Problematizing the Peace Discourse in *World's Largest Lesson*: A Critical Exploration of Knowledge Production Through Discussions of Violence

Maggie O'Neill

Stockholm University
maggieoneill12@gmail.com

Abstract: There is no single concept of peace in peace education. A large part of peace education recognizes and discusses different forms of violence and how they affect peace. Critical peace educators and transnational feminists recognize the need to critically consider concepts of violence. Using transnational feminist theory and a transnational feminist critical discourse analysis, this study problematizes the peace discourse that is created in peace educational material from World's Largest Lesson. In order to problematize the overall peace discourse, this study critically explores the knowledge that is produced through discussions of different forms of violence. The peace education materials were selected based on their relevance to peace education occurring in relation to education for the Sustainable Development Goals. They were also selected based on their aim to produce knowledge specifically related to concepts of peace and violence. The study finds that overall, the knowledge produced in the materials deemphasizes the interconnectedness of different forms of violence and, therefore, creates a peace discourse that is decontextualized, dehistoricized, depoliticized, and maintains the status quo. The study also discusses pedagogical implications in relation to Mohanty's (2003)

discussion of different pedagogical strategies. It is argued that the peace discourse in World's Largest Lesson contributes to a peace as tourist pedagogical model.

Introduction

Peace education is a diverse field without strict definitions or set curricula. There have been different ways to study peace, and Reardon (1999) has suggested that "the practices and perspectives that comprise the field are varied and not fully consistent one with the other" (p. 4). This could be a result of peace education having "sprung up in many parts of the world, often independently of efforts in other countries, and has been developed in various subject areas" (Reardon, 1999, p. 4) Understandably, one concern of many peace educators is violence.

Some peace educators have described the need for a more critical version of peace education and refer to it as critical peace education. Bajaj and Hantzopoulos (2016a) state that peace education must continually "re-evaluate its goals to open up possibilities for engagement in new ways" (p. 236). Brantmeier (2013) suggests that considerations to power are missing in peace education and he challenges the field to include "a critical eye on power dynamics and place-based violence" (p. 244). Bajaj (2008a) challenges traditional peace education and notes that peace education must transform "educational content, structure, and pedagogy to address direct and structural forms of violence at all levels" (p. 135). She notes an approach to peace education should introduce students to "asymmetrical power relations [and] structural violence" (Bajaj, 2008a, p. 139). Critical peace educators are not only concerned with promoting peace, but are also concerned in the critical connections that can be made within peace education. Bajaj (2015) notes that critical peace educators and peace education should always be in conversation with other fields like postcolonial theory, critical race theory, human rights and others.

Notable peace educators like Betty Reardon and Birgit Brock-Utne have specifically recognized feminism's role in peace education. Brantmeier (2013) notes that feminist discussions of power can be helpful for peace researchers and educators. He notes, "there is much to be learned by peace researchers and educators from feminist theories and critiques of patriarchy" (p. 245). However, there is no one definition of a feminist perspective. Brock-Utne (1989) recognizes six different feminist perspectives. The feminism this study is rooted in is most similar to what Brock-Utne (1989) describes as women of color feminism, though I refer to it as transnational feminism. Transnational feminism considers a variety of oppressions and their interconnections in its analysis. Transnational feminism

"encourages an examination of how categories of race, sexuality, culture, nation, and gender not only intersect, but are mutually constituted, formed, and transformed within transnational power laden processes such as European imperialism and colonialism, neoliberal globalization and so on" (Patil, 2013, p. 847).

Additionally, transnational feminism recognizes the need to challenge certain types of knowledge production (Fultner, 2017). A feminist approach to knowledge recognizes that knowledge is powerful and serves a purpose (Brisolara & Seigart, 2014). Hawkeswork (2014) recognizes feminist research interests in knowledge production. Davis (2008) recommends the use of feminist methodologies to explore connections that are not always obvious. Davis (2008) also suggests that feminism is concerned in making connections, and is therefore not only about women and gender. Feminism is a "broader methodology that can enable us to better conceptualize and fight for progressive change" (Davis, 2008, p. 25).

Combing the concerns of critical peace educators and transnational feminism, this study challenges knowledge production and the peace discourse occurring in peace education. Davis (2008) calls us to "always be critical of the vocabulary we use for change" (p. 24). I apply this reasoning to problematize the peace discourse occurring in peace educational material from World's Largest Lesson. This research is rooted in recognizing that there are different forms of violence and how they are discussed produces knowledge that contributes to a certain peace discourse. Williams (2016) notes connections between postcolonial theory and critical peace education and combines insights from both to inform his research framework. Similarly, this study finds influences from critical peace education, feminist peace education and transnational feminism. This study follows the aims of transnational feminism and critical peace education by both problematizing knowledge and creating new knowledge. It engages with critical peace education, transnational feminism, and education for sustainable development in a way that is not prevalent in the current literature of the field (O'Neill, 2019).

World's Largest Lesson as an actor in peace education

Peace education has long been connected to the missions of the UN, UNESCO, and Unicef. In 2015, world leaders gathered and developed the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). These goals were made to reflect a worldwide effort to promote and develop a more sustainable world. Since then, different forms of education surrounding the goals have been in discussion. This can be seen in the

educational programming created in relation to the goals, the conferences centered around the goals, and the global recognition of the goals. Peace education finds connections to all the goals, but peace is specifically noted in SDG 16: Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions. Therefore, there is a unique kind of peace education occurring through education for the SDGs. Feminist perspectives in peace education related to the post-2015 agenda offer a unique opportunity for analysis. The global discourse and knowledge production surrounding educating for the SDGs provides a background that warrants analysis that challenges uncritical education and research.

