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ABSTRACT

A PEDAGOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR GLOBALCITIZENSHIP EDUCATION: THEMES, OBJECTIVES, AND METHODS FOR TEACHING CONFLICT AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL

Tara Nuth Kajtaniak

A strong rationale exists for the creation of learning objectives for secondary global citizenship education in North America, specifically pertaining to conflict, war, and terrorism. This pedagogical framework proposes themes, objectives, and methods/attitudes for teaching and consists of two parts. Themes and learning objectives contained in this framework include humanitarianism and humanitarian intervention, gender and conflict, conflict’s colonial origins and legacies, Western complicity in global conflict, the role of identity and ideology in conflict and terrorism, and cultural demystification as conflict prevention. Methods and attitudes for teaching conflict include the following: challenging students’ assumptions; shifting binary ways of thinking; contextualizing conflict and connecting the global to the local; teaching to think vs. teaching to act; and addressing the complexity of conflict.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Global education policy discourse in the United States dates back to the post-World War II era, but efforts for consistent practice of global education have yet to materialize. Meanwhile, young Americans significantly lack knowledge about the world and issues of global significance. This is of great concern given increased global interconnectedness, increased economic competitiveness, the persistence of human rights abuses, and the exacerbation of global problems such as climate change and health issues.

There are many ways to define global citizenship as well as conflicting views of global citizenship pedagogy. However, enough common themes exist in these discourses to begin setting the stage for the consistent practice of global citizenship education. Given the current climate of academic standardization in the United States, this project is a step towards the creation of academic and skills standards that specifically address global citizenship and global competence.

For this project, I decided to create a pedagogical framework for global citizenship education focused on teaching violent conflict to secondary students, specifically a set of themes and specific learning objectives that can be explored in social science, English, and/or interdisciplinary global studies programs. Specific learning objectives are followed by discussion of rationale as well as practical applications in the secondary classroom. Because a number of interesting methodology considerations also
emerged during the course of this research, the second half of the framework is a discussion of methods and teacher-attitudes for teaching conflict.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

History of Global Education in the United States

Global education in the United States has its roots in the post-World-War-II era (Sutton, 1998). The war exposed the military and civilians alike to other cultures and nations, witnessed the end of European colonialism which placed the United States in position as a world leader, and brought hope for peaceful future conflict resolution through the newly-created United Nations (Sutton, 1998). Furthermore, both the United States and Europe experienced an increase in ethnic and cultural diversity during the post-war period as a result of the waning of colonization as immigrants left their native lands to improve their economic livelihoods (Banks, 2004). As all of these changes transformed the West, educators responded to this new sense of international community (Sutton, 1998).

The lessons of unchecked nationalism prompted the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to publish the first official international-oriented curriculum in 1949 through a series of books entitled Towards World Understanding that guided educators in the promotion of world peace and internationalism (Sutton, 1998). The term “world-minded” was used to describe this type of education until the beginning of the Cold War, when the fear of communism pushed national interests to the forefront of education (Sutton, 1998). In the 1950s, the
term world-minded was replaced by “international understanding” out of fear that the former implied the idea of one world-government (Sutton, 1998). By the late 1950s, anticommunism became a focal point in education and largely replaced global education with the exception of content that was relevant to knowing-thy-enemy (Sutton, 1998).

Major shifts in global and multicultural education in the United States occurred in the 1960s (Banks, 2004; Sutton, 1998). The Civil Right Movement triggered ethnic revitalization movements, not just in the United States, but around the world, through which marginalized people began demanding that their histories and cultures be reflected in official curriculum (Banks, 2004). The 1960s also brought images of the earth from space, emphasizing the interconnectedness of the world and global unity rather than national isolation (Sutton, 1998). In 1966, Congress passed the International Education Act, but despite this new consciousness of global interconnectedness, it was never funded (Sutton, 1998). Then in 1969, the United States Office of Education commissioned a study on the needs and priorities of international education (Becker, 1969). Although the study identified knowledge, skills, and attitudes that contribute to global awareness, federal funding for global education was still not forthcoming (Becker, 1969; Sutton, 1998).

Global education received a tremendous amount of attention in the 1970s, with national professional organizations, state departments of education, and schools of education providing curriculum and teacher training (Sutton, 1998). Funding also came from a variety of organizations and the federal government (Sutton, 1998). New textbooks in the social sciences slowly began to incorporate global education, but not
Study*, was labeled atheist and communist by opponents, and was later also criticized for
its pedagogy as well, sparking a Congressional debate in 1975 (Sutton, 1998).

During the 1980s, the collapse of the Soviet Union shifted emphasis on
economics, rather than world-mindedness, as the justification for global education
(Sutton, 1998). Although a wealth of resources were available to teachers in the 1980s,
global education still failed to become part of the mainstream pre-collegiate curriculum
(Sutton, 1998). Funding for global education declined in the 1980s, and basic-skills-
competency and the beginning of the movement towards standardized testing further
undercut social studies curriculum in general (Sutton, 1998). Furthermore, criticisms of
certain global studies curriculum, on the grounds that it was leftist and anti-free-market,
continued to mount (Sutton, 1998). The 1990s brought globalization to the forefront of
international political discourse; however global education in the 21st century still
remains on the periphery with its strength being a function of the will of individual
teachers (Sutton, 1998). Meanwhile, as the world becomes more and more competitive
and interconnected, students in the United States continue to lack global knowledge and
skills to prepare them for the world’s current and future challenges.

*Rationale for Global Citizenship Education in North America*

Global economic competitiveness is a common rationale for globally-oriented
education in North America (Howald, 2012; Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2011;
Stewart, 2012). More than 3 billion people in India, China, and the former Soviet Union
have entered the work force since 1990, and their sights are set on developing prosperous middle classes through highly skilled and competitive work forces (Stewart, 2012).

Some research posits that the United States cannot maintain its standard of living unless it provides its citizens with an education system that enables them to compete and cooperate on a global scale (Howald, 2012; Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2011; Stewart, 2012). In December 2010, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development released its Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) results, and American students scored significantly below those in other developed countries (Stewart, 2012). Meanwhile, 21st century jobs require higher levels of education, sophisticated problem-solving skills, and communication skills that cross national boundaries (Stewart, 2012). While global education standards have changed along with the transformation of skills and global knowledge necessary to be successful, the education system in North America has remained stagnant (Stewart, 2012)

Human rights issues and global social and environmental justice is another rationale for global citizenship education (Abdi & Sculz, 2008; Eidoo et al., 2007; Harth, 2010; Yamashita, 2006). The post-World War II promise of world peace has yet to be seen despite the fact that in 1948, the United Nations adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Since its adoption, all of its 30 articles have been violated on every continent in the world (Abdi & Schulz, 2008). The increasing interconnectedness of the world brings a profound ability for people to either help or hurt others throughout the globe (Harth, 2010). Despite the fact that 85% percent of the world is composed of non-Western cultures, citizens of the West—in particular of the United States, due to its
position of power in the world—have a significant role to play in either contributing to or alleviating problems around the world including global environmental destruction, economic instability, poverty, political turmoil, among others (Harth, 2010).

An abundance of evidence exists that shows that young Americans simply do not know a lot about the world outside of their own cultural spheres (Harth, 2005). The most recent graduates of American educational institutions are unprepared for the global world as evidenced by their lack of knowledge about global economic issues, contexts of world events, and human and political geographies (National Geographic & Roper Public Affairs, 2006). In a comprehensive survey of global knowledge, young Americans between the ages of 18 and 24 answered about half of the questions correctly (National Geographic & Roper Public Affairs, 2006). About 37% of young Americans cannot find Iraq on a map, 60% do not speak a foreign language, 20% believe that Sudan is an Asian country, and almost half believe that Islam is the majority religion of India (National Geographic & Roper Public Affairs, 2006). In addition, about half of young Americans cannot find New York on a map (National Geographic & Roper Public Affairs, 2006). In terms of how the United States fits into the world economically, young people are also lacking basic knowledge; 75% of young Americans think that English is the most widely-spoken language in the world rather than Mandarin, and 71% are unaware that the United States is the largest exporter of goods and services rather than China (National Geographic & Roper Public Affairs, 2006). Most young people in America do not believe that this kind of geographic knowledge is absolutely necessary (National Geographic & Roper Public Affairs, 2006).
Young Americans not only lack global knowledge, but they also lack a drive to engage in crucial world events (Zhang, Hui-Yin, & Wang, 2010). In comparison to high school students in China, American high school students place less importance on becoming global citizens and find less enjoyment in global-awareness-related events (Zhang, Hui-Yin, & Wang, 2010). Chinese students tend to study abroad more than American students and show more understanding and respect for different cultures (Zhang, Hui-Yin, & Wang, 2010). Chinese students also pay closer attention to international news and information than American students (Zhang, Hui-Yin, & Wang, 2010).

The United States’ position of power in the world brings a responsibility to its educators to prepare students who are reflective and prepared to confront the challenges of the globalized world (Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005; Harth, 2010; Stewart, 2011). Furthermore, schools are perfect places to promote social justice within the local and global communities (Abdi & Schulz, 2008). Schools are also places where people learn how to be inclusive, gain the courage to confront injustice, and live in diverse communities (Abdi & Shulz, 2008). However, less than one-half of schools in the United States offer opportunities to develop global competencies (Reimers, 2009). Educational materials are overwhelmingly Eurocentric and work to reinforce Western ideals and consumerism without offering alternative ways to view the world (Pike, 2008b). Although new forms of citizenship are blossoming as a result of a more globalized political landscape, national citizenship and the nation-state are still dominant forces in education (Davies, Evans & Reid, 2005). Policy-makers call for scientific and
technological literacies, but the advocacy for global literacy tends to be muted (Pike, 2008b).

While scientific and technological literacy is important, it is equally essential to have both an understanding of the forces that shape human life and the ability to positively shape our individual and collective future (Pike, 2008b). An education system responsible for preparing global citizens updates its core subjects to include non-Western cultural awareness, geography, political science, economics, and multidisciplinary global-issue-oriented classes (Harth, 2010). However, entirely new forms of education are necessary rather than just tying together the different academic disciplines (Davies, Evans & Reid, 2005). There is an abundance of theoretical conversations about global citizenship education, but all too often, theory becomes an end to itself (Guilerme, 2006). As Henry Giroux notes, citizenship education must make the connections between theory and practice as well as reflection and action (Guilerme, 2006). Finding a common ground on how global citizenship is defined is the first step in the creation of a practical framework for global citizenship education.

Global Citizenship Defined

Global citizenship is defined in so many ways by so many scholars and organizations that it risks slipping from a framework for action into pure abstraction (Davies, 2006). The traditional view of citizenship denotes a national identity and commitment, as well as the rights and responsibilities, of a person who belongs to a
nation (Carter, 2001). However, on a global level, the exertion of citizenship rights in the
traditional sense is all but impossible, giving the term *global citizenship* a metaphoric
quality (Davies, 2006). Nevertheless, the concept is defined by political science and
education theorists the world over and even serves as the framework of national
secondary education standards in the United Kingdom (Pike, 2008a).

Global citizenship is foundational to an Oxfam curriculum guide, which defines it
as thinking critically about complex global issues, understanding how the world works,
and being willing to take action to make the world a just and equitable place (Oxfam,
2007). Another definition brings in a local dimension to the global citizenship concept:
global citizenship, which is more than just an understanding of complex global issues,
also includes the global dimension to local issues (Brownlie, 2001). These definitions
view the citizen as an activist who takes action to address global poverty and engages in
debates about global economic structures (Carter, 2001). Unlike these definitions that
take a social justice stance, the neoliberal view bases global citizenship on the individual
rights of consumers and their entitlement to acquire material possessions and wealth from
throughout the world (Carter, 2001).

Global citizenship can also be understood on a spectrum of four definitions that
range from vague to precise (Heater, 1997). “Member of the human race” (belonging to
a world community) is the most vague definition on the spectrum (Heater, 1997, p. 36).
Next is “responsibility for the condition of the planet,” or global activism, that would be
applicable to people such as members of Greenpeace or Amnesty International (Heater,
1997, p. 36). A more precise definition is “individual subject to moral law” such as
international laws and tribunals (Heater, 1997, p. 36). Finally, the most precise definition is the “promotion of world government” (Heater, 1997, p. 36). This definition would likely be employed by those promoting a global democracy (Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005).

The work of Henry Giroux shows a deep concern for the role of the citizen in a globalized world and his ideas of global citizenship reflect an aspiration for global democracy (Guilherme, 2006). Citizenship includes the notion of responsibility not just to nations, but to each other as human beings (Guilherme, 2006). According to Giroux, “A globalised notion of citizenship extends that concept of the social contract beyond the boundaries of the nation-state, invoking a broader notion of democracy in which the global becomes the space for exercising civic courage, social responsibility, politics, and compassion for the plight of others.” (Guilherme, 2006, pp. 164). Giroux’s definition of global citizenship offers the hope that people will be empowered to shape international trade laws in order to check uncontrolled global economic power (Guilherme, 2006). Furthermore, Giroux contends that global citizenship is not merely concerned with political rights, but with narrowing the gap between the promise and the reality of global democracy (Guilherme, 2006).

A practical framework for global citizenship education must weigh the various definitions of global citizenship and determine which is the most appropriate and accessible for use in the secondary education classroom. Likewise, one must also evaluate the various ways in which global citizenship education is theorized.
Contested ideas and robust debate characterize global citizenship education theory (Eidoo et al., 2011; Fanghanel & Cousin, 2012; Wright, 2012). This debate can be framed as a polarized dichotomy between multiculturalist theory and postcolonial theory (Fanghanel & Cousin, 2012). Multiculturalism has historically meant an inclusion approach to curriculum that views North America as a cultural mosaic (Andreotti et al., 2010). Over the past 20 years, multiculturalism has emerged as a way of teaching the importance of multiple identities in terms of race, class, and gender in our diverse democratic society (Torres, 1998). The multiculturalist approach to global citizenship education respects differences and seeks to promote diversity appreciation as well as local cultures and knowledge (Fanghanel & Cousin, 2012).

