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FOREWORD: THE DEVELOPMENT, CONFLICT AND SECURITY NEXUS

PÁDRAIG CARMODY

On behalf of the Development Studies Association of Ireland I am delighted to have the opportunity to introduce this special issue of Policy and Practice: A Development Education Review, which arises out of our conference on ‘The Development, Conflict and Security Nexus’. The relationships between poverty and conflict are contextual and multi-dimensional, but nonetheless have patterns. Low income countries are more likely to suffer from armed conflict for a variety of reasons. Chief amongst these is that extreme poverty may foster resentment against the existing social order, particularly if this is combined with what sociologists call horizontal inequality between different social groups. The so-called opportunity cost of conflict is also low in contexts where poverty is endemic as people may not be risking their jobs, for example, but may be paid by militias, such as Al-Shabaab in Somalia, in order to join them. Processes of marginalisation and immiseration then may feed conflict, particularly when combined with a sense of injustice based on identity.

Low income country governments may have few resources to redress the causes of conflict and if they are not delivering adequate and necessary public goods effectively, efficiently and transparently or are perceived to be corrupt or biased, they may be a cause of grievance themselves. Economic marginalisation and poor governance often co-occur and, by virtue of the dynamics described above, may provide fertile ground for conflict to breed. Under-resourced governments may not only be a source of grievance, but also lack the capacities to effectively deal with conflict dynamics. This may result in what some have referred to as conflict traps. Effective conflict resolution depends on both addressing proximate and structural causes. While negotiation, mediation and other mechanisms may help reduce conflict it may risk recurring if underlying deprivation and other grievances remain unchecked or under-addressed.
The 2018 Development Studies Association of Ireland Annual Conference explored such issues. It brought together both practitioners and theorists of development and conflict. Many of the articles in this special issue were also presented at the conference and cover a variety of vitally important topics, ranging from addressing the legacies of conflict and the importance of memory in post-conflict contexts to assessing the human development and capabilities approach (HDCA) as an ethical lens for assessing neoliberal securitisation.

The development-conflict-security nexus will become an increasingly important lens through which to understand future developments. There is a substantial debate in the literature on the extent to which climate change will feed into conflict, and the ways in which its fallout is being securitised. Informed, evidence-based policy and research can play a vital role in illuminating pathways from what otherwise might be a dystopic future. The articles in this special issue make a valuable contribution in shedding light on the issues and creating hope for the future.

Pádraig Carmody is Chair of the Development Studies Association of Ireland.
Editorial

THE DEVELOPMENT, CONFLICT AND SECURITY NEXUS: DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION AS PEACE-BUILDING

GERARD MCCANN

Since the end of World War Two there have been an estimated 250 significant conflicts around the world, which have cost the lives of over 50 million people and caused hundreds of millions of highly vulnerable people to be driven into exile. This widespread conflict also carries with it secondary contiguous effects such as impoverishment, forced migration and intercommunal tension often accompanied by xenophobia. It is compounded by the role of significant vested interests which deliberately profit from suffering - such as the arms industry and states which derive strategic influence from conflict or actively incite wars in other regions. From a public policy perspective, it has been prudent to take persistent conflict as the norm, be it from active engagement in military actions or securitisation reacting to the constant threat of acts of terror.

Across the globe, with security at the forefront of governmental action, education has remained a counter-balance in an attempt to build peaceful interdependent societies. This is often a struggle against prevailing circumstances. Educationalists will, by instinct and training, communicate hope and futures to all those lucky enough to have the opportunity to attend school. Globally this is considered as the formative role of teachers in society, yet paradoxically most are working in conditions and situations where futures are being actively denied to children. Development and security stand, as they always have, in tension with each other. We can see this in numbers - and the trajectory is not comforting. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI, 2018) estimated that in 2017 alone global military spending reached $1.7 trillion, whereas in the same year the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2019) estimated that global development aid contributions amounted to a comparatively paltry
$146.6 billion. In both sectors, the percentage rise on the previous year was 1.1 per cent.

Development education (DE) as it has evolved has included peace building as a component aspect of its pedagogy. It is an aspect of the work that governments often find difficult to reconcile with their own political sensitivities. There is also the theoretical and practical compatibility which DE has with the long tradition of ‘peace education’ that exists in regions often affected by conflict. Currently around the world several different terms are used for what can generically be referred to as ‘educating for peace’. ‘Tolerance’, ‘interdependence’ and ‘development’ are often used as hooks for informing the design of programmes on peace building within formal and informal education environments. The contexts may vary considerably, but the principles and methods around the world are remarkably similar and show a significant overlap. For example, ‘peace education’ is accepted as a standard enough subject in the United States (US), whereas in parts of the European Union (EU) ‘development education’ takes on a similar remit. In the United Kingdom (UK) ‘global learning’ has become a catchall term that engages issues to do with a peaceful society, and in the Republic of Ireland there has been the promotion of ‘Civic, Social and Political Education (CSPE)’. In areas that have undergone recent periods of conflict the terminology of peace education also takes similar forms. In Rwanda it is termed ‘education for peace’; in Sri Lanka, ‘education for conflict resolution’; in South Africa, ‘peace and reconciliation’; in Lebanon ‘global education’; in Mauritius ‘education for development’; and in Burundi ‘peace-building in schools’. In Northern Ireland, ‘education for mutual understanding’, ‘shared’ and ‘integrated’ education, have all contributed to peace building.

Educating for peace, as pedagogy, also carries with it some complex situational adaptations, which can be seen with the South African example, where the government has a policy of promoting ‘conflict resolution’. This aspect of the subject, the situational adaptation, may include terms such as ‘reconciliation’, ‘transformation’, ‘peace-building’, ‘peace-making’ - or as is experienced in Northern Ireland - ‘mutual understanding’ ‘diversity’ or ‘community relations’. We have also seen the emergence of ‘inter-culturalism’, which has become immensely influential in Eastern Europe with regions dealing with the complexities of a new
Cold War. All reflect specific applications, but key principles remain constant.

For the practitioners of peace education there is the ongoing understanding that conflict exists at different levels across societies, from the interpersonal and familial to the structural and political. Peace education has a tendency to encounter all of these levels while emphasising socially sensitive aspects within specific geo-political situations. The foci, as such, are those dysfunctional aspects of human development that have created the conditions and mentalities that generate conflict. The objective of practitioners - from those who address domestic violence and gun violence in the inner cities of the US, to those who are working to overcome the effects of genocide in Rwanda or Democratic Republic of Congo - is to embed peaceful endeavour in societal development through education. One of the most influential textbooks on the subject, *Peace Education* (2003) by Ian Harris and Mary Lee Morrison, introduces the topic and its themes succinctly and for this it is a worthy starting point:

“Peace education is currently considered to be both a philosophy and a process involving skills, including listening, reflection, problem-solving, cooperation and conflict resolution. The process involves empowering people with the skills, attitudes and knowledge to create a safe world and build a sustainable environment” (Harris and Morrison, 2003: 9).

The key themes of peace education can be recognised across educational systems, often being integrated into other subjects. While the subject ‘peace education’ has been refining its role across different curricula for decades, the interface that exists with other similar subjects has become increasingly relevant, with some educational disciplines being readily adaptable to the application of peace building within the local educational environment. In the ‘community of educators’ working on themes relevant to peace education, there are practitioners teaching and students learning through the media of human rights education, gender studies, social justice education, sustainable development education and citizenship education – to mention a few. It is an interface where subjects are often at cross-purposes and practitioners are possibly not as
concerted or as connected as they should be. There is, however, general agreement across these fields that common purpose could be strengthened by common practice. This, to an extent, is the greatest challenge facing peace education and by necessity approaches development education, as a sector, for solutions.

An additional useful and authoritative definition of peace education comes from UNICEF, which states that it is:

“...the process of promoting the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values needed to bring about behaviour changes that will enable children, youth and adults to prevent conflict and violence, both overt and structural; to resolve conflict peacefully; and to create the conditions conducive to peace, whether at an intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup, national or international level” (Fountain, 1999: 1).

Peace education in this instance is pro-active and works through various methods of communicative interaction. Indeed, instilling the idea of peace is seen as central to this UNICEF interpretation – it is a culture enhancing exercise, seeing cultural formation as central to societal cohesion. The perceived method of doing this, accruing resources and material from international experience, is to embed the ideal of peace as an area of study throughout curricula.

Consequently, the concept of peace as an educational process needs to be built into a complex of layers across curricula for different contexts and is usually not explicit as a theme. There has been an ongoing debate at an international level and among educational theorists on the role of peace education in the promotion of ‘reconciliation’ in particular in different environments. For example, the US-based Peace and Justice Studies Association (PJSA) has a long-standing appreciation of the methodology and pedagogy of peace education as a means of bringing people together to reconcile historic and perceived differences. This interpretation of peace education contains a strong global development emphasis. That is that they introduce global themes about reconciliation in their day to day work, emphasising the interdependence of people and cultures. Their definition of peace education is, that it is a:
“multi-disciplinary academic and moral quest for solutions to the problems of war and injustice with the consequential development of institutions and movements that will contribute to a peace that is based on justice and reconciliation” (COPRED, 1986)

This approach places central importance on the knowledge focus and theory of the subject and in this may not be as action-centred as some of the other applied initiatives. Nevertheless, the message is very strongly conveyed and is an internationally recognised position on peace education.

Alternatively, the interdisciplinary aspect of DE (from a European understanding) is where its educational strength lies and in that it enriches various subjects with specific universal ideals (Bourn, 2014: 9-11). This methodology has also been pioneered and encouraged by the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) from its inception as long ago as 1972. The premise of these various definitions is to connect to a formative interdisciplinary pedagogy, yet facilitates the more conventional role of education in actively constructing society. It must give society alternatives and a means of opposition when necessary. Indeed, as Reardon noted, historically:

“... education has legitimized warfare and nurtured militarism. Now the task for peace education is to legitimize the search for alternatives within the framework of social evolution and human development” (Reardon, 1996: 156).

Peace education has the potential of introducing alternative, more protean, understandings of development – such as peaceful means of protest. As Burns and Arpeslagh noted in Three Decades of Peace Education Around the World: ‘Peace education clearly emerged as a concern for “one world, or none”, from its early concerns with personal peace to an overriding concern with societal peace issues’ (Burns and Arpeslagh, 1996: 11). They go on to note that the implication of this process is the shift from studying the underlying tenets of a peaceful society to engendering a culture of peace, which is interpreted as an
objective, in the understanding that: ‘... peace education can shape the conditions for a peace culture...’ (Ibid.: 20).

The resolution of both the knowledge focused approach and the methods and practice of peace education has also brought forward more ubiquitous definitions. Following on from the work of David Hicks (1985) in *Education for Peace: Issues, Dilemmas and Alternatives*, and Johan Galtung and Daisaku Ikeda (1995) in *Choose Peace*, there was an attempt to introduce what they termed ‘peace studies’ in a manner that aimed to combine the knowledge and the skill-building aspects. The formative nature of this links the understanding of the reasons for conflict to the means of actual peace building. This assimilates social and psychological aspects into the work. What comes through in the works of these theorists is the idea that peace education can become a central educational aspect of policies for interpersonal wellbeing and community development. The cultural aspects of conflict are addressed in a process which aims to adapt socio-cultural aspects of society that anticipate conflict and its reasons, and take preventative action (Hicks, 1985; Galtung and Ikeda, 1995: 12-17). In response to this challenge there is the belief that peace, as an absence of conflict and violence, is an aspiration that can be normalised within society – violence an illness that can be cured. Peace education, in effect, is presented as supporting community integration. This interpretation was subsequently enhanced by the more civil society based ‘deliberative dialogue’ method typified by attempts to transform learners into agents of positive social change through public discourse, constructive communication and experiential learning (Kester, 2010; Finley, 2013).

On this problem of defining peace education, the concept demands comparative analyses, the relating of scenarios, human experience, events and similarities. With a comparative approach 'peace' is presented in its broadest form to overcome the limitations that may be brought to bear by limiting or confining our understanding of peaceful society to national or ethnocentric definitions. The more global approach has led to a strong affinity between what can loosely be described as global development studies or more precisely what David Hicks has listed as ‘development education, world studies, multicultural education’ and peace education (Hicks, cited in Burns and Arpeslagh, 1996: 161).
Development education has the benefit of engaging with the geo-political questions of human development (such as poverty, climate change, aid and trade) while the latter peace education - as intercultural learning - has had a tendency to work from more interpersonal aspects of human development (community, psychology and sociology). This difference suggests the need for a more assertive and influential partnership between DE and peace education as pedagogy. Such a methodology would invariably be more holistic in its understanding of development. In effect, what is being suggested here is an integration of both sectors to bring peace building to the fore in global educational culture.

From the perspective of the most influential lobby for peace education, the United Nations, it views peace education as an experience of cultural exchange with regional and national interests embedded into the schemes of work and pedagogic aspects of promoting interdependence. In generic terms the ‘subject’, such as it is, aims at the delivery and facilitation of knowledge, skills, the attitudes and values that can inform peace. This culture of peace is not new, it was explored by UNESCO at the ‘International Congress on Peace in the Minds of Men’, which was held at Yamoussoukro, Cote d’Ivoire, in 1989. The Congress recommended to UNESCO that it should: ‘... construct a new vision of peace by developing a peace culture based on the universal values of respect for life, liberty, justice, solidarity, tolerance, human rights and equality between women and men’ (UNESCO, 1995). Underpinning this was the development of an educational network and a research import which would actively work towards this.

The United Nations and its various specialised agencies, educational institutions, numerous non-governmental organisations, and civil society networks have - by stealth - brought forward the theory and practice of educating for peace by collaborating on modular and curricular aspects of the subject. This has manifested itself through the growth of international partnerships. Furthermore, there has been an increased appreciation of the role of the web and social media in offering significant technological opportunities in this process. To carry the influence and to enhance the consensual aspect of peace building as a lobby - involving agencies such as the United Nations, the churches, non-governmental development organisations and educationalists - the various levels of
engagement need continual dialogue and scrutiny. The study of comparative state violence, for example, is implicit to the understanding of the nature of peaceful society. Likewise, the high levels of domestic violence or the casual portrayal of violence in the popular media or gaming industry, needs to be analysed and challenged. In a rapidly changing social context this rounder understanding of peace building needs to be in itself developmental, evolving.

To conclude this clarion call for the integration of development and peace education, it must be noted that peace building through education is brought out strongly in the approach taken through most international human rights documents - such as the United Nations’ *Convention on the Rights of the Child*, which explicitly challenges all forms of violence and espouses a society which has as its key principle the primacy of peaceful interaction. With this in mind, educating for peace has a particular and important role in the process of human development. In effect, learning to live peacefully is implicit to the process of overcoming societal, causal, intercommunity, domestic, state and structural violence. All are implicated in the same dynamic, working towards a culture of reconciliation and peace building as a developmental process.

**Issue 28 of Policy and Practice**
The dilemmas which come with conflict, security and peace building, are at the core of this issue of *Policy and Practice*. The theme is ‘The Development, Conflict and Security Nexus: Theory and Practice’ and it explores the interconnectivity between international development, conflict and security through a development education understanding. It is a joint initiative which ties the innovative work of the Development Studies Association of Ireland (DSAI), *Policy and Practice*, and the Centre for Global Education. Issue 28 is a special issue of the journal published in partnership with the DSAI with its Focus articles in particular concentrating on the problems of dealing with the legacy of conflict. Su-ming Khoo leads the discourse with a look at the contradictions that exist between securitisation and development practice, concluding that development ethics need to be strengthened to present a bulwark against a conflict prone geo-political environment. Mairéad Smith tackles the difficult question of dealing with the trauma of the Êzîdî genocide in Iraq.
In a third Focus article, Jia Wang addresses the issue of international criminal justice with reference to trials in the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia and its reading of Khmer Rouge atrocities.

The Perspectives articles in Issue 28 offer a much more ubiquitous understanding of the conversation between development and security, with Michelle Murphy surveying the findings of the Sustainable Progress Index for 2019. This article highlights some of the performance indicators on development from across the European Union and how Ireland has been fairing with the SDGs to this point. Then Paddy Reilly reflects on the work of the Kimmage Development Studies Centre in Dublin, its programs, innovation and contribution to development studies in Ireland since 1974. Following this Nita Mishra, one of a number of contributors from the DSAI, argues for the development of a ‘culture of peace’ in education and advocates for the introduction of a peace discourse which fosters empathy and compassion.

The first Viewpoint article for this special issue comes in the form of an extraordinary conversation between the internationally renowned journalist and commentator on the Middle-East, Robert Fisk, and the Irish film-maker and broadcaster Peadar King. The discussion covers a range of issues and highlights some pertinent concerns regarding the drift of the wars in the Middle East and the role of the international community in these wars. Finally, this issue is completed by a second Viewpoint article, an insightful analysis of the nature of global inequality ten years on from the global financial crisis by Stephen McCloskey. In this, he summarises the manner in which the crisis facilitated an unprecedented global wealth grab by elites and the way in which this increasing divergence between the global rich and poor has caused political instability around the world.
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ETHICAL DILEMMAS IN THE DEVELOPMENT-SECURITY NEXUS: A HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND CAPABILITIES APPROACH

SU-MING KHOO

Abstract: The ‘development-security nexus’ marks a paradigm shift for development, security and humanitarian practice, with implications for education and development education. This article explores zigzag changes, initially towards human security and human development, then back towards donor governments’ own security and economic interests. Aid has become ‘bunkered’, while development’s scope has somewhat narrowed. The increasing salience of private actors and educational securitisation add to the ethical ambiguities and complexities. Four ethical dilemmas are explored: securitisation, privatisation / ‘NGOisation’, fragmentation, and declining internationalism. Development ethics considers both the ethical justifications for doing development and ethical judgments about development practices. Development ethics helps us think clearly about how responsibilities are assigned, ensuring that responsibilities are not assigned to the wrong actors. This article assesses a major new resource on development ethics (Drydyk and Keleher, 2018) and endorses the human development and capabilities approach (HDCA) as an ethical lens for assessing neoliberal securitisation.

Key Words: Development-security nexus; Securitisation; Development ethics; Human development and capabilities.
Introduction: The changing contexts of the development-security nexus

The ‘development-security nexus’ describes a number of intersecting dynamics and trends that together constitute a paradigm-shift for ‘development’ and ‘security’ where the agendas of ‘development’ and ‘security’ are blended. The increasing centrality of this ‘nexus’ indicates a paradigm shift for development as well as security and humanitarian practice, with humanitarian assistance providing some common ground for approaching security and development in conflict affected and fragile settings and during, or following, conflicts and emergencies, whether politically or naturally induced. This shift has also impacted education, development education and education for global citizenship.

As the development-security nexus has become more salient, development’s scope and problem focus has shifted perceptibly and narrowed, from policies concerned with economic development and welfare expansion to emergency assistance and the containment of forcibly displaced and stateless people. The United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) reports some 68.5 million forcibly displaced people worldwide, including refugees, in 2017, about 40 million of whom are ‘internally’ displaced (UNHCR, 2019). In 2009, the figure was 40 million in total, 25 million of whom were internally displaced (UNHCR, 2017). The latest decade has seen a further drift from the development-security nexus towards ‘continuous global disaster management’ (Sörens and Söderbaum, 2012). These new articulations can be used to legitimise a more radically interventionist, but also more narrowly defined and exclusionary security agenda which purports to be ‘about’ the global South but is in reality predicated on securing the global North, including the advanced economies’ own economic and ‘development’ interests, including promoting military and dual-use exports.

With the end of the Cold War in the 1990s, it was initially proposed that ‘security’ could be redefined to move closer to
‘development’ and become better aligned with human development, changing the referent object of ‘security’ from the state to the human being. This change of referent object was intended to enable the global community to address challenges to human survival and wellbeing, which cannot be secured by merely protecting state territories and apparatuses (Owen, 2004). The idea of ‘human security’ offered a way to achieve security in a people-centred and sustainability-oriented sense of the term (Nsiah-Gyabaah, 2010). However, the 9/11 attacks in 2001 and ensuing ‘War on Terror’ shifted the direction of change back, towards donor countries’ priorities to secure their own territories against various risks. In Britain, (the most influential force on Irish development policy) the project that began with New Labour and the establishment of the Department for International Development (DFID) joined overseas aid and security sector reform in an ambitious programme for ‘doing development’ as a means of reducing security risks ‘at home’. ‘Any previously perceived contradictions between benevolence and self-interest has vanished in a seamless fusion of moral obligation and national interest’ (Abrahamsen, 2016: 286).

Liberal western donor powers have increasingly focused on humanitarian assistance as the key modality for addressing external political crises beyond their borders (Duffield, 1997). Over the past two decades, the context and worldview has zigzagged, initially towards human security and human development and then back again to donor security and economic interests, including arms exports (Klare, 1996). I make this last point because it has regained currency of late due to calls upon United States (US) and European states to restrict arms exports to Saudi Arabia following the recent murder of the Saudi journalist Jamal Kashoggi (Chazan and Pitel, 2018; Reinhard et al., 2018). The human security rationale has not been effective in preventing military exports to Saudi forces who have, in the past three years, used these imports to attack and embargo Yemen, forcing some 12 million Yemenis and other North Africans in Yemen to suffer casualties, displacement and famine.
The zigzag back towards securitisation has redefined economic welfare in terms of the interests of a donor-military-industrial-NGO complex and arguably redacted the scope of ‘development’, which might otherwise have been more broadly defined. The current global prospect is one of continuing complex and protracted conflicts and a changing *modus operandi* that continues to deepen its focus on security-sector reform and the operational challenges of delivering emergency relief amidst persistent insecurity and war.

The increasing importance of the development-security nexus brings to the fore the increasing role of private actors in development and security. The aid industry is a powerful industry in itself that, in some instances, can come to assume a ‘quasi-state’ aspect (Jackson, 1990), even approximating a powerful sovereign actor (Edkins, 2003). However, such ‘sovereignty’ of donor aid is not uniform or straightforward – it is hybrid and complex. Since 2001, the world has seen a major shift towards outsourced, subcontracted and privatised governance, involving major for-profit contractors and non-profit NGOs (Duffield, 1997). Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) have found themselves operating in concert with a vast range of actors and within increasingly morally, ethically and politically conflicted and ambivalent spaces – governmental versus non-governmental, profit versus non-profit, securing development actors or securing beneficiaries. Recent NGO forums have also raised the ethical dilemmas that they face when they are obliged to resort to making agreements with warring political actors, in order to be able to deliver humanitarian aid in conflict zones. The zigzagging between human security and private economic interests has also been noted in the development education sector. For example, the UK government significantly withdrew grant funding for development education in late 2010. Remaining programmes subtly reframed development education in terms of private, commodified learning providers, while redefining learners as consumers, a shift that I commented on in the Guest Editorial for Issue 13 of this journal which was on the theme ‘The Shifting Policy
Landscape of Development Education’ (Khoo, 2011). Education in both donor and recipient countries has become securitised with the introduction of the ‘countering extremism’ and ‘protecting vulnerable people from being drawn into terrorism’ or ‘Prevent’ agenda (HM Government, 2015a; 2015b, Human Rights Watch UK, 2016). O’Donnell criticises this development from an educational and pedagogical perspective, arguing that the ‘securitisation of education, effected through initiatives in counter-terrorism such as Prevent, leads to what I call ‘pedagogical injustice’ for students and teachers (O’Donnell, 2017: 177).

