REFERENCES:

The *Journal on Education in Emergencies (JEiE)* publishes groundbreaking and outstanding scholarly and practitioner work on education in emergencies (EiE), defined broadly as quality learning opportunities for all ages in situations of crisis, including early childhood development, primary, secondary, non-formal, technical, vocation, higher and adult education.

BOOK REVIEW

What is peace education and how can it support peacebuilding? These questions are extensively debated and deliberated in *Peace Education: International Perspectives*, a volume edited by Monisha Bajaj and Maria Hantzopoulos. Peace education has played a formative role in the education in emergencies movement and has been an important focus of research that examines the relationship between education and conflict. However, as this volume shows, there is a need to critically examine the assumptions that underscore current peace education practices, in particular its focus on negative peace—that is, the absence of large-scale violence—and security discourse. The volume helpfully highlights the need to move beyond conventional framings of peace that are confined to the classroom, and instead to consider localized and contextualized approaches that address questions of social justice. The book's four parts include 12 chapters that generously discuss the insights and lessons learned from the experiences of different countries and contexts that currently are or previously were in a state of emergency.

Throughout the book, peace education is defined either in relation to violence, as a process or intervention, or as an outcome (chap. 6). An important argument that runs throughout the book is that addressing the drivers of violence does not necessarily imply nurturing the drivers of peace. Instead of looking at violence, the guiding agenda for peace education should focus on social justice (chaps. 3, 5, 8, 9). Furthermore, there is a general consensus among the book's contributing authors that understanding violence must precede the understanding of peace, as it is the role of peace education to mitigate the underlying structures of violence.

According to Murphy, Pettis, and Wray (chap. 2), peacebuilding is a strategy that is often employed only as a rehabilitation mechanism in postconflict societies, when in fact it should be a curriculum used in stable societies as well. Using peacebuilding in the former case and not in the latter indicates that it is an ad hoc rather than a conscious effort (chap. 11). Peace education programs often promote negative peace but not positive peace—that is, the alleviation of social injustice in ways that have a transformative effect. This is problematic because negative peace policies that focus on zero tolerance of violence exclude the socializing and

humanizing structures that endorse a critical peace education approach (chaps. 8, 10). Other authors (chaps. 9, 12) promote a simultaneous focus on both positive and negative peace.

Building on these observations, Zakharia (chap. 4) underscores the need for a more nuanced understanding of conflict. She argues that conflict is dynamic, not linear. As such, the postconflict state is rather imaginative, in that it does not exist in a pure form in reality; while different conflicts coexist, some become latent, others revive, and others continue. Consequently, critical peace processes should be complex, nonlinear, and interdependent in order to accommodate the dynamic nature of violence and conflict (chaps. 7, 8).

Bekerman (chap. 3) argues that education for coexistence is "guided by functional, psychologized, and idealistic perspectives" (p. 64), and thus it needs to be reoriented toward historical and critical pedagogical perspectives to better account for power relations. In other words, peace education should critically examine the everyday politics of identity that permeate education systems. The role of teachers here is quintessential but, just like students, they first need to willingly confront their own assumptions and judgments (chap. 5). As such, other authors (chaps. 6, 8, 11) contend that peacebuilding is multilayered and should target not only students but their families, teachers, and communities. Similarly, Zembylas (chap. 1) shows that conceptual and long-term healing and reconciliation necessitate not only critical pedagogy and peace education but nurturing emotional practices that can help sustain peace.

Although critical pedagogy can offer empowering and transformative educational experiences, it does little to address the emotional complexities that violence invokes. Moreover, it often overlooks the need to work with privileged and cynical groups, focusing instead on transforming perspectives around marginalized groups. As such, peace education as a response to violence (chaps. 9, 10) is often decontextualized. This leads to abstract discussions of violence and peace. As much of the literature in the field of comparative and international education has shown, borrowing policies from other contexts without giving due attention to the emotional praxis, context, and power dynamics that shape policy implementation can result in unexpected and unintended outcomes (Steiner-Khamsi 2016). It is therefore essential to localize approaches to peace education by drawing from evidence that supports the selection of a particular approach. Several authors (chaps. 1, 9, 10, 11, 12) show that such an approach should be a proactive intervention that fosters such skills as critical thinking (chaps. 1, 2), conflict resolution (chaps. 1, 12), collaboration and communication (chaps. 10, 11, 12),

compassion and curiosity, and commitment and genuine care (chaps. 10, 11). This will yield positive and transformative change. This book will be of interest to agencies that design education intervention programs, often in collaboration with government institutions; NGOs involved in the education sector; curriculum designers and teachers of history and civics; and, finally, researchers who are rethinking what peace education entails.

SAMIRA N. CHATILA
Centre for Lebanese Studies at the Lebanese American University

*The views expressed here are the author's
and do not represent the Centre for Lebanese Studies.*

For permission to reuse, please contact journal@inee.org.

REFERENCE

Steiner-Khamsi, Gita. 2016. "New Directions in Policy Borrowing Research." *Asia Pacific Education Review* 17 (3): 381-90. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-016-9442-9.