In general, the postcolonial approach to conceptualizing global citizenship education can be characterized by critique (Fanghanel & Cousin, 2012). From this perspective, global citizenship education is another attempt to Westernize the world by spreading Western ideas and values to the non-Western world under the guise of unity (Fanghanel & Cousin, 2012). Critical of the multiculturalist approach to global citizenship education, postcolonial theory contends that the inclusive cultural mosaic concept tokenizes minorities and creates a culture of benevolence among the dominant group that is kind enough to include them (Andreotti et al., 2010). Discourse that is overly focused on celebration of diversity often ignores the ways that the dominant culture defines otherness (Eidoo et al., 2011). Postcolonial theory contends that if the
complexity of local/global economic and cultural processes and contexts is not fully understood, then global citizenship education could be in danger of promoting a civilizing mission that harkens back to white-man’s-burden conceptualizations of saving the world (Andreotti, 2006).

Postcolonial critique accuses global citizenship education of promoting a culture of benevolence towards an inferior “Other” (Jefferess, 2012). It seems to point to a way of acting in the world as a global citizen who is there to help an unfortunate “Other” (Jefferess, 2012). This view contends that imperialism is alive and well, although its form has changed (Jefferess, 2012). Racist and oppressive discourse has been replaced by a language of cultural diversity and global citizenship (Jefferess, 2012). The idea of aid and rescuing the “Other” from poverty enforces the idea of the Other as being an object of benevolence (Jefferess, 2012). The idea of global citizenship is neocolonial at its core and is an example of humanitarian imperialism, the ideology that attempts to sell war using the justification of global justice and human rights (Bricmont, 2006; Jefferess, 2012). Essentially, global citizenship serves as an ethical framework to mask the violence that exists in global power relations, and global citizenship education risks spreading and reinforcing that ideology (Jefferess, 2012). Global citizenship education should be informed by the grassroots movements of the Global South instead of being informed by the European Enlightenment thinkers such as Kant, Locke, and Hobbes in order to avoid Eurocentric teaching and learning (Jefferess, 2012).

Global citizenship education can also be understood to be either soft global citizenship education or critical global citizenship education (Andreotti, 2006). Soft
global citizenship education attempts to address the problem of poverty and helplessness, whereas critical global citizenship education attempts to address the problem of inequality and injustice (Andreotti, 2006). Soft global citizenship education interprets the cause of the problem to be a lack of development, skills, education, and resources, whereas critical global citizenship education interprets the cause of the problem to be complex structures, power relations, and attitudes that maintain exploitation and disempowerment (Andreotti, 2006). Soft global citizenship education promotes a responsibility for the other and critical global citizenship education emphasizes a responsibility towards the other (Andreotti, 2006). The goal of soft global citizenship education is to empower people to act according to what has been defined for them as the ideal world, whereas critical global citizenship education empowers people to think critically about their cultures, envision a different future, and take responsibility for actions (Andreotti, 2006). Finally, soft global citizenship education promotes campaigns and raises awareness of issues of global significance, and critical global citizenship education promotes an engagement with issues of global significance in a way that addresses power relationships (Andreotti, 2006).

Another critique of global citizenship education contends that the unexamined idea of the global citizen living in an interconnected and interdependent global village does not adequately take into account the unequal power relationships between the Global North and the Global South (Dobson, 2005). Additionally, the idea of the global village, to a great extent, has not altered the way we live our lives in North America (Pike, 2008b). One conceptualization of global citizenship education is to debunk
legends and myths about the world—ideas about economic, political, and cultural systems—that have taken root in the cultures of the dominant groups (Pike, 2008b). Global citizenship education must create an alternative version of the story of humans on Earth to the story that has been dominated by colonialism, the industrial revolution, and capitalism (Pike, 2008b). These new alternatives to the legends and myths about the world that have dominated our education system may be uncomfortable for those in positions of power and privilege and will likely constitute a challenge for the global citizenship educator (Pike, 2008b).

Despite the many ways of conceptualizing global citizenship education, some common themes exist: citizenship education must now go beyond national borders, social studies in schools do not adequately address global issues, and global citizenship education must avoid exoticizing peoples and cultures (Eidoo et al., 2011; Pike, 2008b, Wright, 2012). Core principles of global citizenship in general include active, informed participation in global civic life, the need for a transnational human rights system, and democracy that extends beyond national borders (Wright, 2012). Another theoretical commonality is the notion that as national citizenship weakens and the world becomes more interconnected, entirely new ways of educating are necessary (Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005). The existing literature clearly points to different ideas of what these new ways of teaching and learning for global citizenship look like in the classroom.
Global Citizenship and Global Competence Pedagogy

A worldly pedagogy is a way of thinking about teaching in a global context that is related to the human experience sharing a common world (Fanghanel & Cousin, 2012). One characteristic of a worldly pedagogy is that it encourages students to reflect critically on their own beliefs in order to free themselves intellectually from nationalism and leave them open to new understandings of cultural difference (Fanghanel & Cousin, 2012). A worldly pedagogy embraces tension in the learning space, reflective of the tension that exists in the real world, and uses it as a learning tool (Fanghanel & Cousin, 2012). It views learning as a continuum of development that is never fully achieved (Fanghanel & Cousin, 2012). A worldly pedagogy emphasizes the plurality of independent cultures sharing a common world while maintaining an awareness that an unbalanced promotion of world unity could endanger cultural diversity (Fanghanel & Cousin, 2012).

Global citizenship education must adopt a self-reflective approach that emphasizes how individuals, groups, and nations contribute to problems on both the global and local levels (Eidoo et al., 2011; Pashby, 2012). When teaching and learning about global issues, students and teachers need to recognize the West’s complicity in global problems instead of simply characterizing them as Third World issues (Tikly, 2004). An example of this would be using cultural differences (such as high fertility rates) to explain the spread of disease (such as HIV) while avoiding a discussion of the effects of globalization and Western consumption on poverty (Tikly, 2004). Global citizenship education is essentially a decolonizing and anti-imperialist project (Pashby,
A thorough understanding of imperialism is central to any kind of global citizenship education that seeks to promote social justice; studying the imperial legacy of countries that have determined who does and does not belong to the global community is of utmost importance (Pashby, 2012). In order for education to be truly emancipatory and reveal diverse ways of knowing the world, it must go beyond teaching about the knowledge that has been left out of or silenced by the dominant cultures; it must also recognize the Other (i.e. women, colonized peoples, indigenous peoples, minorities) as producers of knowledge (Tikly, 2004).

Educators could confront the part of education that is dominated by development economics by incorporating social justice and equity issues into the process (Tikly, 2004). One way to help transform geopolitical power relationships is for educators to take on a different view of history, not only recognizing what and whose history has been left out, but what history is presently a force in people’s lives (Willinsky, 1998).

Global citizenship education, therefore, must include analyses of who holds power and who does not (Andreotti & de Souza, 2012). The forces of globalization are highly complex, and a comprehensive global citizenship education will speak to those complex historical, political, and cultural contexts of global issues (Andreotti & de Souza, 2012). It is important to challenge students to think critically about globalization (Pashby, 2012). Global citizenship education could actually go so far as to “interrogate global hierarchical power relations” (Eidoo et al., 2011, p. 64). Even if a global citizenship program aims to embody an inclusive and holistic perspective, in practice, it
should avoid unintentional ethnocentrism, paternalism, and salvationism (Andreotti & de Souza, 2012). It is important for global citizenship education to avoid celebrating diversity unless it also addresses and presents solutions for those dealing with dismal realities (Andreotti & de Souza, 2012). It should promote critical thinking about globalization in such a way that avoids exoticized stereotypes of peoples and paternalistic pedagogy (Taylor, 2012).

The concept of critical literacy is instrumental to global citizenship education (Andreotti, 2006). Critical literacy refers to the way learners read not only the word, but the world itself, and it includes providing the space for allowing students to discover the origins of their own assumptions (Andreotti, 2006). Here, critical does not necessarily mean uncovering a truth or a bias (Andreotti, 2006). Critical literacy asks students to question how we came to think and act the way we do, as well as explore the implications of our ways of thinking on local and global power relationships and the distribution of resources (Andreotti, 2006). Critical literacy assumes that learning is not finite and that knowledge is shaped by our cultural environments (Andreotti, 2006). It promotes creating an educational space where students are not told what to do or how to think, but they are given the freedom and the space to explore other ways of knowing and thinking (Andreotti, 2006).

Various pedagogical challenges remain in terms of implementing global citizenship education in schools (Merryfield, 2001, Pike, 2008a). First, citizenship education is still strongly tied to the notion of nationhood despite both the increasing influence of international corporations and inter-governmental alliances and the vast
increase in people who hold multiple citizenships (Pike, 2008a). The challenge for education is to begin decreasing its emphasis on national citizenship and refocusing on global interconnectedness and the individual’s connection to the world (Pike, 2008a). Second, economic globalization is undermining global citizenship education with efforts to privatize education and education’s focus is increasingly driven by the forces of the global marketplace (i.e. the unending pursuit of growth) (Pike, 2008a). In order to challenge the mechanistic and compartmentalized world view that currently pervades education, a more holistic approach is necessary, perhaps driven by the increasing technological connectedness of today’s youth (Pike, 2008a). A third challenge to global citizenship education lies in the increasing antipathy towards and lack of civic participation in the democratic process in North America, as evidenced by low voter turnout and a lethargic inclination to act locally (Pike, 2008a). Schools can confront this challenge by encouraging civic participation of all kinds that goes beyond tokenized fundraising for global causes. A fourth challenge for global educators is related to the fact that nationalism is the foundation of Western stability and prosperity (Pike, 2008a). It is actually a privilege to not have to fight for national identity (Ignatieff, 1993). Global educators can address this challenge by being mindful of this privilege and by addressing the underlying pedagogy of imperialism (Merryfield, 2001). Finally, a challenge for teaching global citizenship is that the idea that citizenship in the Western world is centered on the individual’s right to enjoy the fruits of industrialized society rather than on the peoples’ responsibility to the people of the planet to achieve sustainability (Pike,
Global citizenship education can confront this challenge by emphasizing the interconnectedness between humans and the environment (Pike, 2008a).

Schools have some options for incorporating global education into their education communities (Asia Society, 2008). One option would be developing a single international element, such as an international exchange, offering critical languages such as Chinese, adapting well-established programs such as Model United Nations, or creating one or two international courses (Asia Society, 2008). Another option is to transform the entire school into an international-themed program by designing a school vision, learning outcomes, curriculum, assessment, professional development, and community partnerships that support global education (Asia Society, 2008). A global mission statement prioritizes the development of international skills and knowledge that will drive the school culture and climate (Asia Society, 2008). Yet another option is to creating a graduate profile that defines a student’s global competency upon graduation gives clarity to the mission, and offering special international diplomas creates an incentive for students to take a certain number of international courses (Asia Society, 2008). Schools can also recruit international-oriented teachers who are lifelong learners, knowledgeable about world cultures, engaging, and committed to equity is essential, as is professional development that is global in scope (Asia Society, 2008). Finally, designing broadened curriculum that incorporates global issues into each traditional content area, combined with best instructional practices and assessments, is one way to globalize the curriculum while meeting state and national standards (Asia Society, 2008).
Globally competent students are able to do the following: “investigate the world beyond their immediate environment;” “recognize perspectives, others’ and their own;” “communicate ideas effectively with diverse audiences;” and “take action to improve conditions” (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011, p. 11). Teaching for global competence requires that educators strive for deep understanding of issues of global significance by adopting the following framework of principles and practices: topics of local and global significance, global competence outcomes, performances of global competence, and global competence assessment (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). Topics of local and global significance connect global issues to local issues, are deeply engaging to students, are both disciplinary and interdisciplinary, and highlight issues of global significance (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). Global competence outcomes refer to what students will take away and are shared with students by their teachers (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). Performances of global competence refer to what disciplinary skills students will learn and use while focusing on global competencies and linking students’ experiences to the world (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). Global competence assessment, which lets the teacher know if students are making progress, must be ongoing, give useful feedback, and be conducted by teachers and by students themselves (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). Teachers can choose whether they incorporate an in-depth unit of study related to global competencies, or infuse more traditional units of study with selected global-oriented lessons (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). Some ideas of what constitutes global content knowledge can be found in the works of various global education scholars and non-governmental organizations’ curriculum guides.
Global Content Knowledge

Choosing topics of global and local significance presents challenges because of the sheer breadth of knowledge about the world today and limited time and resources (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). Four considerations for teachers in selecting powerful global topics include deep engagement, clear connection between the local and global, visible global significance, and grounding in disciplinary as well as interdisciplinary content (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). In order to ensure deep engagement by teachers and students, teachers can ask themselves whether they are passionate about the topic and whether it connects to the lives or interests of their students, and then they can explore ways to best frame the topic to make it truly engaging (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). Crafting topics that emphasize a local/global connection can be accomplished through thematic explorations of cultural variations, such as love, motherhood, language, etc., through the global explanation of local phenomena, or through exploring the impact of international policy on local issues (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). The significance of global topics can be evaluated through the lens of immediacy, consequence, ethical implications, breadth, uniqueness, and urgency (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). For example, a topic may be significant because it affects a large number of people or because it requires an urgent solution to a problem (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). Finally, a strong topic requires the synthesis of knowledge from different academic
disciplines in order to engage in complex problem solving (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011).