The ways in which governance, security and even education regimes are being redefined reflect complex, mixed logics. Public and economic life in both donor and recipient regimes has evolved through waves of privatisation, public-private hybridisation, managerialism in general and ‘New Public Management’ in particular – in short a spectrum of neoliberal governance, in its different manifestations. In 2017, The Guardian reported that at least half the world’s population has more private security workers than public police officers (Provost, 2017). This rise of private security is a consequence of increasing income and wealth polarisation, and in South Africa, the world’s most economically unequal country (Chapman, 2010), there are around half a million security guards, more than twice the number of state police and military personnel combined (Provost, 2017). The global market for private security services alone is estimated to grow to $240bn by 2020, outdistancing by far the total international aid budget promised for ending global poverty ($140bn a year) and dwarfing the Gross Domestic Products (GDP) of over half the world’s countries (Ibid). The growth in the private security industry followed the US-led wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, which greatly expanded the use of private contract services. Following on from military contracting, security companies continued to expand and seek opportunities in private and privatised services in the civilian sector, employed to protect private wealthy individuals and their private personal and commercial assets.
Bunkered aid and fractured, narrowed development

Aid efforts have become increasingly narrowly defined, concentrated and bunkered. Instead of being progressively developmental in a people-focused sense, localised and recipient-driven, the development-security nexus has increasingly led to the centralisation of aid in heavily fortified compounds. Development practice is increasingly concerned with risk analysis and a sensibility set by standardised, centralised and ubiquitous field security training (Duffield, 2012). This new normal defines the external working environment for development practitioners as one of permanent and pervasive danger. The standardisation, centralisation and professionalisation of security training aims to effect behavioural change and strengthen personal and organisational resilience; it is an absolutist approach which cannot entertain doubt, critique or reflection. Local environments and people are seen as risks, hence isolation and risk aversion end up being the default (Duffield, 2012: 28).

The threats are very real. Security risks to aid workers, including fatalities are thought to be steadily increasing, from 30 incidents increasing to 160 per year, reported by Stoddard et al. (2009). Reliefweb monitoring shows consistently high levels of threats, attacks and fatalities in the humanitarian sector (Reliefweb, 2018), while Christian Aid (2018) reports that that 300 human rights defenders were killed in 2017. While Duffield is not criticising the need for security or risk management per se, he does suggest that the institutionalisation of risk management erodes individual and local autonomy in favour of rules and protocols devised by distant security experts. Risk management within the civilian aid industry has been effectively militarised and become increasingly rigid and conformist. Social segregation and defensive living are the everyday reality of aid practice. Within the context of United Nations (UN) work, and many of the larger NGOs who work with the UN, standard security training is compulsory and unavoidable. The UN attributes the increased risk to the emergence of violent and ‘irrational’ non-state actors who do not play by the rules of humanitarian law or norms (Boutros-Ghali, 1995: ...
Mary Robinson’s voice-over in the UN Basic Security training module offers the opinion that: ‘...some barrier has been broken and anyone can be regarded as a target, even those bringing food to the hungry and medical care to the wounded’ (UNBSF 2003 cited in Duffield, 2012: 27).

The trend towards militarised and securitised aid results in the locations of aid work becoming heavily fortified and segregated in compounds, mirroring a broader pattern of development which privileges ‘elite gated communities, social segregation and defensive urban living’ (Duffield 2012: 31). A new fractured and exclusionary urbanism is emerging, a pattern that closely links with cycles of urban violence and threats to personal and community security (Koonings and Kruijt, 2007). Ironically, the built environment that is supposed to signal the physical signs of a return to peace and define features ‘of the architectural peace dividend’ offers instead fortified compounds or even whole districts, taken over and divided up between different agencies. Aid’s alienating and exclusionary physical spaces seem to prefigure failure, even before the shift from humanitarian assistance to ‘developmental’ support can commence, while underdevelopment and those who suffer it are continuously redefined as other and dangerous (Duffield, 2012: 32-33).

The logic and form of international interventionism has changed, particularly with ‘integrated missions’ which converge humanitarian and development activity with peacekeeping and political agendas (Eide et al., 2005). In integrated missions, UN specialist agencies and NGOs combine forces in ambitious, donor-led post-intervention programmes of disarmament, demobilisation and reconstruction (DDR) in support of an internationally recognised state, such as Kosovo, Afghanistan or Iraq. Integrated missions go beyond the limits of traditional humanitarian action, forming more ambitious efforts to reshape the social, political and economic structures of the countries concerned (Duffield, 2012).

**The ethical dilemmas: four challenges**
Building on the preceding discussion, four challenges can be identified arising from the current development-security nexus: i) securitisation, ii) privatisation and ‘NGOisation’ leading to iii) fragmentation and complex, mixed governance, and iv) declining internationalism which are considered in turn.

**Securitisation**
Securitisation has led to an increased emphasis in external interventionism and potentially a crisis of legitimacy. Securitised interventions are more often designed to achieve the goals of the interveners rather than those of the intervened upon, the so called ‘beneficiaries’. As the distance between the interveners and the intervened-upon widens, local and national dynamics and cultural understandings may be obscured or minimised (Gelot and Söderbaum, 2012) since the referent object of security has zigzagged back to the security of the external donor and their idea of security sector reform, rather than the security of the people who constitute the intervened-upon.

**Privatisation and ‘NGOisation’**
The outsourcing of national and global public policies relies on greater penetration of for-profit market actors and not-for-profit NGO service deliverers into the development space, displacing state and citizen agency. The entry and proliferation of NGOs in the development scene was premised on the idea that they would deliver alternative and transformative development based on popular empowerment and social justice. The growth of the NGO sector was seen to widen the real participation of civil society in development and increase the inputs of poor people into planning and implementing development, making them more responsible for it. However, as NGOs became more successful and grew bigger, they began to play by managerialist, top-down approaches that enhanced the advantages of larger more ‘corporatised’ NGO players, while smaller organisations with pro-poor and participatory values
became somewhat marginalised (Khoo, 2018; Lewis, 2008; Wallace, 2003).

The privatisation trend that characterises the role of government and public services is paralleled by a ‘governmentalising’ trend that sees NGOs becoming increasingly influenced by, and dependent upon, donor policies since the late 1990s. Since the 1980s, neoliberal politics have sought to actively reconfigure the relative roles of the state, the market, and civil society – focusing on the role of states before the 1980s, promoting the role of markets in the 1980s and 1990s and pointing to market failures after the mid-1990s (Wallace, 2004). Thus the rise and proliferation of NGO actors reflects ideological preferences and assumptions concerning global development and poverty reduction since the 1980s (Hulme, 2013). While this trend was not a focus for development research until recently, more recent work has started to address this in greater depth (Khoo, 2018; Lang, 2013).

The trends of privatisation and NGOisation may actually undermine local and national movements for structural change and benefits to the poor, while serving, and remaining complicit with, state and private sector interests (Lang, 2013). This underpins the radical argument that the dramatic expansion of the NGO sector over the past three decades has failed to produce a stronger, more vibrant civil society capable of tackling issues of power and inequality head-on, thus generating real transformative change. Upward accountability to a profit bottom line or donor or consortium agenda displaces the bottom-up expectations about legitimation processes justifying any intervention. Downwards accountability and answerability regarding the responsibilities of actors has tended to decline as managerial solutions and efficiencies are sought to overcome the problem of fragmentation.

**Fragmentation**
The field or profession of development practice is also fractured by areas of functional specialisation and focus: humanitarian relief workers rarely interact with development researchers and analysts; human rights activists or advocates rarely interact with development programme implementers. Legal structures also constrain and fragment development practice. For-profit enterprises are legally distinct and regulated differently from non-profit NGOs and community-based organisations, although the Busan Principles make it clear that for-profits should be treated as ‘equal partners’ to nonprofits in development practice. Arguing that the old architectures for global collaboration cannot handle the shift from ‘collective action’ to today’s ‘hypercollective action’, Severino and Ray (2010) suggest that a more open and comprehensive framework should focus on knowledge sharing centred on evaluation, to provide ‘innovative sticks and carrots for governments and all civil society players to improve convergence’ and form new generation coalitions.

Amidst a general global development context of increasing complexity and plurality of actors, motives and underlying values, Severino and Ray (2010) argue that the prime challenge for global governance is simply steering that increasing complexity towards efficiency. From an ethical perspective, however, this is only one possible justification, which much of the work on complexity and fragmentation tried to dodge. In the context of scarce resources and high-stakes competitive bidding, NGOs and aid consortia are expected by donors to be as innovative, cost-effective, and based on ‘best practices’ as possible. Yet, the field or profession of development practice is fractured by areas of functional specialisation and focus: humanitarian relief workers rarely interact with development researchers and analysts; human rights activists or advocates rarely interact with development programme implementers. The problem is that collaboration and learning are stymied as it is not in competing actors’ interests to reveal to others in their ‘industry’ how they are going to solve the development challenges as posed by the terms of reference. There is relatively little incentive for
implementers within the industry to share their experiences and participation by the intended ‘beneficiaries’ in either setting the initial terms of reference or in revising and learning from them is usually absent or severely limited (Schwenke, 2018).

We will return to Schwenke’s provocation that development practitioners are absent from the critical conversation about development ethics in the concluding section, and it is enough to say at this point that this is an extremely important criticism. Development practitioners comprise an immense industry, but one that employs a relatively small number of people. Development practitioners work as (largely self-defined) global ‘experts’, problem solvers and purveyors of ‘best practices’. They deliver humanitarian relief, as well as ‘development’ projects and programmes, aiming to direct communities or even whole nations or regions towards sustainable development. These aims and practices involve highly aspirational ambitions in a world of actually unsustainable politics, great and growing inequalities and immense absolute need and suffering.

Declining internationalism
The founding instrument of the UN system, the UN Charter was devised to prevent the scourge of war, reaffirm common faith in fundamental human rights based upon the dignity and worth of the human person, advance the equal rights of men and women and establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from the treaties and other sources of international law. This vision of cooperative internationalism provided the backdrop to the project of ‘development’, as social progress and improving standards of life ‘in larger freedom’ (UN, 1945).

Article 28 of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights (UN, 1948) states that ‘[e]veryone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in the Declaration can be fully realized’. Article 28 comes near the end of the UDHR, followed by Article 29 stipulating everyone’s duties to the community, the limitations
morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society and the principle of non-contravention of purposes and principles. The ‘salvatory clause’, Article 30 conserves the human rights set out in the declaration and prohibit their destruction. Yet these statements of intent leave most people with a feeling of scepticism, even incredulity concerning the international system. The emergence of the development-security nexus, and numerous threats to, and deterioration of the state human rights in recent years, coupled with the rise of right-wing nationalist-populist politics offer indications that the commitment to cooperative internationalism is not in a healthy state and that it has been significantly declining (Amnesty International, 2018; Human Rights Watch, 2017; 2018).

**Development ethics**

Despite strong underlying shared values and a sense of shared mission amongst development and humanitarian practitioners, the space to debate development ethics and what it means for development practitioners, their work and identities remains very limited. In the absence of an open space for debating and deliberating development ethics and thinking about development critically, development ethics becomes increasingly occupied by a single concern – efficiency. The concern for efficiency cannot solve ethical dilemmas as it consigns a world of value plurality to a narrow and unrealistic ‘reality’ dominated by value singularity – *a reductio in absurdum*. The hegemonic discourse in international development is dominated by the so-called ‘realist’ perspective on political-economy and an anarchistic perspective on international relations (Mitzen, 2005). The discourses that prioritise effectiveness, efficiency, power and money are rooted in the presumption that all human behaviour and decision-making must be driven by the maximisation of self-interest in a Hobbesian world and the presumption of the rational impossibility of a collective world. Sen’s work in establishing the human development is oriented to challenging that set of assumptions:
“It strikes me as absolutely extraordinary that people can dismiss any attitude as irrational other than that of the maximization of self-interest. Such a position necessarily implies that we reject the role of ethics in our real decision-making. Taking universal selfishness as read may well be delusional, but to turn it into a standard for rationality is utterly absurd” (Sen, 1993, cited in Schwenke 2017: 331).

Development ethics goes beyond the purely philosophical and abstract ground and is not just a dream or demand, as it might have been in the 1960s (Goulet, 1995), but an actual ongoing set of discussions, research, political interventions, and policy initiatives. Drydyk and Keleher’s new handbook on development ethics (2018) particularly focuses on helpful forms of cooperation between philosophers, other academics, and practitioners. They note that development ethics has become quite robust in research, but its scope in teaching and grassroots practice discussions still remains very limited, especially when compared with other fields of applied ethics such as environmental ethics, business ethics, or bioethics.

Development ethics works on both ‘sides of the divide’ looking at ethical justifications for doing development and ethical judgments about development practices. Development ethics involves the examination of the goals and nature of desirable or worthwhile development, and asks questions about the legitimacy of the governmental, institutional, and corporate policies and practices that support these. The space of justification, where options for exercising power, discussing and making decisions is the space of ‘public reasoning’ (Drydyk and Keleher, 2018: 6-7). One of the key issues that is being raised in the civil society research grouping is how the definition of civil society, its workings and resulting expansion or capture of the spaces of public reasoning are influencing and narrowing the spaces of public reasoning.

Development ethics is concerned with how we evaluate development and the ability to make distinctions between desirable,

Development ethics highlights why it is important for development decisions and processes to be ethically justifiable. It links the somewhat abstract and philosophical concepts of justifiability to processes of public justifiability and legitimation. Development ethics is therefore of central relevance to development practitioners and not only something of interest to academics and theoreticians. As the:

“forms and instruments of coordinated humanitarianism have changed, resulting in shifting roles for different actors such as the state, the international community and international NGOs. The translation of the core principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and non-violence into practical measures is giving rise to a process of re-definition, which introduces new understandings” (Melber, 2012: 3).

This brings us onto the ground of moral plurality and ethics. There are several practical difficulties that are evident when it comes to discussing, or rather NOT discussing morality and moral values. There is a sort of background assumption in place that any ethical discussion concerning development must be grounded in universal, secular, moral values, but
these are not givens and are hardly ever made explicit. Debates about moral values and ethics are entangled, and enmired in perspectives that take their moral groundings to be non-negotiable and, therefore, relativistic local or religious-based values are assumed to have priority. But having a particular moral viewpoint is not the same as engaging in ethical practice. The fact that many of the leading development practitioner organisations are themselves faith-based and motivated by religious convictions further complicates any effort to democratically debate and justify the values underpinning development practice.

The questions of development ethics raise for me the most general of sociological questions - how to think about solidarity and social progress, amidst the confusions and crises of capitalism? The human development paradigm offers richer ground for critically questioning economism, globalisation and consumerism and considering the difference between 'helping' and charity to more egalitarian concerns about rights, citizenship and the wellbeing, freedoms and capabilities of individuals, but they offer less in the way of thinking about how to resolve social disintegration and conflicts. Environmental limits and sustainable development have not been sufficiently addressed, despite their urgency and centrality to the social questions concerning inequality and the distribution of goods, benefits and harms and the reliance of such distributions on social solidarity and cohesion.

The development ethics state of the art – seven domains for development ethics
Drydyk and Keleher (2017) situate the relevance of development ethics in the space of ‘public reason’ – development ethics includes ethical judgments about right or desirable and wrong or undesirable development decisions and practices, and the justifications for those judgments. Development ethics concerns how state and non-state power is exercised, legitimated and limited in development choices. It is especially concerned in cases where power asymmetries are strong.
‘Public reasoning’ is used to evaluate what is considered justifiable and what limits there are on justifiability. However, value pluralism exists everywhere and different people resort to different moral tools and rules of thumb when making their justifications, and they may orient their justifications towards endorsement, critique or transformation (radical or reformist) of the status quo (Khoo, 2018).

In the face of these growing challenges, ethical considerations remain central in development theory and practice. Here we can draw upon a new comprehensive resource on development ethics (Drydyk & Keleher, 2018). Drydyk and Keleher’s handbook identifies seven core aspects that we can focus on, in addressing development ethics in theory and practice. These are: a well-being focus, equitable benefit-sharing, empowerment for free participation, environmental sustainability, promotion of human rights and rights-consistent cultural freedom, and responsible conduct that upholds integrity and counters corruption. The handbook addresses each of these seven ethical domains in detail and provides an excellent introduction to each of these specific topics.
A Human Development and Capabilities Approach to securitization

The concept of human development, and Sen’s reconceptualisation of development as freedom (Sen, 1999), adopted and partly institutionalised in the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has extended a liberal theory which also powerfully challenges the dominant instrumental ideologies of neoliberalism and securitisation. Jolly (2003) notes that there are similarities between these different approaches, but also very considerable differences. The ‘human development paradigm’ was conceived to enable thinking to move away from economistic assessments of development that treat people as means for economic growth rather than as the point of development itself. Taking ‘people’ as the ultimate end of development, the human development paradigm views development as a process through which to expand human choices and strengthen capabilities. ‘People’, the first Human Development Report (HDR) argued, ‘are the real wealth of a nation’ (UNDP, 1990: 2010).

Shani (2012) argues that human development merely continues the problems of instrumentalism without actually disrupting it. The human development approach may serve to make the otherwise ‘disposable’ poor or ‘surplus populations’ (Duffield, 1997) marketable through depoliticised forms of ‘empowerment’ that essentially play a stabilising and containment function by giving individuals the ‘capabilities’ needed to meet their basic needs themselves within the context of a market economy. Shani argues that there is too little difference between neoliberal and human development approaches since both share a fundamental belief in the centrality of individual choices and agree that there is a need for ‘well-functioning markets’ to enable individuals to exercise these choices (Jolly 2003: 109). Most believe that there are few alternatives to neoliberal globalisation (ul Haq, 1995). The best that can be done is ‘adjustment with a human face’, the option for the poor in times of social and economic change (Jolly, 2003). Like neoliberals, human development advocates share the preference for liberal institutions - democratic governance, rule of law and the
recognition of basic human rights are seen as the most preferable framework for the smooth functioning of markets and, therefore, the expansion of individual choices (Shani, 2012: 105).

This article suggests that the human development and capabilities approach (HDCA) aligns with rights and offers ethical approaches to thinking about and doing development that foreground the treatment of people as ‘agents’, not ‘patients’ (Sen 1999: 288; Saha, 2012). Development ethics offers an important bulwark against asymmetric, securitised and exceptionalist practice, re-orienting the evaluative space towards humans whose wellbeing and capabilities matter in their own right.

Conclusions – focusing on responsibilities
The audience in Irish development education and practice will likely find the section on ‘responsibility’ in Drydyk and Keleher’s excellent new handbook on development ethics most relevant. This covers the particular ethical responsibilities that attach to development agents – whether that concerns individual development practitioners, organisations or governments. Development ethics helps us think clearly about how responsibilities are assigned, ensuring that important responsibilities are not assigned to the wrong actors. Drydyk and Keleher also specify an ‘omnibus responsibility’ which entails state actors’ responsibility to identify and carry out the responsibilities of aid, while individual practitioners must navigate conflicting responsibilities with integrity. The omnibus responsibility to ‘act with integrity’ requires all development actors to avoid and combat corruption (Drydyk and Keleher, 2018: 333). This requires the capacity and space for critical reflection and developing professional capabilities to navigate an increasingly complex and mixed terrain. It has been suggested in this article that opportunities, experience, spaces and professional ethics expertise needed to carry out these responsibilities with integrity are currently too rare or absent and
arguably need some strategic commitments and investments to be made in promoting development ethics.

In identifying our ethical responsibilities and working to fulfil them appropriately, it remains crucial that all stakeholders in the development community are able to ask themselves the most fundamental questions and distinguish between worthwhile and desirable or harmful and undesirable development. The challenges are considerable and the four trends of securitisation, privatisation, NGO-isation and declining internationalism have exacerbated ethical pressures and potential ethical dilemmas.

Larger development organisations like official donor agencies, multilateral financial institutions and large NGOs should make more room for ethical discussion and debate instead of closing down such spaces and may consider employing designated professional development ethicists and conduct explicit development ethics training. Development educators, especially higher and advanced educators and professional educators in universities, particularly in the fields of economics, public policy, international relations and peace and humanitarian studies, together with development studies, can ensure that there are explicit spaces devoted to development ethics in the curricula that they teach.

For example, I have revised Bachelors and Masters courses that I teach in order to make ethical dimensions and dilemmas very explicit. As a research mentor and supervisor, I can advise research applicants and researchers to incorporate development ethics into the ethics sections of their research proposals. Why shouldn’t development practitioners hold themselves to higher and more consistent ethical practices and standards, especially since many allied health, medical and scientific practitioners and researchers associated with development studies and their organisations already incorporate ethics considerations and protocols. Not every organisation will be large enough to justify employing a fulltime professional development ethicist or have the freedom that an academic
has to incorporate ethical reflection and deliberation into their practice, but every organisation can consider what kind of ethics training and what ethical discussion and deliberation spaces they might need. In a world of increasing ethical complexity, challenges and dilemmas, ethical responsibilities are critical necessities and we cannot afford to continue ignoring development ethics as if such responsibilities are irrelevant, tangential or an ‘unaffordable luxury’.
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The Search for Meaning in Memory in the Aftermath of Genocide: The Construction of Êzîdî Identity

Mairéad Smith

Abstract: The 2014 Êzîdî Genocide caused a rupture in the social fabric of the Iraqi ethno-religious Êzîdî minority as a whole, disrupting a sense of self on an individual level and identity on a collective level. A search for meaning in the aftermath of such violence has caused a group of poets, which I label memory makers, to understand the causes of the event by partaking in memory work through the composition of Arabic prose poetry. A narrative analysis has been used on a selection of poems written and semi-structured interviews conducted with five poets, and I investigate their trauma process through adopting the theory of a cultural trauma, viewing ‘trauma’ from a social constructivist point of view in an attempt to advance and challenge trauma theory and position the importance of investigating memory in terms of collective healing after violence. With a focus on the nature of the suffering, the nature of the victim, and the attribution of responsibility which this theoretical lens provides, I attempt to move past narratives of ‘victimhood’ which often pervade after violence, and definitions of trauma as event-based which lend to obscure the understanding of those who have not experienced the event.

The poets write in sharp and defiant words choosing not to become passive victims of genocide, but instead use poetry as a means for repairing the social fabric of their community through reconfiguring a collective Êzîdî identity while advocating for justice in order to heal the wounds of the present through engagement with their memories of contemporary violence. I view memory work as serving a similar role to development education in its power to address the issues which have led
to suffering and advocate the utility of exploring cultural production as an avenue for further learning in development education.

Key words: Êzîdîs; Genocide; Poetry; Memory; Cultural Trauma; Representation; Development Education.

Introduction

“To write poetry after Auschwitz is barbaric. And this corrodes even the knowledge of why it has become impossible to write poetry today” (Adorno, 1983: 34).

Stemming from the remnants of thinking which stretches as far back as the marker of atrocity in Western memory and culture, the Holocaust, Theodor Adorno’s statement draws attention to the ‘unsharability’ of traumatic experience when pain ‘does not simply resist language but actively destroys it’ (Scarry, 1985: 4). However, the denial of the possibility of accessing traumatic experience and memory has contributed to a culture of victimology (Eser, 2018) and at times has led to an incomplete picture of political violence and its causes. Investigating the effects of violence on individuals and communities requires an exploration of how violence is implicated and encoded in the collective memories and, therefore, narratives of individuals in the aftermath of dismal events. Attempts have been made to reserve the idea of trauma’s unnarratability to present a more holistic view of trauma which pays attention to complex forms of trauma as well as the dismissal of a hierarchisation of suffering.

With a discarding of the notion of the Holocaust’s uniqueness in recent times, the field of memory studies has moved away from a focus on trauma as it was formulated in a post-structuralist context, in relation to its unrepresentability and the death of the subject. In this article, I consider the contribution memory work can make to transitional justice by focusing on its informal expressions, outside of the state apparatus and
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processes. By invoking the term, I urge the recognition of the informal contribution of those engaged with memory in social justice beyond the imperative to redress particular events but as a process of building and securing social justice. Through focusing on Êzîdî poets engaged in the production of memory in the Êzîdî community, who it can be argued speak on behalf of others in the community, development educators can gain an insight into the suffering and healing of the community.