World's Largest Lesson is an organization that was created to advance the SDGs. According to its website, it has been used in over 130 countries and has reached millions of students all over the world since its launch in 2015 (World's Largest Lesson, n.d.). It produces "free and creative resources for educators to teach lessons, run projects and stimulate action in support of the Goals" (World's Largest Lesson, n.d.). The materials include digital content in the form of films, posters, and lesson plans that are meant to be used across different sectors. Each SDG has specific material created in relation to the goal, including SDG 16: Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions. Ministries of Education, education organizations, for and non- profits, are all encouraged to use the materials provided by World's Largest Lesson in order to promote action for working towards the Global Goals. The website has numerous resources regarding the Global Goals, ranging from classroom decorations, print outs of certificates of participation, to educator training courses. There is also a resource library, information about teaching the goals and information about different ways students can take action for the goals. Lastly, information about partnerships with World's Largest Lesson and how to use social media to promote World's Largest Lesson and the Global Goals is mentioned.

Two lessons created in relation to SDG 16 specifically give examples of peace and violence from around the world to serve as examples for peace education. These lessons are "The Power of Peace[1]" and "Understanding Community Violence[2]". The Power of Peace describes stories about peaceful activists from around the world, while Understanding Community Violence gives examples of violence experienced by children around the world. Lessons from World's Largest

---

[1] 1

http://cdn.worldslargestlesson.globalgoals.org/2016/06/8_The_Power_of_Peace.pdf

[2] 2 http://cdn.worldslargestlesson.globalgoals.org/2016/06/Understanding-Community-Violence-LP-PDF.pdf

lesson are worth exploring because they differ from other discussions occurring in peace education, like how to create peace, avoid conflict, etc. They are lessons about what peace *is*. Through discussions of violence, the lessons create a specific peace discourse that is in need of exploration and further consideration. The lessons aim to create new knowledge surrounding peace and have a global audience.

While this study is not generalizable, it contributes to and critiques knowledge production within peace education. Bajaj and Hantzopoulos (2016a) note that peace education must "continually take into account [the] intricate negotiation between participants' experiences and the larger structural realities that frame them" (p. 236). They suggest that we must illuminate the discussions of the larger structural realities that "transcend demarcated international, national, regional, and local levels of violence" (p. 236). This study follows Bajaj and Hantzopoulos (2016a) suggestion that "complex analyses of violence must undergird peace education" (p. 233).

Concepts of violence

Direct, structural, and cultural violence are some of the ways different forms of violence are conceptualized. Galtung (1969) describes direct violence as violence that is committed against a person via direct action, like killing, maiming, or detention. Direct violence can be "exemplified by torture, war, militarism, rape and other forms of aggression" (Bajaj & Hantzopoulos, 2016b, p. 3) Structural violence, can be described as when a structure "has exploitation as a centre piece, meaning that some get much more out of the system than others" (Galtung, 2013, p. 37). It can be described as a "state of social inequality in which privileged groups exploit or oppress others; created by deprivation of basic human needs, such as civil rights, health, and education (Galtung, 1969; Harris & Morrison, 2003)" (as cited in Bajaj, 2008b, p. 166).

Cultural violence is when aspects of culture, via "religion and ideology, language and art, empirical science and formal science" are used to "justify, legitimize direct or structural violence" (Galtung, 2013, p. 38). Cultural violence "makes direct and structural violence look and feel right, or at least not wrong" (Galtung, 2013, p. 39). Brantmeier (2013) describes cultural violence is when cultural beliefs are used to "legitimate any form of violence, either direct or indirect" (p. 246).

Transnational feminism and concepts of violence

Transnational feminism is concerned with the complexities of and between different forms of violence. Davis (2008) notes that if we want to end violence against women, our work must extend beyond addressing individual acts of violence because violence is not only "individualized and domestic" (p.25). She recognizes how different forms of violence such as prisons, state violence, capital punishment and torture are all connected (Davis, 2008, p. 25). Davis' approach to violence recognizes a "spectrum of violence" and she suggests that "while we cannot simultaneously eliminate the entire spectrum of violence, we can always insist on an awareness of these connections" (2008, p. 25). Davis notes the need to make connections between different kinds of violence.

A transnational feminist approach to violence rejects conceptualizing violence without considering its political context (Chew, 2008). Chew (2008) is critical of "antiviolence" activities that do not challenge sexism more broadly (p. 85). Chew (2008) gives the example of educating males who are abusive to their partners through an anti-violence paradigm rather than an anti-sexist paradigm. She discusses that this approach encourages behavioral changes, not structural ones. Chew says that focusing on "how *individual* males perform violent masculinity in limited circumstances, misses the overwhelming structural inequalities that remain in place to prop up abuse" (2008, p. 86). She suggests that we should question how economics, politics, social support, or citizenship status "allow some people to prey on others in interpersonal relationships" (Chew, 2008, p. 86). A feminist approach to violence challenges the "larger societal structures fueling violence- rather than simply accommodating its existence" (Chew, 2008, p. 86). Chew argues for the political and structural conceptualizations of violence. Therefore, a transnational feminist view of violence is not only concerned with different types of violence, but is also concerned with their connections.

Aim and Research Questions

The aim of this study is to problematize the peace discourse that is created in peace education material from World's Largest Lesson from a transnational feminist perspective. Specifically, this study critically explores the knowledge that is produced through discussions of different forms of violence.

1. What peace discourse is created through discussions of violence in World's Largest Lesson?
2. What are the pedagogical implications?

Theoretical framework and methodology

This study uses a transnational feminist critical discourse analysis to problematize knowledge production occurring in peace education. Transnational feminist theory draws on recognizing the intersections of oppressions, which can be described as intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991). Transnational feminism "encourages an examination of how categories of race, sexuality, culture, nation, and gender not only intersect, but are mutually constituted, formed, and transformed within transnational power laden processes such as European imperialism and colonialism, neoliberal globalization and so on" (Patil, 2013, p. 847). Transnational feminism is critical of the "neoliberal appropriation of feminism that uses feminism as a theory of gender minus a feminist critique of power relations" (Mohanty, 2013, p. 972). Mohanty (2003, p. 6.) has been critical of the predominantly class based gap between a vital women's movement and feminist theorizing, and the "neoliberal, consumerist (procapitalist) feminism concerned with "women's advancement" up the corporate and nation state ladder" which encourages competition and individualism. Davis (2008) also discusses a feminism that does not "capitulate to possessive individualism" (p. 21).