Although academic standards have not been developed for international studies education in the United States, guidelines can be used to validate local curricular decisions (Collins, Czarra, & Smith, 1998). These guidelines fall into three broad categories: Global Challenges, Issues, and Problems; Global Cultures and World Areas; and Global Connections: the United States and the World (Collins, Czarra, & Smith, 1998). Global challenges can be broken down into conflict (terrorism and war), economic systems (international trade, aid, and investment), global belief systems (ideologies and religions), human rights and social justice issues, global resource management, and political systems (Collins, Czarra, & Smith, 1998). Additional subtopics that fall into the category of global challenges include population growth and movement, race and ethnicity, technological revolutions, and sustainable development (Collins, Czarra, & Smith, 1998). The second broad category, global cultures and world areas, seeks to provide a deep understanding of world cultures beyond holidays and food by including cultural change, universals that connect all cultures, human identification with more than one culture, and the impact of history and geography on cultures (Collins, Czarra, & Smith, 1998). The third broad category, global connections, seeks to foster an understanding about how Americans are connected to the world historically, politically, linguistically, geographically, ecologically, etc. (Collins, Czarra, & Smith, 1998). Students also explore the implications of increasing global interconnectedness and the role of the United States in international policies (Collins, Czarra, & Smith, 1998). These
guidelines include not only knowledge objectives, but skills and participation objectives as well (Collins, Czarra, & Smith, 1998).

In terms of globalization, which is often missing or underrepresented in content standards, global citizenship education includes opportunities for students to learn about how the acceleration of globalization affects the relationship between humans and their environments, both natural and human-created (Eidoo et al., 2011). It also includes opportunities to explore the relationships between different global issues that seem distinct, but are really interwoven (Eidoo et al., 2011). For example, students can explore the relationship between income and environmental quality-of-life, analyze the dominant sustainable development models that are embedded with unlimited-growth economic theories, and explore the transnational social movements that have developed as a result of globalization (Eidoo et al., 2011). Global citizenship content knowledge could also include critical visual literacy whereby students learn how to read maps through the lens of recognizing geopolitical power relationships (Eidoo et al., 2011).

Eco-justice is another potential category of global citizenship content knowledge (Bowers, 2002; Eidoo et al., 2011). Global citizenship education can foster an understanding of the relationships between ecology and culture, including the environmental effects of Western consumer culture on vulnerable populations throughout the world (Eidoo et al., 2011). When studying environmental racism as subtopic of eco-justice, students can explore the disproportionate placement and impact of toxic waste sites on marginalized groups (Bowers, 2002). Students can reflect on the deep Western cultural assumptions that accept consumer culture and view environmental destruction as
an acceptable trade-off for material goods and a technology-dependent lifestyle (Bowers, 2002). In addition, students can recognize the non-commoditized aspects of their own families and communities (Bowers, 2002). Eco-justice content includes the effects of both past and present forms of imperialism on the environment and colonized peoples (Eidoo et al., 2011). Students can learn about worldviews and religious beliefs that view the environment with reverence and recognize the interconnection between the environment and human life, and then learn ways to adapt our lifestyles that will not harm the environment (Eidoo et al., 2011). In terms of technology, eco-justice-oriented global citizenship education teaches students the differences between traditional and modern technologies. Eco-justice education also analyzes how modern technologies have not only influenced the way we think and communicate, but also how industrial technology deskillled the worker and changed communities (Bowers, 2002). The constructive side of eco-justice content knowledge could include the principles of ecological design in shop and engineering classes (Bowers, 2002).

Overall, there seem to be endless possibilities of what might constitute global content knowledge. Additionally, there appears to be a consensus in the literature that it is not enough to merely possess global knowledge; students must also be able to possess global competence, skills, and attitudes.

Global Competence, Skills, and Attitudes

In addition to possessing globally-oriented content knowledge, 21st century students need to embody global competence (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). Global
competence is defined as “the capacity and disposition to understand and act on issues of global significance” (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011, p. xiii). Globally competent students can employ ideas, tools, and languages that pertain to all content areas in order to solve pressing global problems (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). The development of global competence requires that they engage in deep investigation of these global issues, learn to recognize multiple perspectives, learn to effectively communicate their ideas, and then take action to improve the world (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). Students who are reflective about the complexity of cultural interactions are able to formulate their own questions for investigation and engage in critical problem solving (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). Globally competent individuals are able to not only examine the perspectives of others, but examine and explain their own worldviews and traditions and understand how these influence their daily lives (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). In terms of communication, the globally competent individual understands how to listen and communicate with diverse audiences by recognizing how different people may interpret information based on their own cultural experiences (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). Finally, students who are able to develop a plan of action will view themselves as active contributors and problem-solvers in an ever-changing global landscape (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011).

Global competence is acquired through the development of crucial skills at all grade levels (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). Critical thinking is a skill that can be explicitly taught in schools and ranges from listening and asking questions in the foundation years to engaging in critical analysis of information and complex and
contentious issues in high school (Oxfam Development Education Programme, 2009). The ability to argue is a skill that, at the elementary level, takes the form of expressing a point of view, and by high school means taking part in political processes (Oxfam Development Education Programme, 2009). The ability to take on injustice ranges from recognizing unfairness to challenging viewpoints that perpetuate injustice to, ultimately, campaigning for a just and equitable world (Oxfam Development Education Programme, 2009). Respecting people and things is also a skill and includes empathizing with people, recognizing consequences of our choices, and following a lifestyle that is compatible with a sustainable world (Oxfam Development Education Programme, 2009). Conflict resolution is another necessary skill that is vital for students to acquire in order to be globally competent (Oxfam Development Education Programme, 2009).

The adoption of global citizenship values and attitudes is also a part of an effective global education program (Oxfam Development Education Programme, 2009). The sense of identity and self-worth in the primary grades progresses to open-mindedness by high school (Oxfam Development Education Programme, 2009). Empathy and a sense of common humanity includes compassion, sensitivity to the needs of others, and the sense of individual and collective responsibility (Oxfam Development Education Programme, 2009). Other important values and attitudes include a commitment to social justice, diversity appreciation, and concern for the environment (Oxfam Development Education Programme, 2009). Finally, the belief that people can make a difference in the world is a crucial attitude to be cultivated among young people because it includes a willingness to learn from our mistakes, a belief that we can improve and become better
people, and a willingness to work towards a more just and equitable future (Oxfam Development Education Programme, 2009).

The embodiment of global citizenship skills, values, and attitudes can also be thought of as an “ethos of global citizenship education” (Pike, 2008a, p. 45). Expansion of loyalty, the first part of this ethos, means recognizing that we can be loyal to family, community, and nation, but we can also be loyal to a continent, species, and planet (Pike, 2008a). Another element of an ethos of global citizenship is the predisposition to critically assess both our national governments as well as transnational organizations from a human rights and social justice perspective (Pike, 2008a). The third skill in this ethos is the development of global thinking, which is the ability to see connections and relationships between global phenomena, as well as the interrelationship between the past, present, and future (Pike, 2008a). Understanding global citizenship as doing rather than just knowing, accepting the moral responsibility of global citizenship, and understanding the role we play as citizens in the future of our planet are the other crucial elements of an ethos of global citizenship (Pike, 2008a). Global citizenship requires not only knowledge, but also a broad set of skills and attitudes, and therefore education for global citizenship requires an interdisciplinary approach in practice.

*Interdisciplinary Nature of Global Citizenship Education*

Understanding the world through interdisciplinary study involves investigating the world, recognizing perspectives, communicating ideas, and taking action (Boix-
Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). These four capacities are not a collection of independent skills, but rather are a set of interdependent and dynamic competencies that can transform the traditional academic disciplines ((Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). Each subject area has the ability to contribute to students’ global knowledge and competence through the adoption of a global focus (Asia Society, 2008). Global citizenship education, which is relevant to all age groups, all abilities, and all areas of the curriculum, encompasses entire schools; global citizenship education is not only explicitly taught, but is apparent in the fabric of a school’s ethos (Oxfam Development Education Programme, 2009).

Scientific inquiry and mathematical thinking have clear international dimensions because these skills will ultimately enable students to solve some of the most pressing global problems (Asia Society, 2008; Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2011; Stewart, 2012). Some examples of global concepts in the sciences include the global history of science, the ecological implications of human choices, the causes and consequences of natural phenomena, the pros and cons of the extraction and use of various natural resources, renewable resource development, global nutrition issues, global water supply problems, and many others (Asia Society, 2008). Because scientists often work in global teams, school science programs could also begin adopting international collaborations (Asia Society, 2008). Like science, mathematical thinking is also truly international at its core; math itself is an international language that goes beyond culturally specific symbols (Asia Society, 2008). In addition to studying the global history of math, students can explore global issues through applied mathematics (Asia Society, 2008). The increasing
availability of data on the Internet allows students to use mathematics and science to describe, analyze, and ultimately solve global issues (Asia Society, 2008).

English/Language Arts and the Social Sciences are other traditional academic disciplines through which global education can be channeled (Asia Society, 2008). English teachers can meet state and national standards and teach for global competency by adopting universal themes that address global issues (Asia Society, 2008). Literary selections are another avenue for global citizenship education in the English classroom; choosing multicultural literature, as well as connecting literature to its global and historical context, are methods for creating an interdisciplinary global English classroom (Asia Society, 2008). Writing assignments for a global audience allow students to practice communication skills (Asia Society, 2008). Geography can be transformed to focus less on memorization of capitols and more on changing geographical patterns, cultural geography, and new mapping tools such as Geographic Information Systems and Google Earth (Asia Society, 2008). United States History can be taught in a global context, and economics classes can teach the cause and effect relationships between economic growth, political and social change, and technological development (Asia Society, 2008).

World language study is an especially important academic discipline for global education (Asia Society, 2008; Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011; Stewart, 2012). Although English will continue to be a dominant global language, Chinese, Arabic, and Spanish are increasingly being used for business and global interaction, and the United States is currently far behind other developed countries in terms of learning a second
language (Stewart, 2012). One of the most effective ways to understand multicultural perspectives is through learning a second language (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). In order to promote successful language acquisition, schools can ensure that students get adequate time studying a second language, foster optimal student engagement through meaningful and motivating tasks, develop content-based learning in another language, assess proficiency, create opportunities for cultural interaction, and offer a wider range of languages (Asia Society, 2008).

The visual and performing arts, health and physical education, and career and technical programs all have the ability to contribute to global competency and citizenship (Asia Society, 2008). The arts can introduce the history and culture of different regions of the world and honor the diverse cultures of students (Asia Society, 2008). Career education can infuse international dimensions, and technology training can contain a global context (Asia Society, 2008). Health education provides many ways for students to gain global perspective, including the study of nutrition, the spread of disease, obesity, violence prevention, and the effects of population (Asia Society, 2008). Physical education can be expanded to include non-Western sports and physical activities (Asia Society, 2008).

In addition to the infusion of global education into the traditional academic disciplines, teachers can collaborate on interdisciplinary projects and courses (Asia Society, 2008). Time is an essential element in creating interdisciplinary projects and courses because of the need to align content standards and learning outcomes (Asia Society, 2008). Courses in the humanities in particular have the ability to bring together
literature, arts, culture, and history with a global focus (Asia Society, 2008). An international capstone project is a way for students to demonstrate international expertise; generally self-selected by students, capstone projects are culminating activities that students present publicly and are often counted as performance assessments like a senior thesis (Asia Society, 2008).

*The Current Standards-Based Educational Climate in the United States*

Common Core standards differ from state standards in English and math in a number of ways (Stewart, 2012). The English language arts standards include challenging informational texts and emphasize text complexity while leaving specific literary choices to the local level (Stewart, 2012). In terms of writing, the Common Core standards focus on persuasive writing, as well as research, listening, and speaking skills at all grade levels (Stewart, 2012). The Common Core standards for math emphasize depth of understanding and the application of mathematical concepts to real life situations. They ensure students are learning at high levels rather than just learning enough to pass the next test only to forget shortly after (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2012).

The historical impetus for the creation of national standards in the United States stems from the wide discrepancy in educational quality from one zip code to another, as well as the United States’ low performance on international assessments (Stewart, 2012). The history of the effort for national standards dates back to 1959 when President Eisenhower advocated for national goals in education as well as standards (Stewart, 2012). President Ronald Reagan’s 1983 Nation at Risk program called attention to the lack of rigor in the education standards, and in 1989, President George H. W. Bush gathered state governors together to articulate the first national education goals (Stewart, 2012). President Clinton attempted to provide grants to states for the development of national standards in 1994, but the effort eventually failed (Stewart, 2012). No Child Left Behind was the legacy of President George W. Bush and required both schools and states to submit progress reports annually and promoted nationwide testing, but not
national standards (Stewart, 2012). No Child Left Behind resulted in huge variations in standards and test scores among the states, as well as a dumbing-down of proficiency levels to meet the law’s requirements, and is now viewed as an overall failure to improve and reform education in the United States (Stewart, 2012).

The Common Core standards movement is different than these historical efforts because it is being led by states rather than the federal government and it is happening in the context of increasing international competition (Stewart, 2012). Committees of teachers and academic experts were the writers of these standards, and they focused more on depth of knowledge and crucial college and career readiness skills rather than breadth of knowledge (Stewart, 2012). The standards were written as a vertical progression of knowledge and skills that begin at Kindergarten and end at 12th grade (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2012). The final Common Core Standards were released in 2010, and they are currently in the process of being implemented, and computer adaptive assessments are being developed (National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2012).