The Êzîdîs in Iraq

The Êzîdîs in Iraq have long lived on the margins of society as a result of both their relatively small numbers and their heterodox religious beliefs. Despite being a monotheistic religion with belief in seven archangels, the chief of these Tawus Melek, the Peacock Angel, they are viewed by the majority Muslim population as ‘worshippers of the devil’ and are not regarded like Muslims and Christians as ‘People of the Book’. Throughout their early modern history, Êzîdîs have been subjected to massacres and displacement. During the Ottoman Empire, Êzîdîs were defined as renegades and were continually targeted for forced conversion and attack, so much so that the Ottoman Turkish word *ferman*, meaning order or decree, has become synonymous with genocide and has been incorporated into their Kurdish language to mean just that.

The strategic importance of Sinjar has made it both an internal and external battlefield since the formation of the Iraqi state during the time of the British mandate and has resulted in the region having weak ties with the rest of the Iraqi state (Fuccaro, 1999). During the Ba’thist Arabisation campaign of the 1970s, national homogeneity in Iraq was developed through a state policy ‘of linguistic, cultural, and ethnic cleansing’ (Moradi and Anderson, 2016:122). Êzîdîs were again subjected to forced displacement, the destruction of villages, and resettlement in collective towns or *mujme’at* in Sinjar. During the Arabisation campaign, Saddam Hussein, military leader of Iraq, used a narrative of Êzîdîs as descendants of Yazid Ibn Muawiya, a Sunni Muslim, providing grounds for
an Islamic origin for the community in Ummayyad decent (Kızıylan, 2017: 334). Since the creation of the autonomous Kurdish region but specifically since the political restructuring which followed the American invasion of Iraq in 2003, Êzîdîs have been forceably undergoing a process of ‘Kurdification’. The Êzîdî’s origins have been made malleable to contemporary Kurdish political agendas with parties suggesting that Êzîdîs are the ‘original Kurds’. Furthermore, due to the Iraqi Constitution’s grounding of Islam as ‘the official religion of the State’ and as a ‘foundational source of legislation’ (Constitution of the Republic of Iraq, 15 October 2005, Article 2) the Êzîdîs have been vulnerable to social and systemic violence stemming from the denial of their rights as a distinct religious minority with a disparate identity.

On 3 August 2014, the Islamic State (IS) entered the district of Sinjar with the specific aim of targeting Êzîdîs on the basis of their religious identity declaring them infidels or kuffār and subjecting the group to mass murder, forced conversion and slavery. IS brutally attacked Êzîdî collective villages and towns with the south of mount Sinjar being particularly affected. Abandoned by Kurdish Pêşmerga forces in the early morning hours, those that were in the position to flee to the mountain did so. Up to 3,100 Êzîdîs died over the course of a few days in August while many of those who fled to the mountain died from starvation, dehydration, or injuries inflicted during the IS raid (Cetorelli et al., 2017). An estimated 6,800 Êzîdî women and children were captured, forced into conversion, sold into slavery and for young boys, forced to be child soldiers (Cetorelli et al., 2017). Those who survived on the mountain were evacuated between the 9-13 August when a safe corridor was opened by Syrian Kurdish forces, allowing Êzîdîs to flee through Syria, into the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. The attacks resulted in the Êzîdî ancestral homeland of Sinjar and approximately 85 of its villages, as well as the Êzîdî majority populated area of Bahzane and Bahshiqa, being emptied completely of their Êzîdî, Christian and Shabak population. As of 2018, 3,000 Êzîdîs
remain unaccounted for and 69 mass graves have been found around the Sinjar district (Yazda, 2018).

**Violence, memory and trauma**

It is in the aftermath of atrocities, such as those experienced by the êzîdîs, that society is most in need of social order and coherence, which is often gained through the formation of memory via state-led commemoration. Violent events can easily be manipulated by those in positions of power, in order to perpetuate conflict or organise communities around it and as such, a competition between various meta-narratives often ensues, which contributes to the marginalisation of certain voices. Much literature deals with the ways in which post-conflict societies deal with the past, with most looking at the macro nation-state level and the anchoring of identity through memorials, commemorations and anniversaries (Gillis, 1994; Winter, 1998; Jelin, 2003) as well as monuments and museums (Parr, 2008; Jacobs, 2000).

Often studies focus an inordinate amount on violence and its legacy (Rigney, 2018: 369). Gutman in her introduction to *Memory and the Future* writes:

“For those who study memory, there is a nagging concern that memory studies are inherently backward-looking, and that memory itself – and the way in which it is deployed, invoked and utilized – can potentially hinder efforts to move forward” (Gutman et al., 2010: 1).

Scholarship has thus tended to evoke the ‘traumatic paradigm’ which has produced an unquestioned focus on theories of trauma, witnessing, and the politics of representation, focused on traumatic pasts related to twentieth-century violence (LaCapra, 2001; Caruth, 1996; Alexander et al., 2004; Felman and Laub, 1992). In fact, trauma theory has become the dominant mode through which to analyse the process of transmitting
experiences of catastrophe (Radstone, 2011: 116). However, the theory’s focus on the unspeakable and the unrepresentable, fails to give proper attention to local repertoires of witness and tends to monumentalise trauma as a singular event in time without the acknowledgement of traumas experienced by minority groups. Stef Craps has suggested that ‘the traumas of non-Western or minority groups must also be acknowledged on their own terms’ (Craps, 2013: 3) and such a movement towards the decolonisation of trauma theory requires an approach which includes the lived experiences of subordinate or subaltern groups. Whigham (2017) notes that a positive potential for the memory of genocidal violence exists, in its capacity to mark the starting point for new conversations which lead to empathy and understanding through the creation of ‘new narratives that counter the dangerous incitements of the old narratives’ (2017: 68) which provide a preventative capacity to violence. The importance of memory on reconciliation or ‘reparative remembering’ (Rigney, 2012) in aiding the construction of new hopeful futures out of nostalgia (Radstone, 2011) has been noted, as well as the possibility of new forms of solidarity emerging through practices of remembrance, forms of solidarity which are not confined within ethnic, religious or national boundaries, but are global and based on demanding justice.

Following the lead of those who call for a decolonisation of trauma theory, I propose the utility of working with memory workers in the aftermath of catastrophe, with the aim of highlighting the complexity of political violence, genocide and war. Memory workers are defined as ‘people in the creative class who become occupied with questions of how to memorialise...war through social and artistic activities’ (Haugbolle, 2010: 8). The memory workers focused on in this article are a group of Sinjar poets, the majority of whom fled to mount Sinjar on 3 August and now survive in camps scattered throughout the Dohuk governorate. Those involved in memory work wrestle with structures of power in order to engage with meaningful societal transformation. The term is often used
together with ‘transitional justice’ when referring to contexts in which activists are dealing with past human rights violations, injustices and war (Gould and Harris, 2014: 2). I see an investigation of memory workers and their cultural production as providing a similar means of understanding as development education for peacebuilding which conceptualises violence at both local and global levels (Smith, 2010). Development education, according to the work of Galtung and Freire, see conflict as a matter of injustice which arises through structural violence and direct conflict (Harris, 2004). The memory workers presented here focus on their experiences of ‘slow violence’ and the implication and interconnection of suffering within a globalised world.

By focusing on the intricacies of memory work, it is possible to come an understanding of belonging and identity being articulated through the production of memory, providing space for the articulation of alternative histories and through using the theoretical lens of cultural trauma. Cultural trauma, a theory put forward by Jeffrey Alexander provides the guiding interpretative framework for this study and offers a sociological model for understanding trauma. For Alexander:

“Cultural trauma occurs when members of a collectivity feel they have been subjected to a horrendous event that leaves indelible marks upon their group consciousness, marking their memories forever and changing their future identity in fundamental ways” (Alexander, 2012: 6).

This constructivist understanding of trauma sees it not as a naturally occurring response by a community to a cataclysmic event, but rather as a cultural process which is ‘mediated through various forms of representation and linked to the reformation of collective identity and the reworking of collective memory’ (Eyerman, 2001: 1).
Exploring the Êzîdî case provides the opportunity to challenge hegemonic definitions of trauma, namely its monumentalism and the ‘eventness of the event’ as somehow ‘arbitrary, fortuitous, contingent, aleatory, unforeseeable’ (Derrida, 2002: 82), and gain a greater understanding of the historical context which resulted in a genocide. Through approaching the experience of trauma via those who are involved in the making of its memory, a revised understanding of trauma can be expanded to (post)colonial conditions and new forms of response to collective, everyday forms of traumatising violence considered. This article calls attention to the mundane everyday details of traumatic experience and addresses the goal articulated by Craps regarding trauma theory, that it ‘need not be abandoned altogether but can and should be reshaped, resituated, and redirected so as to foster attunement to previously unheard suffering’ (2013: 37). It is of vital importance to both our understanding of violence and the integrity of those we research to investigate narratives which diverge from ‘victimhood’ and give space for alternative narratives to emerge which promote collective awareness and the capacity of healing.

**Methodology**

Poetry and cultural artefacts broadly speaking, create an ‘alternate public space for articulating and recounting experience silenced by officially sanctioned narratives’ (Das et al., 2001: 3). A combination of semi-structured and informal interview data was analysed with a selection of poem texts from each poet. This interviewing technique allowed me to conversationally guide the participants through their accounts of the genocide, displacement, their poetic writing process and the impact on their lives, while granting participants complete freedom to respond and providing the flexibility to ask follow-up questions. All interviews were recorded with the permission of participants and transcribed for analysis. Interviews were carried out between October 2017 and May 2018 with five participants writing poetry since, and for some before, the genocide in 2014. The poems presented in this article are direct translations of
poems written in Arabic which is the language of choice for these poets. These poems are some of the first representations of the genocide found in poetic verse.

**Findings**

In line with the components of the theory of cultural trauma, I will detail the main collective memories narrated through the trauma process by the poets obtained through both interview data and excerpts from poems.

**The nature of the pain**

One of the most dominant narratives that emerges from the data is that of the 74th *ferman*, an originally Turkish word meaning Sultanic decree, which has become synonymous with genocide due to the Êzîdîs’ history of attacks against them. In Sarmad’s poem (2015), which takes the form of an identity card, he refers to ‘74 stabs in the back’:

“Place of birth: Sinjar, which means the beautiful side
Religion: Êzîdî and the overwhelming pain is confirmed
Visible Disabilities: 74 stabs in the back
Eye colour: Salty water
Face colour: Blood splattered”

Saad (2015) directly refers to this master narrative while also taking a similar form to Sarmad, through his investigation of some basic aspects of his identity:

“I live genocide number 74
I’m Saad Shivan – this name is my short name,
My permanent address is Bersive Camp 2, which bring me depression, loneliness, and shit
Sometimes I drink beer at the cost of what my little brother brought from his work in the apple field
My mother is being treated for kidney stones, my mother, who has resisted all the wars so far, is only defeated by our tears
Unemployment bites like a dog and it is not enough to scream”

Both Sarmad and Saad refer to a continued persecution, the last of which made the 74th attempt at elimination, a narrative which has come to redefine the Êzîdî identity through a shared sense of trauma that has emerged out of continued religious persecution. This is most clearly narrated in this excerpt from Emad’s poem (2015), ‘Belonging’:

“Sinjar, my soul  
To you I belong  
My blood is a sacrifice  
And in you, healing”

The nature of the victim
In searching for the nature of the victim, the poets look to how the pain of structural violence has affected Êzîdîs specifically. A decade previous to the 2014 genocide, the United Nations placed overall deprivation in Sinjar at an extreme level and among the least developed districts in Iraq with noted weaknesses in the lack of education, basic infrastructure and housing, all leading to a form of long-term suffering which has often been ignored in many accounts of the genocide. These conditions contributed to feelings of marginalisation which Saad deals with while reflecting on his childhood in Sinjar (2016):

“We were accompanying the coffins which went out into the streets  
Wrapped in a blanket and not the flag of the country  
At the time, we didn’t really have a country; at least we did not feel like we did  
They were speaking about the money that could be earned  
One of them from border smuggling cigarettes and gasoline”
And in the morning, the names of the detainees and the bullet wounded are announced
We did not betray anyone; I mean we did not have a country”

Saad points to the precarious nature of employment and security in Sinjar during his youth, where due to its location as a hinterland of sorts, the poet feels he did not have ‘a country’ to identify with. The area suffered from a lack of employment opportunities which as the poem shows, resulted in cross-border smuggling being the most viable form of employment for many living in the north of mount Sinjar.

The ‘disputed’ nature of Sinjar has led to the underdevelopment and systematic negligence in public investment and service provision in Sinjar city and its collective villages. The human security that should have been provided by government and state institutions to develop economic, social and political lives of society in Sinjar were neglected with the security and well-being of the Êzîdî population suffering. Certain structural arrangements embedded in the political and economic organisation of society in Iraq, regarding minority religious status in a Muslim majority country, conspired to constrain individual agency and led to Êzîdîs being left out while areas of Kurdistan in particular progressed following the invention of the autonomous region, and the reaping of oil wealth. Saad (2016) deals precisely with this issue in one of his most poignant poems:

“I am from a miserable minority, it’s called the Êzîdîs
We have many holidays and our believers do not wash on Wednesday
No oil wells in Sinjar where we were living
but I assure you, we are rich in mass graves”

Relation of the trauma victim to the wider audience
The poets revise and reconstruct their collective Êzîdî identity in relations to wider audiences, both Kurdish, Iraqi, and the international community through memory work and the re-remembering of a collective past in which suffering prevailed and through which a distinct identity is produced. Zedan, in his poem, *Non-Broadcast News* (2016), discusses specifically the relation of Êzîdî’s trauma of displacement to wider Kurdish society. Through positioning the victim in relation to the camp authorities, journalists, and emergency services, he shows the marginalisation of the community who are confined to camp spaces where their suffering goes unrecognised:

“There were no causalities the camp manager told a local channel
What about the child that had just been born and burned in his cradle?
It is true that he cried out once or twice but he did not produce any tears
His eyes were not yet open,
He did not hear the lulls or a similar sigh of his mother,
He did not carry enough pain for them to say that he was displaced,
The journalist shouted at me
How can we write in the news bar with a lying heart ‘One person died as a result of a fire in two tents?’
Where are the human losses if it is a displaced person who dies?”

While the poets do speak specifically of the suffering of the Êzîdî community, they do not limit themselves to this narrative only but contextualise their suffering within a greater history of war, pain and suffering within the borders of the nation of Iraq. In doing this, the poets move beyond ‘ethnicised memory’ or notions of justice, reconciliation and peace filtered through an ethnic understanding and speak of the suffering of Iraqis in general, relating themselves to the wider Iraqi citizenry. In Musafir’s poem (2017), he speaks exactly of this:
“Every day we make sure that death becomes easier  
We see each time the news bar expands more on the screen  
At the beginning of every hour, the news anchor tells us in a soft voice,  
that there has been an explosion or the discovery of a mass grave,  
and such news does not surprise us Iraqis,  
Simply put, we turn our faces from the television, we gather for a picnic and we eat sectarianism together”

**The attribution of responsibility**

The theory of cultural trauma implies that through identifying the cause of the trauma, members take on moral responsibility for it and through doing so, a group defines their solidary relationships compelling them to share the suffering of others. Interestingly, the poets do take some responsibility on behalf of the community for their suffering. An expression often repeated to describe the Êzîdî community used by Êzîdîs themselves is ‘simple; we are simple people’. The poets often speak of seeing themselves as part of a new generation which bear the responsibility of advancing the development of the community as a whole. Through identifying the sources of suffering in structural violence and inequalities which led to threats to the human security of the Êzîdî community and the ultimate devastation; genocide.

Through their memory work, the poets assign responsibility which is an important part of transitional justice and reconciliation efforts. The poets illuminate neglected domains of social responsibility and political action and frame their opposition to the continual identity politics and sectarianism of Iraq and the Kurdish region by taking control of the narration of their experiences of genocide and displacement and the formation of their identity in relation to these events. In doing so they expand the circle of ‘we’ to all who have suffered genocide in the hope of repairing their society and building an inclusive Iraq which can prevent
genocide. As Musafir (2017) has said along with many others, they see themselves as 'humanist poets':

“I write for any person, any persecuted person, any person like us, [who is] displaced, who lives like us in a camp and far away from his area. Any person, it’s not conditional to be a Êzîdî, Christian or Muslim...”

The poets write in sharp and defiant words choosing not to become passive victims of genocide, but instead use poetry as a means for repairing the social fabric of their community through reconfiguring a collective Êzîdî identity while advocating for justice in order to heal the wounds of the present through engagement with the past. The poets call on ethical and moral principles and human values of equality, mutual respect, justice, non-violence but most importantly recognition for their suffering. However, until the underlying issues pertaining to human security in Sinjar are actually addressed, the community will not feel a desire to return to their homeland. While recognition of their suffering on an international stage has led to many positive developments for the community, with survivor Nadia Murad being awarded the 2018 Nobel Peace Prize, healing within Kurdish and Iraqi society is slow. While memory work has been vital for these poets in their investigation of the root causes of their suffering, future talks within the Kurdistan Region and Iraq need to focus on specific aspects which gave rise to the genocide, and issues in human security need to be addressed such as lack of sufficient services and safety concerns related to social tensions in the Sinjar area.
Conclusion
The portrayal of the previous religious persecution, marginalisation and exclusion on the basis of their religion reflect a separatist trend in the Êzîdî community. The emerging Êzîdî identity is anchored in their collective memory and set apart from discourses of Kurdishness or Iraqiness. Instead, the poets strive to express their self-perception in order to determine their communal identity through cultural trauma. It is clear that the cultural trauma has articulated a group membership which identifies the genocide and the collective memory of former persecution and processes of ‘othering’ as solidifying both the individual Êzîdî identity and their collective identity. It is the alternative space which poetry presents for articulating and recounting experiences often silenced by official narratives which has enabled these poets to write and shows that the narration of trauma does not always have to reflect victimhood but allows competing interpretations of suffering to emerge.

They address inherent inequalities in society and in doing so demand a transformation in ways of restructuring the state and economy in order to redress inequalities raising a collective awareness of painful memories and situating the capacity for healing and action. Similar to development education, the poets address the issues which have led to their suffering and in doing so become active promoters of peaceful, tolerant and inclusive societies. The utility of exploring the arts and cultural production as an avenue for further learning in development education is evident, as it allows for the exploration of nuanced narratives of complex situations. Through the narration of their experiences in poetic form, they educate about their experience of genocide, while also giving hope that the prevention of violence is possible, despite the pain felt. They give voice to pain and turn victims into agents and tragedy into an opportunity to repair the Êzîdî social fabric.
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DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION AND INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE: REFLECTIONS ON THE TRIALS AT THE EXTRAORDINARY CHAMBERS IN THE COURTS OF CAMBODIA (ECCC)
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Abstract: This article positions the trials at the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC) in a broader context of the conflict in Cambodia during the twentieth century and links international criminal justice and development education through their shared goals towards global justice and a fairer world order. The primary task is to examine the relations between international criminal justice and the development education sector which is actively operating in Cambodia. This article argues that international criminal justice, especially in the Cambodian scenario, shall be understood holistically and historically by development educators. There is a potential contradiction between international criminal justice and global justice when the former is utilised to address internal conflicts. Given that internal conflicts in the global South were often caused by the unsustainable social and economic policies inflicted by the global North, merely holding the local leaders responsible is not sufficient to achieve global justice and risks turning international criminal justice into a political tool.

International criminal justice is inherently selective in terms of pursuing individual accountability due to legal constraints, and it has been received with caution among Southeast Asian states. In the context of United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the development education sector has a potential role to play in resolving the contradiction between international criminal justice and global justice by nurturing a stronger institutional partnership with transitional justice mechanisms and generating more support for global citizenship in both Cambodia and internationally.
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**Introduction**

Cambodia is hosting one of the most significant international trials of atrocity crimes, the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia (ECCC). The ECCC costs nearly US$25 million per annum (ECCC, 2018) and is among the most expensive international intervention projects in Cambodia at present. As the trials continue, various tribunal monitoring projects and international development agencies have settled locally. This article sets out to examine the relations between international criminal justice and the development education sector which is actively operating in Cambodia. More specifically, it assesses how international criminal justice may be adequately grasped by development agencies and what role may be played by the development education sector towards assisting efforts toward peace and reconciliation in Cambodia.

This article is divided into three parts. The first part provides the backdrop to the conflict in Cambodia and the remit of the international criminal justice project that is operating in Cambodia, known as the ECCC. It points out that the function and impact of the ECCC are limited due to various legal constraints. The second part argues that international criminal justice alone is not sufficient to adequately address the impact of conflict and impunities. There is a potential contradiction between the two. In other words, global justice and the fairer world order sought by the development education sector is broader and more complex than international criminal justice. For the people in the global South who find themselves facing both domestic and foreign oppression, the two justices could work against each other. The third part of the article proposes that the development education sector could benefit from a deeper understanding of the local paradox towards international criminal justice. It concludes that development educators could assist in solving the contradiction between international criminal justice and global justice by
upholding the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and generating broader partnerships with transitional justice mechanisms and the individual and institutional actors therein.

**The conflict in Cambodia and the remit of the ECCC**

As a protectorate of France for nearly a century, between 1863 and 1953, Cambodia’s social structure and economic organisation was significantly transformed and became more connected with and vulnerable to the international market. Merchants and elites were mostly residing in Phnom Penh, while the wider society lived in rural areas depending mainly on farming and plantations (Thion, 1983).

The end of Second World War was followed immediately by the First Indochina War in Southeast Asia. The Vietnamese resistance movement, the Viet Minh, fought with France and its later North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) allies, while Cambodia was negotiating its independence with France. The conclusion of the Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference on the Problem of Restoring Peace in Indochina (the Final Declaration) on 21 July 1954 affirmed the independence of Cambodia, together with two other former French colonies, Vietnam and Laos. Vietnam was divided into the northern part under the control of the communist resistance and the southern State of Vietnam backed by the United States (US) (Richards, 2004). The conflict between north and south Vietnam continued after the Final Declaration. The Second Indochina War was fought from the late 1950s to 1975 between the communist bloc, mainly with support from China and the Soviet Union, and several US-backed local governments in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

In Cambodia, King Norodom Sihanouk remained the leader until 1970 through several national elections. The early underground socialist movement in Cambodia, the Krom Pracheachon, also participated in elections, but its members were often subjected to repression and police
harassment from Sihanouk’s government. Sihanouk feared that the local resistance might be joined by the growing influence of the communist resistance in northern Vietnam and this would lead to threats to both his rule in Cambodia and the security of the country (Gottesman, 2002). In 1970, Sihanouk was overthrown by the US-backed Lon Nol government, later named the Khmer Republic. A civil war broke out between the Khmer Republic and Sihanouk’s royalist followers. Around the same time, American President Richard Nixon authorised a bombing campaign in Cambodia, which started on 18 March 1969, to confront the resistance from communist Vietnam. It was estimated that more than 2.7 million tonnes of ordinance were dropped on Cambodia, exceeding the amount that the US had dropped on Japan during WWII (including Hiroshima and Nagasaki) by almost one million tonnes (Owen and Kiernan, 2006).

Both the coup and the war in neighbouring Vietnam helped the Khmer Rouge to gain domestic popularity and rise to power while Sihanouk sided with his former enemy, the communist Khmer Rouge. And the Khmer Rouge eventually seized control of the country, marked by the taking over of Phnom Penh on 17 April 1975 and the establishment of Democratic Kampuchea (DK). The rule of DK was not total isolation from foreign interference although it was claimed to be closed and secretive by observers at the time. As the war in Vietnam also ended in 1975 and north and south Vietnam were joined together, the major conflict in the region shifted to the Third Indochina War.

The Third Indochina War includes all conflicts following the Second, such as border clashes between DK and Vietnam from 1975 to 1979, the civil war among different factions in Cambodia with support from international powers until 1991, and the short war between China and Vietnam in February and March 1979. Vietnam’s invasion of Cambodia brought an end to the DK era in 1979. The Khmer Rouge were forced into the jungle although domestic conflict in Cambodia did not end until the 1990s. The conclusion of the Paris Peace Accords in 1991
marked the end of the Third Indochina War and brought Cambodia to the long quest for peace and reconciliation (Findlay, 1995). One important element of the peace and reconciliation process in Cambodia is to address the accountability of the Khmer Rouge for the atrocities committed during the DK era. Thousands of execution centres and mass graves were evacuated around the whole country and pointed to individual criminal responsibilities of the Khmer Rouge leaders for crimes against humanity, genocide and war crimes (United Nations, 1999).

