knowledge of government and organized politics and such that can be evaluated by authorities outside the learning selves of our students. Some - but not all - elements of the effective application of conceptual frameworks to reflective inquiry can be assessed by a teacher. A teacher can ascertain if learners are including all components of a framework and applying them appropriately to the problem at hand, but she is not likely to be able to adequately assess the degree to which the framework deepens and clarifies learners' conceptual understanding of the problematic. The best test of such comprehension is the communal conclusions and problem resolutions developed in consensus by the learning community. Comprehending the full significance of a framework to the illumination of a problematic is primarily a communal and dialogical process requiring the insights and reflections of all participants in an inquiry. There are areas in all learning situations that outside agents cannot apprehend. At later stages of judgment and action some indicators may be apparent, but they tend not to be of a nature that might be subject to the kind of surface assessment broadly applied in formal education.

Conceptual frameworks as constructions of thoughts and ideas that are often abstract and amorphous are instruments for defining and clarifying the core concepts relevant to the problematic that produces an inquiry. They illuminate the nature of and the relationships among components of a problematic. Thus, they are essential tools of reflective inquiry in peace education. Peace educators need to be alert to learners' comprehension of a concept as illustrated by how they use it in oral and written reflections. Indeed, they need to determine if students comprehend what a concept is. I have encountered significant lack of understanding among adult learners, not only of the learning uses of concepts, but even of how concepts function in thinking about peace and other social and political issues. Conceptual abstractions are in many ways the very essence of the peace education problematic, abstract ideas that can take various concrete forms (or be still without concrete form) and that serve many functions of meaning and description. Communal reflective inquiry can be used to clarify and determine a common

meaning for concepts that comprise a framework for the study of a problematic or of proposals to respond to one. Indeed, in case where the community has had sufficient experience of reflective inquiry, it can be used to communally construct the conceptual framework for study of the focus problem. This is the process through which a common vision of some of the potential features of the actualization of the concepts can be derived by the learning group. Peace building is a process of transforming the conceptual abstractions of our visions of peace into the material descriptions of the actual realization of the vision.

Frameworks make possible the use of holism, the means to a comprehensive view of any peace problematic. Frameworks serve both to delineate the problem and to discern patterns of relationships to be explored and analyzed through reflective inquiry. These functions apply to the understanding of the material nature of a problematic and to comprehension of proposed theoretical explications. I have found that learners sometimes confuse the functions of conceptual and theoretical frameworks, perhaps because there is little consideration given to theory at the level of general citizenship education; and - as noted in the original essay - where theory is addressed in university peace studies courses, it is often limited to the consideration of the work of the recognized theorists, and not to theory making per se. All citizenship education should include experience with theory making, as preparation to be critically reflective in consideration of the rationales given for public policies. Political efficacy for change would capacitate citizens to formulate their own alternative theories, ones more likely to produce the peace directed policies we seek. One role for instruction can be in making these distinctions as part of the foundational substance that is provided as the content of an inquiry. In simplest terms, it can be postulated that conceptual frameworks work as descriptions of a problematic and theoretical frameworks as explications; the first is an attempt to describe *what* the subject comprises and *how* the components relate to each other; the second explains *why* it is as described and *how* the set of relationships came to be. Effective peace learning calls for practice in the use of conceptual and theoretical frameworks where and in the manner appropriate to the purposes of the inquiry, constructing knowledge that prepares us for effective political action for peace.

Background Knowledge: Substance is Constitutive to Reflective Inquiry

The primary functions of frameworks in this pedagogy are the ordering and organization of knowledge, and providing a directional map for inquiry. Designating an order and delimiting a map as guiding functions for inquiry emphasizes the centrality of substance in critical reflection. The term “background knowledge” could be used to indicate the core substance or curricular content in the form of data of various kinds from sources such as student research, assigned readings, films, lectures, the web and prior discussions as guided by the initiator and/or facilitator of the inquiry – in schools, the teacher. This is instruction in the sense of building a basic, initial content into the common learning experience. Relevant knowledge produced by agents outside the learning community is always necessary, especially so when the community (or the class)

itself has not identified the subject or the problem source of the core queries of the inquiry - usually the case with course syllabi. In instruction to initiate reflective inquiry, it should be stipulated that the knowledge provided is necessary but not sufficient to the inquiry. A core goal of the learning process is the creation of new knowledge, using, but going beyond the background provided. (This is another factor that influences my opinion on mastery.) As we would encourage learners to be independent theory makers, so too, we would guide them toward being autonomous builders of knowledge. In all peace education, we need to make clear that all the knowledge necessary for the making and building of peace is not yet available to us; that our task as peace learners and peace makers is to contribute to the building of the fundamental peace knowledge base, involving all existing fields of human knowledge and perhaps inventing new ones. Peace learning is a creative rather than a primarily receptive/retentive process.