The Need for Global Citizenship Standards in the United States

Despite the ongoing policy rhetoric on the importance of global understanding, and despite the efforts made by the proponents of global studies, the social studies curriculum in the United States has only partially incorporated global dimensions (Sutton,
Many important global issues and understandings are either not present at all or are addressed inadequately in the content standards (Collins, Czarra, & Smith, 1998). An illustration of this is the fact that the terms globalization and global citizenship lack a significant presence in curriculum standards in the United States (Rapoport, 2009). Out of all of the state academic standards in the United States, only 15 states include the term globalization in its social science standards (Rapoport, 2009). Only two states include the term global citizenship in their social science standards (Rapoport, 2009). Possible reasons for these omissions include a lack of consensus on the meaning of the term global citizenship and post-9/11 patriotism that views globalization education as anti-American (Rapoport, 2009). Clear curricular guidelines have the ability to ensure that global issues are present in the U.S. education system as well as validate local decisions regarding global education (Collins, Czarra, & Smith, 1998).

Global illiteracy in the United States is clearly a sign of systemic failings in the education system (Harth, 2005). A major contribution to this failure is the considerable variation within the field of Global Studies (Harth, 2005). States do not view global education identically; for example, social studies curriculum standards vary state by state, as do graduation requirements and assessments (Harth, 2005). Furthermore, less than one half of the states have standards-driven testing in the social sciences at all, let alone testing in global studies (Harth, 2005). However, it is not enough to merely add international content or token global educational activities to existing curriculum (Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005). Collaboration between academics, teachers, professionals, and
others are necessary to clarify and develop a new form of education for global citizenship (Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005).

A significant part of global citizenship education is teaching about conflict and war (Yamashita, 2006). However, teachers are not comfortable teaching about these issues for many reasons (Yamashita, 2006). One reason is that they worry that they cannot teach about war and conflict with neutrality or non-partisanship (Yamashita, 2006). Another reason is that teachers are concerned that they may upset their students with stories and images of violence that are inherent in the content (Yamashita, 2006). Finally, teachers are not confident with their own understanding of specific violent conflicts and are therefore not comfortable teaching about them (Yamashita, 2006). In order to solve this problem, clear legislation, government support, and supplementary funding for training are necessary in order to help teachers successfully include this content in their students’ education (Yamashita, 2006). Clear curricular guidance can ensure certain that crucial topics in global education are no longer avoided because they are difficult and/or emotional (Collins, Czarra, & Smirth, 1998).

While states’ efforts to support teachers with instructional materials and model lessons are laudable, the Common Core standards lack global dimensions and international content (Howald, 2012). The standards clearly call for global histories and cultures to be taught through literature and informational texts, but they lack content about issues of global significance (Howald, 2012). In order to be successful in a global society, students need to not only learn how to communicate and collaborate, they must be proficient at doing both across cultures (Howald, 2012). The practice of implementing
the Common Core standards could emphasize global learning, but there will still be no state- or national-adopted content standards in the United States that address global competencies, skills, and content (Howald, 2012).

Summary

Studies show that young American students lack basic knowledge about the world and are unprepared to both compete in the globalized economy and confront the world’s most pressing problems. Although many scholars and policy makers have actively advocated for global education for decades, it is still not adequately taught in American schools. Despite the fact that global citizenship education is a relatively new field of research, it has advocates and critics, as well as multiple pedagogical approaches. One debate within the realm of global citizenship education can be characterized as multicultural vs. postcolonial, with the multicultural approach emphasizing diversity appreciation and the postcolonial approach emphasizing Western complicity and critique of global power dynamics. The critiques of global citizenship education only serve to strengthen a potential framework, and education theorists and practitioners alike continue to propose pedagogies for global citizenship education.

Education in the United States is in the midst of the Common Core standardization movement which emphasized critical-thinking and 21st century skills. The Common Core standards themselves, however, do not explicitly address issues of global significance. Nevertheless, there has never been more apt time to propose a new
set of content and skills standards to complement the Common Core. I propose to research and develop a framework of consideration for state or national Departments of Education to use in the creation of academic and skills standards for global citizenship education. These standards will take into account the common themes presented in the literature, will be interdisciplinary in nature, and could be implemented and assessed concurrently with the Common Core standards.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

After reviewing the literature on global citizenship education, I came to three significant conclusions that fueled this project. First, there is a significant need for global education at the secondary level (Howald, 2012; Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2011; Stewart, 2012; Harth, 2005; National Geographic & Roper Public Affairs, 2006; Reimers, 2009). Second, while a void exists in the articulation of global education objectives or standards in the United States, it is clear that global education standards have the potential to help teachers who feel unprepared to teach issues of global significance (Rapoport, 2009; Davies, Evans & Reid, 2005). Third, a broad set of global education guidelines written Collins, Czarra, and Smith (1998) existed and could serve as a starting point.

Soon after I decided that I wanted to articulate standards for global citizenship education for secondary students, I realized that this was an enormous undertaking for one individual, and that without a team of scholars and ample time, the effort would be overwhelming. I decided to narrow my scope significantly. From the literature, as well as from my own experiences teaching at the secondary level, I learned that although a significant part of teaching for global citizenship is incorporating war and political violence—an area that teachers are rather uncomfortable teaching (Yamashita, 2006). For these reasons, I decided to write a pedagogical framework containing a set of topics,
themes, and/or objectives focusing on the teaching of conflict that could, perhaps, be a step towards the articulation of content standards for global citizenship education. I used the work of Collins, Czarra, and Smith (1998) to help me define conflict. By conflict, we mean primarily war and terrorism, but conflict could also include any of the following: revolutions, civil strife, rebel activities, genocide, secessionist movements, weapons proliferation, state-sponsored terrorism, religious terrorism, and national separatism (Collins, Czarra, & Smith, 1998).

I decided that the best methodology for collecting rich and illuminative insights into what should be included into this framework required a qualitative approach, specifically, purposeful sampling. I wanted to find a diverse sample of scholars who were actively involved in the research and teaching of conflict and/or conflict resolution. Thus, I attended the four-day 2013 International Studies Association Convention in San Francisco, with the express purpose of conferring with scholars and researchers at the largest gathering of international relations and international studies scholars in the world. I developed both surveys and interviews to be conducted with informative and willing participants. I attended four sessions of panels and roundtables per day, and I focused on the following sessions dealing with conflict, peacebuilding, and pedagogy: “Gender and Conflict,” “Extreme Pedagogy: Approaches to Experiential Learning,” “Diffusion of Global Studies Programs,” “Teaching Gender and War,” “Social Movements and Power,” “The Arab Spring: Causes and Consequences,” “Pedagogy and Global Ethics,” “Paradigms for Knowledge Creation in Peacebuilding,” “Children and Youth in Peace and Conflict,” “Integrating Multiple Perspectives into Core International Studies
Curricula,” “Critical Pedagogies in World Politics: Structures, Spaces and Contexts of Learning,” “What Do We Teach? How Do We Teach It? Critical Pedagogies and World Politics,” and “Culture and Peacebuilding: Conceiving of the ‘Them’, the “Us’, and the ‘There.’” At each of these sessions, I took extensive notes and highlighted participants who I felt would be provide valuable insight into my framework. I initially intended on connecting with scholars at the convention, setting up some interviews, and passing out my business cards with a link to my survey, but I adjusted my strategy once I realized that the best way to connect would be to wait a couple weeks after the convention to send an email inviting potential participants.

This follow-up strategy proved to be instrumental. I composed a personal email to 22 international studies scholars whom I met at the convention. The email discussed what I found to be insightful about their talk at the ISA Convention and explained my project. I asked each scholar if I could either interview them or survey them. Of the 22 emails, I received 12 survey responses and 5 interviews. Respondents consisted of professors and experts in political economy, political science, war studies, security studies, crisis management, international relations, and peace studies. There were also 3 international studies students who responded, presumably affiliated with one of my interviewees. My interviewees consisted of a scholar of Arab studies, two international relations professors affiliated with political science departments at private universities, a former U.S. diplomat and current international studies professor, and a sociology professor whose expertise is in peace studies and international social movements.

The survey consisted of five open-ended questions:
• What is your occupation and/or area of expertise?

• If you were creating a Global Studies curricular unit for North American high school students entitled “Global Conflict and Conflict Resolution (War and Terrorism),” what subtopics, specific issues, potential case studies, and/or practices would you be sure to include. Please provide a brief rationale for your inclusions.

• If you were creating a Global Studies curricular unit for North American high school students entitled “Global Economic Power Relations (Trade, Aid, and Investment),” what subtopics, specific issues, potential case studies, and/or practices would you be sure to include. Please provide a brief rationale for your inclusions. Please provide a brief rationale for your inclusions.

• What do you believe are the most important global skills and/or competencies that high school students should acquire prior to exiting high school?

In the end, the most useful question for the creation of my framework was the question dealing specifically with conflict. Thus, while I initially thought I would write a framework for teaching both conflict and global economic issues, I eventually chose to narrow my scope and focus entirely on conflict.

I utilized a mix of standardized open-ended questions and informal conversation interview techniques. I started with the same questions in the same order for each interview, but I allowed new questions to emerge naturally. The standardized interview questions included the following:

• What is your occupation or area of expertise?
• Are you affiliated with a public school, college or university, NGO, federal agency, or other?

• What is the rationale for teaching conflict (violence/terrorism/war) to high school students? (Conflict could include any of the following: revolutions, civil strife, rebel activities, genocide, secessionist movements, weapons proliferation, terrorism (state-sponsored, religious, national separatists.)

• What is the rationale for teaching international conflict resolution and peacekeeping to high school students?

• If you were teaching a high school course that addressed current global conflict and conflict resolution, what are one or two big ideas or universal themes you’d want high school students to take away from your class, if nothing else?

• What is the rationale for teaching global economic systems and power dynamics to high school students?

• If you were teaching a high school course that addressed global economic systems and power dynamics, what are one or two big ideas or universal themes you’d want high school students to take away from your class, if nothing else?

• How do we teach these topics, especially those dealing with violent conflict, in ways that do not either desensitize students or leave them feeling hopeless?

• Do think teachers are responsible for encouraging students to take action?

• Have you ever experienced resistance to something you were teaching, and how did you respond to it?
Although I intended each interview to last about a half an hour, each one went for over 45 minutes and contained my hoped-for depth of insight. I recorded the conversations, transcribed them all, and read both the surveys and interviews several times.

The coding process involved looking for themes that emerged multiple times in the surveys and interview transcripts. I categorized the emerging themes as either content topics/themes or teaching methods/attitudes. The dominant topics/themes for teaching conflict that emerged included humanitarianism and humanitarian intervention, gender and conflict, conflict’s colonial origins and legacies, western complicity in global conflict, connecting the global to the local, the role of identity and ideology in conflict and terrorism, and cultural demystification as conflict-prevention. Interestingly, all of those themes were also present in the literature about global citizenship education and teaching conflict, so I decided that I would use these themes to create broad education objectives that could also be the basis for standards in the future.

The second category, methods/attitudes for teaching conflict, became the basis for the second half of this framework which includes the following discussions: challenging students’ assumptions; shifting binary ways of thinking; contextualizing conflict and connecting the global to the local; teach to think, teach to act, or both; encountering and responding to resistance; and teaching with humor and empathy.

I have created a pedagogical framework that weaves my original qualitative interviews and surveys conducted with international studies educators, my experiences teaching Global Studies at the secondary level, and the existing literature on teaching for
global citizenship. The framework articulates six broad learning objectives and six methods for teaching conflict, and includes rationale and curricular suggestions in each discussion. It is designed to serve as a framework to be used by teachers who are considering creating Global Studies or International Studies humanities programs, social science teachers, English teachers, or anyone else involved in global education and the teaching of conflict. It may also be used as set of considerations for the future creation of secondary global education standards.
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The contents of this framework are informed by the idea of a “worldly pedagogy,” a way of thinking about teaching in a global context that is related to the human experience sharing a common world (Fanghanel & Cousin, 2012). One characteristic of a worldly pedagogy is that it encourages students to reflect critically on their own beliefs in order to free themselves intellectually from nationalism and leave them open to new understandings of cultural difference (Fanghanel & Cousin, 2012). A worldly pedagogy embraces tension in the learning space, reflective of the tension that exists in the real world, and uses it as a learning tool (Fanghanel & Cousin, 2012). It views learning as a continuum of development that is never fully achieved (Fanghanel & Cousin, 2012). A worldly pedagogy emphasizes the plurality of independent cultures sharing a common world while maintaining the awareness that an unbalanced promotion of world unity could endanger cultural diversity (Fanghanel & Cousin, 2012).

The rationale for teaching globally is both varied and compelling. Global economic competitiveness is a common rationale for globally-oriented education in North America (Howald, 2012; Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2011; Stewart, 2012). More than 3 billion people in India, China, and the former Soviet Union have entered the work force since 1990, and their sights are set on developing prosperous middle classes through highly skilled and competitive work forces (Stewart, 2012). The United States
cannot maintain its standard of living unless it provides its citizens with an education system that enables them to compete and cooperate on a global scale (Howald, 2012; Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2011; Stewart, 2012). In December 2010, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development released its Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) results, and American students scored significantly below those in other developed countries (Stewart, 2012). Meanwhile, jobs of the 21st century require higher levels of education, sophisticated problem-solving skills, and communication skills that cross national boundaries (Stewart, 2012). While global education standards have changed along with the transformation of skills and global knowledge necessary to be successful, the education system in North America have remained stagnant (Stewart, 2012)

Human rights issues and global social and environmental justice is another rationale for global citizenship education (Abdi & Schulz, 2008; Eidoo et al., 2007; Harth, 2010; Yamashita, 2006). The post-World War II promise of world peace has yet to be seen (Abdi & Schulz, 2008). In 1948, the United Nations adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and since then, all of its 30 articles have been violated on every continent in the world (Abdi & Schulz, 2008). The increasing interconnectedness of the world brings a profound ability for people to either help or hurt others throughout the globe (Harth, 2010). Despite the fact that 85% percent of the world is composed of non-Western cultures, citizens of the West—in particular of the United States, due to its position of power in the world—have a significant role to play in either contributing to or
alleviating problems around the world including global environmental destruction, economic instability, poverty, political turmoil, among others (Harth, 2010).