**The Nature of the Conflict**

To fully understand the conflict in Cambodia holistically and historically, it is important to not only examine atrocities committed by the Khmer Rouge but also the range of conflicts during the twentieth century which had associated themes and ideologies of anti-colonialism, nationalism and communism. This understanding involves moving beyond the mission of the Paris Peace Accords in 1991 which focused on coping with the immediate situation at the time. Meanwhile, sympathisers of the Khmer Rouge still live among the communities in Cambodia, and the country remains among the poorest and least developed in the world (UNDP, 2018). Sustainable peace and reconciliation have yet to embrace a holistic and historical point of view towards Cambodia’s conflicts so that violence can be effectively detected and eradicated in the future.

Early reports of the Khmer Rouge atrocities did not seize the attention of the world because western critics took the Khmer Rouge revolution during the early 1970s as a force to resist the expansive intervention of the west in the region (Herman and Chomsky, 2002; Shawcross, 1979). The rise of the Khmer Rouge to power was accompanied by a series of policies that were envisaged and advanced since the 1960s towards a ‘national people’s democratic revolution’ (Heder, 2012; Vickery, 1999). The Khmer Rouge revolution is rarely debated in revolutionary studies (Baker and Edelstein, 2015; Richards, 2004). However, the debate about the nature of the revolution has not
ended as demonstrated by the discourses at the ECCC which will be explained in the next section.

International law examines the nature of conflict to decide upon the applicable legal norms. The ECCC recognises that both national and international armed conflicts took place during the era of Khmer Rouge rule. However, the United Nations expert report in 1999 found that historians failed to link Khmer Rouge atrocities to the armed conflicts referring to tortures, mass executions, starvation and overwork (United Nations, 1999). Rules of armed conflict were not sufficient to address the Khmer Rouge atrocities because these atrocities were essentially violations of obligations owned by the government to the people under its authority. Accountability in that regard has to employ rationales of human rights and consider the overall situation faced by the government. Some revolutionary policies, such as population movements, might not be directly triggered by armed conflict but still have a strong connection with the general level of national security which was substantially driven by the preceding civil war and the on-going border conflicts. Establishing the criminality of a human rights catastrophe in the 1970s in the middle of armed conflicts proved to be challenging. The United Nations is on board to hold Khmer Rouge leaders accountable 30 years after the atrocities, and the ECCC is struggling to differentiate the criminal and non-criminal parts within the overall revolutionary goal of the Khmer Rouge as demonstrated by its judgments quoted in the following section.

The Remit of the ECCC
The ECCC was set up in 2003 based on an agreement between the United Nations and the government of Cambodia (The Agreement, 2003). Meanwhile, Cambodia also promulgated the ECCC Law to provide for the organisation and procedure of the trials featuring the super-majority rules between the international and national judges (The ECCC Law, 2004). Article 1 of the ECCC Law states that:
“The purpose of this law is to bring to trial senior leaders of Democratic Kampuchea and those who were most responsible for the crimes and serious violations of Cambodian penal law, international humanitarian law and custom, and international conventions recognized by Cambodia, that were committed during the period from 17 April 1975 to 6 January 1979” (ECCC Law 2004).

Accordingly, the persons that can be brought to trial at the ECCC include two groups, the senior leaders of DK and those who were most responsible for human rights abuses. The senior leaders were broadly understood as members of the Standing Committee of the Communist Party of Kampuchea and its subordinate Central Committee (Jørgensen, 2018). When the trials started, Nuon Chea, Ieng Sary and Khieu Samphan were charged based on this basis. While the second group, ‘those most responsible’ for the alleged crimes, is open to different interpretations and has caused divisions between the national and international components of the ECCC. The Cambodian government only wished to prosecute the top-tier individual suspects, while the United Nations had always emphasised the need for independent and transparent investigations by the co-prosecutors and co-investigating judges (Heder, 2011). According to Steve Heder, given the social structure advanced and implemented by the Khmer Rouge, the second group of suspects should have included mid-level leaders who were heads of districts (ECCC, 2013).

Eventually, Ieng Thirith and Kaing Guek Eav, alias ‘Duch’ were included in the initial indictment. The former served as a government minister, and the latter was in charge of the most notorious Khmer Rouge prison, the S-21. The United Nations takes on board the reluctance of the Cambodian government in bringing more suspects to trial as a serious interference of justice. This disagreement has provoked tremendous distrust during the negotiation between the United Nations and the Cambodian government to set up the ECCC and once led to a halt to the
negotiations. According to the memoir of David Scheffer, who supervised negotiations to set up the ECCC, ‘international justice is the art of the possible, and nowhere was that demonstrated more profoundly than in Cambodia’ (Scheffer, 2012). This cooperation risks being further undermined if the trial chambers decide to drop further cases indicated by the international co-investigating judges.

The charged crimes at the ECCC include genocide, crimes against humanity, grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and violations of the Cambodian penal code of 1956. Temporary jurisdiction of the ECCC is set between 17 April 1975 and 6 January 1979. Territorial jurisdiction of the ECCC is confined to the territory of Cambodia (Jørgensen, 2018). It is evident that the remit of the ECCC does not respond to the conflict mentioned in the previous section holistically. The ECCC has been tailored to address the responsibility of one government while ignoring the pre-existing conflict context which led to the formation of that government and its policies. Accountability pursued by the ECCC is subject to a set of strictly defined criminal norms and only applies on a handful of indirect perpetrators, not to mention the amnesties and pardons awarded to direct perpetrators of the charged offences. Even though the direct responsibility of other parties to the conflict may not equal to that of the Khmer Rouge, the selective assessment of the Khmer Rouge’s liability deserves to be noted because of the risk of the trials being turned into ‘show trials’ for political exploitation (Koskenniemi, 2002).
International Criminal Justice versus Global Justice: potential contradiction

Finding the relations between international criminal justice and development education may be done through the lens of their shared goal of global justice. Justice sits in the centre of a fair, peaceful and sustainable world order. It is recognised that development education aims to enable receivers and learners to understand local and global injustice and to act towards a fairer world (Mallon, 2018). There is a wide range of specific tools and frameworks that may be adopted to materialise that process. This part of the paper argues that there is a significant gap between the current international criminal justice framework and the general goal of global justice caused by the evolving status of international criminal law and the particular situation in which the people in the global South find themselves.

The ECCC’s finding of criminal nature in the Khmer Rouge revolution

Case 002 at the ECCC deals with the responsibility of the senior leaders of the Khmer Rouge, and the charged situations cover a broad range of policies and events during the DK era. It is worth noting that the death toll during the DK period is controversial, and it is not always possible to identify the cause of death even with the exhumation of bodies from mass graves (Kiernan, 2003). Michael Vickery calculated on the basis of CIA estimations that roughly one million people died from killings, hunger, disease, and overwork. Execution accounted for about 200,000 to 300,000 of the victims and about 750,000 ‘deaths in excess of normal and due to the special conditions of DK’ (Herman and Chomsky, 2002). Prosecution at the trials for deaths caused by population movement and overwork are controversial as they were intended as revolutionary policies. The chambers at the ECCC had to reason extensively to establish a sufficient causal link between crimes against humanity and the radical policies adopted by the Khmer Rouge.
As the accused persons are often not direct perpetrators of the charged crimes, certain legal concepts have been developed to establish the link between indirect perpetrators and the charged statutory crimes. The ECCC has adopted a mode of liability, known as the joint criminal enterprise (JCE), to hold the senior leaders accountable (Case 002/01 Judgment, 2014). The rationale of the JCE doctrine is to identify a common criminal purpose so that the individuals who share this common purpose can be held responsible even though they did not directly perpetrate the crimes (Ambos, 2009). Several cases at the ad hoc and hybrid tribunals have confirmed that the identified common purpose has to be criminal (Meisenberg, 2014). And this is the point where the chambers have to debate on the nature of the revolution. Interestingly, the Trial Chamber and the Supreme Court Chamber had taken different approaches towards finding the common criminal purpose among the accused persons, who were all members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kampuchea.

Regarding the purpose and nature of the revolution, the Trial Chamber is satisfied that:

“[A]t the latest, by June 1974 until December 1977, there was a plurality of persons who shared a common purpose to “implement rapid socialist revolution through a ‘great leap forward’ and defend the Party against internal and external enemies, by whatever means necessary”.

Members of the Standing and Central Committees, government ministers, and Zone and Autonomous Sector secretaries, including NUON Chea, KHIEU Samphpan, POL Pot, IENG Sary, [...] were part of this group with the specified common purpose. The evidence establishes that this common purpose to rapidly build and defend the country through a socialist revolution, based on the principles of secrecy, independence-sovereignty, democratic centralism, self-reliance and collectivisation, was firmly
established by June 1974 and continued at least until December 1977. *This common purpose was not in itself necessarily or entirely criminal* (Case 002/01 Judgment, 2014: paras. 777-778) (emphasis added by the author).

While recognising the shared common purpose, i.e. to rapidly build and defend the country through a socialist revolution, is not criminal in itself, the Trial Chamber found that the policies, referring to the population movements, ‘resulted in and/or involved the commission of crimes’ (Case 002/01 Judgment, 2014: para. 804). This finding directly contradicts the JCE doctrine which requires a criminal purpose. Hence, the Supreme Court Chamber remedied the previous statement of the Trial Chamber by specifying that:

“[…] while the Trial Chamber’s findings may lack precision, there can be no doubt that it was the criminal aspect of the two policies (referring to the population movement and targeting policies) that was at the core of Case 002/01 […] the common purpose of implementing a socialist revolution through these policies was indeed criminal. Put differently, given that the common purpose was to be achieved through the commission of crimes, as encompassed by the policies, the objective of implementing a rapid socialist revolution in Cambodia was indeed criminal” (Case 002/01 Appeal Judgment, 2016: para. 816).

The rationale of the Supreme Court Chamber’s opinion is that policies amounting to statutory crimes would absorb the other non-criminal common purposes. This is potentially problematic regarding the application of the crimes against humanity on the population movements policy because criminal intent would have to be deduced from actual results according to this rationale. Then a revolution’s nature can be only judged with hindsight. More importantly, the excessive violence in the context of conflict could be imputed to non-criminal purposes and
individuals who did not agree to all specific policies at the beginning or any later stage of the revolution. This would lead to violations of fundamental criminal law principles, including the principle of legality (Meisenberg, 2014).

A similar controversy in finding the criminal nature in an identified common purpose also occurred in the trials of the rebel groups at the Special Court for Sierra Leone. The Trial Chamber in the Brima et al. case, i.e. the trial of the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council, noted that ‘a rebellion is not a crime under international law’ (SCSL, 2007). The Appeal Chamber in the same case corrected and claimed that,

“[T]he criminal purpose underlying JCE can derive not only from its ultimate objective, but also from the means contemplated to achieve that objective. The objective and means to achieve the objective constitute the common design or plan” (SCSL, 2008) (emphasis added by the author).

The same reasoning is also found in the case against the other rebel group at the Special Court for Sierra Leone, the Revolutionary United Front. Scholars and practitioners of the law governing armed conflict have raised serious concerns about this expansive interpretation and application of the JCE doctrine (Meisenberg, 2014). This rationale might not substantially add to the punishment of the Khmer Rouge leaders because the targeting policies and the subsequent measures of torture and mass executions would be enough to prosecute them for a long time. However, if the policy results were to be taken as criminal intent, then any future government which finds itself in conflict should expect to be held responsible for crimes against humanity. Moreover, the total death toll of conflict also depends on other varying factors, which are entirely separate from the agreed ideology and policies. Michael Vickery was critical of criminal trials held in Cambodia during the 1990s and pointed out that pursuing criminal justice is in itself an injustice when one situation is
scrutinised by a set of standards that are not universally applied elsewhere in the world (Vickery, 1999).

The coherence of international criminal justice has not been fully addressed in the field (Simpson, 2012). It is often contentious that international criminal tribunals present certain biased views of history especially when only selected parties of conflict are prosecuted while other responsible parties are left out of the pre-fixed jurisdiction limit (Koskenniemi, 2002). The trials of the former Khmer Rouge leaders present another challenging example of the contemporary world effort to bring about justice.

**Critique towards international criminal justice from the global South**

Colonialism may mostly be part of the past, but the legacies of resisting colonial rule are far from being developed and recognised especially given the current struggles towards better governance among Southeast Asia states. As pointed out by the Third World Approaches to International Law (TWAIL) scholars, individual criminal responsibility is an important mechanism in addressing internal conflicts but it is far from sufficient, especially considering that violence in the global South has been created partially by the unsustainable economic and social policies promoted by the global North (Anghie and Chimni, 2003). Serious attempts to identify responsibility and to establish universally applicable legal regimes, should also inquire into the roles played by other powerful international actors in causing and exacerbating violent situations.

Beyond the issue of failing to investigate the role played by influential international actors, TWAIL scholars also challenge the validity of holding selective individuals accountable in situations where whole communities have in fact participated in the perpetration of acts of mass violence against each other. It is indeed the view of TWAIL scholars that:
“A legal approach that addresses the conditions under which these broad societal conflicts take place may prove more effective in quelling violence against civilians over the long term than a regime of individual accountability alone enforced through national and international courts” (Anghie and Chimni, 2003).

Both of the previously mentioned challenges against international criminal justice find their counterparts in the trials at the ECCC given the specific environment in which the conflict unfolded. The defendants continuously refer to the threat and devastation inflicted by the US and Vietnam and emphasise the necessity and legitimacy of the revolution that should be considered differently from intentional crimes. Meanwhile, it remains controversial as to whether the intermediate cadres shall also be held responsible. If mid-level leaders were brought to trials, assessments of their specific roles would further complicate the finding of responsibility of the convicted senior leaders. The judgement in case 002 already faces criticism for its lack of specificity of the individual roles played by Nuon Chea and Khieu Samphan towards the charged offences (Cohen et al., 2015).

Empirical research on the ground shows that stakeholders tend to have different attitudes toward the ECCC in regard to international criminal justice (Killean, 2018). Most of the victims and survivors report that the worst trauma left by the conflict concerns their devastated family structures and personal life (Ratana, 2017). It is essential for the local population to find out why their families were targeted and persecuted. It is also essential for them to hear what the accused leaders of the revolution have to say (Ratana, 2017). However, both the truth-seeking effort and attempt to rationalise the revolution goes beyond the capacity of the ECCC and open a potential discussion on the alternative views of domestic governance in the face of external threats and the responsibility of the failed international actors. And questioning that boundary of domestic governance requires a human rights narrative which is much
broader than international criminal justice. The gap between international criminal justice and global justice represents the Cambodian people’s perceived sense of justice that cannot be fulfilled by the ECCC.

Development education and alternative mechanisms of transitional justice
International criminal justice and development education are more closely linked than their seeming separation between legal expertise and nurturing global citizenship. The sense of justice shared by local communities in Cambodia focuses on both direct and indirect perpetrators (Ratana, 2017). While only very few leaders were tried and many mid-level cadres are still living among the local communities, it remains to be seen how the concept of justice will continue evolving in future memorial projects. The ECCC has endorsed 11 projects in its judgments, including setting up a National Remembrance Day, constructing memorials and exhibitions and initiating various educational projects. The implementation of these projects relies on broader social participation, especially development educators and institutions. The legacy of the past revolution is still being retold by local actors and agendas. Peace and reconciliation experience from Northern Ireland shows that it is essentially beneficial to generate a procedure or space where local citizens could speak to the conflict legacy issues that they believe to be significant (Rooney, 2018). Given that international criminal justice is received among the locals with different attitudes and the charged senior leaders of the Khmer Rouge can only present their defences within the fixed legal framework, the development education sector could assist in filling the gap between international criminal justice and global justice by building stronger justice institutions and generating broader partnerships with alternative transitional mechanisms.

The contradictions between the pursuit of international criminal justice and global justice lie in the competing expectations held by people in the global South towards their governments. On the one hand,
people rely on capable governments to improve their international status as impoverished nations. On the other hand, the governments’ policies and functions have to be strictly limited in order to respect people’s rights fully. Educating and promoting the understanding of the past conflict among citizens could be a very important component and function of the development education sector when it operates in post-conflict societies. Violence sits at the centre of conflicts. Transitional justice educators have developed some toolkits to assist local peace and reconciliation efforts (Rooney, 2018). Drawing on the progress of criminal justice in the Cambodian case, different views regarding the nature of the conflict will lead to different senses of justice. The general approach to redress violence risks failing to consider the different landscape of perpetrators especially contributors to the conflict situation including foreign powers. Holding local leaders responsible for human rights abuses and ignoring the compelling international environment that contributes to the external pressure is hardly sustainable towards constructing a more just and peaceful world.

It is recognised that education about local conflict is often more controversial than education about cases elsewhere in the world (Mallon, 20). Development education in Cambodia should expect more challenges and complexity especially given the fact that causes of the past conflict are still present in the current debate regarding the country’s international strategic status and political courses. Patriotism, nationalism, and desires for prosperity are still very much alive among the national ideology and ordinary citizens’ hearts. It is crucial for the development education sector to strike a balance in this dilemma in Cambodia: the risks of repeating the past are not yet fully understood, and a holistic understanding of the past often presents complexed lessons. The United Nations’ struggle with the ECCC has demonstrated the limit of international criminal justice in achieving global justice alone. Sustainable progress lies in more proactive institutions and individuals
who see themselves as global citizens, and development education has an important role to play in supporting this active citizenship.

Conclusion
This article does not intend to exonerate the atrocities committed by the Khmer Rouge, but to point out the limits of international criminal justice. The international criminal law and its implementation mechanisms as of today are still subject to the vagaries of international politics and rely heavily on powerful states. Embracing international criminal justice as an element of development education, especially in the Cambodian scenario, requires development educators to receive the judgements at the ECCC with a holistic and historical view towards global justice. The question of whether the Khmer Rouge revolution was criminal will probably continue to divide local communities. Nationalism and patriotism are closely related to the pursuit of a fairer world order which immediately reflect on the living conditions of the most impoverished populations in the world. Besides individual accountability, the other valuable lesson to take away from the trials at the ECCC by development educators is that peace and reconciliation concern equality among nations as much as providing for human rights in the domestic sphere. Only by generating more individuals who embrace global citizenship can the challenge of internal conflicts and the goal of a better world order be truly meet.
References


**Acknowledgement**

This paper was initially presented at the Development Studies Association Ireland annual conference in 2018 in Dublin. The author would like to thank the Association’s invitation to the conference and the valuable comments offered by the audience. Thanks also go to the Irish Centre for Human Rights at the National University of Ireland Galway for the funding provided to attend the conference. For the final publication of this article, the author also thanks the journal editor and the anonymous reader for their helpful comments.

**Jia Wang** is a PhD researcher at the Irish Centre for Human Rights, National University of Ireland Galway. She holds a LL.B. and a LL.M. in international law from the Harbin Institute of Technology in China. She had interned with the Defence Team for Ieng Thirith in 2010 at the ECCC in Phnom Penh, Cambodia. She is completing her doctoral thesis titled ‘Revolution and International Criminal Law: The Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia’. Her research interest covers international law, human rights,
transitional justice and Chinese ideologies towards global governance. Jia Wang can be reached at wangjia_ch@163.com or Irish Centre for Human Rights, National University of Ireland, Galway, University Road, Co. Galway, Ireland.
Perspectives

HOW IS IRELAND PERFORMING ON THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS?

Michelle Murphy

Abstract: This article presents a summary of the findings of the Sustainable Progress Index 2019. The Index is an annual publication commissioned by Social Justice Ireland which examines Ireland’s performance toward implementing the Sustainable Development Goals and compares us to our peers and neighbours in the European Union (EU)15 (OECD, 2007).
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Introduction
In 2015, the United Nations (UN) proposed and adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN, 2015) and identified 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with 169 targets and over 230 indicators. In January 2016, the SDGs came into force. The SDGs are designed to refocus efforts towards policies that directly help people and communities toward sustainable development. They aim to provide both a pathway out of poverty for about a billion people in the world, and a pathway to a sustainable future for all countries and peoples.

The SDGs have become an essential part of scoring economic, social and environmental progress and have given national governments clear economic, social and environmental standards against which established policies should be judged and prospective policies should be measured. Equipped with these goals as tools for guidance and accountability, the Irish Government has the opportunity to lead the way
towards a new generation of politics shaped by the economic, social and environmental needs of a truly healthy society. This article presents a summary of the findings of the Sustainable Progress Index 2019 (Clark and Kavanagh, 2019). The Index is an annual publication commissioned by Social Justice Ireland which examines Ireland’s performance toward implementing the Sustainable Development Goals and compares us to our peers and neighbours in the European Union (EU)15.

The importance of the sustainable development goals
Some of the measures used to pursue economic growth (policies and values) are often barriers to social progress and environmental sustainability. Increasingly, policy analysts and international agencies are promoting a more direct approach to address these issues rather than pursuing the old strategy of economic growth with the hope that the benefits will trickle down to eradicate poverty, protect the environment and promote social exclusion. Social Justice Ireland’s argument is that such a narrow way of thinking about economic growth leads to policies that only promote one aspect of what can be called sustainable social progress, and either ignores or harms other aspects. We are not arguing against prosperity. Rather, we are arguing for a view of prosperity that is inclusive of all and is socially and environmentally sustainable. Driving up Gross Domestic Product (GDP) leads to a false prosperity; temporary in its benefits, lasting in its costs.

The SDGs provide an ambitious, comprehensive plan of action for people, planet and prosperity. The aim of the SDGs is to change the perspective of public policy. Directly focusing on social and environmental goals, rather than waiting for economic growth to trickle down and produce desirable outcomes, is what underpins the SDGs and makes them revolutionary. The SDGs are a rejection of the paradigm of one-way causality of economic growth leading to everything else. Clearly the economy and economic growth are important, but they exist in a context, and economic growth is as much an effect of social progress as a potential contributor to social progress. A disposable society that uses up
and discards people and resources with the single goal of ensuring the continuation of the process of capital accumulation is not sustainable, socially or environmentally.

**The index**

The Sustainable Progress Index 2019 is the third in a series of reports that examine Ireland’s performance toward achieving the SDGs in the context of its peers in the European Union 15. The main aim of the index (Clark and Kavanagh, 2017; Clark, Kavanagh and Lenihan, 2018a; 2018b) is to provide an analysis of Ireland’s track record in achieving the SDGs over time and in examining the challenges Ireland faces in achieving the SDGs relative to these countries, over time. Social Justice Ireland believes this is valuable, because as noted by Klaus Schwab, Chairperson of the World Economic Forum, in his commentary on the SDGs: ‘[w]e must continually measure progress on the ground, at local, national and international levels’ (Sachs et al, 2017: 4). Comparing relative performance among countries from a similar regional or income group is valuable. Sachs et al (2016) have emphasised that the substantial variations observed in small groups of similar regions should encourage policymakers to better understand reasons for divergence and design strategies for achieving the SDGs by 2030.

Data collection for the analysis in the index was far-ranging. The starting point for data selection is the UN Indicator Set (2017) and we attempted to align our indicator set as closely as possible with this list. We employed some simple rules to guide our choice of data. *Relevance and applicability*: the data must be directly related, similar, or relevant to monitoring the SDGs. For some SDGs, indicators are chosen because they are more applicable to EU policies and initiatives (Eurostat, 2017). *Quality*: to ensure the best measures are used to capture the SDGs, we only use officially published data from international sources such as Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), World Health Organisation (WHO), United Nations (UN), etc and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) such as Gallup and Transparency.
International. **Coverage:** data must be available for all 15 EU countries. **Most recent available:** all data must refer to the most recent year available.