Continually, transnational feminism is "political in nature" and has the "commitment to challenge injustice or oppression" (Parekh and Wilcox, 2018, n.p.). It recognizes that in order to understand different systems of oppression, gender, race, class, and sexuality cannot be ignored (Cagan, 2008). Alcoff (2017) also notes that "nationality, religion, geographic region, disability, and political status (citizenship)" (p. 23) also need to be considered. Transnational feminism suggests that while there are differences in women's issues across the world, "women's plights in one place are often deeply connected to women's situations everywhere" (Fultner, 2017, p. 205). Fultner (2017) suggests that this is this is "perhaps *the* defining feature of transnational feminist theory" (p. 205). Continually, Fultner (2017) says transnational feminism recognizes that the historical, economic, political, social and cultural contexts need to be considered in order to understand a given issue.

A transnational feminist critical discourse analysis draws on concepts from discourse analysis (DA), critical discourse analysis (CDA) and feminist critical discourse (FCDA) analysis. DA recognizes that our language is filled with bias and agendas, therefore we are not neutral when we speak and write. DA also looks "beyond linguistic features to the links between language and society, language and the social context in which they are set" (Cohen et al., 2018, p. 687). This is similar to CDA. In other words, the way something is discussed creates a certain version and understanding of it. It creates a certain *knowledge* of it. Here, language forms versions of our social reality and creates particular world views. CDA considers not only how language creates social realities and world views, but it also considers

who maintains power in the process. Continually, CDA "aims to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, signaled, constituted, legitimized and so on by language use (or in discourse)" (Wodak, 2001, p. 2). An interest in power structures and power dynamics is at the core of CDA. In CDA, the analysis not only considers what is included in the text, covertly or overtly, but also what is excluded, covertly or overtly, to investigate power dynamics. This is similar to FCDA, which aims to highlight the "complex, subtle, and sometimes not so subtle, ways in which frequently taken-for-granted gendered assumptions and hegemonic power relations are discursively produced, sustained, negotiated, and challenged in different contexts and communities" (Lazar, 2007, p. 142). The attention given to language, knowledge, and power through CDA and FCDA are in alignment with the concerns of transnational feminism. Like CDA and FCDA, transnational feminism considers how oppressions intersect.

I suggest a transnational feminist critical discourse analysis extends even beyond CDA and FCDA, because it is an analysis that examines a discourse for even "broader patterns and structures of domination and exploitation" (Mohanty, 2013, p. 967). Transnational feminism extends beyond traditional liberal feminisms, radical feminism, and Marxists feminism, which either don't allow for historical considerations, singularize gender, or ignore race and gender (Mohanty, 2003, p. 243). A transitional feminist analysis "refuses to choose among economic, cultural, and political concerns" (Kaplan & Grewal, 1999, p. 358). Therefore, transnational feminist critical discourse analysis not only considers how language can influence a discourse at the expense of women, but it also considers how language creates discourses that are at the expense of other marginalized groups. Beverly Bain says that feminism helps "makes visible how the discourses of race, nationalism, citizenship, colonialism, queerness, economics, culture, are invested in whiteness, masculinity, class privilege, and homonormativity" (Carty & Mohanty, 2015, p.99). Therefore, a transnational feminist critical discourse analysis is not only concerned with critiquing discourses that maintain patriarchal structures, but also in critiquing discourses that maintain structures that are racist, colonial, capitalist, nationalist, etc.

Considering the peace discourse that is created in World's Largest Lesson, this study does not aim for generalizable findings. Rather, this study is follows a feminist view of research which does not aim to claim universal validity, instead it seeks to "illuminate existing social relations, demonstrate the deficiencies of alternative interpretations, and debunk opposing views" (Hawkeswork, 2014, p. 114). This study challenges the deficiencies that are presented in the peace discourse. In doing so, the thesis "debunks" the peace discourse present in World's Largest Lesson.

Findings

The Power of Peace lesson largely reduces concepts of peace to a binary of peaceful and non- peaceful, which limits the extent other forms of violence are recognized. It recognizes people's right to live free from structural violence, but it does not challenge the structure itself. Williams (2016) notes that if structural violence is left unquestioned, it becomes a "major blockade to the implementation of comprehensive critical peace education interventions" (p. 154). The few examples of structural violence (like access to education or civil rights) that are mentioned are discussed without reference to racism, classism, colonialism, religious discrimination, or sexism. Therefore, the types of violence that are described in the stories are disconnected from each other and do not account for cultural violence. The violence is largely discussed without context, which also limits connections to be made. Continually, despite mentioning some group involvement in peaceful protests, the overall focus of action for peace is shown as action by individuals fighting against either direct violence or unnamed or decontextualized structural violence. This framing of peace does not allow the structures that potentially have "exploitation at a center piece, meaning that some get much more out of the system than others" (Galtung, 2013, p. 37) to be questioned. Overall, the lesson produces knowledge that understates the interconnectedness of different forms of violence. This kind of peace education omits cultural, political and economic forces from peace education programs (Bajaj & Hantzopoulos, 2016a, p. 236).