Retention, however, is essential if knowledge building is to be a continuous process of adding to the store of peace information to which learners and their societies have ready access. Even in the age of info-tech, disciplined human memory has an important role to play in all social learning. The discipline to which I refer is a conscious process of mental review of what is known at a particular stage in a given inquiry, retrieving the relevant (a process of judgment making) and relating it to other knowledge - even to other inquiries - as a way of strengthening the retention capacity by identifying a previously integrated knowledge hook to hang it on. A similar function is served by applying information to another mental process or application to any thinking task. It is for this reason that I have taught through learning exercises that assess background knowledge through a task that requires its application rather than simply its recitation or repetition. These exercises put background knowledge through a process of review and retrieval that provides the essential substantive foundation for reflective inquiry. Knowledge, I have found, is best retained through the integration process of use, especially so when it is used to make new knowledge. Reflective inquiry emerges from a concept of learning that includes the building and as well as the acquisition of knowledge.

Justice and Peace: Defining Concepts, Describing Conditions, Honing Conceptual Tools

Defining the core and most cogent concepts for peace learning is both essential and problematic. Definitions make for the clarity needed to construct the framework of the discourse. However, they also may limit the degree of openness necessary to the creative forms of reflective inquiry that hold the possibility of producing the essential new learnings. Adding to this complexity is the widely held general perception of peace as being “a time between wars” or an indefinable and thereby an unsustainable or an unachievable abstraction. It raises the profound philosophically daunting issue of “what is is”. Peace is - or will be – what we think it is. It is the destination toward which our values lead us. We will know it when we see it. If we are committed to seeing it, we need to be able to envision it. Visions of the unprecedented lend themselves more to description than to definition, i.e. “It would look like or be like this.....”

From a common comprehension of the vision/description, a definition of the abstract concept we might agree is peace, can be derived, the derivation coming from the social values that are our ideas about the good. Defining the concepts of a discourse directed toward change, especially within a learning experience, is a process of negotiation toward an agreement on what the term will mean within the communal inquiry. Thus, we can propose for these purposes such conditional definitions as, “peace is a condition in which justice is assured and violence is abjured.” (A definition, I have used at various times) While I find that the widely used terms “negative peace” as the absence of organized political violence and “positive peace” as the presence of social and economic justice – i.e. conditions that could prevent organized violence - has been a useful device in widening thinking about what might actually constitute peace, I find them to have been used sometimes in ways that are definitive in the sense of closing the inquiry into the conditions of peace I see as necessary to making it possible to abjure violence. So, my argument is that peace can and should be conditionally defined as a tool of the inquiry at hand and continually reviewed as the inquiry produces new insights and knowledge. It is in this way that peace may be understood as a dynamic and socially creative process,¹⁶ that those convinced of the need for social transformation intuit it to be. Indeed, were we to have been in the habit of such constant review of the concept of democracy, we would probably not now be in the political circumstances that so threaten democracy as Dewey and Metcalf conceptualized it in their notions of education for democratic citizenship.

Open Inquiry: Formulation of Cogent Questions; Expectations for Replies

Direct questions call for definitive, descriptive *answers*. Queries call for conditional, speculative *responses*.¹⁷ Verbs are crucial in the formation of questions. For example “can” implies that something is or is not possible, “Can we do so and so?” The expected reply is an affirmation or negation of the possibility (usually one or the other) imbedded in the question, i.e. an answer which may or may not be elaborated or subject to further questioning. Questions require primarily recall, or at best, reasoned deduction, rather than careful reflection. Queries are formed to initiate individual and group reflection intended to produce multiple responses from which a communal inquiry can be further elaborated. Questions might become queries when we substitute “can” with “might” or “could.” The expected replies are more likely to be reflective speculations that could suggest possibilities and provoke further queries and questions as both would be required for deepening the exploration of proposed possibilities. Queries are a way of putting the “quest” into questions and the “search” into research. It is the questing after and searching for the learning that will best prepare us to be makers and builders of peace that actually. It is the questing and the search that “opens” an inquiry.

¹⁶ John F. Kennedy in his commencement address at American University in June 1963 defined peace as, “a process, a way of solving problems.”

¹⁷ Query is a term borrowed from a Quaker tradition, the form in which issues of concern are put before a meeting, expecting all to share their reflections toward making communal decisions.