Abundant evidence exists demonstrating that young Americans simply do not know a lot about the world outside of their own cultural spheres (Harth, 2005). The most recent graduates of American educational institutions are unprepared for the global world as evidenced by their lack knowledge about global economic issues, contexts of world events, and human and political geographies (National Geographic & Roper Public Affairs, 2006). In a comprehensive survey of global knowledge, young Americans between the ages of 18 and 24 answered about half of the questions correctly (National Geographic & Roper Public Affairs, 2006). About 37% of young Americans cannot find Iraq on a map, 60% do not speak a foreign language, 20% believe that Sudan is an Asian country, and almost half believe that Islam is the majority religion of India (National Geographic & Roper Public Affairs, 2006). In addition, about half of young Americans cannot find New York on a map (National Geographic & Roper Public Affairs, 2006). In terms of how the United States fits into the world economically, young people are also lacking basic knowledge; 75% of young Americans think that English is the most widely-spoken language in the world rather than Mandarin, and 71% are unaware that the United States is the largest exporter of goods and services rather than China (National Geographic & Roper Public Affairs, 2006). Most young people in America do not believe that this kind of geographic knowledge is absolutely necessary (National Geographic & Roper Public Affairs, 2006).
Young Americans not only lack global knowledge, but they also lack a drive to engage in crucial world events (Zhang, Hui-Yin, & Wang, 2010). In comparison to high school students in China, American high school students place less importance on becoming global citizens and find less enjoyment in global-awareness-related events (Zhang, Hui-Yin, & Wang, 2010). Chinese students tend to study abroad more than American students and show more understanding and respect for different cultures (Zhang, Hui-Yin, & Wang, 2010). Chinese students also pay closer attention to international news and information than American students (Zhang, Hui-Yin, & Wang, 2010).

The United States’ position of power in the world brings a responsibility to its educators to prepare students who are reflective and prepared to confront the challenges of the globalized world (Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005; Harth, 2010; Stewart, 2011). Furthermore, schools are perfect places to promote social justice within the local and global communities (Abdi & Schulz, 2008). Schools are also places where people learn how to be inclusive, gain the courage to confront injustice, and live in diverse communities (Abdi & Shulz, 2008). However, less than one-half of schools in the United States offer opportunities to develop global competencies (Reimers, 2009). Educational materials are overwhelmingly Eurocentric and work to reinforce Western ideals and consumerism without offering alternative ways to view the world (Pike, 2008b).

Although new forms of citizenship are blossoming as a result of a more globalized political landscape, national citizenship and the nation-state are still dominant forces in education (Davies, Evans & Reid, 2005). Policy-makers call for scientific and
technological literacies, but the advocacy for global literacy tends to be muted (Pike, 2008b).

Although scientific and technological literacy is important, so is having both an understanding of the forces that shape human life and the ability to positively shape our individual and collective future (Pike, 2008b). An education system responsible for preparing global citizens updates its core subjects to include non-Western cultural awareness, geography, political science, economics, and multidisciplinary global-issue-oriented classes (Harth, 2010). However, entirely new forms of education are necessary rather than just tying together the different academic disciplines (Davies, Evans & Reid, 2005). There is an abundance of theoretical conversations about global citizenship education, but all too often, theory becomes an end to itself (Guilherme, 2006). As Henry Giroux notes, citizenship education must make the connections between theory and practice as well as reflection and action (Guilherme, 2006).

Despite the ongoing policy rhetoric on the importance of global understanding, and despite the efforts made by the proponents of global studies, the social studies curriculum in the United States has only partially incorporated global dimensions (Sutton, 1998). Many important global issues and understandings are either not present at all or are addressed inadequately in the content standards (Collins, Czarra, & Smith, 1998). An illustration of this is the fact that the terms globalization and global citizenship lack a significant presence in curriculum standards in the United States (Rapoport, 2009). Out of all of the state academic standards in the United States, only 15 states include the term globalization in its social science standards (Rapoport, 2009). Only two states include
the term global citizenship in their social science standards (Rapoport, 2009). Global illiteracy in the United States is clearly a sign of systemic failings in the education system (Harth, 2005). A major contribution to this failure is the considerable variation within the field of Global Studies (Harth, 2005). States do not view global education identically; for example, social studies curriculum standards vary state by state, as do graduation requirements and assessments (Harth, 2005). Furthermore, less than one half of the states have standards-driven testing in the social sciences at all, let alone testing in global studies (Harth, 2005). However, it is not enough to merely add international content or token global educational activities to existing curriculum (Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005). Collaboration between academics, teachers, professionals, and others are necessary to clarify and develop a new form of education for global citizenship (Davies, Evans, & Reid, 2005).

A significant part of global citizenship education is teaching about conflict and war (Yamashita, 2006). I decided to focus this framework on one area of global education, the teaching of global conflict\(^1\), not only because of its relevancy in the post-9/11 era, but also because it is perhaps the most daunting area of global citizenship education for teachers. Teachers are not comfortable teaching about global conflict for many reasons (Yamashita, 2006). One reason is that they worry that they cannot teach about war and conflict with neutrality or non-partisanship (Yamashita, 2006). Another

\(^{1}\) For the purpose of this framework, by “conflict” we mean primarily war and terrorism, but could also include any of the following: revolutions, civil strife, rebel activities, genocide, secessionist movements, weapons proliferation, state-sponsored terrorism, religious terrorism, and national separatism (Collins, Czarra, and Smith, 1998).
reason is that teachers are concerned that they may upset their students with stories and images of violence that are inherent in the content (Yamashita, 2006). Finally, teachers are not confident with their own understanding of specific violent conflicts and are therefore not comfortable teaching about them (Yamashita, 2006). In order to solve this problem, clear legislation and government support for this kind of education are necessary in order to help teachers successfully include this content in their students’ education (Yamashita, 2006). Clear curricular guidance can ensure that crucial topics in global education are no longer avoided because they are difficult and/or emotional (Collins, Czarra, & Smirth, 1998).

This framework is a step towards a clear articulation of learning objectives in the area of secondary-level global conflict education, and the objectives are designed to be interdisciplinary, thematic, and adaptable. In order to articulate these objectives, I began my research at the International Studies Association Convention where I had access to thousands of conflict and peace researchers and international studies scholars. I attended panels and roundtables for four days dealing with conflict and pedagogy, took extensive notes, and followed up with a variety of scholars via email. I administered an open-ended survey asking respondents to discuss what they thought were most important themes for teaching conflict to high school students. I also interviewed five international studies scholars that I chose based on their areas of expertise as well as their passion for discussing pedagogical practices: an international studies professor from the Midwest who won the prestigious annual ISA Pedagogy Award; a former diplomat who now teaches international relations at a state university in California; an author and Arab
studies scholar who educates the TSA and the FBI on Islam and Arab culture; an international relations professor and former ISA Pedagogy Award recipient from the northwest; and a peace-studies scholar and professor at a private university in Pennsylvania.

When I asked these international studies scholars to provide a rationale for teaching global conflict in particular to high school students, I was already aware of statistics regarding the lack of global knowledge young Americans possess. I was also anecdotally aware of the hesitancy of my educator colleagues to teach complex global conflicts and issues to high school students. I was looking for rich, in-depth responses that would not only help me make the case for teaching conflict, but would perhaps also reveal some potential thematic student outcomes for a course that included conflict studies. Interestingly, one of the most moving responses to the question of why should we teach conflict to young people was from a scholar who drew the analogy of raising small children in the presence of complex music such as jazz and classical. The world is a complex place and it’s full of conflicts, and not only do children intuitively know that from a very young age, but no one is ever too young to learn difficult things.

To the same question, another international relations expert responded with an essential question that pointed to both the causes and prevention of future conflict: How do we create government legitimacy? How do we create a structure in which citizens are engaged in a positive way with their government structures? When we analyze conflict around the world, we can learn about the breakdowns of governance legitimacy, as well as how these breakdowns are resolved. As we look at conflict around the world, we need
to identify the same sorts of tensions in our own society. It is vital that we educate our citizenry about our rights and responsibilities in creating better governmental structures.

Compelling rationale also came from an interview with a peace studies scholar who discussed the amount of what she considers to be “remedial work” that needs to be done at the college level to get American students to understand how their country looks from an outside perspective. This scholar contends that by the time they are 19 or 20 years old, many students already have hardened understandings and defensive responses when they see another side of their country (i.e. their own country’s complicity in global conflicts). According to this scholar, if they’ve been exposed to these types of conflict at the secondary level, then they are better prepared to understand this information, work with information, and shift their world maps, so to speak, at the college level. She believes that the current generation of young Americans desperately needs both a sophisticated global outlook and the capacity for inward reflection. This scholar contends that previous generations really could ignore the rest of the world because of America’s position of privilege internationally. Today, as the world rapidly changes and U.S. power declines, we no longer have a bubble of privilege within which to reside, and students very much have to engage not only with the world, but with the way our own country contributes to conflict and peacemaking.

I am hoping that this framework is a step towards the articulation of a set of standards for secondary global citizenship education that are compatible with the Common Core State Standards and go beyond the fragmented collection of social science standards in the United States that largely focus on Eurocentric views of history, political
geography, economics, and government. After much research, I managed to dig up a broad set of articulations, similar to standards, that were developed in the late 1990s by Collins, Czarra, and Smith (1998) entitled “Guidelines for Global and International Studies Education: Challenges, Cultures, and Connections.” These articulations are the closest I could find to my own conceptualization of global citizenship standards and could very well serve as a foundation for future work. These guidelines focus on three broad themes: Global Challenges, Issues, and Problems; Global Cultures and World Areas; and Global Connections: The United States and the World. I decided to focus my research for this pedagogical framework on a category within the first theme of “Global Challenges, Issues, and Problems” entitled “Conflict and Its Control: Violence/Terrorism/War: Low Intensity to International.”

This framework is informed by interviews with international studies scholars about teaching conflict, survey research, pedagogical literature, as well as my own experiences teaching high school Global Studies. It consists of two sections: Themes and Objectives for Teaching Conflict and Methods and Attitudes for Teaching Conflict. This framework is not only a contribution to the discussion about teaching for global citizenship in general and teaching conflict specifically; it is also meant to be used as a tool for ideas and inspiration for secondary educators who are interested in engaging their students in conflict and peace-building studies.
THEMES AND OBJECTIVES FOR TEACHING CONFLICT

Introduction

Organizing an interdisciplinary Global Studies course can be daunting. Does one organize it by region, around a historical chronology, by issue or topic (for example, water issues, indigenous issues), by universal theme or message, or by a combination of all four? I tend to favor a more thematic approach; however, because I work with a team of English and Social Science teachers with their own individual teaching styles and interpretations of the standards to which they must adhere (i.e. World History standards, which are often Euro-centric and strictly chronological), we have adopted a mixed- organizational structure. Briefly, our structure employs topics of study—Arab Studies, European Imperialism, Revolutions, the World Wars—which are loosely both chronological and regional. Woven through these topics are universal themes and ideas such as “Understanding + Communication + Trust” and “There is genuine power in collective action.” In terms of teaching global conflict specifically, I became interested in discovering what topics and universal themes international studies scholars would consider important for high school students. Through my surveys of and interviews with international studies scholars, a number of topics and themes emerged. I’ve articulated those themes into six broad objectives, which are followed by a discussion of ways in which they can be explored at the secondary level.
Themes

1. Humanitarianism and Humanitarian Intervention
2. Gender and Conflict
3. Conflict’s colonial origins and legacies
4. Shifting the outward gaze inward: Western complicity in global conflict and bringing the global local
5. The role of identity and ideology in conflict and terrorism
6. Cultural demystification as conflict-prevention

Student Objectives

Objective 1: Students will analyze the ways in which humanitarianism and humanitarian intervention impact communities, including, but not limited to, their positive effects and unintended consequences.

Objective 2: Students will explore the changing interactions between conflict and gender (i.e. the ways in which women are used to justify conflict and participate in conflict, as well as the ways in which violent conflict affects women in particular).

Objective 3: Students will analyze the political and economic colonial origins of conflict including, but not limited to, the impact of globalization on conflict starting with colonization, colonial roots of structural violence, and the colonial roots of conflict in the United States in particular.

Objective 4: Students will turn the outward gaze inward by making connections between global and local conflict and analyzing Western involvement in global conflict. (This
may include United States’ role in international relations since World War II, American
exceptionalism, fostering conditions for global terrorism, and making connections
between global and local grassroots movements as a solution/response to conflict.)

**Objective 5:** Students will investigate the role of identity and ideology in conflict and
terrorism, which may include the role of single-group identity in conflict, terrorism as an
ideological response to perceived injustice, homegrown extremism, and the rise of
xenophobic movements as a response to terrorism.

**Objective 6:** Students will examine diverse cultures and understand various cultural
points of view, as well as differing perspectives within particular cultural groups;
recognize cultural interconnections; and be able to explain the points of view of diverse
cultures without distorting them through ones’ own cultural lens.

**Discussion**

**Objective 1:**

Students will analyze the ways in which humanitarianism and humanitarian intervention
impact communities, including, but not limited to, their positive effects and unintended
consequences.