Understanding Community Violence creates an idea of violence that acknowledges its complexity and attempts to make connections between local and global experiences of violence. It recognizes different forms of direct and structural violence, but the discussion of cultural violence is largely missing. The stories do not provide much context, so the different forms of violence become disconnected from their foundations. The actions to take to prevent violence that are offered by the lesson lack recognition of structural or cultural violence. Galtung (1969; 2013) and Brantmeier (2013) both recognize structural violence leads to unequal power and unequal life chances and that cultural violence is used to legitimate direct violence. The way direct violence is presented in the lesson fails to recognize this. The actions that are discussed also create an element of choice in preventing violence in a way that lacks connecting structural and cultural violence to direct violence. Attention largely is not given to "the cultural, political, and material forces –often rooted in colonial relations- that engender [violence] in specific places and times with specific groups of people" (Bermeo, 2016, p. 159). The lesson attempts to have students take action and make connections between violence in their communities and the world. However, the lesson itself largely does not do this. While some connections between different forms of violence are made in the

lesson, overall, the lesson does not offer students the opportunity to "cultivate an understanding of social dynamics and resist pressures –be they post/colonial or the outcome of class conflict- to assimilate into dominant economic and cultural structures that often do not serve the needs of students and their communities" (Bajaj, 2016, p. 109).

Of the different forms of violence that were mentioned in the two lessons, racism, classism, colonialism, religious discrimination, sexism, and more, are never named. The lesson creates a concept of peace that does not name these types of structural violence. By extension, the lessons do not account for different forms of cultural violence like white supremacy, capitalism/casteism, patriarchy, misogyny, homophobia, anti-blackness and more. Continually, not only are these types of violence not considered, they are not connected to one another. Considering all this, the next section discusses how knowledge that deemphasizes the interconnectedness of violence creates a peace discourse that is decontextualized, dehistoricized, and depoliticized, privileges individuals, and maintains the status quo.

Analysis

A decontextualized, dehistoricized, and depoliticzed peace

Both lessons create knowledge about peace and violence that lack recognizing the interconnectedness of different forms of violence, which results in a peace discourse that is decontextualized, dehistoricized, and depoliticized. The Power of Peace lesson notes that some peaceful activists could be viewed as political and warns the teachers to choose with care, but the stories of the peaceful activists are themselves depoliticized. All the stories create a concept of peace that does not acknowledge or connect many forms of structural and cultural violence. For example, Mahatma Gandhi's story about his fight for independence against the British Empire is told without acknowledging structural and cultural forms of violence like colonialism, racism, religious discrimination, classism, or sexism. Similarly, in the story of Nelson Mandela, there is no mention of racism, white supremacy, or colonialism. This creates a peace discourse in peace education that Horner (2016) critiques. She challenges the discourse of what she calls liberal peace, which is presented as neutral and depoliticized (Horner, 2016). This discourse of peace makes Western political and economic violence invisible (Horner, 2016, p. 126). Within this discourse of peace, less attention is given to the "complexities and interactions between the less visible forms of cultural and structural, which may underpin direct violence" (p. 126). Malala Yousafzai's story does not make the connection between the direct violence she experienced and the

structures of sexism/patriarchy. Therefore, it promotes the type of thinking that does not connect the idea that, as Fultner (2017) notes, the struggles of women in one place are often connected to the struggles of women in other places. Because these examples do not make connections between these different forms of violence, their peaceful activism is based in a story with no contextual, historical or political foundation. It creates a discourse of peace that does not consider the "complex relational understanding of experience, location and history" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 238). Without acknowledging the history, politics, and context of the past, the peace discourse of the future becomes disconnected and limited.

Karim Wasfi's story describes his response to acts of direct violence without any mention of the structural or cultural forms of violence that form the background of the bombings in Baghdad (imperialism, colonialism, militarism, religious fundamentalism). Leymah Gbowee's story highlights her ability to get Muslim and Christian women to work together for the first time, but it does not give any indication to why this was so out of the ordinary, and therefore deemphasizes the significance of overcoming potential structural and cultural violence to work together for peace. It also does not mention sexism or patriarchy, so it neglects discussing that the group of women demanded peace because they were seeing and experiencing horrible forms of violence that were unique to them as women. The story describes Gbowee's activism without acknowledging how women experienced different forms of violence than men. It does not acknowledge how the women in particular were able to fight for peace in ways that were informed by the violence they faced. This neglect to make the connection to how women, as Brock-Utne (1989) suggests, are "as a group are oppressed by the patriarchy on a macro level, and experience male dominance at the meso-and micro levels" (Brock-Utne,1989, p. 7). Discussing the stories of these peaceful activists without making connections to different forms of cultural and structural violence creates a version of peace that is decontextualized, dehistoricized, and depoliticized because it separates the work of the activist from the context, history and politics that their work was/is rooted in. Additionally, because it does not mention things like white-supremacy or misogyny, it limits the historical, contextual, and political connections that, Mohanty (2003) and Alcoff (2017), suggest can be made between groups throughout the world.

Similarly, the stories and actions described in the lesson to prevent violence in Understanding Community Violence also create a decontextualized, dehistoricized, and depoliticized version of peace. Gang violence in the stories about Martin, Denis, Susana, and Farida is not connected to other forms of violence like colonialism, imperialism, classism, capitalism, etc. Alia's increased risk of being a victim of violence because she is a girl is not connected to sexism or

patriarchy. Susana's story does not connect ideas of masculinity and patriarchy to gang violence. Denis' story does not connect children's experiences of sexual violence to other forms of violence like classism, sexism, homophobia, or racism. Hanh's story does not connect child labor exploitation to capitalism or racism. This contributes to a peace discourse that is neutral and depoliticized (Horner, 2016). The violence they experience is presented as something that is separate from time and space. This discourse of peace does not focus on "institutional or historical domination" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 209).

The actions to prevent violence continue to create a discourse of peace that ignores forms of violence and their interconnectedness. The examples do not offer solutions to violence that acknowledge structural and cultural violence like racism, sexism, classism, or cultural ideas about physical punishment or their connections. Galtung (2008) expresses the importance for peace education to make connections to historical mobilizations against structural violence, but the strategies for violence prevention in the lesson lacks contextual, historical or political relevance. I suggest a transnational feminist perspective of peace is a peace that recognizes that different forms of violence are connected and refuses to separate them from either context, history, or politics because a transnational feminist perspective of peace knows these things cannot be disconnected. Because the stories fail to mention many forms of cultural and structural violence, the depictions do not allow for connections to be made between the activists' peaceful responses and the structures that had them living in a "state of social inequality in which privileged groups exploit or oppress others" (Galtung, 1969; Harris & Morrison, 2003)" (as cited in Bajaj, 2008b, p, 171). I suggest a decontextualized, dehistoricized, depoliticized concept of peace is one that cannot work towards transformative feminist peace.