Raising issues for reflection as queries rather than questions, I believe, helps to make it possible for all members of the community to contribute to the inquiry, and to have their responses validated as indicative of individual thinking that is valued by the group. Limiting learning exchanges to definitive or “closing” questions tends to perpetuate the atmosphere of hierarchical valuing of replies, offering affirmation only to those who present the “right answer,” closing possibilities for further reflection for all who fail to produce the answer, not a situation that contributes to self esteem and respect for the individual capacities of all in the community.

The Moral and Political Philosophies of Open Reflective Inquiry

Reflective inquiry as pedagogy is itself a political philosophy grounded in a set of ethical principles, functioning as a moral philosophy to guide our judgments of what comprises a social good. It is premised upon undertaking the responsibility to contribute to a form of education that will serve to advance the development of an authentically democratic political order committed to human equality, nonviolence as the core guideline of individual and social relationships, and respect for the integrity of Earth, the components of what I have earlier referred to as universal moral inclusion.

It assumes that all human beings who enjoy unimpaired mental capacities – whatever their ranking on the various limited assessments of human intelligence – are capable of moral agency on behalf of justice and the reflective inquiry into social good that comprises ethical judgment making. This is a philosophy which obliges education to strive toward releasing and developing that capacity in all learners, no matter what life roles they are being prepared for. It is the core of the political philosophy of that which I believe to be authentic democracy. It would suggest that all political philosophies be reviewed and assessed for their potential for guiding principles for judgments in peacemaking and peace building. The motivating argument for such study lies in the assertion that all political philosophies should be assessed primarily in terms of their compatibility with the *sine qua non* principle of what I *intuit* to be peace and what I assert to be the fundamental social purpose of peace education, contributing to the achievement of universal moral inclusion.

Snauwaert’s Concluding Reflections

An intimate connection between cosmopolitanism and reflective pedagogy is at the heart of a comprehensive, critical peace education. From this perspective, reflective inquiry is not only a means to the actualization of cosmopolitanism; reflective inquiry is an *ethical requirement*, and thus a *constitutive element*, of cosmopolitanism. The political efficacy, including political knowledge and skill, required for transformative social and political agency is based upon complex peace learning. This learning is in turn facilitated by a pedagogy of reflective inquiry. Reardon’s complex and insightful inquiry into the nature of reflective inquiry and its pedagogy points to the insight that a pedagogy

of reflective inquiry central to a critical peace education must not only engage and develop the inward reflection of the student; it must constitute a social and political dialogue. The pedagogy of reflective inquiry that leads to political and social transformation mirrors the nature of public reason and democratic deliberation.¹⁸ The classroom, as do democratic public spaces of freedom, is site of open, impartial deliberation wherein the reflective responses, proposals, visions, and ideals of citizens, present and future, are subjected to open (fully inclusive and cosmopolitan), impartial scrutiny. The responses that “survive” such scrutiny are authentically reflective and dialogical, and qualify as potential transformative propositions. Through this process students develop the capacities of public reason and become adept at democratic deliberation. This pedagogy enacts the processes and substantive issues of democratic public deliberation in the classroom. From this perspective, critical peace education is authentic democratic education.

References

- Nussbaum, Martha C. *Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Rawls, John, and Erin Kelly. *Justice as Fairness : A Restatement*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Reardon, Betty. *Comprehensive Peace Education : Educating for Global Responsibility*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.
- . *Educating for Global Responsibility : Teacher-Designed Curricula for Peace Education, K-12*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.
- . *Educating for Human Dignity : Learning About Rights and Responsibilities, Pennsylvania Studies in Human Rights*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995.
- . *Sexism and the War System*. 1st Syracuse University Press ed, *Syracuse Studies on Peace and Conflict Resolution*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1996.
- Reardon, Betty A. "Concerns, Cautions and Possibilities for Peace Education for Political Efficacy." In *Critical Peace Education: Difficult Dialogue*, edited by Bryan Wright and Peter Trifonas: Springer, 2011.
- . "Peace Education: A Review and Projection." Sweden: School of Education, Malmo University, 1999.
- Sen, Amartya. *The Idea of Justice*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Snauwaert, Dale. "Human Rights and Cosmopolitan Democratic Education." *Philosophical Studies in Education* 40 (2009): 94-103.
- . "The Ethics and Ontology of Cosmopolitanism: Education for a Shared Humanity." *Current Issues in Comparative Education* 12 (2009): 14-22.

¹⁸ Sen, *The Idea of Justice*.