**Discussion:**

Ever since I began engaging my students in learning about global issues, I’ve
noticed that many of them really want to jump right into fixing the problems immediately
through humanitarian means. This is not surprising given the explosion of mass
humanitarianism throughout the 20th century in the United States as a result of the advent
of advertising campaigns for humanitarian organizations and the sensationalism of tragedy and suffering in the mass media beginning with the Red Cross (Rozario, 2003). Humanitarian organizations such as Oxfam, the Red Cross, Doctors Without Borders, among others, have undoubtedly contributed to the alleviation of suffering the world over, and worthy of exploration are the positive impacts of our donor culture. However, when I first ask my students to develop solutions to a particular global problem or conflict, they overwhelmingly want to throw money and/or military force at it, as they have not yet analyzed the unintended consequences of aid and “humanitarian” intervention. Through much reflection on my practice and deep analysis of my own assumptions and misunderstandings about humanitarianism, I have begun to try to shift the ways in which I teach and my students learn about fixing the world’s problems. Two of my survey respondents had some powerful insights connected to this theme.

One of my survey respondents, a professor of international relations who teaches introductory courses in global politics and more advanced courses on humanitarianism, human rights, ethics, and development, had some interesting ideas on how to frame this theme. One could teach a unit that looks at “Humanitarianism from Above,” i.e. state- or military-led (so-called) humanitarian interventions, as well as “Humanitarianism from Below,” i.e. NGO-led humanitarian efforts. Relevant case studies on “Humanitarianism from Above” could include Somalia (1993), Rwanda (1994), Bosnia, (1991-1995), Kosovo (1999), Libya (2011), and potentially Syria (ongoing). The unit could include discussions and analysis about how humanitarian rationale have been used to justify military intervention and help garner support for other strategic political and economic
goals, such as the recent wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. One respondent to my survey specifically mentioned exposing students to the conflicts that the United States left behind following withdrawal from Iraq and Afghanistan in order to further illustrate both the help and harm that can be produced by military intervention. In short, expose students to the unresolved issues left behind in those countries as well, because that will help them assess the pros/cons of “humanitarianism from above.” The Responsibility to Protect Doctrine (See Appendix A), authored by the United Nations General Assembly in 2005, offers an interesting debate opportunity for students. Although it is considered a norm rather than international law, it lays out the following pillars for the international community:

1. The State carries the primary responsibility for protecting populations from genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing, and their incitement;
2. The international community has a responsibility to encourage and assist States in fulfilling this responsibility;
3. The international community has a responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other means to protect populations from these crimes. If a State is manifestly failing to protect its populations, the international community must be prepared to take collective action to protect populations, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

The question for students to explore is the following: Is military force ever justified for humanitarian objectives, and if so, under what circumstances?

Another interesting consideration would be to look at the international justice system as a form of “humanitarianism from above.” Students could explore and debate the role of the International Criminal Court (ICC) Tribunal in the conflict between Uganda and the notoriously brutal rebel group, the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA),
headed by Joseph Kony. Briefly, the ICC, impatient with the slow progress of peace talks between the government of Uganda and the LRA, issued a warrant for the arrest of Kony, subsequently scaring the rebels back into the bush and both ending the peace process and increasing the bloodletting. What was the justification for ICC’s action? What were the consequences of the Western-led desire for justice, despite its humanitarian objectives?

North Americans are surrounded by a culture that assumes that non-governmental organizations are inherently good and that the best way to respond to global issues is to give money. Not only have I witnessed this consistently in my own classroom, but so have the international relations scholars I spoke with throughout my research. Furthermore, many North American students assume that humanitarian intentions are enough, but they have little exposure to the ways in which good intentions can have negative consequences. Students can explore some compelling questions regarding the theme of “humanitarianism from below.” For example, how do large NGOs use marketing strategies for fund-raising purposes? What gives large Western NGOs the moral authority to “do good” in the world? How can we tell whether NGOs have had a positive or negative impact on the communities they serve? Students can look at case studies such as the ineffective delivery of humanitarian relief following the earthquake in Haiti and the refugee camps in Goma following the genocide in Rwanda. Students should learn how to effectively critique the actions of NGOs as well as question the ways in which humanitarianism has been used to justify various political actions. Additionally, it is vital that students are able to recognize the inherent inequality that lies right below
the surface of humanitarian giving. In what ways does aid create dependencies that harken back to colonial power structures? The ultimate goal is not to discourage students from wanting to be agents of positive change in the world, but to help them understand the pitfalls and potential humanitarian consequences of “doing good.”

**Objective 2:**

*Students will explore the changing interactions between conflict and gender (i.e. the ways in which women are used to justify conflict and participate in conflict, as well as the ways in which violent conflict affects women in particular).*

**Discussion:**

An exploration of the intersection of humanitarianism-from-above and gender has the potential to be particularly compelling. Worthy of analysis is the preoccupation by Western powers to save presumably oppressed Muslim women from their traditions, and the use thereof as justification for military intervention (Maira, 2009). Sherene H. Razack (2008) argues that three stereotypical figures have emerged as representative of the War on Terror: the “dangerous” Muslim man, the “imperiled” Muslim woman, and the “civilized” Western culture. Students could explore the use of these stereotypes not only as justification for humanitarian intervention, but also as justification of the expulsion of Muslims from the political community through war, surveillance, incarceration, and torture (Razack, 2008). The question then becomes how to simplify these somewhat complex concepts for teenagers to be able to grasp.
One survey respondent, a professor whose areas of expertise includes war and security studies, posed some interesting questions about changing gender roles within the modern face of warfare. We often assume that fighters are men and women are camp cooks, but how is this dichotomy changing? What are the roles that women play in terrorist movements and rebel movements? One case study that could be a basis for conversation is the actions of woman/girl soldiers in the civil war in Sierra Leone. Who is a civilian and who is a soldier in contemporary conflicts? Can girl soldiers be recognized as militants? Students could explore the studies of Swati Parashar (2011) and Megan MacKenzie (2012), who have studied the roles of women in terrorist movements (Parashar, 2011) and women/girls soldiers in Sierra Leone (MacKenzie, 2012). Students could also explore the growing number of women involved in suicide bombings and other terrorist activities.

**Objective 3:**

*Students will analyze the political and economic colonial origins of conflict including, but not limited to, the impact of globalization on conflict starting with colonization, colonial roots of structural violence, and the colonial roots of conflict in the United States in particular.*

**Discussion:**

Global citizenship education is essentially a decolonizing and anti-imperialist project (Pashby, 2012). A thorough understanding of imperialism is central to any kind of global citizenship education that seeks to promote social justice; studying the imperial
legacy of countries that have been determining who does and does not belong to the global community is of utmost importance (Pashby, 2012).

Incidentally, a popular theme that emerged in my survey and interview research was the importance of teaching conflict within its historic colonial context. One idea that emerged is to teach a unit on economic globalization starting with the colonization of the Americas, Africa, Australia, and Asia, and then extend that theme of globalization into the present. Contemporary political and economic structures created by globalization include the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the World Trade Organization, the International Criminal Court, and the United Nations. Students can explore these organizations and the roles they play in the creation, exacerbation, prevention, and resolution of political friction and conflict.

Another international studies scholar with a background in sociology specifically discussed the idea of structural violence as a critical concept for students to understand. Structural violence can be conceived as social injustice and/or violence imbedded in economic inequality and a society’s social structures (Galtung, 1969). Structural violence is often the underlying source of conflict and should be explored by students along with the historical contexts of conflict. Because economic inequality often traces its roots back to colonialism, a discussion of the colonial roots of conflict should also include a discussion of the difference between personal and structural violence. Students need to understand that conflict is a much more complicated story than what the mainstream news and dominant political discourse is presenting. Although these ideas
may be more challenging to teach, students will be able to leave the classroom and apply
their knowledge of structural violence to situations that come up throughout their lives.

In order to encourage more of an inward gaze, several survey respondents
suggested that any study of conflict should begin with colonial history of the Americas
beginning in the 15th century and include American internal imperialism, i.e. the United
States’ policies towards Native Americans. One survey respondent remarked that the
United States’ policies of assimilation, extermination, and genocide towards the Native
American populations were essentially acts of terrorism performed throughout the
nation’s history. I have found that my students are incredibly engaged throughout my
department’s unit on the genocide of Native Americans throughout our local region, and
it helps them understand that genocide is not this other-worldly horror that only happens
in countries beyond our borders. It has happened within our own borders, and for some
of my students, it happened in their own towns.

In contrast to these ideas, one interviewee, a former United States diplomat, felt
that the overemphasis on the colonial roots of conflict was rather troubling and should be
avoided by teachers. This professor cited a presentation by a group of her students that
analyzed the genocide in Guatemala and placed all of the blame on the Spaniards while
ignoring all of the other factors involved in the cause of that conflict. This group
essentially ignored another 50 years of history, as if to say nobody in Guatemala had any
power or bore any responsibility for the killing of hundreds of thousands of people. This
particular scholar’s point was that not every country in the world bears some hideous
imprint of their colonial masters, and that there are other stories that need to be told and
one should not rely solely on the colonial narrative as the cause of conflict. She contended that this kind of over-simplification should be avoided if students are going to truly understand the complex nature of conflict. Students must be able to explain not only the colonial roots of conflict, but other causes and ways in which conflicts are exacerbated. Teachers must be prepared to guide students through the complexity of conflict.

**Objective 4:**

*Students will turn the outward gaze inward by making connections between global and local conflict and analyzing Western involvement in global conflict. (This may include United States’ role in international relations since World War II, American exceptionalism, Western complicity in fostering conditions for global terrorism, and making connections between global and local grassroots movements as a solution/response to conflict.)*

**Discussion:**

A vital aspect of teaching for global citizenship is not only to encourage a global outlook, but also to shift the outward gaze of our students inward (Brownlie, 2001). Global citizenship is more than just learning about complex global issues in other countries, as important as these understandings are; it is also about bringing into the classroom the global dimension to local issues which are present in our lives and communities (Brownlie, 2001). Global education must adopt a self-reflective approach that emphasizes how individuals, groups, and nations contribute to problems on both the
global and local levels (Eidoo et al., 2011; Pashby, 2012). When teaching and learning about global issues, students and teachers need to recognize the West’s complicity in global problems instead of simply characterizing them as “Third World” issues (Tikly, 2004). An example of this would be using cultural differences (such as high fertility rates) to explain the spread of disease (such as HIV) while avoiding a discussion of the effects of globalization and Western consumption on poverty (Tikly, 2004).

In terms of teaching conflict in particular, the sections in this framework on critiquing humanitarianism and colonial roots of conflict indeed force our gaze inwards. But there are a number of ways to explore Western complicity in global conflict beyond engaging students in an exploration of the conquest of North America as a site of conflict and terrorism. One way is to challenge the assumption of American Exceptionalism, that global conflict and terrorism are out there, separate from us. One international relations scholar that I interviewed placed great importance on students understanding how the rest of the world views us and why. Students could be asked to explore this question: In what ways is the West complicit in fostering conditions for global conflict and terrorism? In order to answer that question, students will have to work through serious conundrums about themselves in relation to the war, conflict, global economic issues. For example, terrorism provides an opportunity to explore the humanity of the terrorist and our (US) complicity in the conditions that foster terrorism. Another question that came up in my survey research was, “What is it about suicide bombing that makes it so repulsive?”

---

2 The term “Third World” is particularly problematic in that it groups very diverse nations into a vague and imprecise category that has come to represent modern colonial misunderstandings (Tomlinson, 2003).
Other questions deal directly with the role that rampant consumerism plays in conflict. In what ways is our culture complicit in securing both privilege and inequality, and how is global inequality connected to conflict? Although this certainly takes students out of their comfort zone, one international studies expert suggested that secondary teachers could follow these difficult inward explorations with examples of how grassroots social movements respond to these situations, with the emphasis that these movements are comprised of people just like them as opposed to political elites and/or militants.

Another way to invite the inward gaze is to explore the ways in which interference by the Western political establishment exacerbates ongoing conflicts. Because young Americans have become so captivated by Kony and the LRA in Northern Uganda and the Congo in recent years, I use this particular conflict to draw them in. My students very much assume that this issue is an “Africa problem,” something going on “over there” that has little connection to the West beyond its colonial roots. There are certainly many other case studies that reflect this theme, such as the role of the United Nations and the American government in the Rwanda genocide, among others. In order to include both the inward and outward gaze, broader questions could guide a unit on global governance: What are the benefits and potential consequences of institutions of global governance and international justice such as the United Nations and the International Criminal Court Tribunal? In what ways do they prevent and resolve conflict, and in what ways do they exacerbate conflict?

A peace studies researcher and professor I interviewed gave me an entirely different way to help my students understand conflicts, and at the same time, develop the
inward gaze. Her ideas center around the fact that both violent and non-violent conflicts develop in similar ways, and that one way to encourage an inward gaze is delve into local, resource-based conflicts, of which there are many throughout the United States:

In most of my work, I don't talk about places that are enmeshed in violent conflicts because that just becomes really messy and difficult to tease out what's actually going on. My argument about some of the research out there, especially peace research, is that they treat situations of violence as fundamentally different from other kinds of conflicts, when in fact, they're not. The only difference is the ways in which the conflict has escalated. So sometimes it's easier to look at a conflict where they're not actually shooting at each other…and you don't have to go too far. You can go outside in northern California and find resource-based conflicts. And [you can explore] how power is part of conflict and how economics is part of power dynamics. The economic crisis and the ecological crisis are really forcing me to think seriously about pedagogical models and I’m feeling like we were totally need to shift gears because we've been training students for a world that is turning out to be different [than we thought].