In so far as possible, we align our indicator set with the official UN list of indicators. However, for some of the SDGs, we replace some of the official indicators (e.g. the incidence of extreme poverty, mortality rate of under 5s), with variables that better reflect the high income countries in the EU, and also, to allow for greater variance in the data (it is important to differentiate between countries performance). For example, obesity – a major risk factor for a number of chronic diseases - is increasingly becoming a problem in high-income countries (and also some low-middle income countries) and we use this as one of the indicators for SDG 2. Other indicators, although not official UN indicators, are included to capture the theme of a particular SDG and monitor progress. Data coverage across the goals is unequal. For some SDGs (SDG1, SDG17), because we only use officially published data, only one indicator is available for all countries to reflect the objectives of the goal. This is far from ideal. Notwithstanding these issues, our data selection criteria identify 65 indictors across the 17 goals (for a full outline of our data selection process and a list of all 65 indicators see Clark and Kavanagh, 2019: 30; 58-59).

**Agenda 2030** sets ambitious targets across the three dimensions of sustainable development: economic development, social inclusion and environmental sustainability. Although we fully recognise that all goals are interdependent and interconnected, we think there is value in attempting to understand how countries are doing on the three aspects of progress. Hence, using our judgement, we cluster the goals by these three dimensions: economic, social and environment. These three dimensions combined make up the composite SDG index.
Key findings for Ireland

The Sustainable Progress Index is an aggregate across all 17 goals. Equal weight is assigned to each SDG (and each indicator under each goal). The scores allow us to rank the countries on the aggregate measure, to identify the countries that are making most progress in achieving the SDGs. The composite Sustainable Progress Index is presented in Table 1. Sweden, Finland and Denmark top the rankings and Ireland’s overall ranking is 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Index Score</th>
<th>Country Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>71.45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>66.60</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>62.11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>57.37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>53.42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>50.71</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>49.39</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>48.32</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>46.06</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>38.38</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>37.66</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>37.15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Measuring Progress: The Sustainable Progress Index 2019

Table 2 outlines how Ireland is performing on all 17 SDGs. The data shows the scale of the challenge facing Ireland under the headings of economy, society and environment. Ireland’s overall ranking on the SDGs relative to its EU peers is 11. On the economy dimension, Ireland ranks 11th, on
society Ireland ranks 10th and on the environment Ireland ranks 13th. This is the lowest score Ireland has overall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Ireland’s Rank by Dimension and by SDG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ireland Overall Rank on the SDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Society</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Measuring Progress: The Sustainable Progress Index 2019
Analysis of the findings
The Sustainable Progress Index provides a simple report card to track Ireland’s overall performance on the SDGs compared to its EU peers; countries that have experienced similar levels of development. Ireland ranks 11th out of the EU15 in the 2019 index, showing no change from it’s ranking in 2018 (Clark, Kavanagh and Lenihan, 2018a). Although Ireland performs well on three SDGs, poor scores in many other areas drags our ranking down towards the bottom of the index.

Ireland performs well on the indicators for SDG 4 (Quality Education), with an overall ranking in second place for this SDG. This is Ireland’s most impressive score overall, and is indicative of the progress Ireland has made in areas such as levels of tertiary education in the population and expected years of schooling, amongst others. On SDG 16 (Peace and Justice) Ireland is ranked fourth, with the data indicating that Ireland is a relatively safe society. Ireland also scores well on the indicators for SDG 6 (Clean Water and Sanitation) indicating that we are making progress in this area. The ranking on these SDGs shows that Ireland is performing well in some areas, and that we are making progress. It is important that we learn the policy lessons from what is working in the SDGs and apply them to those areas where we are not doing well.

Notwithstanding the strength of Ireland’s performance on SDG 4, 6 and 16, our overall ranking is dragged down due to a very poor performance on other goals. Ireland ranks second last out of the EU15 on SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production). This is Ireland’s lowest SDG score and is a result of a combination factors: Ireland has a higher waste generation rate than the EU average, our poor record on waste water treatment and we have the lowest recycling rate among the EU15. Ireland’s second lowest score is on SDG 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy). Ireland’s share of renewable energy is low relative to our EU peers and we perform poorly in CO2 emissions from energy fuels. Ireland
also performs poorly on SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure), SDG 10 (Reduced Inequality), SDG 13 (Climate Action) and SDG 17 (Partnership for the Goals), ranking 11th on each of these goals. Significant challenges lie ahead if Ireland is to achieve its objectives on these goals.

If Ireland is to improve its performance in the years ahead, action is required in a number of areas. There is a need to gather evidence and track progress on policies that drive outcomes in order to implement the 2030 Agenda. The implementation of ambitious emissions reductions policies is vital, in conjunction with gathering better evidence on environmental indicators. Satellite National Accounts should be developed and published. All 17 SDGs must be integrated into the policy making process and be given the priority they require. This would ensure Government policy is not at odds with the SDGs which is the case with the current policy of generating economic growth by increasing agricultural production which runs counter to the objectives of the SDGs.

**Conclusion**
The world needs a new development model based on a broader understanding of what it means to be human and how humans relate to one another and to their common home. The message of the Sustainable Progress Index 2019 is that the SDGs are not just another list of suggestions for poor countries; they can be a tool for all countries, informing decision making and public policy. Social Justice Ireland does not believe there is a single policy solution to solve every problem; in fact, we doubt one exists. But the analysis in the Sustainable Progress Index suggests that Ireland can improve its performance in specific areas such as responsible consumption and production, affordable and clean energy, innovation, reduced inequalities and climate action. We can learn from the other countries and pursue policies that ensure we achieve our SDG objectives. Some countries have discovered how to pursue growth while also reducing the impact on the environment. Others can provide higher levels of public services. Of course, countries can also learn from what
Ireland does well. There are no natural advantages in promoting social well-being; it is a matter of social choices.
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Abstract: Using a selective clustering of three main inter-related concepts, namely ‘people-centred’, ‘pedagogy’ and ‘partnership’, this article presents a reflection on the engagement of Kimmage Development Studies Centre within the broad ‘development studies’ / ‘development education’ contexts in Ireland and abroad during the period 1974-2018. The programmes that were delivered by Kimmage have since transferred to a new Department of International Development at Maynooth University. Of the three ‘pillars’ employed, the element of partnership is the most tangible and visible aspect. However, the other two aspects – ensuring people remained at the centre of the work, and the educational approaches used – comprised a dedicated process, which ensured that the content, represented in all of the activities and outputs of Kimmage, remained congruent with good development practice. Though mainly a reflective piece looking back over four decades, the concluding remarks indicate a desire and commitment to continue the legacy of Kimmage.
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Introduction

Kimmage Development Studies Centre (KDSC) was an institute that grew out of programmes initiated by the Congregation of the Holy Spirit (also known as Holy Ghost Fathers) in 1974. It was based in Holy Ghost College at Kimmage Manor, Dublin and over the period in question successfully ran educational programmes for people working, or intending to work, in the development education (DE) or development aid sector generally. The programmes included courses that were offered at full-time undergraduate and postgraduate levels, part-time distance learning options, professional in-service upskilling training seminars, and non-
formal evening classes. In addition to the training and education offered at Kimmage Manor, a number of long-running partnerships were established during this time, involving collaborations with institutions in Tanzania and South Africa. Kimmage had the distinction of offering the first-ever fully accredited undergraduate courses in development studies (DS) in the Irish Republic. It was also a pioneer in adopting new credit accumulation processes for part-time students, and being among the first institutions to offer courses that were validated for transnational awards, e.g. between Ireland and Tanzania. A core grant towards its operations was provided by the Department of Foreign Affairs, in the latter years through Irish Aid. For the last five years of its existence, Kimmage was in negotiation with Maynooth University with a view to relocating its programmes and staff, and this was finally effected in June 2018.

Kimmage DSC was in existence for a period of 44 years. This reads like an obituary, and for many who studied and worked there, the cessation of its work in Kimmage Manor in June 2018, was indeed a definite and sad ending. Others among the former staff of Kimmage, including myself, prefer to see it as the closing of a significant chapter (or several chapters) rather than the full story of this unique experience. Therefore, from the outset, I wish to make clear that what follows is not a neutral or detached viewpoint, but I hope, an honest and critical reflection. The term ‘Kimmage’ will be used in this article to refer to the organisation that, only about half way through its evolution, finally became Kimmage Development Studies Centre (DSC). Over the years, it has been called the ‘Development Education course’ (Ryan, 2011: 134) initially under the Faculty of Theology at Kimmage Manor. A few years later, it was known as the Department of Development Studies, before becoming what people knew as either ‘Kimmage DSC’ or ‘KDSC’, or still for many in the sector, simply ‘Kimmage Manor’.

This article is not an historical record and will not subject the reader to the intricate details of every activity engaged in by Kimmage
during its four decades of operations. Instead I explore a few aspects of the significant work of this institute under three inter-related headings, or pillars: ‘People-Centred’, ‘Pedagogy’, and ‘Partnership’. In concluding, I suggest how the legacy of ‘the Kimmage Experience’ may be a resource for academics and practitioners into the future.

People-Centred

‘People-centred development’ is a concept familiar in the development sector, which was pioneered by David Korten (1990), and incorporated the values of justice, sustainability, and inclusiveness. Perhaps more familiar to those of us within the education sector is the term ‘learner-centred’. I suggest that Kimmage, which evolved into a role which saw it acting as a bridge between academia and the world of practice, managed to create a synergy between these two concepts, people-centred and learner-centred. With reference to the origins of the Kimmage programme, the Congregation of the Holy Spirit, (CSSp), based at Holy Ghost College, set up a course in ‘development education’ for their final year seminarians (4th year theologians) with a view to equipping them with additional knowledge and skills that they would use in their missionary work abroad. I qualify the term ‘development education’ because the course content in 1974 would be more than a little mystifying for current adherents of development education (DE), including a combination of theories of counselling, community development, adult education, theological subjects, and practical areas such as car maintenance and how to repair a generator! Nevertheless, some core elements, such as adult education theories and methods, were introduced by the first director of the programme, Dr Liam Carey. These were heavily influenced by constructivist theories of learning - the philosophical foundation for learner-centred education – including those of John Dewey, Carl Rogers and Paulo Freire, among others. The congregation’s historian, Fr Paddy Ryan commented:
“It could be said that this was an early recognition by the Spiritans of the profound changes in mission and pastoral ministry that were sweeping through the period since Vatican II. Although the course, in its early years, catered almost exclusively for Spiritans and other religious congregations, by the late 1970s an increasing number of applicants, particularly those working in the rapidly-growing overseas aid sector, were seeking admission to the course. No other course in development studies existed in Ireland at this time” (Ryan, 2011: 134).

Hence from the beginning a clear learner-centred approach was part of the programme. Moreover, given the influence of Liam Carey (who was later to head up the Adult and Community Education Department in Maynooth), and a growing constituency of mature learners, created a distinctly adult learning culture in Kimmage. We shall explore this further below under the heading ‘Pedagogy’.

But people-centred? Cannot all education programmes claim to be this? Perhaps implicitly. Kimmage explicitly put experiential learning, with influences from Kolb (1984) among others, at the core of its curriculum. This resonated well with the increasingly ‘secular’ intake, who relished being enabled to share their rich and varied experiences and have these validated as an important part of the programme. As the staff and faculty of Kimmage gradually became a secularized, professional grouping, and with fewer Spiritans involved, the centre began to become a more autonomous institute within Kimmage Manor. However, there was a realization that the influences of the congregation – in terms of its international outlook, inclusive intercultural orientation, and pastoral care for the needs of groups on the margins – had shaped what was certainly a people-centred ethos within Kimmage. This was reflected in the Mission Statement which included the goal ‘...to create an international, intercultural learning community, which promotes critical thinking and action for justice, equitable sustainable development, and the eradication of poverty’ (Kimmage DSC, n.d.).
The notion of community would resonate with many alumni, whom, many years after their graduation, continue to express themselves as part of ‘the Kimmage family’. A replication of the broad vision of development that sees people at the centre of change in their own lives, was established internally at Kimmage. A deliberately non-hierarchical, unconditional respectful approach to relations between staff, and between staff and students, can be credited to Fr Richard Quinn CSSp. He was Director of the centre at a pivotal time in its evolution, when it was transitioning from being a non-formal course provider, mainly for religious on sabbaticals, towards an academically approved institute, aimed at serving the professional development sector at home and overseas.

**Contradictions and tensions**

Throughout the evolution of this institute, as with any other, were many contradictions and tensions. Contradictions between those who held that Kimmage should present development from a Christian perspective, those who sought to cater to an inclusive multi-faith group of participants, and those who preferred a non-denominational outlook. One can appreciate the challenges inherent in providing a programme which had a distinct religious history, and in a location that was, for the first 20 years of the programme, still home to a seminary. However, to be fair to the Spiritans, the congregation adopted a hands-off approach on such matters as course content. Such differences were more apparent in class discussions on occasion between more devout, faith-based students and their agnostic or atheistic classmates, and these could reflect stark cultural divergences between people from the global South and global North. Yet, to the best of my perhaps selective memory, good relationships, generally were sustained; maybe due to the culture of acceptance that had been established, and/or the promotion of an idea that we were all working towards a ‘Common Good’?
As regards a tension that all learned to work with, an ever-present ‘elephant in the room’, was the constant insecurity around long-term funding. As I became the ‘institutional memory’ of Kimmage, I was able to reminisce during discussions about the challenges of planning ahead in only a three or five-year span (the latter was a real luxury) of the ‘good old days’ when we considered ourselves lucky to have funding for just one year in advance. Such tensions would not be alien to practitioners working within the development education sector, but perhaps not as familiar to those in mainstream higher education.

Another conceptual tension Kimmage has worked with over the years was with regard to interpretations of development education and development studies. As mentioned, although initially identified by the founders of the programme and called development education, when the then director sought formal academic accreditation for the program (in the late 1970s) the official response was to approve it but only with the preferred title of development studies. The distinction made was due to the accreditation authority’s assessment that DE was quite unstructured, with unclear borderlines, was values-driven, and more suited to the non-formal sector, whereas DS was more academically acceptable, more structured in terms of content, more objectively measurable, and more firmly rooted in the social sciences. Whether this assessment, now lost in time (I am reliant on the recollection of Richard Quinn, the director at that time), would be a fair distinction today, is debatable. However, for the staff and students of Kimmage, the process delivering the programmes often had more in common with definitions of DE than DS. For example, such as that offered by Trócaire:

“Development Education is an active and creative educational process to increase awareness and understanding of the world we live in. It challenges perceptions and stereotypes by encouraging optimism, participation and action for a just world” (Trócaire, n.d.).
The action and participation elements of this definition chime with the process-oriented, practically focused classes run by Kimmage. It seemed as though academic staff worked with an unspoken assumption of ‘doing the best we could with what we had’ and did not pay undue attention to the labels DS/DE. My colleague Eilish Dillon expressed her challenges with the concept of development itself (let alone DS as a discipline):

“No the education processes I facilitate realise the critical potential they set out to achieve? Does it matter whether or not they are guided by participatory methodologies or that they start by questioning assumptions? Are they too focused on the negative and to what extent do they facilitate participants to critically reflect on the possible? To what extent am I aware of how my own constructions of global development are shaped by my taken-for-granted assumptions and the power relations which affect my work? Do I, like many others, replicate the stereotypes and problematic assumptions I seek to challenge and do I give enough focus to reframing understandings of global relationships beyond development?” (2017: 24).

The critical questions posed above echo the reflexive practice of Rosalind Eyben, as described in her book, *International Aid and the Making of a Better World*. Perhaps Kimmage succeeded in achieving what she calls the ‘management of contradictions’ (2014: 160-1). Eyben’s disquiet at working for international non-governmental organisations (NGOs) whom, it seemed, often sought funding from donors who were intent on preserving the status quo, evokes for me that what was sometimes idealized in the classrooms of Kimmage was beyond our capacity to see realized and we could be accused of merely maintaining ‘observer status’ on situations of injustice. Nevertheless, perhaps we can draw consolation from these words of Paulo Freire:

“An education of answers does not at all help the curiosity that is indispensable in the cognitive process. On the contrary, this form
of education emphasizes the mechanical memorization of contents. Only an education of question can trigger, motivate, and reinforce curiosity” (Freire, 2003: 31).

On this appropriate note, we turn to the theme of pedagogy.

**A Pedagogy of Kimmage?**

I place a question mark against the sub-heading because it would be indulgent and erroneous to assume that all the programmes offered by Kimmage – which included academic postgraduate and undergraduate courses, and shorter, not-for-credit professional updating training courses, using both classroom based and online distance learning modes – followed a uniform approach. It is fair to claim that there is not one pedagogy, but a cluster of pedagogies that characterized the approach of Kimmage.

From the beginning of the programme in 1974, there was a definite leaning towards a learner-centred, constructivist approach. It was perhaps not coincidental that Spiritans enthused with liberation theology during that period - some of them embarking for Brazil following their studies in Kimmage – were attracted by the teachings of Freire. It is safe to state that a year did not pass – in each of its 44 years of activities – without some rigorous examination of Freire’s seminal work, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1972). Kimmage had a definite Freirean influence and the adult learning foundation of all courses was rooted in the key principles of Freire. However, given the eclectic nature of its course offerings – offering a range of modules which explored global issues, technical approaches, local and personal development concerns, gender, climate change, conflict, etc. – any formulaic and rigid adherence to *conscientization* approaches was simply not practical. In modules that explicitly featured his ideas and approaches, critiques of his ideas were routinely examined and numerous flaws highlighted, while retaining the core principles of dialogue, relevance, questioning, and praxis – reflection and action – as valuable tools for both staff reflexivity and process work.
with students. The overarching ideas about the political nature of this 'education of question' and the goals of transformation, remained as inspirational for everyone at Kimmage. Nonetheless, while Kimmage had a Freirean foundation, Kimmage was certainly not 'Freire fundamentalist'.

Consistent with the experiential learning aspect of a learner-centred education, it is helpful to view other approaches within educational traditions that prioritise learning from experience. The works of Sharan Merriam (1995) and Tony Saddington (1992), among others, point towards the traditions of the Progressive and the Humanist schools. These two philosophical traditions emphasised different aspects of learning; for the Progressive, social change, reform, and problem-solving; for the Humanist, self-actualisation, personal growth and integration. The Progressive school was inspired by the ideas of Dewey, Lindeman, Grundtvig; the Humanists by Rogers, Maslow, Knowles and Mezirow. Freire firmly belongs in another tradition, the Radical, along with writers such as Illich, Gramsci, Gelpi, Shor, hooks, Lovett, Thompson, and many more. However, together with the other two traditions, these three form the basis for experiential learning (Saddington 1992) which was present at the outset of the Kimmage programme, through to its conclusion in May 2018. Hopefully, experiential learning will continue to influence the work of staff in their new location at Maynooth University.

However, two other traditions – the Liberal and Behavioural schools – are not totally discarded either. The latter could feature in some instructional orientated trainings done by Kimmage, and elements of the Liberal – a more cognitive centred, transmission of knowledge approach – are difficult to eschew, particularly since they remain the orthodoxy in mainstream education, and most of us, teacher or student, are firmly inculcated within this tradition. Nevertheless, the experience of the learner was a consistent requirement, and seen as a primary aspect of all classwork at Kimmage. Therefore, in summing up ‘a Kimmage pedagogy’, one is left with the notion of a cluster of approaches that embrace key
elements of the Humanist, Progressive and Radical traditions, and which call for participatory, interactive methodologies encouraging discussion, dialogue and critical reflection.

**Partnership**

Another buzzword in development practice, and elsewhere is partnership (Cornwall 2007; Horton et al, 2009; Chambers, 2012). Indeed, Robert Chambers (2013) in an online blog, claimed ‘*The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness* repeatedly talks of partners and partnership, which added together are used more in the Declaration than any other word or word root (my count is 96 times)’. For Kimmage it was more than a buzzword, it was a practical necessity. As a relatively small institute – compared with almost any other educational establishment – it was vital to seek collaboration with others in order to adequately resource activities and remain relevant to the sector. Despite a negative perspective sometimes heard from a few other academics and development agency personnel - that Kimmage was in a 'little cocoon' out there in the suburbs of south west Dublin, with limited interaction with the wider worlds of academia or the broader professional development sector - three substantial examples can quickly refute such ill-informed comment.

Firstly, in 1994 Kimmage embarked on a collaborative programme with a Tanzanian-based Danish institute, MS–Training Centre for Development Cooperation (MS-TCDC). The partnership was to last 20 years until it was concluded in 2014. Secondly, inspired by this first successful experience of a ‘North-South’ partnership, Kimmage was invited by the Training for Transformation Institute to provide academic support to a new programme based at the Grail Centre, Kleinmond, South Africa. This partnership began in 2003 and continued until 2018. The programme was extraordinarily successful, attracting participants, mainly women, and largely but not exclusively from the continent of Africa, all of whom perceived themselves as ‘grassroots activists’ and pursued social change, justice and equality in their respective countries.
It continues today with support from Arrupe College, Harare, as part of the transfer of Kimmage’s operations to Maynooth.

Thirdly, Kimmage was the lead partner in a consortium, which included international training and research NGOs, International NGO Training and Research Centre (INTRAC) from the UK, and Management of Development Foundation (MDF), a consultancy from the Netherlands, which together successfully tendered for a training and learning programme, subsequently called DTALK (Development Training and Learning at Kimmage), and which was delivered with the support of Irish Aid from 2005 – 2012. This programme provided participants with short courses covering a wide range of development practice and attracted between 800 and 1,000 personnel from across the NGO and missionary sector in each year of its existence. Unfortunately, Irish Aid discontinued funding for this training in 2012.

These experiences of partnership have been hugely beneficial to Kimmage. They were not successful in terms of sustained financial gain, but certainly in terms of personal and organisational learning. On reviewing the partnership with MS-TCDC in an earlier programme (Reilly 2017), I noted the characteristics highlighted by Wanni et al (2010:18), as consistent with the experience of Kimmage staff over the two decades:

“...a dynamic collaborative process between educational institutions that brings mutual though not necessarily symmetrical benefits to the parties engaged in the partnership. Partners share ownership of the projects. Their relationship is based on respect, trust, transparency and reciprocity. They understand each other’s cultural and working environment. Decisions are taken jointly after real negotiations take place between the partners. Each partner is open and clear about what they are bringing to the partnership and what their expectations
are from it. Successful partnerships tend to change and evolve over time”.

Each of these long-running international collaborations in Tanzania and South Africa were successful for a variety of reasons, but two factors can be confidently asserted; they were not time-bound and they were mutually respectful relationships.

The first factor, limitation of time in partnership programmes, was highlighted by Teferra (2016, online):

“The literature on development cooperation, including university cooperation, is replete with challenges of forging successful, productive and truly equal partnerships between institutions in the North and the South. One of the persistent concerns of such programmes and partnership schemes have been the brevity of their lifetime”.

On this topic, he is echoing the views of Aburi et al (2010), Oliphant (2013), and McEvoy (2013). The second factor, relationships, is a more elusive, less tangible aspect, but the sheer longevity of the partnerships points towards a special ‘X Factor’, and I am convinced that this was it. This emerged as a significant phenomenon during the research on the Kimmage- MS-Training Centre for Development Cooperation partnership (Reilly 2017). Several colleagues, from Kimmage and MS-TCDC referred to it including Stella Maranga, who was involved in the programme from its earliest days and had been engaged in the first two programmes delivered with Kimmage:

“... it was an easy relationship we had, I wonder now if the fact that there wasn’t a financial transaction between us, if this contributed to the relationship feeling mutually beneficial? We remained in this relationship because we wanted to be there, not
because we felt we wanted something. Kimmage as well. We got something from each other” (Reilly, 2017: 38).

And secondly, this from Prudence Kaijage, a former Principal of MS-TCDC:

“For institutional partnership to succeed personal relations matter. We (MS-TCDC) had many other institutional collaborations, I don't think many were as equally productive as the one we had with Kimmage. When I looked back, some of the things I could point towards, that personal chemistry, it's something that is under-rated, not valued but it does make a difference” (ibid).