An individual peace

Both lessons produce knowledge about peace and violence that lack recognition of the interconnectedness of different forms of violence, which results in a peace discourse that places the emphasis on individuals, instead of structural or cultural aspects when creating the peace discourse. Different definitions of peace in The Power of Peace highlight individuals' possibilities to live in peace (by having food, education, clean water, etc). However, the lesson does not mention individuals' possibilities to challenge unjust systems. Therefore, the burden of peace is placed on individuals having the opportunity *to* have something in a system because they are an individual human, rather than a more collective one where everyone has the opportunity to live with the freedom *from* an unjust system. Focusing on individuals' rights within a system can "extol a culture of individualism and consequently suppress notions of collective rights" (Horner, 2016, p. 126).

Instead of framing peace as "when everyone has fair and equal access to water", I suggest a transnational feminist framing of peace would challenge the structural and cultural violence that allows some people to go without access to water, and instead would say "peace is when everyone is able to live free *from* an unjust system that prioritizes access to water for some people, while neglecting or even blocking the access of others (often women, people living in poverty, transgender people, immigrants, prisoners, non-citizens, or other marginalized groups). A transnational feminist perspective would challenge the injustice or oppression in the system, not just accept the system as is (Mohanty, 2003). I suggest an individual peace is a peace that does not recognize the interconnections of different forms of violence, therefore it is also a peace that does not see the need for the structural and cultural change that would benefit humans, animals, and the environment, as Brantmeier (2013) suggests.

Individuals are also highlighted in other places in the lesson. The entire structure of the lesson focuses on peaceful *activists* instead of peaceful *movements*. This deemphasizes the roles of organizers, many of whom have been women, "and the agency of the participants in movements for change" (Davis, 2018, p. 48). The stories are also formatted in a way that furthers the idea of individual action. Not only does this deemphasize the collective struggle for peace, but it also continues the idea that peace is something that belongs to individuals. It creates a discourse of peace that contributes to "possessive individualism" (Davis, 2008, p. 21). The lesson highlights different characteristics of the peaceful advocates in a way that promotes individual choice for peace and rewards individuals for acting for peace. This concept of peace focuses on individual change rather than challenging structural and cultural violence and deemphasizes the need for structural change for peace. It creates a discourse of peace that is part of the "masculinist leadership paradigms anchored in charismatic individualism" (Davis, 2018, p. 48). This is also seen in Understanding Community Violence.

The lesson describes direct violence as something that is directly life-threatening through physical harm without considering how other types of violence can be life-threatening themselves. This frames direct violence as a physical act against an individual, not as a structure itself. This peace discourse contributes to what Mohanty (2003) describes as when "complex structural experiences of domination and resistance [are] ideologically reformulated as individual behaviors and attitudes" (p. 209). Framing violence through individuals limit how we conceptualize violence. For example, if direct violence is when someone commits physical harm, then what kind of violence is it when certain people are denied access to medical care due to their race, gender, or class? Is it not direct, structural and cultural violence? When direct violence is framed in this individual way, it

limits the need for structural change because it does not see direct violence as also being structural or cultural violence. It limits the complexity and interconnectedness between these forms of violence. It creates a discourse of peace that is unable to critically account for how, for example, police violence, sexual violence, or state violence are all simultaneously forms of direct, structural, and cultural violence. Discussing action for peace by focusing on individuals contributes to a discourse of peace that does not account for the "complexities and interactions between the less visible forms of cultural and structural, which may underpin direct violence" (Horner, 2016, p. 126).

Additionally, the lesson highlights how organizations have helped the individual children in the stories, but it does not mention what they are continuing to do to work towards violence prevention. This emphasizes how an individual organization has helped individual children, but it does not say how the organizations are continuing to work with the children and the community towards violence prevention. Focusing on the organizations' violence prevention without actually discussing what they are doing to prevent violence in communities ignores how different forms of violence are connected. This deemphasizes the structural and cultural change that is needed to prevent violence against children, which also leads to ignoring the structural and cultural change that is needed to work towards peace. This discourse of peace simply tries to eliminate violence within in a system, rather than challenge "the larger societal structures fueling violence" (Chew, 2008, p. 86).

A status quo peace

Both lessons produce knowledge about peace and violence dismiss the interconnectedness of different forms of violence, which results in a peace discourse that does not challenge power or structures, and therefore maintains the status quo. Despite recognizing the potential power of peace, as seen in the title of the lesson, The Power of Peace does not challenge the status quo. This is seen in The Power of Peace when it describes pictures of peaceful and non-peaceful protests. If images (displaying actions) are clearly meant to be either peaceful or non-peaceful, it has the potential to create a meaning of peace that ignores structural or cultural violence in favor of something simply *appearing* peaceful. For example, if a teacher shows a picture of people "shouting or being aggressive" (The Power of Peace, n.d., p. 2) what kind of concept of peace does this create? If shouting or being aggressive are seen as non-peaceful situations, what does this mean for images of activists *yelling* in protest of police shootings of unarmed Black people, or images of women *being aggressive* towards elected officials in demanding sexual assault to be taken seriously.