Perhaps not only should we “think globally, act locally” as the old adage goes, but as teachers of global citizenship, we should also consider adopting the saying “Think about global conflicts, connect them to local conflicts.”

Objective 5:

Students will investigate the role of identity and ideology in conflict and terrorism, which may include the role of single-group identity in conflict, terrorism as an ideological response to perceived injustice, homegrown extremism, and the rise of xenophobic movements as a response to terrorism.

Discussion:
Nobel-prize winning Indian economist Amartya Sen’s thought-provoking book entitled *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny* (2006) is fundamental for all educators who teach violent conflict. In it, Sen argues that the simplification of our complex, multi-layered identities into single-group identities (whether they be ethnic, religious, or nationalistic) under the pretense of unity, in effect, divides us and serves as a catalyst for violent conflict. Sen describes this by saying, “Within group solidarity can help feed between-group discord,” and he goes on to explore how this idea is exemplified by the Hutus and Tutsis in Rwanda and the Hindu-Muslim riots of his childhood in India. In later chapters, Sen dispels the “clash of civilizations” myth by exposing the over-simplification of reducing the complexity of each of us as individuals into one or two civilizations (i.e. “Western” vs. “Non-Western”). He also discusses the mislabeling of global ideas (such as liberty and civic participation) as “Western” in order to elevate Western civilization over “Others.”

From my own experience, many secondary students seem to want simple and quick answers when it comes to violent conflict, and they often ask the question about why there is so much violence in the world. I have heard this question in every class each year that I have taught this type of content. Although my Global Studies course as a whole seeks to engage them in the complexity of the answer to that question, I have led them through powerful discussions about Sen’s ideas specifically, and my students usually quickly link his ideas to problematic high school in- vs. out-group dynamics that they experience. I have also assigned passages and short excerpts of Sen’s book as well,
and that also serves to help them learn how to grapple with complex text (a central
requirement of the Common Core State Standards).

As an educator of complex conflict and terrorism in the post-911 era, I find
myself frequently challenging my students’ assumptions that Islamic ideology is
inherently violent, and that the religion itself promotes modern terrorism. Interestingly,
the role of ideology as a cause of conflict, specifically terrorism, came up several times in
my survey research. One international relations researcher who responded to my survey
specifically mentioned the use of terrorism by young Muslim men as a tool to increase
conflict and ideological reaction against perceived injustice and as a pathway to vent,
despite its ineffectiveness. Dr. Oliver Roy, European University Institute political
science professor and expert on Iran, Islam, and Asian politics, wrote a noteworthy op-ed
piece for The New York Times entitled “Ideology and Terror” (2005) in which he
challenges the assumption that religious ideology is the root cause of modern terrorism
(See Appendix B). In this piece, Roy asserts:

What was true for the first generation of Al Qaeda is also relevant for the present
generation: even if these young men are from Middle Eastern or South Asian
families, they are for the most part Westernized Muslims living or even born in
Europe who turn to radical Islam….Moreover, converts are to be found in almost
every Qaeda cell: They did not turn fundamentalist because of Iraq, but because
they felt excluded from Western society (this is especially true of the many
converts from the Caribbean islands, both in Britain and France).….The Western-
based Islamic terrorists are not the militant vanguard of the Muslim community;
they are a lost generation, unmoored from traditional societies and cultures,
frustrated by a Western society that does not meet their expectations….And their
vision of a global ummah is both a mirror of and a form of revenge against the
globalization that has made them what they are.
It is crucial for students to explore how extremists co-opt religion (including, but not limited, to Islam), and misuse its religious texts in order to elevate, justify and/or popularize their cause. Roy’s op-ed is a particularly accessibly piece for secondary students, and so the full text can be found in Appendix B.

The development of homegrown extremism is another angle through which students can explore the changing role of ideology in conflict and terrorism. While the mainstream media has focused largely on terrorism in the Middle East and South Asia, extremism has become a growing issue for many European countries. The influx of political refugees and their children flooding into Europe has been met with integration challenges, and young, disoriented immigrants fall prey to extremist groups hoping to capitalize on their disorientation (Carpenter, Levitt, & Jacobsen, 2010). The U.S. is also not immune to homegrown terrorism. The case of the active recruitment of children of Somali immigrants in Minnesota into al-Shabaab-affiliated militant groups illustrates this phenomenon, as does radicalization within the prison system illustrated by the 2009 sentencing of two Muslim converts who had planned to attack synagogues and the Israeli consulate in California (Carpenter et al., 2010). Despite this, Arab and Muslim immigrants to the United States have had relatively more positive and inclusive integration experiences (Carpenter et al, 2010).

So, the question for students to explore then becomes: What are the conditions that prevent positive integration and create the disorientation that leads to the radicalization of immigrants? In what ways is the immigrant experience for Arabs and Muslims different in the United States compared to Europe? In what ways do civil rights
and civil liberties protections, as well as inclusive immigration policies, help thwart radicalization? As a case study, students can compare French and British anti-hijab policies in comparison to U.S. Justice Department lawsuits against schools and employers who prohibit the wearing of hijab. Students can also compare rates of hate-crime prosecution by European countries to those by the United States. And students can also spend time generating their own ideas for making integration a positive experience for immigrants.

The good guys vs. bad guys dichotomy has been a dominant ideology in the United States that some would argue has fueled military intervention and ultimately the exacerbation of global conflict (Herman & Chomsky, 2002; Thussu, 2006; Seethaler, Karmasin, Melischek, & Wohlert, 2013). But what exactly is terrorism and who are the terrorists? One survey respondent posed a question that has the possibility to be a basis for a discussion, a research paper, or a project for secondary students: “Why do we view them as ‘terrorists’ while they view themselves as ‘freedom fighters’?” This question fundamentally requires students to think critically about the term “terrorism.” Teaching About the Wars, a publication of Rethinking Schools, has a powerful lesson plan entitled “Whose Terrorism?” written by Bill Bigelow (2013) which requires students to think critically about the term by asking students to define “terrorism” and then apply their definitions to actual world events in the form of vignettes that have been disguised. In other words, the details of the events are factual, but the names of the nations or groups involved are fictionalized. Students then have to identify who are the terrorists in each situation, and through this lesson, students come to learn that it is not always easy to
determine who are the “good guys” and the “bad guys.” Through this lesson, students are also invited to think about whether terrorism can also be economic in nature. A possible follow-up reading could be Vandana Shiva’s article “Solidarity Against All Forms of Terrorism” (2011) in which she expands the definition of terrorism to include economic policies such as World Bank/IMF structural adjustment programs (See Appendix C for full article). Overall, this lesson aims to help students define terrorism, shift the gaze inward, and challenge the “us vs. them” binary dichotomy. (See also the sub-section of entitled “Challenging Binary Ways of Thinking” located in Part Two of this framework, “Methods and Attitudes for Teaching Conflict”).

One survey respondent, who is a university professor with expertise in the areas of war studies, global political economy, security studies, and crisis management, offered the idea of looking at the rise of xenophobic movements in Europe as a lens through which students could explore the role of identity and ideology in conflict. He writes:

In contemporary world in which terrorism and war is constantly changing and taking new (unexpected) forms, I would include a discussion of the rise of right wing, xenophobic movements in Europe to discuss how the shift in the western world toward multiculturalism is challenged. In contemporary Europe, new racist, anti-feminist politics is emerging which creates new insecurities. As an example would be the case of Anders Breivik. Perhaps, talking about hostility, racism and xenophobia in Scandinavia, which are seen as the models for equality and welfare state, can open a discussion on how in North America this phenomenon is emerging.

Another respondent wrote, “I would definitely include discussion of ‘our world after 9/11’. I'd explore responses to fear and trauma, anti-Americanism, and Islamophobia.” Islamophobia is defined as generalized fear of Islam and Muslims (Zine, 2004). Given the escalation of civil rights violations against Muslims and the increased activities of
anti-Islam thinkers and hate groups, teachers have a significant role to play in the prevention of Islamophobia (Hing, 2011; Zaal, 2012). The following section discusses rationale as well as pedagogical considerations for the inclusion of cultural demystification of Muslims and Arabs in the classroom.

Objective 6:

Students will examine and understand various and diverse cultures and cultural points of view, as well as differing perspectives within particular cultural groups; recognize cultural interconnections; and be able to explain the points of view of diverse cultures without distorting them through ones’ own cultural lens.

Discussion:

Cultural demystification was a clear theme that emerged in my surveys and interviews, specifically, the ways in which cultural education can play a role in conflict prevention. According to the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee Research Institute (2008), anti-Arab sentiment in the United States has peaked in the post-9/11 era. Hate crimes against Arabs and those who are perceived to be Arab and/or Middle Eastern have surged, and the Arab-American community has found itself not only in a defensive position, but oppressed by the image of Arab-as-terrorist (Shaheen, 2012). Further fueling this image, as well as homegrown right-wing militant extremism, is the seemingly endless use of military force by the United States in the Middle East as a response to terrorism. In light of these current global conflicts, scholars that I interviewed cited
cultural demystification as a crucial part of secondary education in order to help prevent further conflict as well as hate crimes.

While Collins, Czarra, and Smith (1998) articulate this objective clearly in Part II of their international studies guidelines, “Global Cultures and World Areas,” they do not include hate-crime and global conflict prevention as an important rationale, most likely because the global realities set in motion by 9/11 had not yet taken place. Nevertheless, their knowledge objectives in this area include powerful and relevant ideas: understanding how members of cultures view the world in different ways, understanding the ways in which (and to what degree) cultures change over time, understanding common universal ideas that connect all cultures, comparing and contrasting diverse cultural points of view, and articulating a concern or position from the point of view of another culture without distorting it with one’s own cultural lens (Collins, Czarra, & Smith, 1998).

A senior policy advisor and scholar of Arab studies discussed in an interview the many assumptions about the Arabs and Muslims that warrant clarification and critique. For example, many people think of the Arab world as merely consisting of Saudi Arabia, and others think that all of the Middle East is Arab. Students should be able to determine what constitutes an Arab country, and why, for example, Iran is not considered to be Arab. Students must understand that all Arab countries have Arabic as a majority language (although there are many dialects, and it is often not the only language spoken), Islam as a majority religion (although not necessarily the only religion practiced), as well as cultural and historic ties to one another (Shora, 2009). Secondary educators can help
students explore what Muslims believe, deconstruct stereotypes of Muslims and Arabs, analyze the misinterpretations of women in Islam, and critique the ways in which holy books of all kinds are often taken out of context to use as justification for conflict, oppression, and violence. Teachers can expose students to the contributions and accomplishments of Arabs and Arab-Americans, as well present students with positive Arab characters in popular culture.

This same scholar, who educates the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security about Arab culture, discussed (with quite a bit of humor, might I add) about why it’s important to demystify Arab culture for the American public. He told me the following:

Give them enough knowledge and tools to have foundational respect for these cultures, because they look at the Arab world and say, “There are no democracies there, they are kind of backwards, they are still developing, they have oil, and they have Dubai.” Explain to your students that a lot of the developments from the Arab world helped usher in the Renaissance, [influenced] Roman and Greek literature…[Arab] people didn’t get dumber, the situation around them got worse.

Although the cultural demystification of the Arab world is a logical choice for teachers who are looking to incorporate this theme into a study of global conflict, there are many other cultures/regions to which this theme can be easily applied. For example, one could easily tie in the cultural demystification of Asia and/or Africa part of an entire Global Studies course. The same stereotypes of backwardness and underdevelopment mentioned by the scholar above apply to Africa as well. For example, one can teach Chinua Achebe’s *Things Fall Apart* through the lens of the demystification of Igbo tribal community structures (including polygamy) and Igbo spirituality. This could be part of a
larger critique of colonial literature (exemplified by Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*) and the dehumanization of the African people that lies therein. Teaching *Persepolis*, Marjane Satrapi’s memoir of growing up in revolutionary Iran, has the potential to demystify Persian culture and engage students in a critique of Western assumptions of Iranian people. Through my own experience teaching the language arts portion of a global studies humanities course, literature has the potential to be a highly effective vehicle for cultural demystification in that reading the stories of diverse cultural groups enables students to understand human commonalities and varying cultural perspectives.

Even if a global citizenship program aims to embody an inclusive and holistic perspective, in practice, it should avoid unintentional ethnocentrism, paternalism, and salvationism (Andreotti & de Souza, 2012). It is important for global citizenship education to avoid celebrating diversity unless it also addresses and presents solutions for those dealing with dismal realities (Andreotti & de Souza, 2012). It should promote critical thinking about globalization in such a way that avoids exoticized stereotypes of peoples and paternalistic pedagogy (Taylor, 2012).

METHODS AND ATTITUDES FOR TEACHING CONFLICT

*Introduction*

As I designed my survey and interview questions, I envisioned a number of topics and content-related themes to emerge. What surprised me was that even though I did not ask any specific questions related to methodology and teacher-attitudes, aside from one
question about teaching to think versus teaching to act, passionate and lengthy discussions about methods and attitudes surfaced. I quickly came to realize that the ideas discussed in this section are instrumental to teaching for global citizenship in general and teaching conflict in particular. They are also applicable to teaching any content or discipline. Many of us engage in these methods already without even realizing it. I, for one, have noticed them more in my own practice. I have grouped these methods/attitudes into six topics that are discussed at length in this section and they consist of the following:

- **Challenging students’ assumptions**
- **Shifting binary ways of thinking**
- **Contextualizing conflict and connecting the global to the local**
- **Teach to think, teach to act, or both?**
- **Analyzing the complexity of conflict before finding the solution**

**Challenging students’ assumptions**

Globally competent individuals are able to not only examine the perspectives of others, but examine and explain their own worldviews and traditions and understand how these influence their daily lives (Boix-Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). From my own experience as a student and as a teacher of global studies, I’ve noticed that real learning takes place when our assumptions are challenged and we are forced to reevaluate what we always thought to be true. One of the most moving moments as a teacher happened just a couple years ago in my second year teaching 10th grade Global Studies. The theme
of the course is “Understanding + Communication = Trust.” In the beginning of the year, we take a quiz on what we know about Arabs and Arab-Americans, and the sophomores in my class largely conclude that they really only know that Arabs are terrorists. I will note that this is one reason why I have made one of the goals of the class to foster a deep understanding of Arabs, Arab-Americans, their contributions, their culture, their art, and their writing. Equally important is the communication piece, so my students communicate regularly with a class in Morocco via blog.