Relationships certainly seems to be a neglected aspect within development discourse. This is emphasised by Eyben (2006, 2011) as she sees relationships as a key – and sometimes missing or overlooked – aspect of development practice and aid. For example, her critique on the Paris Declaration is interesting. While it emphasises principles of mutual responsibility and partnership, she says, there was ‘little consideration as to how donors should change to live up to these principles’ (2006: 2). She goes on to say:

“There has been little public discussion of what we have learned from psychology; that ultimately, the only people we can change are ourselves (Harris, 1969) and that in order to be part of the solution, donors must recognise that they are part of the problem” (ibid).

Eyben is supported in her argument by Chambers who discusses the competing paradigms of ‘Things’ and ‘People’ (2010: 11-12). He records the growth in popularity of a more ‘People’ based rhetoric (if not reality) in development practice through the 1990s, and then the shift again, towards ‘Things’ in the 2000s. A move away, perhaps, from People-Centred Development? This aspect of prioritizing good relations between
those who work together, as a full-time or part-time staff (most of whom had long unbroken records of employment at Kimmage), between staff and course participants, and between Kimmage personnel and colleagues from other organisations, is evidently something to be recorded as part of the ‘Kimmage Experience’.

**Conclusions**
The choice of these three pillars is an attempt to reflect upon, and describe, some of what I consider key aspects of the contribution Kimmage has made to the development sector, both in Ireland and internationally. Of the three, the element of partnership is the most tangible and visible aspect. However, the other two aspects – ensuring people remained at the centre of the work, and the educational approaches used – were essentially the dedicated process, which ensured that the content, represented in all of the activities and outputs of Kimmage, remained congruent with good development practice.

What have we learnt from the four and a half decades of Kimmage? Perhaps one point we can conclude from this brief subjective survey is that Kimmage was part of, and witness to, many profound changes in development studies / development education. Changes to the content of curriculum, reflecting changes in demand from dramatically different cohorts of learners, i.e. from religious practitioners to lay volunteers, to professional development workers, and more recently, to professionals seeing options to work on short-term assignments, overseas or at home. Changes in the types of course provision from traditional year-long academic courses to flexible, part-time, including distance learning options. Changes in participation from North and South, i.e. people from the global South engaged as lecturers and trainers on programmes, people from Ireland and elsewhere in the global North, attending as students in Tanzania and South Africa. A blurring of distinctions between DE and DS?
What is the legacy of Kimmage, and can those of us fortunate to continue in this work, now in Maynooth University, build upon it? Is this so-called ‘Kimmage Experience’ – characterised here with the three pillars of ‘people-centred’, ‘pedagogy’, and ‘partnership’ - really unique? Can the special atmosphere and environment of learning that was created and carefully nurtured in Kimmage Manor, be rekindled? My clear bias is that it could be, but that it will not be easy. My former colleague in Kimmage, Richard Quinn always maintained that development is ‘an Art not a Science’ and the same is true for development studies / education.

As I write this reflection on the work of Kimmage, I am considering these three pillars and wondering which will stand strong in the years ahead? Partnership is something that can be carried forward, and perhaps our ‘ex-Kimmage’ faculty have something that other departments and institutes here in Maynooth may find a useful addition to research and learning linkages with other institutions. Pedagogy? We have reasons to be optimistic here too, because of successful attempts to engage students in participatory lecture sessions to date, and also that we seem to be swimming with a current rising tide towards more interactive learner-centred pedagogies here in Maynooth. However, the classroom architecture and learning space generally still leave much to be desired. People-Centred? That is the responsibility of the new faculty of International Development. There is a commitment to continue with this as a core value, attitude and behaviour. This is epitomised by a favourite poem, often misattributed to Gwendolyn Brooks, but actually written by another contemporary of hers, June Jordan (1970):

“Our earth is round, and, among other things
That means that you and I can hold
Completely different Points of view and both be right.
The difference of our positions will show
Stars in your window I cannot even imagine.
Your sky may burn with light,
While mine, at the same moment,  
Spreads beautiful to darkness.  
Still, we must choose how we separately corner  
The circling universe of our experience.  
Once chosen, our cornering will determine  
The message of any star and darkness we encounter.”
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LONG WALK OF PEACE: MISSING DIMENSIONS

Nita Mishra

Abstract: In this article, I argue that a spiritual approach to build a ‘culture of peace’ is missing in the recently published United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation’s (UNESCO) document titled Long Walk of Peace: Towards a Culture of Prevention (2018). The focus of the UNESCO document is on achieving Sustainable Development Goals as key to its peace-building strategy. However, the mainstream peace-building conversations ignore other noteworthy developments in the field of peace discourses, especially those relating to acknowledging and understanding the inner worlds of the human being. The argument that peace begins within oneself can be found in the exemplary life of leaders like Mahatma Gandhi, and in discourses which are relegated into the religious or spiritual domains. Without giving undue importance to the institutions of organised religion, this article attempts to bring focus to scholars and organisations working towards developing critical skills required to foster empathic and compassionate communities. By not providing clear direction to educators on how to develop such critical skills of humaneness, respect, and dignity amongst others, the ‘peace and security architecture’ of the United Nations which the UNESCO document rightly commends as momentous, stands on shaky ground.
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Introduction

In its most recent publication, Long Walk of Peace: Towards a Culture of Prevention (2018), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) states that the peace and security architecture of the United Nations rests upon three predicates: peace and security; human rights; and development as these have ‘...inspired new trajectories
to handle the growing complexity of new and old conflicts...’ (2018: 154-155). The UNESCO document stresses the important role of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (2018: 23) in diminishing conflict in societies and discusses the concept of peace from a historical perspective. It further highlights emerging issues which need to be addressed by peace-builders before a ‘culture of peace’ can be achieved.

In this article, I firstly focus on the tenuous relationship between development and peace raised by post-development scholars reflected in the concerns and difficulties of communities living in different contexts which go unnoticed by ‘development’ enthusiasts. Secondly, I also consider the historical analysis of peace which has ignored the significant role of the spiritual approach to achieving peace and reducing, or resolving, conflict as an important sustainable approach to peace-building. In many ways, the spiritual path with its emphasis on inner worlds of an individual is perhaps the oldest approach to peace-building. Gandhi becomes relevant here as part of his greatness lay in his acceptance of human imperfectness, a continuous effort to strive for peace and non-violence in his daily life, and his call to practice what one preached. In other words, the personal was political for Gandhi, and as a leader of peace his life was exemplary.

Thirdly, I wish to generate interest amongst educators on how to ‘spiritually’ equip the next generation with the skills to cultivate peace and harmony within oneself, with the community, and with the environment. The peace-building activities of the Soka Gakkai International (SGI) is one example. I also reflect on the core message of a seminar event, held in October 2018, on the role of Protestant schools and their contribution to the future of Irish society as a second example stressing the need for such a ‘spiritual’ education. At the seminar, leading educators called for an education system which, instead of ignoring the role of religion, must question the relevance of religion. It argued for an ‘educated religion’ to enable emotional and empathic skills amongst young people. Finally, the article reminds us that other scholars have also made a plea for fostering
compassionate global citizens. The task of education is therefore to enable and empower the youth with the requisite skills to support active citizenship.

This article is based on secondary sources with special references to the UNESCO 2018 document, the SGI newsletters, and my readings of Gandhi. I have relied heavily on direct quotes from the documents to illustrate my main argument. My contention is that not only are we missing a spiritual dimension to peace and the tools needed to eke out (or manifest) that spiritual aspect in our daily lives, but that our peace-building processes lack leaders who are spiritually awakened. Furthermore, values of compassion, empathy, humanism, wisdom, inner transformation, and dialogue between people and their leaders, and among civil society are crucial for the UNESCO call for a ‘culture of prevention’ (2018: 23) of conflict. In other words, we need many more Gandhis in this long walk of peace.

**Long Walk of Peace**

The UNESCO document argues that building peace is a continuous process, and sometimes an elusive goal because well-intentioned policies over a long period of time have not always resulted in achieving peace within many communities.

“Decades after the nations of the world came together to form the United Nations system with a determination to build peace and security for all, conflicts continue to rage claiming countless lives, displacing millions of people, and threatening to destroy our common heritage” (2018: 3).

Through a variety of concrete examples, the UNESCO document shows how the United Nations (UN) has pursued peace and attempted to avoid conflict in precarious situations. Examples of strategies undertaken range from building capacities for food security through sustainable agriculture, environmental cooperation, learning from culture and heritage for peace-
keeping, women’s participation as uniformed personnel, education, and youth leadership amongst others. The document then goes on to reflect upon the UN’s understanding of peace quoting Hobbes, Spinoza, and Foucault fleetingly. Resting its arguments on Richmond (2005: 207) who famously said that providing for a clearer understanding of what must be done, and what must be avoided becomes easier if we know what peace is, the UN peace agenda has evolved and expanded its manifold horizons amid the global transformations and disruptions of recent decades. Ranging from a focus on Eurocentric security concerns embedded in Cold War legacies, the UN peace agenda has moved to innovative methodologies and holistic visions of peace including societal concerns of social justice, poverty alleviation, women’s empowerment, and harnessing the potential of young people and children’s welfare.

Using concerns of the environment, health and culture defined by heritage, music, theatre and sports, the UNESCO document stresses that the emerging concept of ‘sustaining peace’ organically directs itself towards achieving a culture of prevention. It declares that peace and security, development and human rights are the pillars of the UN strategy of achieving peace. Acknowledging the limitations of encompassing all conceptual and empirical studies, the document clearly emphasises that: ‘It is, however, possible to discern some of the prominent trends in the evolution of the UN peace agenda by employing the academic. This is the raison d’être of this publication’ (2018: 33-34).

The document, commendably, argues for the role of alternate discourses in attaining peace in the ‘Imperatives of Reform’ chapter where examples of communities moving towards non-violent and peaceful methods of conflict resolution have been recommended to policy makers.

“Clearly, peace activities need to emerge organically from within society... Peace cannot be imposed from outside...The transformative norms, values and narratives of such successful practices need to be evaluated by policy-makers and
practitioners in order to develop guidelines to help attain peaceful, just and inclusive societies” (2018: 159).

The UNESCO document further alludes to the importance of culture, and synergies present in different religious paths: ‘The importance of cultural dimensions and multi-religious synergy for transformative education also needs to be accorded greater attention at all levels’ (2018: 160). Again, in its concluding section, the authors have mentioned an inclusion of other types of peace mechanisms, ‘...holistic visions of peace resonate well with the ethos of culture of peace’ (2018: 164). The concluding remarks, however, raise the hopes of the peace-searcher by directing attention (without suggesting how) to the significance of using different strategies and alternate discourses:

“Peace can be radically transformative or it can be a passive acceptance of wrongdoing and injustice. Just as conflict is inevitable to the human experience, the concept of ‘peace’ will always be a site of arguments and a journey of discovery...Instead of trying to conflate peace with one or other schema, all those involved should constantly anticipate and nurture its plural ramifications” (2018: 164-165).

However, in its final framework in the section on ‘Structures and Processes’, the document considers the transformative education needed to ensure a culture of prevention of conflict but offers inadequate attention to multi-religious synergies and the corresponding spiritual dimensions of peace. While this well-written UNESCO document fills the peace-searcher with hope, it leaves one with despair on the question of where, in the document, does one look for the (promised) alternatives to the mainstream discourse on peace, conflict, or its resolution. What could possibly be the indicators of ‘transformative education’ which have not been tried before, and moreover, what are the ‘transformative norms, values and narratives’ which the document refers to?
The document clearly stresses the inter-linkages between the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and puts forth the argument that unequal power distribution, discrimination and inequality are some of the root causes of poverty.

“With growing competition over natural and other resources essential to an adequate standard of living, denial of economic and social rights is increasingly becoming a cause and predictor of violence, social unrest and conflict” (2018: 106-107).

The way out of such poverty is to stress the ‘holistic’ nature of the Sustainable Development Agenda 2030, by linking people, the planet, prosperity, peace and partnerships. The report ends with suggestions for conflict prevention in the future using different peace and security tools (described in detail in the document), and ensuring that the pillars of development, human rights, and humanitarianism are upheld in the process.

“Grounded in the human rights framework, the 2030 Agenda and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) provide new momentum to promote peace through human rights and development, with the aim of leaving no one behind. SDG 16, which aims to ‘Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels’, alongside the other SDGs, offers renewed potential to achieve the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, through a human rights framework, environmental protection and strengthened international cooperation...” (2018: 106-107).

In Section B of the document we hear grassroots voices from different groups of people globally which is inclusive, and highly commendable. While the document refers to a set of values and modes of behaviour, among other attributes, in a ‘culture of peace’, it leaves the keen peace-
searcher wanting to know what that could mean in daily life for an ordinary peace loving individual or community. The ‘culture of peace’ with its ‘set of values, attitudes, and modes of behaviour and ways of life that reject violence and prevent conflicts by tackling their root causes to solve problems through dialogue and negotiation among individuals, groups, and nations’ (UN Resolution A/Res/52/13 of 20th November 1997) is not something which can be taken as a given. On the contrary such a set of values and attitudes have to be cultivated and nurtured by observing one’s peace within and without or inner and outer. The document also does not tease out the human experience of conflict or the journey of discovery it refers to (164-165). Nor does it discuss how peace develops organically in the same societies where violence has become the norm.

Interestingly, the document begins its journey with Gandhi’s quotation that ‘The world will live in peace, only when the individuals composing it make up their minds to do so’ (2018: 20). However, the document’s analysis did not delve deeper into the spiritual dimension of Gandhi’s understanding of what he meant by making up one’s mind to live in peace which is discussed below. Again, the document reminds us that since 2007, 2 October (Gandhi’s birthday) has been declared ‘International Day of Non-Violence’ (UNESCO 2018: 31) to recognise the fact that without non-violence, achieving positive peace and social progress is not possible.

**Gandhi: The personal is political**

Describing the relevance of Gandhi, Heredia (2018) writes that the Gandhian discourse and praxis is foundational to understanding peace and harmony, especially because of his emphasis on the personal as political: ‘I don’t have a message; my life is my message’ (Heredia 2018:16). For Gandhi, the personal was political, and the political was inclusive of other dimensions of personal and social life, religious or rather an ethical struggle, precisely because it was always a work in
progress for a new and liberated society. The Gandhian understanding of peace, according to Heredia, began with his notion of Swaraj or self-rule which meant primarily a rule over one’s self as the foundation for living with others in a just, free, harmonious environment premised on forgiveness and reconciliation. Heredia further elaborates on his understanding of the Gandhian approach as follows:

“For Gandhi, justice must be founded on equality and dharma, prioritising duties rather than rights; freedom on self-control and self-reliance, more than freedom from others; harmony on self-respect and self-realisation, not on power and dominance over others” (Heredia 2018: 17).

Heredia shows, as below, how the Gandhian personal quest for becoming just, free, and at peace was relevant to the political or wider societal sphere.

“Gandhi’s emphasis on ahimsa (nonviolence) and satyagraha (truth-force), his swadeshi (one’s own neighbourhood, pays) and Swaraj are foundational in his continuing quest for peace premised on justice, freedom, harmony, his Ramrajya, the homologue of the Christian Kingdom of God. Such a peace in our world is perhaps the most relevant and deepest human quest for a new age, ‘a new heaven and a new earth’, a quest that not only bonds each to the other, but embraces the whole of the cosmos too, in one inclusive ecological community, beginning with the local village and neighbourhood, in ever widening oceanic circles to include the whole world” (Heredia 2018: 18).

Using Gandhi’s words without a careful examination of his lived philosophy, therefore, may pose problems in the very understanding of how to progress in the walk towards peace. Perhaps we find it irrelevant to do so, or maybe we have less time to deliberate upon them but using his quotations for peace and justice and not delving deeper into what
Gandhi meant by ‘my life is my message’, means only focusing on half the truth.

**Post-Development**

Gandhi has been invoked by post-development scholars as well. Quoting Gandhi (n.d.) ‘...in fighting the imagined enemy without, he neglected the enemy within’, eminent post-development scholar, Majid Rahnema highlighted the age old spiritual quest that the object of human quest was not outside the self but resided within (1997a: 337). Giving examples of grassroots movements which followed a Gandhian path, Rahnema (1997a: 400-401) argued that a dimension of the inner world, akin to the ambiguous term ‘spirituality’, had emerged out of people’s art of resistance which needs a careful analysis. Furthermore, attention must be given to such a search for truth and peace (as Gandhi did) which starts from deeper layers of one’s own inner world and manifests in practice, friendships and solidarities with others engaged in a similar search for truth or peace. ‘This way of being has firm roots in the traditions of resistance by the weak. In these traditions, “right action” involving others starts always as a personal work on oneself’ (Rahnema 1997a: 401).

Rejecting the dominant paradigm of development, Rahnema then called for signposts in new languages and new paradigms arguing that the development ideology had substituted the familiar universe predominated by mutual help and hope in human relations with new forms of control, dominations, and exclusions. Discussing the limits of the dominant discourse and its language with clear references to other traditions in the east including Persian, Lao Tzu, Confucius, and Gandhi, and new forms of co-action and helping, Rahnema, gives examples of the Zapatista movement, and the Theology of Liberation in Latin America. Emphasising questions of ‘who am I to intervene in another’s life?’, or the project of intervention needs ‘to examine the whys and wherefore of their actions’, Rahnema writes that:
“Before intervening in other people’s lives, one should first intervene in one’s own; ‘polishing’ oneself to ensure that all precautions have been taken to avoid harming the objects of interventions...Many questions should be explored first...Is it friendship, compassion, the ‘mask of love’, or an unconscious attempt to increase my powers of seduction...” (1997a: 397).

In their acclaimed book, The Post-Development Reader, Rahnema and Bawtree (1997) reflect upon what they term as ‘the agonies of development’ witnessed by scholars and experienced by those who lost in the development paradigm from across different communities. Concerns raised by both, activists and academics, in this edited volume were related to subjects absent in the UNESCO’s Long Walk of Peace document. For instance, Rahnema shows how community movements such as Chipko and Lokayan in India, the Zapatistas in Chiapas, Chodak in Senegal or the Longo Mai in France, were all driven by universally recognised virtues of compassion, friendship, human solidarity and hospitality (Rahnema 1997b: 127). Clarkson et al (1997) emphasise natural law and spirituality, and respect as the basis of relating with earth. Dahl and Megerssa (1997) discuss ideas of societal and cosmological order using local terms in the Boran lands in Ethiopia.

Thus, the idea of a universal panacea for problems of conflict and its resolution seems to be an aspirational dream which is unrealisable. Perhaps the solutions to conflicts lie elsewhere, i.e., in the domain of individual quests for peace within.
Understanding the inner worlds
In a different world, Gandhi’s spiritual seeking path which focused on the inner worlds of the human mind is put into practice by a global spiritual movement, i.e., the Soka Gakkai International (value creation) or SGI, which declares that world peace can be spread through self-awareness of the inner worlds, and individual attempts to transform oneself through revolutionising the self. The previous sections indicate that the spiritual dimension may provide us with the missing link between praxis and theory. However, how can this gap between the theory of peace and its practice be reduced? While one can find answers in Gandhi’s life as an example of such praxis, in this section, I have deliberated upon the tools such as understanding the inner worlds within us which motivate our actions with the hope that peace activists will be able to strive to enact this in their lives before helping others to engage with the peace process. Gandhi’s ‘my life is my message’ echoes such a process.

The inner worlds have been best described in the Buddhist concept of ‘ten worlds’ or the ten states or conditions of life which are influenced by our thoughts, interactions, and our environment. The ten worlds are hell, hunger, animality, anger, tranquillity, rapture or heaven, learning, realisation, Bodhisattava, and Buddha. All ‘ten worlds’ have positive and negative aspects within themselves, and at any given point, we gravitate between all ten worlds. Conflict arises when the ten worlds are constantly vying with each other to manifest their reactions, responses or tendencies. We will be successful if we can keep the negative reactions of each aspect at any given moment lower than our higher selves. For instance, one may be in hell because one is in pain, but instead of investing the time in one’s own pain, one may reflect upon pain experienced by others. I provide a brief description of the ten worlds below (Art of Living, 2018: 32-33).

The first is ‘hell’ which is characterised by misery and suffering. However, the experience of this suffering makes us empathetic to others’
pain, and to improve our circumstances. The second is ‘hunger’ which refers to cravings and desires which dominate us, and yet, if seen positively, one can hunger to alleviate suffering and fight for peace. The third, ‘animality’, rules our instinctive behaviour making us fear the strong, and bully the weak. On the positive side, protective instincts for the self, and for others is also characterised in this condition of life-state. The fourth, ‘anger’, refers to a superiority complex, aggressiveness, and a feeling of conflict with others. In its positive form, anger can motivate one to stand against injustice.

The fifth is ‘tranquillity’ and is described as laziness and inactivity in its negative connotations, and yet in a positive sense, it refers to calmness, being at peace, and being reasonable. It also provides a mental space to restore our energies. Sixth is the state of ‘rapture’, a short-term gratification of desires, and lead us to cravings which revert to hell or hunger for more. It could, however, lead to a deep sense of happiness or support others to reach their goal. The seventh condition of life is ‘learning’ which refers to knowing about oneself from others and from existing knowledge. However, an obsession with ourselves can lead to a negative tendency of self-centeredness.

Eighth is the state of ‘realisation’ or the wisdom to understand aspects of life through observation and experiences which is a positive factor. It could however, also, lead to self-centeredness where one can be too focused on trying to understand using the intellect which may lead to the subversion of one’s state of wisdom to solve problems. The ninth is the ‘bodhisattva’ state which refers to someone who seeks enlightenment for self and others and is characterised by devotion such as that from parents for a child, and nurses for patients in ideal conditions. However, such devotion may lead to exhaustion as a result of the denial of one’s own needs, and create discontent leading to strife in the community. The final state of life is ‘Buddhahood’ which refers to the awakening of an ordinary human to the true nature of life within its daily routine. This is characterised by compassion, joy, wisdom, courage, and life-force.
The first six worlds are referred to as ‘lower worlds’ because we experience it automatically, while for the last four we need to make constant efforts of being. Conflict arises in the lower worlds, and / or when we are unable to balance the higher worlds. None of the life-conditions are static or fixed. For example, within the life-state of anger lies the potential of realisation or learning. While ‘Buddhahood’ is a difficult state to achieve, the argument is that if we train ourselves through specific (chanting) exercises, we will gain insights into the workings of our mind and will be able to direct our actions towards best practices fostering a ‘culture of peace’. In other words, an individual has the responsibility to face the enemy within by being vigilant of the life-state we are in at any given moment.

**The Peace Proposals**

Without going into detailed discussion on the precepts and tenets of the SGI, I want to highlight another significant aspect of this global movement which is reflected in its peace proposals forwarded each year since 2000. The founding president of the Soka Gakkai International had proposed the idea of ‘humanitarian competition’ which meant ‘by benefiting others we benefit ourselves’, as a means to overcome conflict among nations, to spread the spirit of peaceful coexistence, and build a truly global society (Ikeda, 2009). Since 2000, the current President of SGI has been submitting annual peace proposals, as listed below, to the United Nations. A quick examination of the titles of the peace proposals, as below, gives us a glimpse of a departure from dominant discourses on peace and conflict resolution, and what alternative aspects of peace-building processes may look like.


While the above are not without critique, my argument is that the peace proposals provide us with a framework to redefine conflict and conflict resolution using concepts of creating values, compassion, wisdom, human connection, inner transformation, humanism, and dialogues. The idea of negotiating between the ten (inner) worlds at any given moment reinforces and firms up the belief that we possess the capabilities and the tools to transform our own lives first. It further gives ordinary humans the hope and the courage to challenge or transform their circumstances and claim their rights through taking responsibility of their development.