Alternatively, what does this mean for images of "a large peaceful rally" (p. 2) if the rally is a rally for white nationalism or rallies for certain political figures? Does peaceful mean a large group of people gathered together without physical harm being done (direct violence)? Is this really peaceful? This is not to say that no images can be used to display something peaceful and non-peaceful situations, rather it is just to question how portraying something as non-peaceful could be at the expense of people who are fighting against structural and/or cultural violence. Continually, the idea of something as peaceful and non-peaceful creates a binary that has the potential to keep those in power already in power because they are the ones who get to decide what is seen as peaceful and non-peaceful and therefore can promote and dismiss certain concepts of peace (which can turn into another form of violence). This is also seen in the when the lesson encourages schools to participate in the Great Kindness Challenge Week. Equating peace with kindness has the potential to maintain the status quo because it can allow those in power to dismiss demands of people fighting against structural or culture violence because it does not sound *kind* enough. This discourse of peace potentially allows those already in power to maintain a "monopoly of violence" (Bannerji, 2018, p. 56) because they get to decide what peace is and what it is not. It allows those in power to disregard legitimate criticism because they deem it unpeaceful.

Similarly, the lack of interconnectedness of different forms of violence promotes a status quo peace in the stories about the peaceful activists. I have already discussed how the stories are decontextualized, dehistoricizied, and depoliticized, and focus on individuals. These all contribute to maintaining the status quo. But the stories further this in other ways as well. The stories of Gandhi and Mandela both mention that the men broke laws by protesting for freedom and they were both imprisoned. Because the lesson does not consider the different types of violence that contributed to their imprisonment, the stories frame imprisonment as an event in the men's lives, rather than as another form of violence. It allows violence that is perpetrated by the state or governments via imprisonment, to be seen as stand-alone events committed against individuals, rather than as structural or cultural forms of violence. This allows the existence of prisons, and the laws that allowed the men to be sent there, to go unchallenged. This creates a discourse of peace that does not view these different forms of violence on a "spectrum of violence" (Davis, 2008, p. 25). It does not acknowledge how prisons and state violence are connected (Davis, 2008). This also seen when the text discusses Mandela being released from prison. It says that both men agreed to stop fighting as if they were coming to the discussion with the same amount of power. It positions both of them as agreeing to stop fighting in way that assumes they are in the same position, as if they were both equally wrong or right. This reproduces a status quo peace discourse because it ignores how power dynamics and hierarchies, as Brantmeier (2013) suggests, lead

to the domination of some humans over others. Bajaj (2008a) notes "approaches that fail to question the status quo and examine structural causes of social conflict usually accommodate the economically and politically privileged" (p. 142). She suggests the "conceptual foundations of peace education must be reexamined in order to tease out issues of power, domination, and symbolic violence "(p. 142).

Some of the stories in Understanding Community Violence also contribute to a status quo concept of peace. The stories of Martin and Susana present the idea that there is an element of choice and an element of worthiness in who gets to live without violence. This creates a concept of peace that places the power to live without violence on choices and worthiness and therefore creates a concept of peace that does not challenge the current power positions of society. It presents a concept of peace where the burden of peace is placed on the choices of individuals rather than on challenging the powerful structural and cultural aspects that create violence. This allows current power structures to retain their power because they are not positioned as something that needs to be changed. Henry (2009) suggests that without considering macro inequalities and structural violence, the status quo is reinforced (as cited in Williams, 2016). Creating a concept of peace that does not challenge power structures maintains the status quo. Therefore, it creates a discourse of peace that does not consider "how dominant groups maintain power over others" (Brantmeier, 2013, p. 247). Brantmeier (2013) suggests that critical peace education is needed to help "actualize a vibrant, sustainable peace" (p. 255) and suggests that understanding forms of violence and power allow for "intentional change on individual, institutional, societal and global levels" (p. 255).

Implications

Mohanty describes three different pedagogical strategies for internationalizing gender and women's studies programs and names them the feminist as tourist model, the feminist as explorer model, and the comparative feminist studies or feminist solidarities model (Mohanty, 2003). The feminist as tourist model "involves a pedagogical strategy in which brief forays are made into non-Euro-American cultures" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 239). She believes this model is a problem because it "leaves power relations and hierarchies untouched since ideas about center and margin are reproduced along Eurocentric lines "(Mohanty, 2003, p. 2016). Feminist as explorer model positions women as "the object and subject of knowledge and the larger intellectual project is entirely about countries other than the United States" (p. 240). She suggests this model is inadequate because it leads to "global as a way of not addressing internal racism, capitalist hegemony, colonialism, and heterosexualization as central to processes of global domination, exploitation, and resistance" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 240). The comparative feminist

studies or feminist solidarities model considers the "interconnectedness of the histories, experiences, and struggles of U.S. women of color, white women, and women from the Third World/South" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 242).

Mohanty suggests that these arguments hold for other education programs that are seeking to globalize or internationalize their curriculum (2003). Due to peace education's global nature, specifically in the form of education curricula created in relation to the SDGs, I suggest that these arguments also hold for the lessons from World's Largest Lesson. The lessons specifically highlight stories from around the world in order to educate for SDG 16: Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions. Based on my analysis, I suggest that the curriculum presented in the lessons fall under the feminist as tourist model. With this in mind, I decide to call it the peace as tourist model. Mohanty (2003) usually describes specifically women in her discussions of the different models, but I consider all the people described in the lessons. The following section will describe how the lessons contribute to this model.

Peace as tourist model

Mohanty (2003) describes the feminist as tourist model includes curriculum that briefly looks at non-Euro-American cultures from an otherwise Eurocentric gaze. This can be seen in the lessons from World's Largest Lesson. The lessons look into examples, from what Mohanty calls the Third World/South, without much connection to context, history, politics or power, therefore the Eurocentric gaze is maintained. The Eurocentric gaze is maintained because the examples offered portray the people from the stories either as victims or as powerful (Mohanty, 2003). This allows World's Largest Lesson, UNICEF, and the other educational businesses mentioned in the lesson to remain at the center, while briefly considering stories from the periphery. Mohanty (2003) suggests this type of model creates a clear sense of who is seen as the other and without considering power relations.