**Teachers and Theology**

This section draws attention to the role of educators and teachers in building a just and peace-loving society through training the next generation in values of dignity of life, respect, grace, forgiveness and others as the need may arise. The importance of imparting such values is a core need of building a just political society which in the future may be better equipped to take immediate action to choose peace over non-peace. Professor Annette Scheunpflug (Chair of the Education Foundation and
Centre for Global Learning in the University of Bamberg, a leading thinker of Global Learning Europe urges schools and religious institutions to orient towards the pedagogy and theology of hope with a focus on learner centred education which encourages students to ask what is important in my life, and what is good for others? An education that opens people’s eyes and minds to the realities of the world and awakens the youth to bring about a world of greater justice, equality and human rights for all is the need of the hour, according to Scheunpflug. Linking her arguments on an educated religion to certain fundamental principles of the Protestant schooling system, Scheunpflug emphasises the need to celebrate difference and protest against injustice. Table 1 draws attention to the chief characteristics of our global society and the challenges it poses in learning activities for students in schools.

**Table 1: Characteristics of a Global Society, and challenges it poses for learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of Global Society</th>
<th>Challenges for Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Plurality of Globalisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Rapid Social Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>Losing anchor in space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Andy Wolfe (2018), Deputy (Chief Education Officer with the Church of England’s Foundation for Education Leadership), has argued for a system of education which focuses on wisdom, hope and aspiration, community and living well together, dignity and respect, and enhancing knowledge and skills which lead the youth towards living life in all its fullness. Leadership must bring together pedagogy and theology together in schools in order to be able to lead society towards peace. Furthermore, thin narratives (see Table 2) based on competitiveness, individual gains, reductionism and utilitarianism must give way to hope and aspiration through forgiveness and grace, to community gains, respect and dignity, and wisdom, knowledge and skills that will help us live well.

**Table 2: Thin Narratives and Thick Narratives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thin Narratives</th>
<th>Thick Narratives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism; Instrumentalism</td>
<td>Wisdom, Knowledge, and Skills for living well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness</td>
<td>Hope, Forgiveness and Grace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductionism</td>
<td>Respect and Dignity of all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Elsewhere, Murphy et al (2014) argue for developing a curriculum focusing on emotional literacy to enable the growth of active citizens who have capacity to take compassionate action for global justice. The authors contend that there is a need to synthesise development education (DE) with the skills to think critically and react to injustice with Cognitively-Based Compassion Training (CBCT) skills which equip young people to have the ability and emotional capacity to intervene for change, without giving in to despair, anger, or burnout. The emotional and intellectual skills necessary for productive social activism and change can thus be critical tools for peace-education. An example of ongoing work on such transformative pedagogy, according to Murphy et al (2014), is the collaboration between Children in Crossfire (CIC), an international development organisation, and peace-scholars of Emory University and Life University’s Centre for Compassion and Secular Ethics to evolve a teacher training curriculum titled ‘Educating the Heart for Compassionate Global Citizenship’.

The UNESCO document alludes to the need to focus on enabling children with values of dignity and respect, but it seeks to do so in ‘conflict-affected or fragile settings’.

“Teaching young children, the values of respect, tolerance and empathy, and equipping them with the necessary skills to resolve even daily conflict among peers in a non-violent manner, provides them with the tools they need, now and in the future, to foster peaceful relations at home, school and in their communities and beyond” (2018: 111).

Furthermore, the document states that ‘as today’s youth are tomorrow’s world leaders, it is vital to ensure their engagement in nurturing peace’
(2018: 156) but fails to emphasise the importance of developing skills of humane values or higher states of life as key features of a ‘culture of peace’ which, this article argues, is an opportunity missed by leading voices of peace-builders.

“Nurturing peace in today’s interconnected world thus requires a broader canvas that along with the imperatives of human rights and development also entails a vibrant focus on education for peace, global citizenship, cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue” (2018: 160).

Conclusion
This article, through an exploration of alternate discourses on peace and development, highlights the absence of an important dimension of peace, i.e., a spiritual approach, from UNESCO’s Long Walk of Peace (2018) document. It discussed how such peace can be realised through acknowledging and understanding the ten conditions of life within each human being. UNESCO’s document brings timely attention to narratives on peace and the prevention of conflict across the globe showing that peace-building is possible through development related activities. However, the absence of the spiritual dimension to peace-building in the document ignores the simple fact that peace begins from within. In the absence of peace-leaders like Gandhi, in the political arena, peace processes today need each and every individual to understand their inner worlds, and act accordingly. The role of teachers and educators becomes more significant as the future of peace is in the hands of the youth. Bringing up children who are empathic, and value-laden, will show light to the long walk of peace, and encourage a culture of prevention.
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Peadar King

(PK): Robert could you start by telling us how Palestinians came to be located in Lebanon?

Robert Fisk

(RF): Well the Palestinians came to Lebanon in the same way as they washed up as refugees in Gaza you know and what is now the West Bank. They were driven off, driven from their homes, or fled from their homes in what is now Israel, during the war of 1948/49 when the Israeli state was established and the refugees were living on the land which is now Israel.

They of course call it Palestine and that was their property. They lived on it, they had the deeds to it, they owned it and they were citizens of a mandate, British mandate before the Second World War called Palestine, which of course was composed, too, of both Jews and Arabs. Most of the people of Palestine historically are Arabs and were, indeed, when the original British Balfour declaration said that the British would support a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

So those Palestinians who fled their homes either because of massacres or through sheer fear, fled northwards, say from Galilee, and the Galilean Palestinians ended up in Lebanon, in the south of Lebanon, in
Beirut itself in large numbers and in the Bekaa Valley in eastern Lebanon, and they believed of course when they arrived, the original refugees, that in a matter of days or weeks they would return to their homes in Palestine which is why they kept their land deeds, the keys to their front doors. They were going away for a few days, locked the front door, left everything intact inside their houses, thinking they were going to go back when the war was over.

PK: Many people looking at that scenario, that period in history, they are surprised that the Palestinians were duped so easily into believing that they were leaving Palestine for a short period of time.

RF: Well they weren’t duped, no one told them they were fleeing a war, and remember at that period we had the end of the Second World War which occurred in Europe in 1945, you know April/May.

Millions of people were on the roads of Europe, and refugees were a very common phenomena. Refugees in the Middle-East seemed to us in the west like any other refugees, and as we know in Europe in most cases - not in cases for several millions - but in most cases people could return to their homes, and there was a natural assumption that when the war was over you would go back to your home, partly because you thought well maybe the Palestinians or the Arab armies would win, partly because you were looking after your children in a neighbouring county or in a part of your country which wasn’t the scene of warfare, and naturally you would go back to your home afterwards.

This was a battle controlled by political people, by different political leaderships and that once this was finished you would return, after all you owned the land. And promises had been made to the Arabs, remember in the First World War, that they would have this vast land between Morocco and Iraq and rule it themselves, but the Palestinians inside Palestine in the years leading up to the Second World War, they feared this would happen, they were well aware they may be
dispossessed, which they were. It was an act of dispossession, and once they arrived in Beirut, if you read the diaries of the first arrivals, they clearly believed a matter of weeks, months at the most, and it would be arranged that they could return.

The richer Palestinians, some of them had fled before the war, they knew what was going to happen and they had houses in Lebanon which they owned. Some of them had houses which they actually sold in Palestine, in some cases to Jewish people who took the houses very happily. “It’s going to be part of the Israeli state one day”, they thought, and it was. But by and large those people, remember they were destitute, they had children, they were poor farmers in most cases, most of the Palestinians who came to Lebanon were not wealthy, they were poor people, they were people who had olive groves, were sheep farmers. Some of them came across the border, and you can actually see it in the old filmed photographs, with their animals. They actually got their farm animals and drove them dozens of miles because they thought, well we can use the fields of Lebanon and we can settle there for a little while and then we can go home.

And of course, they didn’t go home and then constantly the international community, the world told them, “oh you will go home”. And then remember we had a UN General Assembly resolution that refugees would return to their homes, but unfortunately General Assembly resolutions of the UN were not, and are not binding, so they did not return to their homes. And the Palestinian refugees became a kind of institution in themselves, and at one point there were 340,000 perhaps, maybe it’s only 140,000 or 150,000 now, but people said “oh well the Palestinians in Lebanon, yeah well, they were refugees from, what was it – 1948, it was after the Second World War wasn’t it?”, and the history began to disappear. They became a permanent feature of the landscape, the geography of Lebanon, except of course to the Christians of Lebanon who feared that the refugees, almost all of them being Muslim, would upset the religious balance in Lebanon and effectively destroy the Christian
community and there you have the seeds of the civil war which began in 1975.

PK: But staying in that period, they were the majority of the population in 1946/47 and again a lot of people would find it incomprehensible that the majority of a population can be forcibly removed from their country.

RF: Well I think not, you see, you’ve got to remember that in 1936 to 1939 there had been a ferocious - well not a civil war really - an Arab uprising against British rule. The Palestinian Arabs of Palestine naturally regarded the British as being the people who had brought upon them this enormous immigration of Jews who at some point were going to set up a state, and they were right in believing that. So, they started an insurrection, partly against Jews of Palestine but also very much against the British.

And so, the British effectively and very brutally repressed that uprising and disarmed the Palestinians, whereas in many cases at that point Jewish settlements in what was Palestine still, were heavily armed and probably had to be because they were being attacked by the Arabs and the British could not dispossess the Jewish inhabitants of Palestine of those weapons. Now after the Second World War the situation reversed itself, and you had a Jewish uprising against British rule in which of course the Palestinians became the dispossessed and the Jews were fighting for their homeland against the Arabs and later the Arab armies.

It’s not a simple story but it’s not that complicated. At the end of the day Palestine for centuries had an Arab Muslim majority, and after the creation of the state of Israel, that part of Palestine that became Israel had a very small minority of Arabs left.

PK: You mentioned earlier on that other countries made promises to the Palestinian people – specifically what countries made promises: what
was the nature of those promises and how did they renege on those promises?

RF: Look, the principal promise that was made was made in one sentence in the Balfour Declaration - it was only one sentence long - in which the British said they supported a Jewish homeland in Palestine providing this did not affect the civil or existing rights of the existing communities, meaning Arab Muslims, although they didn’t say that. The Balfour declaration was issued in the First World War because the British wanted Jewish support against Germany and the Austrian empire and the Austrian Hungarian empire so for short-term aims in 1917, we encouraged the establishment of this entirely new state in the Middle-East most of whose people were millions and millions of Arab Muslims, and as I say, the Arabs realised this was coming.

During the same First World War, the British also promised the Arabs that they would have an Arab independent land between effectively Morocco and Mesopotamia and Persia, Iraq and Iran today. But then there was a special mandate for Palestine, and then once the implications of the Balfour declaration of Jewish homeland were clear, the Arabs / Arab nationalism began to take shape in a different way and said look this is a threat to the Arabs of Palestine, we are going to be driven off our lands, and by the time that the war has ended, I’m talking about the Israeli Arab war, the first one in 1948/49, the Israeli State as it would then become, effectively controlled, well something like 78% of what had been the mandate of Palestine.

That figure changes of course, because of who you believe was ruling Gaza at that period and so on, but of course Jordan first of all annexed the Arab part of what was left of Palestine, and in the end the modern Palestinian history, the history of Yasser Arafat and the Palestinian refugees who are alive now, was fighting to get back 22% of what had been Palestine, and even that’s failed completely.
PK: Moving on then to the 1982 Shatila massacre, can you tell me please what happened and about your own personal experience in Shatila at that time?

RF: Look, the Sabra and Shatila massacre was the bloody highlight and climax of Israel’s invasion of Lebanon in 1982 and the purpose of that invasion - and Israeli scholars, historians, politicians have talked about this - was effectively to end the political Palestinian presence in Lebanon, drive them out, throw them out, send them to Syria, anywhere, but make sure that you have a safe Christian minority presidency allied to Israel.

So, the whole purpose of the invasion of Lebanon in 1982 was effectively to neutralise the Palestinians or to neuter them if you like, just to destroy them as well. And so, when the Christian president elect, Bachir Gemayel, the man who was going to be the chief ally in Lebanon of Israel, was assassinated in a bomb explosion in east Beirut, the Christian Phalange, his own militia, allied and armed and in some cases paid by the Israelis, moved in to the (one bit of Beirut,) the western Muslim Palestinian sector of Beirut which had not been crushed by the Israeli invasion, and then went straight into the camps. They were sent into the Sabra and Shatila camps on the instructions of Ariel Sharon, the (then) Minister of Defence in Israel, who had the previous night actually told the Phalangists that Palestinians had killed Gemayel. They hadn’t in fact but that’s what he said, and so they went in there with the Israelis watching, and the Israeli Commission of Enquiry made this absolutely clear, that the Israelis watched the massacre happening and did nothing.

The massacre began on a Thursday and it finished on a Saturday mid-day. I arrived on Saturday morning and there was just devastation: flattened houses, exploded buildings, corpses lying in the street, a woman who had been eviscerated, a dead baby beside her, some dead horses. I couldn’t figure out why would they kill horses, and then we realised. I was with an American correspondent, and a Norwegian Journalist who was a good friend of mine, and still is today, and we realised we could hear
armed vehicles moving and we realised that the Phalangist militia, the murderers, were still in the camp. We at one point ran into the backyard of a hovel, and there was a woman lying on her back and she just had just been killed, there was blood running from her head, and I didn’t see her at first, I was hiding behind this iron gate. We were trying to keep away from the noise of this vehicle we could hear passing only a few meters away, and my colleague said “Robert, behind you”. I looked around, and there was this dead woman and she had obviously stayed in her home when she heard all the shooting of the massacre, and she had tried to carry on her ordinary life. You could see some of her clothes were hanging on a clothes line and she had a sort of a halo of clothes pegs around her head and she’d been shot as she was putting out her morning clothes for drying in the sun. And that’s when we were pretty frightened because we thought if these guys come here they’re not going to say “hands up” members of the national unit of journalists, they were going to kill us!

But we waited until they passed and then we walked on though the camp and you sort of lost any thought about fear, you didn’t think about courage, you just were so appalled at what had happened, and there was something propelling you, whatever the cost may be to go on looking. I walked over a mass grave that was bouncing under my feet, I climbed over corpses, and when I got back to my home my clothes were stinking of dead people. I hate clichés but it was a great turning point in my journalistic career because I remember saying I don’t care what the Israeli lobby may say, I don’t care what all the friends of Israel may say, this is a war crime and I’m going to write about it and I don’t care to hell what anyone says.

And that’s what Karsten (Norwegian journalist) and I did afterwards. We came out and we wrote our stories, and this is what it was like. I remember afterwards confronting an Israeli soldier who asked me what had happened and I said it looks like Treblinka in there, it looks like the pictures I’ve seen of the aftermath of the liberation of extermination camps in Europe. And I said to him, I’m sorry but that’s what it reminds
me of. And as we know some Israelis who managed to see it said the same thing later on, they were appalled. And rightly so. And I thought then of course, I was a bit younger! I thought it would make a difference and it did for a while, it did, but then...

PK: The writing about them...

RF: Well no, the fact that we were there, there were witnesses by the thousand. I mean many people poured into the camps, they didn't clear the bodies for days, they were there getting larger and stinking in the heat.

I mean it was a horror show and we knew who'd done it and we knew who watched. You know the Christian Maronite allies of Israel had done it and the Israelis sent them in, armed them, fed them... The ground of the massacre site was littered with Israeli equipment which had been given to the Christian Lebanese militia who had done the killings.

PK: It wasn’t my intention to ask you this but at an emotional level, a human level, what does that experience do to you?

RF: I think it's ridiculous for a journalist to talk about their experiences emotionally you know. We're talking about the massacre of people, we're talking about vast millions of refugees who are going through incredible human suffering and trying to keep their families alive. I think that if journalists are worried about their emotions you know they can fly home, business class if they like. I mean we don't count in this.

My feeling at the time was immense anger, and anger at Sharon who I've always believed was a war criminal and should have been tried. He almost was in Brussels but the Americans stopped that, of course, and every time I've been to Gaza since I've said this is Sabra and Shatila. It's not quite the same exactly although occasionally there were very clear parallels with massacres and of course, the Gaza wars when the Palestinians were killed they were killed directly by the Israelis; there was no militia involved. But I think Sabra and Shatila made me realise that if
you want to report the truth go ahead whatever the flack you get around you, but for heaven's sake name the guilty parties.

PK: And Sharon subsequently became prime minister so what, knowing...

RF: Yeah, when he died he was called a peace-maker (laugh). That was Sharon’s legacy. You’re a bad guy and you turned him into a good guy.

And remember Arafat who at the time of Camp David, he was the peace-maker and he ended up as a super terrorist, having begun life as a terrorist in Beirut. He became a super peace-maker and went home to Palestine and ended up in the Muqata Compound in Ramallah as a super terrorist and couldn’t even be buried in Jerusalem (laugh). It’s amazing how you flip between being a good guy and a bad guy isn’t it?

PK: Everyone we met in the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon said: we will return, if not us, then the next generation in 100 years, 200 years.

RF: Yeah. Look I’ve sat in refugee camps. I remember being in Nahr el Bared in the North of Lebanon in 1976, and we’re talking more than forty years ago now, and being told earnestly by this Palestinian family that well the crusaders were here for more than 100 years. We’ll go back, maybe not us but our descendants eventually, and I don’t think the world actually works like that now.

Some refugees go back if the west wants them to. The Kosovo Albanian Muslims went back to Kosovo, but if we’re not really that concerned... Do you think the Rahingyas are going to go back to Myanmar? I doubt it. Certainly, the Germans who were thrown out of Prussia, and eastern Germany, not without good reason in political terms, will never go back. It’s now part of Poland. The German Sudetens will never go back, because their ancestors played a role in Hitler’s takeover of Czechoslovakia. And look at all the Jews, some of whom ended up in Israel,
others in America who would never go back and in many cases wouldn’t want to go back to their original homes in Europe. Refugees by and large don’t go home and I was quite shocked once when I was doing a story about Syrian refugees in Lebanon to learn from the UN, not UN reports, but the actual UN people on the ground, both Western and Lebanese, that on average a third of refugees never leave the country they take refuge in.

That was a figure I constantly remembered when the million refugees, allegedly a million whatever they were, arrived in Europe across the Mediterranean in 2015, and across the sea from Turkey. You know refugees have a habit once they establish any kind of roots to stay where they are, and you can place your trust in international institutions - the UN, the EU, The World Trade Organisation, UN Health Bodies - but in the end it won’t get you home, and you can say well “I’ll fight for it”, yes but how? The 1948 war has been over a long time. I find it more and more difficult, you know you can find them and you’ve found them, but it’s more and more difficult to find Palestinians who are survivors of the Nakba, the “disaster” in Arabic, which happened in 1948/49.

PK: So, seventy years later, four generations later and they’re stuck in Shatila and...

RF: Well no, what’s happening in fact and this is going to happen with the Syrians over the years, Syrian Palestinians I’m talking about, and Syrian refugees themselves, is that slowly but surely through family members abroad in Australia, Canada, America, family members are leaving. So that in a sense their dispossession is finally being resolved in Israel’s favour because they’re not going to go home to Palestine, are they? They’re going to England, France, Canada, America, Australia, New Zealand.

And I reckon and I’m talking about Palestine NGOs who I see regularly in Beirut, that if there were 360,000 Palestinian refugees it could now be as low as 140,000 – 160,000. Now some of those refugees have
gone to Syria and have not come back again and, of course, there are Syrian Palestinian refugees who have arrived in Lebanon, but I think probably over a period of hundreds of years one might see a possibility that all these refugee communities outside what was Palestine - obviously the refugee camps in the West Bank, Gaza is a vast refugee camp - but Palestinians who fled to Syria and Lebanon, the families originally from the 1948/49 war, they will gradually emigrate to other parts of the world and thus will disappear as a Palestinian community.

The problem for the Israelis is the Palestinians who remain in Mandate Palestine, and for them, you see if the Israeli government is to be regarded as the representative of the Israeli People, the Israelis want their land and they are taking it. We call it settlements, they're colonies, a Jewish colonisation project, they're building homes for Jews and Jews only on Arab land across areas of the West Bank and they're not going to give it back and they don't intend to give it back and, therefore, there will not be a Palestine State.

PK: All the documents and other evidence the Palestinian refugees have of their previous lives, the keys to the doors, the deeds to the houses, the maps of their land, none of these are of any value?

RF: Well, do you think after the Protestant dispossession of the Catholics in the east of Ireland that Catholics who came to the gates of Protestant houses, some of them with very, very old documentation showing land ownership, do you think it got them home? I don't think it did, did it?

Once you have an occupying power and that occupying power starts to build colonies, that tends to be the end. You can see in some cases it hasn't worked out like that, the French in Algeria for example, that was a colonial project that didn’t work. But in Israel/Palestine whatever you want to call this entity which you can call Palestine or greater Israel or
smaller Israel, the Israelis are building and taking the land and Palestinians are losing the land.

I reckon that of the 22% of Palestine that’s left to the Arabs they have probably already lost at least 10% so they don’t have much, and the Palestinians in Lebanon who in theory have some kind of notion of returning, they’re not going to have any room for them in what’s left of the Palestinian State.

PK: And the deeds and keys etc?

RF: They will be kept in a museum (such as the Museum of Memories in Shatila Camp, Lebanon) which I visited several times and there they will remain in a museum. And one day like the Armenians who were dispossessed from their homes in the great genocide of 1915; they actually suffered a holocaust which the Palestinians did not, in the scale of World War Two, but in World War One. The Armenians were driven from their homelands; a million and a half were massacred by the Turks and they have never gone home. There is a little state there called Armenia but they’ve never gone back to their homes and now what do they have? You can meet their rich communities in Boston, and they have a museum and in the museums are little items from the homes that their great, great, grandfathers had in what is now Turkish Anatolia, eastern Turkey. It will be the same.

PK: Jared Kushner?

RF: A supporter of Jewish colonisation, yes absolutely.

PK: But he’s talking about a “deal of the century”, we don’t really know.

RF: It’s such a good deal we can’t find out what it is, yeah!

PK: Just so obviously we don’t know the details.
Well we know, we clearly know that the attempt to destroy UNRWA (the United Nations Relief and Works Agency – the UN agency for Palestinian refugees), the only major international institution that looks after Palestinian refugees, the idea is to crush it by withdrawing all money from it which the Americans have done.

The Trump regime as I call it is anxious to ensure that the only Palestinian refugees recognised will be the original refugees now in their eighties or nineties, or seventies perhaps, who fled Palestine. That their children and their children’s children and their great grand-children cannot be called refugees. Well what are they going to be called? Lebanese, no. Syrian, certainly not. Greeks, maybe one day. Americans? Canadians? Remember that the idea of taking over the West Bank which is what the Israelis are doing in their massive settlement, colonial project, is to destroy the notion of Palestine as an entity. Forget about state or nation, as an entity. I questioned Amira Hass, one of the finest Israeli Journalists, a friend of mine, some time ago about this. I said what is to become of the Palestinians and she said really “Robert I don’t know but they won’t leave, will they”?

So how do you get the Palestinians to leave what’s left of Palestine. All the Palestinians in the Lebanon can do is watch.

PK: Helplessly?

RF: Sorry?

PK: Helplessly?

RF: Well I suppose they can send a fraternal delegation to international institutions (laugh). No I mean there are a number of very wise and well-educated Palestinians in Beirut who still try to ameliorate Lebanese law which is deliberately constructed against Palestinian settlement of any kind, for demographic reasons but also because, for example, they don’t want any kind of settlement. If a Palestinian by chance
owns property in Lebanon he cannot pass it on to his Palestinian family, he’s got to sell it, and it cannot be sold to Palestinians.

So this dispossession, having originally happened seven decades ago is now still every day happening in Lebanon when the few refugees who had properties are losing them in Lebanon, the dispossession continues. And if you want to erase a people, Palestine Arabs, that’s how you do it. You make them go even further away.

PK: And is that your sense of what’s going to happen in the future?

RF: Well you see

PK: Will it be wiped out?

RF: Look it’s a question you have to put to the Israelis. Do they want to live in an internationally recognised, which they have, and internationally respected, which they don’t have, state called Israel, which lives in peace with its neighbours, including the state of Palestine all be it that’s only 22% of the original Palestine? Or do they want effectively to have a greater Israel, all the way to the Jordan river, in which case they’ll have a big Israel but they won’t have a democracy because if they want a democracy they’ve got to give a vote to all the Arab inhabitants, and if they do that it won’t be Israel anymore, so it’s do you want the land or do you want democracy, and it’s Israelis who make that decision.

And the Americans won’t do it for them because the Americans will do what they’re told by the Israelis and we all know the reasons for that and that’s a different story and a different movie, but you know you will find very courageous not necessarily Israeli Jews, but Jewish communities particularly in America, and Israeli Jews who speak up for the Palestinians and say there is no future for our Jewish people in an Israel which is a colonising state. There is no future for a free and democratic Israel in that kind of land, but if you look at the Jared Kushner’s of this world, if you look at the Trumps, if you look at the Israeli
government of people like Avigdor Lieberman who frankly is a fascist, these people are not open to that argument, they want the land and my view is they’ll get it one way or the other.

PK: So to conclude then Robert, is your sense that the state of Israel is there to stay?

RF: I thought that Yugoslavia was there to stay. (laugh).

Until I paid a visit and realised it wasn’t true. No, I go to Israel, I fly into Tel Aviv Airport, and you know it looks a very modern State, not only is its economy extraordinary, not only is it state-of-the-art computer science, a remarkable achievement for the Israeli people, the Jewish people of Israel whichever you know definition you want, and when I go to Israel, you see, I automatically go to left-wing Israelis, or liberal Israelis, or former members of the Labour Party or perhaps just, you know, activists who want to see a liberal, democratic Israel within more or less the original boundaries of Israel, and they want Palestine to have a state.

And when you’ve been to see five or six of these people and you’ve had coffee with them, Israeli men and women, some of whom of course are dying out now, the years go by for them too, you can say well ok well maybe this is the Israel, I could believe it and would like to believe it, you know Israel has a right to exist, etc, etc. But then I get on the bus from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem and the people on the bus don’t want to speak or think about the Palestinians. They would like them to go away. And these are the people who elect the government, and the problem is, you see, when you have a State that still doesn’t have a border, where is the eastern border of Israel, is it in Jerusalem, is it east of Jerusalem, is it on the Jordan river, or beyond? I mean when Israel says, you know, does Israel have a right to exist, I always say well show me the borders.

If the borders of Israel do not include the West Bank, yes - but if it includes the West Bank including Ramallah, Jericho, Hebron, then I don’t
think that country has the legal right to exist, it doesn’t exist, it’s not accepted internationally as that. If the United Kingdom says, you know, do we have a right to exist and our territory includes Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales and England, I say yes, sure, but if the map of the United Kingdom includes the Republic of Ireland and shows Cork and Dublin as British cities I say no, it does not have a right to that existence.

PK: So, it’s a question I ask pretty much everybody and I’m sure you’ve been asked this several times, do you recognise the State of Israel?

RF: I just told you – it has a right to exist.

It’s all about the borders. When the Israelis can show me, when I can sit down with an Israeli foreign ministry official, as I often do when I go to Jerusalem and say show me the eastern border, when you show me the actual borders of Israel, then I can tell you whether I think that’s the Israel that exists or not.

PK: But…..

RF: Israel does exist as a state and internationally it is recognised as such within the original borders of the Israeli state as recognised by the UN, by foreign governments and so on. But if it then says the West Bank belongs to us and these vast Israeli colonisation projects are part of Israel, I’m sorry that is not the Israel that exists on anybody’s map except the Israelis.

PK: And in the context...

RF: They haven’t been decided, it not clarified, no one is asking anyone to make them clear, they’re not there.

According, if you look at Israeli maps, you will not find that border marked as an international frontier, until it is who are we to try and answer the question, does Israel exist? It does clearly, and does it
have a right to exist – yes. The UN gave it the right to exist. The UN voted for the state of Israel. It may not have been just to the Arabs that that happened but it is legal. But when you then say “oh but Israel also includes the following territories”, well hang on a minute, you know.

I mean if the British decided to revoke the treaty and came back and sent the British Army into the Republic of Ireland and say well we haven’t quite decided the borders yet, does the United Kingdom have a right to exist in these circumstances. It raises very serious questions. It’s for the Israelis to decide it they exist, not me.

PK: And then in that context then you know the much debated one state, two state solution?

RF: Ah it’s gone beyond it, there won’t be a two-state solution. There will not be a one state if by that you mean a democratic state including the Arabs, and the two-state solution is finished. If you go to the West Bank it’s impossible, if Israel is going to keep these vast areas of lands for their own people, not for Arabs, then it will not be, there cannot be a viable, let alone a secure Palestine state. It’s not going to happen and we haven’t even mentioned Gaza.

In Mandate Palestine as it was ruled by the British, they had their own Palestinian stamps, they had Palestinian pound notes, with one Palestine pound written on it in Arabic, Hebrew and English and they had a Palestinian administration. Palestine as a State did exist as a working entity under the British. It was a floating State in the sense that the British were bound by promises to ensure there was going to be a Jewish homeland which in effect meant a State there and were also bound by that same promise to make sure there wasn’t going to be an Arab State inside the Israeli State or homeland. But of course, you know many of these promises, in fact many of the peace treaties that we are suffering from today were made in a time of war when you can’t actually make peace treaties, and in the First World War I don’t – there were British politicians
in the First World War who said what are we sowing in Palestine, what are we sowing in the Middle East when this First World War is over, they spotted that there was going to be a problem.

Lloyd George spoke in parliament about this in the 1920s and 1930s about what had happened and how the British never thought what they were giving birth to in terms of war and bloodshed, pain and suffering in the Middle East.

PK: You say that the Palestinians are never going back and most likely over generations will emigrate all around the world. In the meantime, there are a lot of young people within the camps and it’s very hard to get work, very hard to get education. What’s their life going to be like into the future - do they sit there and wait and wait until they are old men and old women?

RF: Well I mean you’re talking specifically about Lebanon, now before the war in Syria Palestinians had a much easier life in Syria than they did in Lebanon; they could own properties, they had Syrian passports, they could be Syrian citizens. I suppose that some of these young people will hope that a new Syria will in some way emerge from the devastation of the 2011 war, 2011 to the present, that they might go and live there, but you see at the end of the day it’s very difficult to make a whole people move to another country and not demand that their country is going to be there and the Syrians do not want a Palestinian state in Syria.

You have Palestinians living there like you have Armenians in Beirut, the Armenians are refugees who actually have seats in parliament, and they are Lebanese but they are not of such numbers as to threaten the demographic balance in Lebanon. You know they are Christians too which means that the Christians would not be against the Armenians. I think the real problem is that refugeedom and I think the Balfour Declaration was a hand-book for refugeedom, it is intended to dispossess the Arab Muslims in Palestine, and that was its purpose at the end of the day.
It certainly achieved it whether it was its purpose or not and I think that the problem is that we create refugees very quickly wherever they are in the world, and we then think ok now they’ve got camps, they can be fed, they can be educated, pitifully, but they can be educated, and they are not being massacred, except on rare occasions, it’s over, and then we westerners look around for more refugee communities to protect you see.

But the idea that they have rights, national rights as well as human rights, i.e. to live without being murdered, or to eat or whatever, we don’t go that far, we don’t see that, that’s for the diplomats, that’s for the statesmen or the politicians, and the United Nations - and that will do them no good. And by and large refugee populations do not go home, unless there is a specific international mandate militarily to ensure that they do. The west did that in Kosovo, but they did not do that in Bosnia. If you go to Bosnia and, I’ve just been there again, the front lines are still there as the war ended.

PK: But even if they don’t go home, don’t they still retain the right to go home?

RF: On whose laws? The problem is, you see, that it’s all very well to say we have the right to return, that’s where I was born, that’s where my parents come from, that’s where my grand-parents come from. Fine, but how far back does it go, time continues, does time, does the right to return finish when the original refugees are all dead?

RF: Do we switch homelands off? Do we switch events off from having effects?

Because every Armenian genocide victim is now dead. I met a lot of them but they’re all dead now, does that switch off the right for the Armenians if they wanted to say I’d like to go back to where my grandparents lived? You know do we stop recognising the great epic
suffering of peoples because there’s no survivors left? Do we start allowing people to deny the Jewish holocaust because soon there will be no survivors of the Jewish holocaust left? You know there is an integrity to memory, not just national rights, but memory, and there was a place called Palestine, and that is the problem for the Israelis and for the world - there was a place called Palestine.

PK: And do you have an answer to those questions?

RF: No. No. I’ve no answers.

PK: So, we live with the question.

RF: I report it. (laugh). I’m not a solver of political problems. All you can do as a journalist is to tell people so they can never say we didn’t know. They might forget, but they can’t say they weren’t told.

PK: So, you’re not into prescription.

RF: No, I have lots of colleagues who probably are. No, I can say what might not work and I could probably say what will happen. No, because we live in this sort of easy happy clappy internet world we look for solutions, two plus two equals four, normally, but there aren’t solutions to these great questions of history, there may be settlements but there aren’t solutions.

PK: And there’s no solution to the Palestinian situation?

RF: What is it?

One state, two state solution is fantasy now, two states is not going to happen and one state because it can’t. I don’t know, it’s an untold tragedy which will continue long after we’re gone from the world, and all the survivors will be memories too. I don’t know the answer, I really don’t. I think about it of course. I’m writing now in my new book at the moment,
I’m writing a section on Palestine and Israel itself and it’s three chapters, and I’m just reaching the end of the third chapter and I’m looking at two features that happened and it’s not really in the remit of your film – one was the International UN enquiry into what happened in the Gaza war of 2008-09, and Judge Richard Goldstone a fine man, effectively said that Israel committed war crimes and he then recanted under great family pressure. I think that was a great betrayal of the Palestinians who told of their suffering to him, and at the same time, where my chapter ends is about a Palestine doctor who lost his three daughters in the shelling of Gaza in 2008-09 – one of their heads was cut off in front of him, she was decapitated by a shell, and he made his future in Canada running charitable medical institutions for both Jews and Arabs in Palestine. So you have this immensely powerful figure of Goldstone who betrayed the Palestinians even though he is….., and I knew him very well because I interviewed him at great lengths about Bosnia, and the war crimes in Bosnia when he was a Judge in the International Tribunal for Bosnia, and he betrayed those people, and the Palestinian who lost his family did not betray his people, but he didn’t betray the Israelis either because he speaks fluent Hebrew and he was a doctor in an Israeli hospital. What lesson do you learn from that?

PK: On that note, thank you very much.

RF: You are welcome.
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IT’S TIME FOR THE WEALTHIEST ONE PERCENT TO START PAYING THEIR WAY

STEPHEN MCCLOSKEY

Abstract: An alarming new report from Oxfam points to extreme levels of global economic and social inequality ten years on from the international financial crisis. This is largely attributed to the under-taxing of the world’s wealthiest one per cent, cuts to public services and gender discrimination. The article argues that it’s time for the one percent to start paying their way.
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An economically divided world
An Oxfam briefing paper on the global economy published to coincide with the World Economic Forum held in Davos in January 2019, suggests that a generation of reckless financial deregulation, wealth accumulation by the world’s richest one percent and the rolling back of essential state services has resulted in extreme levels of social and economic inequality (Oxfam, 2019). The report headline (2019: 10) is that in the decade since the 2008 global financial crisis the number of billionaires has nearly doubled and their wealth has increased by $900bn in the last year alone, or $2.5bn a day. In the same period, the wealth of the poorest half of humanity, 3.8 billion people, has fallen by 11 percent (Ibid). Put another way, this means that just 26 billionaires – down from 43 in 2017 - own the same wealth as the poorest half of humanity (Ibid). To quantify this wealth in development terms, the report says that Jeff Bezos, owner of Amazon, has amassed a fortune of $112 billion (Ibid). Just one percent of this sum equates to the entire health budget of Ethiopia (Ibid). In
summary, rich and poor are becoming increasingly polarised and wealth is concentrating in fewer hands.

Oxfam argues that one of the main reasons for this grotesque distortion of wealth distribution is the under-taxing of the super-rich who it suggests are secreting a sum in the region of $7.6 trillion off-shore (2019: 12). The report argues for ‘a new set of global rules and institutions to fundamentally redesign the tax system to make it fair’ (2019: 7). But tax avoidance is just one factor underpinning inequality that is captured in Oxfam’s report; two other significant drivers of poverty are gender discrimination and the erosion of public services.

**Gender inequality**

Globally, women earn 23 percent less than men and in the United States single white men own one hundred times more than single Hispanic women (2019: 14). Oxfam argues that where the poverty gap is greater between rich and poor so is the level of inequality between men and women. The report calculates that if all the unpaid work carried out by women and girls everyday such as caring, cooking and cleaning, was delivered by a single company, it would have an annual turnover of $10 trillion (Ibid). That would represent an income 43 times greater than that of multinational giant Apple (Ibid) but goes undocumented in the development indices and reportage of most multilateral development organisations that rely on the blunt economic instrument of Gross Domestic Product. What is also largely ignored is the stolen time from women, particularly on low incomes, who are denied opportunities to take-up education, political and economic opportunities that would support both individual and community development.

Oxfam make clear that disinvestment in public services as a result of neoliberal ‘reforms’ has also been a significant contributor to gender inequality. The report says:
“The economic rules have been written by rich and powerful men in their own interests. The neo-liberal economic model of today has made this worse – cuts to public services, cut to taxes for the richest individuals and corporations, and a race to the bottom on wages have all hurt women more than men” (Ibid).

Investment in public services not only narrows the gender poverty gap but enhances the development prospects of communities on the coalface of neoliberalism in the global North and South. Health, education and social protection are identified by Oxfam as critical to overcoming the barriers to inequality and enlarging the life opportunities for the millions of people on low incomes.

Today nearly half of the world’s people (3.4 billion) live on less than $5.50 day while the wealthy are persistently under-taxed (Oxfam, 2019: 6). Just 4 cents in every dollar of tax revenue comes from the rich and in some countries, including the UK and Brazil, the poorest 10 percent are paying proportionately as much tax as the richest 10 percent (Oxfam, 2019: 12). This situation is untenable as increasing numbers of the working poor are forced into poverty. As the UN Rapporteur’s report (Alston 2018) on austerity in the United Kingdom (UK) made clear last year, the decade following the 2008 financial crisis has been characterised by increasing poverty in the global North. For example, The Trussell Trust distributed 1.3 million three-day emergency food supplies in the UK to people in crisis between April 2017 and March 2018, a 13 per cent increase on 2017, with 484,026 of these supplies going to children (The Trussell Trust, 2018). Our economy is broken and Oxfam urges a realignment of taxes to ensure the wealthy pay their way. The report calculates that a modest 0.5 percent tax rise on the income of the richest 1 percent would raise sufficient revenue to educate all 262 million children currently out of school and provide healthcare for 3.3 million people (Oxfam, 2019: 12).
Sustainable Development Goals
Governments, civil society movements and development NGOs are pinning their hopes for a more equal society on the 17 Sustainable Development Goals agreed in 2015 ‘to end poverty, protect the planet and ensure that all people enjoy peace and prosperity’ by 2030 (UNDP, 2019). But are the SDGs designed and equipped to address the fundamental questions about wealth accumulation and distribution raised by the Oxfam report and can they ensure that vital public services can be fully funded and available to all who need them? In short, can the SDGs resist the tide of neoliberalism and rein in the power of private companies and wealthy individuals? The Goals themselves suggest not and appear contradictory. For example, Goal 13 calls for ‘urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts’ while Goal 8 seeks to ‘Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all’ (Ibid). As Hickel (2015) says of this apparent contradiction:

“All of this reflects awareness that something about our economic system has gone terribly awry. The pursuit of endless industrial growth is chewing through our living planet, producing poverty and threatening our existence. And yet the core of the SDG programme for development and poverty reduction relies precisely on the old model of industrial growth — ever-increasing levels of extraction, production, and consumption”.

There are significant doubts, therefore, as to whether the SDGs can bridge the current poverty gap while working within the same old tried and failed neoliberal economic model. There have been no indications to date that the wealthiest one percent is interested in more proportionate and fair tax contributions; that goes against their neoliberal grain. Oxfam make three sensible key recommendations based on the evidence of their report (2019: 7). First, the delivery of ‘free universal healthcare, education and other public services that also work for women and girls’. 
Easier said than done but made more possible with the implementation of the second recommendation to ‘end the under-taxation of rich individuals and corporations’ which could potentially liberate billions more in revenue for the public purse. And, thirdly, to ease the millions of unpaid hours that women spend ‘caring for their families and homes’.

The stark alternatives are: deeper poverty among the working poor, particularly women; a greater disconnect between people and the politicians that represent them; more support for the populist right; and greater social upheaval resulting from the economic pressures of austerity and welfare reform. As the Oxfam puts it: ‘Today’s levels of inequality and poverty are a choice. We can continue to choose to reward those who are already rich or we can choose to fight inequality and end poverty’ (Oxfam, 2019: 31).
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UNDERSTANDING GLOBAL SKILLS FOR 21ST CENTURY PROFESSIONALS

Review by Glenn Strachan


This book is a significant contribution to the debate on skills for graduates and professionals and the debate on pedagogical approaches for delivering skills education. Douglas Bourn combines an extensive review of the literature, initiatives, and policies relating to skills education with his own experience of teaching and research in the field. The stated general aim of the book is to generate debate about the current and future skills required by professionals operating in the context of globalisation. It does this by addressing a range of issues including the following: the breaking down of the divisions between various categorisations of skills, such as technical skills, soft skills, cognitive skills, employment related skills and personal skills; the highlighting of how education policy on the skills lags behind the current skills demanded of professionals; and the critiquing of examples of skills education and identifying examples of good practice. Bourn presents his own conceptual Framework of Global Skills before exploring what he considers to be key professional areas that have been impacted by globalisation. This then leads to a discussion on lessons that can be drawn from the pedagogical approaches that have emerged in education for sustainable development and, finally, to skills for global social change in the context of current and future global challenges.

The book has thirteen chapters divided into an Introduction and four distinct but related Parts. The structure of the book is clear and the numerous sub-headings within chapters are useful signposts for the
reader. The writing is excellent in the sense that this is an academic book discussing complex concepts in some depth in a style that is accessible. The Introduction sets out the context for the book in terms of the skills agenda and the scope of the literature; the latter is reviewed in detail in subsequent chapters. The book is written from a Western and particularly a United Kingdom (UK) perspective, but is focused on discussing skills for a globalised world. The author uses Part I of the book to clarify some of the terminology that is central to the main argument. This includes reviewing the concept of ‘globalisation’, the narrow and broad ways in which the term ‘skills’ is used, and the relationship between skills and competencies. Bourn critically reviews a wide range of skills classifications and the way in which they are used. He criticises the focus from some quarters on hard employability skills, which he argues is an out-dated approach given the requirements of some multi-national employers and the current working environment for many professionals. Influential organisations in relation to the skills agenda such as the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) and UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation) are introduced into the discussion, particularly in relation to their role in promoting a broader range of soft skills such as teamwork and problem-solving and socio-emotional skills.

Part II of the book explores the conceptualisation of global skills and in particular the difference between the frameworks of 21st century skills, as presented by the likes of Trilling and Fadel (2009), British Council (2016) and Wagner (2010), and Bourn’s view of global skills. Common themes emerge in relation to some of the skills that should be in a global skills framework such as skills for an uncertain world, critical thinking and systemic thinking, and inter-cultural understanding. The scale of the skillset required by today’s graduates who want to move into working within a global company is highlighted in a quotation from Think Global which presents a typical director’s comment suggesting that ‘The
people that succeed can work in multi-disciplinary, multi-cultural and multi-locational teams’ (Think Global, 2011:2).

The last chapter in Part II is entitled ‘A Conceptual Framework for Global Skills’. From looking at the contents page of the book and from the early chapters the reader may well feel that this chapter is the kernel of this book, because after further analytical review of the literature relating to global skills, Bourn presents his own, new Framework for Global Skills. This Framework draws heavily on the discussion of the literature on 21st century skills and global skills, and Bourn’s own research. The Framework consists of the following seven conceptual areas:

- An ability to see the connections between what is happening in your own community and in the communities of people elsewhere in the world.
- Recognition of what it means to live and work in a global society and of the value of having a broad global outlook that respects, listens to and values perspectives other than one’s own.
- An ability to understand the impact of global forces on one’s life and the lives of other people, and what this means in terms of a sense of place in the world.
- Understanding of the value of ICT and how best to use it, in a way that is self-reflective and critical, that questions data and information.
- Openness to the continued process of self-reflection, critical dialogue and questioning of one’s own assumptions about the world.
- An ability to work with others who may have different viewpoints and perspectives, being prepared to change one’s opinions as a result of working with others, and seeking cooperative and participatory ways of working.
- Confidence, belief and willingness to seek a more just and sustainable world.
Each of these areas is briefly expanded upon with reference to the previous discussions to justify their place in the Framework.

In Part III of the book, Bourn discusses the concept of the global graduate in relation to four professional areas he identifies as having been impacted by globalisation. These areas are business, teaching, engineering and health, with a chapter devoted to each. These chapters continue to reference a range of literature, but they also include examples of initiatives and training programmes that expand the discussion into the pedagogical approaches for skills education. Having presented his Global Skills Framework there might be an expectation that Bourn would use the Framework as part of the analysis in these four chapters, but only brief references are made to it. This lack of application of the Framework is referred to in the concluding chapter of the book and is mentioned later in this review.

Chapters eleven to thirteen constitute the final part of the book, Part IV. Chapter eleven is primarily concerned with education for sustainable development. The relevance of this chapter results from the emergence of sustainable development within education policy in the last 20 years and the close relationship between sustainability skills and global skills. Because of the common pedagogical roots in development education, there is considerable overlap in the pedagogical approaches and debates around sustainable development education and global skills. However, in concluding this chapter Bourn laments the lack of ‘dialogue between sustainability and global academic and practitioner groupings’. Chapter twelve is entitled ‘Global Skills for Global Social Change’ and in many ways it re-affirms and justifies the purpose of the book and the importance of engaging with the concept of global skills, because it argues that the broad approach of global skills as reflected in the stronger social purpose of the Global Skills Framework can influence social change that can, in turn, contribute to addressing some of the global crises. The pedagogical approach is particularly important in this context and the
chapter draws on the transformative learning theory of Jack Mezirow and the critical pedagogy theory of Henry Giroux. The concluding chapter highlights the fact that too many educational debates have failed to address the impact of social and political changes around the world hence the need for this book to trigger increased debate on global skills.

According to the author the reason that the Global Skills Framework was presented but not applied in any significant way to the examples selected, was to generate further discussion in this field. However, applying the Framework may well have increased the potential engagement of the reader and highlighted issues for discussion. Bourn also acknowledges that he has not touched on the measurement or the assessment of global skills in this volume, suggesting that each of these topics are worthy of books in their own right. This is certainly the case, but incorporating links to issues associated with these important aspects of global skills education would have been a useful addition to this book.

With his Global Skills Framework Bourn claims to be pushing the concept of global skills to a deeper level, and making an attempt to break away from the neo-liberal employability view of skills that has dominated much of the policy debate. The extent to which he succeeds is open for the reader to decide. He certainly raises the prominence of socio-cultural skills; makes a case for breaking down the divide between skills for employment and skills for life; and poses some fundamental questions about the purpose of education and the role of skills. The book has a lot to offer anyone involved in skills education in further education, higher education or continuing professional development and that includes policy-makers, educators, awarding bodies and researchers. The review of the literature is substantial and provides a great deal of evidence for supporting developments in the area of skills education. The arguments and discussions raise issues that should concern all educators and policy-makers engaged in development education.
References


Glenn Strachan is a consultant in sustainable development and education, a tutor on the Education for Sustainability MSc at London South Bank University and Chair of the Shared Earth Trust. E-mail; glenn@glennstrachan.co.uk