The feminist as tourist model also highlights extremes from the Third World/South, like dowry deaths or the exploitation of women factory workers (Mohanty, 2003). This results in women just being seen in stereotypical terms rather than in their everyday lives, like Euro-American women are able to be (Mohanty, 2003). The lessons give examples of peace, non-peace, and violence that are positioned outside of Euro-America (with the exception of mentioning Sweden and Hanh's story based in the USA, although it mentions he was adopted from Vietnam). Without connecting the stories to their historical, contextual, and political locations, the people and their experiences are stereotyped and are presented as separate from Euro-America. This also contributes to the idea

Mohanty calls a "confirmed sense of the evolved U.S./Euro feminist" (2003, p. 239). The lessons highlight UNICEF programs and educational organizations, which potentially creates an idea that these organizations know best. The lessons also highlight UNICEF's contributions to encouraging peace and preventing violence. Consequently, their work potentially becomes "a predominantly self-interested chasm" (Mohanty, p. 239) as they seek to highlight their own work.

Additionally, the feminist as tourist model creates the "Third World difference" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 240), which portrays monolithic images of Third World/South women. This image is different to that of Euro-American women, who are viewed as "vital, changing and complex" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 240). This is seen in the lessons. The people in the stories are described through their relationships with violence, largely without considering the interconnectedness of different forms of violence. Therefore, this creates an image of the Third World/South that is monolithic because it does not account for the complexities of the stories. The stories present individuals "as representatives of majority or minority groups whose experience is predetermined within an oppressor/ victim paradigm" Mohanty (2003, p. 209). The overall peace discourse created in World's Largest Lesson contributes to a peace as tourist model because the Euro-American centric gaze is maintained through the overemphasis of stories about individuals from the Third World/South without considering power relations and histories.

Peace as solidarity model

What would a peace as solidarity model, in World's Largest Lesson, look like? This model would recognize that differences and commonalities exist "in relation and tension with each other in all contexts" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 242). Applying Mohanty's (2003) reasoning, a peace as solidarity model would tell the stories of the peaceful activists and the stories of the children experiencing violence in a way that recognizes the interconnectedness of their histories, experiences and struggles. This type of teaching is attentive to power, therefore "each historical experience illuminates the experiences of the others" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 242). A peace as solidarity model in World's Largest Lesson would tell the stories of the peaceful activists in a way that explicitly connects how their struggles for peace are connected through their responses to colonialism, racism, sexism, and imperialism. Their stories of peace would then be centered around collective struggles, instead of being centered around the stories of individuals whose stories are only connected via their use of non-violent acts. In a peace as solidarity model, the stories of peace would start from a place of resistance to these larger oppressions and would only later mention the individuals, because the focus would be on how interconnecting

histories have led to different forms of violence and how collective struggles have fought against it.

In the peace as solidarity model, the lessons in World's Largest Lesson would be organized around "social and economic processes and histories of various communities" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 242). For example, the stories of the children's experiences from around the world would consider how the experiences of violence of one child in one place is connected to the violence experienced by another child in another place. It would consider how the social (racism, sexism, and more) and economic history (colonialism, imperialism, capitalism) in one place leads to violence, while connecting it to how the social and economic history in another place leads to violence. Therefore, the stories would not be centered around individual children or individual UNICEF programs, rather they would focus on how certain economic and social processes result in violence against children. The center of a peace as solidarity model is not individuals, rather the center considers the interconnectedness of the histories, power relations, and collective struggle. I suggest a peace as solidarity model combines both the concerns of critical peace educators and the concerns of transnational feminism. Therefore, I suggest it is the model that is needed in order to work towards transformative peace and a more just world.

Conclusion

A recognition of the interconnectedness of forms of violence is crucial for peace education because if they are not considered, it can lead to the peace discourse that I have described. If we take the goals of critical peace educators and transnational feminism seriously, we must consider how these discussions of violence have a potential to create a specific peace knowledge that, at best, is not transformative and, at worst, is harmful to already marginalized groups. This peace discourse also results in the erasure of groups of people from the peace discourse entirely. According to the arguments I have made, where do gay people, trans people, non-binary people, people with disabilities, Indigenous people, refugees, migrants, prisoners and more, fit in the peace discourse created in World's Largest Lesson? If students are taught about peace and violence in a way that my analysis has argued, how are students supposed to be able to account for and connect their peace knowledge to other marginalized groups? People in these marginalized groups are in the world, in their classrooms, or might even be themselves; yet, these marginalized groups are erased from the peace discourse because the peace discourse that has been created does not allow other connections (historical, social, cultural, political, economic) to be made. If these connections are not made, peace education has the potential to become reduced to a concept of kindness, centered

around individual choices without disrupting the status quo. Continually, the peace discourse that is produced is also a discourse that erases animals and the environment from concepts of peace and violence.

I suggest future research should investigate how peace educators can/ are contribute/contributing to a peace as solidarity model. This research would combine the interests of critical peace educators and transnational feminisms as it seeks to contribute to a peace education that is contextually, politically, and historically connected. I suggest, moving forward, critical peace educators need to avoid contributing to the peace as tourist model and must actively strive for the peace as solidarity model. Only this model is equipped to contribute to change both critical peace educators and transnational feminism calls for.

References

Alcoff, L. (2017). Decolonizing Feminist Philosophy. In M. McLaren (Ed.), *Decolonizing feminism: transnational feminism and globalization*. (pp. 1-18). Rowan & Littlefield International Ltd.

Bajaj, M. (2008a). Critical Peace Education. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education*. (pp. 135-146). IAP

Bajaj, M. (2008b). Glossary of Terms. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education*. (pp. 163-167). IAP

Bajaj, M. (2015). 'Pedagogies of resistance and critical peace education praxis. *Journal of Peace Education*, *12*(2), 154-166.

Bajaj, M (2016). In the Gaze of Gandhi: Peace Education in Contemporary India. In M. Bajaj & M. Hantzopoulos. (Eds.), *Peace education: International perspectives* (pp. 107-122). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Bajaj, M. & Hantzopoulous, M. (2016a). Conclusion: Critical Directions for Peace Education. In M. Bajaj & M. Hantzopoulos. (Eds.), *Peace education: International perspectives* (pp. 232-238). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Bajaj, M. & Hantzopoulous, M. (2016b). Introduction. In M. Bajaj, & M. Hantzopoulos (Eds.), *Peace education: International perspectives* (pp. 1-16). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Bannerji, H. (2018). Materializing Class, Historicizing Culture. In L. Carty & C. Mohanty (Eds.), *Feminist Freedom Warriors*. (pp.51-70). Haymarket Books.

Bermeo, M. (2016). Teaching for Peace In Settings Affected by Urban Violence: Reflections from Guayaquil, Ecuador. In M. Bajaj & M. Hantzopoulos. (Eds.), *Peace education: International perspectives* (pp. 157-173). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Brantmeier, E. J. (2013). Toward a critical peace education for sustainability. *Journal of peace education*, *10*(3), 242-258.

Brisolara,S., & Seigart, D. (2014). Feminist Evaluation Research. In S.N. Hesse-Biber, (Ed.), *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis*. (pp. 1-32). SAGE publications.

Brock-Utne, B. (1989). *Feminist perspectives on peace and peace education*. Pergamon.

Cagan, L. (2008). Reflections on Feminism, War and the Politics of Dissent. In R. Riley, C. Mohanty & M. Pratt (Eds.), *Feminism And War: Confronting U.S. Imperialism*. (pp. 250-257). Zed Books Ltd.

Carty, L. & Mohanty, C. (2015). Mapping Transnational Feminist Engagements: Neoliberalism and the Politics of Solidarity. In R. Baksh-Soodeen & W. Harcourt, (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of transnational feminist movements*. (pp. 82-115). Oxford Handbooks.

Chew, H. (2008). What's Left? After 'Imperial Feminist' Hijackings. In R. Riley, C. Mohanty & M. Pratt (Eds.), *Feminism And War: Confronting U.S. Imperialism*. (pp. 75-90). Zed Books Ltd.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrision, K. (2018) *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). New York: Routledge.

Crenshaw, C. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43 (6), 1241-1299.

Davis, A. (2008). A Vocabulary for Feminist Praxis: On War and Radical Critique. In R. Riley, C. Mohanty & M. Pratt (Eds.), *Feminism And War: Confronting U.S. Imperialism*. (pp. 1-26). Zed Books Ltd.

Davis, A. (2018). Troubling Explanatory Frameworks. In L. Carty & C. Mohanty (Eds.), *Feminist Freedom Warriors*. (pp.35-49). Haymarket Books.

Fultner, B. (2017). The Dyamnics of Transnational Feminist Dialogue. In M. McLaren (Ed.), *Decolonizing feminism: transnational feminism and globalization*. (pp. 203-230). Rowan & Littlefield International Ltd.

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of peace research*, *6*(3), 167-191.

Galtung, J. (2008). Form and Content of Peace Education. In Bajaj, M. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education*. (pp. 49-66). IAP

Galtung, J. (2013). Violence: direct, structural and cultural. In J. Galtung & D. Fisher (Eds.), *Johan Galtung* (pp. 35-40). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Hawkesworth, M. (2014). Truth and truths in feminist knowledge production. In Hesse-Biber, S. N. *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis* (pp. 92-118). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Horner, L (2016). Uncertainty, Fluidity, and Occupying Spaces in- between: Peace Education Practices in Mindanao, the Philippines. In M. Bajaj & M. Hantzopoulos. (Eds.), *Peace education: International perspectives* (pp. 125-140). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Kaplan, C., & Grewal, I. (1999). Transnational feminist cultural studies: Beyond the Marxism/poststructuralism/feminism divides. In C. Kaplan, N. Alarón, & M. Moallem (Eds.), *Between woman and nation: Nationalisms, transnational feminisms, and the state (*pp.349-363). London: Duke University Press.

Lazar, M. M. (2007). Feminist critical discourse analysis: Articulating a feminist discourse praxis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *4*(2), 141-164.

Mohanty, C. T. (2003). *Feminism without borders*. Duke University Press.

Mohanty, C. T. (2013). Transnational feminist crossings: On neoliberalism and radical critique. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *38*(4), 967-991.

O'Neill, M. (2019). Problematizing the peace discourse in World's Largest Lesson: A critical exploration of knowledge production through discussions of violence. Stockholm University. Retrieved August 5, 2019 from https://www.edu.su.se/english/education/master-s-programme/master-s-theses-1.404829?cache=ac13b.

Parekh, S. & Wilcox, S. (2018). Feminist Perspectives on Globalization. In N. Edward (Ed). *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved February 18, 2019 from* https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2018/entries/feminism-globalization.

Patil, V. (2013). From patriarchy to intersectionality: A transnational feminist assessment of how far we've really come. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *38*(4), 847-867.

Reardon, B. A. (1999). Peace Education: A Review and Projection. Peace Education Reports No. 17.

The Power of Peace (n.d.) The World's Largest Lesson. Retrieved March 20, 2019 from http://cdn.worldslargestlesson.globalgoals.org/2016/06/8_The_Power_of_Peace.pdf

Understanding Community Violence (n.d.) World's Largest Lesson. Retrieved March 20, 2019 from http://cdn.worldslargestlesson.globalgoals.org/2016/06/Understanding-Community-Violence-LP-PDF.pdf.

Williams, H (2016). Lingering Colonialities as Blockades to Peace Education: School Violence in Trinidad. In M. Bajaj & M. Hantzopoulos. (Eds.), *Peace education: International perspectives* (pp. 141-156). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about- a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1-14). Sage Publications.

World's Largest Lesson (n.d.) World's Largest Lesson. Retrieved March 20, 2019 from http://worldslargestlesson.globalgoals.org/project-everyone/.