Two years ago, after taking the “What do we know about Arabs” quiz, we started reading the first chapter of The Arab-American Handbook by Nawar Shora, and a rather vocal student whom I will call Brandon, raised his hand abruptly and said to me, “Nuth, there is nothing that you are going to do or say that’s going to make me like Arabs.” I gathered myself together after the initial shock of this student’s honesty, and responded, “I bet you five bucks that your perception of Arabs will change by the end of this year.” We shook on it, and as days turned into weeks, and weeks into months, the bet faded from my mind. That is, until the last day of school, when Brandon came up to me, gave me a big hug, and put a $5 bill in my hand. I asked, “What’s this for?” Brandon replied, “It’s the bet from the beginning of the year, remember? This class has completely changed the way I look at people in this world, especially Arabs.” This was the moment that really made me understand the importance of unseating our students, of challenging their lines of thinking in ways that beckon them to engage rather than shut down. If it is uncomfortable for us as educators, then we need to practice it until it becomes comfortable. Assumptions about the “other” have broad implications for all kinds of
conflicts, not only global conflicts. Challenging our assumptions is a definitive step towards peace-building, and it often starts in the classroom.

A powerful way to challenge the assumptions of our students (and ourselves, for that matter) is to position ourselves to view American culture reflected through another culture’s eyes. This idea emerged from a conversation with a professor who is involved in a college study abroad program. Living abroad for a year has been the experience that has challenged elemental tenets of her students’ cultures. As an example, this professor told me an interesting story about a young woman who went to live in a culture where women were treated in ways that this student perceived to be discriminatory. This student had to grapple with this treatment, and it was a larger struggle of trying to figure out how to interact with a completely different world than she had envisioned. Ultimately, this student realized that the way she was being treated was in no way malicious, but the men were trying to show her honor in the ways of their culture. As a woman travelling in Indonesia with my Indonesian cousin, I too had to let go of the fact that my male cousin was always going to walk ahead of me, because that is the way that they show respect and protection towards women. It was very uncomfortable for me to step back into a position that initially felt inferior through my American lens, that is, until I let go of my American lens. So, following this discussion, I realized that very few of my sophomores would be able to study abroad at this time, but I certainly could encourage them to do so in the future. I began wondering what I could do right now to help students view their own culture through the lens of another. Literature is a powerful tool for this, obviously. Furthermore, there are several This American Life podcasts that
come to mind immediately. Episode 406, “True Urban Legends,” has a segment of interviews in which recent immigrants reveal the aspects of American culture that were most shocking to them upon arrival, including the way we treat the homeless and our elderly relatives, as well as the fact that we allow our pets to jump in bed with us (Snyder, 2010). Episode 302, “Strangers in a Strange Land,” not only includes stories of immigrants coming to the United States, but a story of a well-meaning American who has all of his assumptions about development challenged through his experiences in Sierra Leone. American students tend to have many assumptions about aid and development in particular, and I have found it especially powerful to explore their drawbacks and unintended consequences.

Challenging our own assumptions can be quite uncomfortable, let alone challenging the assumptions of teenagers who perhaps have not yet fully developed the emotional maturity to engage in meaningful self-reflection. One scholar with whom I spoke believes that it is vital to engage her students with the idea that the dominant capitalist paradigm is a major cause of conflict in today’s world, yet this topic is particularly problematic. She told me that it’s as if she is asking fish to understand the water they’re swimming in. Although she pairs this challenge of capitalism with the alternatives being articulated by social movements, some students just don’t get it, and she attributes that partially to their development. Over time, she has come to realize that addressing capitalism through the lens of food sovereignty was a better way to force students to grapple with their assumptions about the dominant paradigm. Given the various stages of development of teenagers, the question for secondary educators who
wish to challenge their students’ assumptions then becomes, must all students get it, as the Common Core State Standards and high-stakes assessments demand? How much must they understand about their own assumptions, and how can this type of understanding measured? Does challenging our students’ assumptions earlier in their emotional and intellectual development actually help them develop self-reflectivity sooner? These would be interesting ideas for future research projects.

Students are trained to be consumers of knowledge, and they assume that facts exist and that they have the ability to negotiate those facts. Students need to learn how to problematize facts and understand the subjectivity of “facts.” A scholar I interviewed told me a story about how in his high school contemporary history class, a Vietnam veteran was invited as a guest speaker. At the end of the lecture, a student asked the veteran if he thought that Americans won or lost the war. He responds by saying that he has no choice but to believe that America won the war because that is the only way he is able to get up in the morning. The professor who relayed this story reflected, “This guy still slept with a gun under his bed, so it’s okay for him to believe that America won the war.” Students need to understand that knowledge is political and that facts are not necessarily “facts” the way in the rigid way that they’ve been taught to conceptualize them. The contexts in which facts are understood and utilized are just as important as the facts themselves.

Another way to look at challenging students’ assumptions is perhaps a bit more personal. It deals with the premise that students genuinely want to know about their teachers, and throwing curveballs at them once in while is a great way to unseat them. I
had a powerful conversation with an international studies professor about this type of unseating of her students’ assumptions about her, and she told a particularly illustrative story:

So in my classes, there are a couple of strategies that I use to unseat students. One of them is that I will occasionally drop some fact about myself, something that I will reveal that will have them looking at me in a sort of confusing way. An American student will look at me and they will have some assumptions because of the way that I talk and the way that I look. I was not born in America. I always wear kind of boy clothes, so occasionally I'll wear makeup and that disrupts them and they get confused. They're desperate to know a lot about you. So, you know, I will play with a lot of different versions of femininity and masculinity and race just to confuse them. One of the things that I talk about is my little car named Betty. And Betty is a shed of a car. And my kids probably all aspire to drive a car that is nicer than mine by a great margin. I tell them a story about going to a wedding and pulling up to the valet and me popping out wearing a nice dress and the confusion that ensues about how I fit in [the context of] Betty. And then they talk about experiences of times that they looked at someone in ways that emphasized the disconnect between what they're perceiving and how they are perceiving themselves and how other people perceive them.

So challenging students’ assumptions is not only limited to the content being taught, but it can also be about students’ perceptions of their teachers. Teenagers are quick to want to fit people into categories, and modeling the disruption of those categorizations can potentially help them see each other, the world, and themselves in a different light.

This same professor also talked about disrupting the assumptions that our students have about the ways in which we engage with the world in the digital era. Our students do not remember a time when cell phones and Facebook did not exist. They do not understand what it is like to go an hour without getting a text message. They've never listened to an album the whole way through. It would be very interesting to explore how these technologies both facilitate and hinder the ways in which we engage with the world.
This professor told me that she gave her students an assignment to put their cell phones in another room for an hour and write about the experience. Some students cried, and many others expressed genuine anxiety throughout the exercise. They don’t know what it’s like to be bored and have their brains wander around until it settles on something to explore. That was our childhood, and that is how our brains developed. Asking students to disrupt their dependency on gadgets is a powerful exercise. It disrupts what they think they already know and it gets them to see that what they would consider to be totally normal has not always been. They have an illusion of being in control. If we ask teenagers to sit down and listen to an album from beginning to end in the order in which the artist intended, they have to resist the urge to push the forward button. We need to find ways to get them to relinquish control, to engage, and to listen. Whether that is giving them an assignment that forces them to disrupt their habits, or revealing something personal about ourselves as humans, it is equally important as using content and subject matter to disrupt their knowledge-based assumptions.

_Shifting Binary Ways of Thinking_

Related to the challenging of assumptions is the challenging of binary ways of thinking about conflict in particular, and this was a clear theme that emerged in my interview and survey research. Various studies have highlighted the importance of engaging students in self-reflection regarding binary modes of thinking in order to support transformational learning and foster true understanding of global problems (Stewart, 2008; Barry, 2010). Ryan and Louie (2007) assert that ignoring complexities
within cultures prior to comparing or analyzing interactions between cultures leads to misunderstanding and is therefore bad teaching practice. Through my own experiences teaching global conflict, I have noticed that my secondary students come into my class with a propensity to think in terms of binaries (i.e. “us vs. them,” “good vs. evil,” “bad guys vs. good guys”). Some of the scholars that I interviewed have seen a similar tendency in their college freshman, so I began to think about the role of the educator in helping students exchanging these simplistic “either-or” modes of thinking for those that recognize complexity and grapple with grey areas of conflict.

I interviewed a former U.S. diplomat who is now a political science and international studies professor, and she told me about the ways in which she sees her students fall prey to the good vs. evil dichotomy, and how she addresses it in her classes. She told me that although her students tend to be very liberal and would view themselves as being open-minded, they often take sides after studying a conflict in a particular area of the world. She tries to get her students to understand that all people are capable of doing horrible things given the right circumstances, and she tries to impart an understanding of the structures that make people do those things. She wants her students to understand that brutality exists on all sides of a conflict; this is especially the case when studying revolutions, because she noticed that her students have a tendency to glorify historic revolutionaries as well as contemporary revolutionary movements.

This same professor also talked about the power of role-play to help students understand the varying perspectives carried by those involved in conflict. She
specifically discussed how many of her students view Israelis as being an oppressive people, and how she responds:

That's where role-play is important. Once you walk around in their shoes and you understand a little history and some context, then you can understand that [the Israel-Palestine conflict] didn't just come from nowhere. Certainly a lot of nice, younger students think that Israel's horrible, but I say let's just rewind the tape, guys, in terms of the Jewish diaspora and hideous things that have been done to them, not just the Holocaust, but over time. Now, let's try to replay this with the mindset of paranoid historical fear and see how we play through this in a different tone of voice, instead of just picking on Israelis as bad, evil people that don't understand anything. I think it's important to get people to walk around in the shoes of the people. They have a desire at that age to want to rebel and assume that everything that someone in power says must be wrong...We need to get them out of the vein of iterating a single narrative.

This professor also discussed her students’ apparent desire to defend and respect cultural autonomy at all costs and that Western society should absolutely never interfere in indigenous cultural traditions. In order to challenge this single narrative, she posed the question of whether female genital mutilation should be respected and defended. She asked them whether they would defend female genital mutilation at all costs. And that is, she says, when they start to understand the trouble with thinking in single-narrative binaries.

In my global studies class, I teach the Israel-Palestine conflict through role play. After students get a solid historical foundation from the perspectives of both the Israelis and the Palestinians, they screen a film called Promises, which follows children from Israel and Palestine as they begin to interact with one another and discuss the obstacles to peace and potential solutions. The film itself challenges binary ways of thinking about this conflict in that it obliterates the idea that it has merely two sides; students see how
the perspectives of religious and secular Israelis vary greatly, and they also come to understand that Palestinians fall on varying points on the moderate-to-extreme political spectrum. Following the film, *Promises*, students engage in a role-play activity in which they attempt to resolve various barriers-to-peace through dialogue. Each student is given information about their family, their history, and their ties to the land, as well as how these have influenced their political beliefs. The goal is not necessarily to solve the conflict, but for students to understand that there are multiple sides, and to begin to feel what it might be like to be involved. The challenge that I have found is that students quickly see the complexity of the conflict, and so they automatically declare that it is a hopeless situation. So to follow-up on this activity, students do a group-project in which they research and present to the class the work of grassroots organizations that are working for peace. The goal is for them to understand the complexity of the conflict, and then also understand that wherever the peace process is on the governance-level, there are also everyday people engaging in innovative and inspiring peace efforts.

Overall, shifting binary ways of thinking about conflict is directly related to challenging students’ assumptions. It is all about challenging the assumption that only one or two narratives exist, that there is just one right and one wrong perspective, one good guy and one bad guy. The key is to get students to *practice* this type of thinking, and as an educator of global conflict, I find that modeling my own process of recognizing when I have fallen into black-and-white thinking is just as important as providing meaningful curriculum. One way to do this is to explore an emerging conflict (about which I am not yet an expert) along with my students. As the crisis in the Ukraine and
Crimea unfolded, I began studying the conflict along with my students for the first time, but I also began exploring with them how difficult it was to tease out the complexity of the conflict through the news reports I was hearing. I showed them propaganda videos from the Ukrainian left that pulled on my heart strings, and we explored the techniques used on both sides of the conflict to push the consumers of American media to take sides. I practiced challenging my own assumptions and my own propensity to want to simplify the conflict in front of them. This process can be applied to any global event. The question that I try to ask myself before teaching any particular conflict is, “In what ways will this lesson help my students shift binary ways of thinking, and in what ways can I model this behavior for them?”

Contextualizing conflict and connecting the global to the local

Contextualizing conflict was a major theme that emerged in both my surveys and interviews. Every one of the five scholars I interviewed emphasized the need to contextualize conflict, as did several survey respondents. I grouped these responses into three categories for deeper analysis: understanding the broader context of singular events within a conflict, exploring our own complicity in conflict abroad, and finding commonalities between the contexts of both local and global conflicts.

One survey respondent discussed the need to put singular events into context by providing the example of Israel’s targeted killings and Palestinian bus bombings. This respondent emphasized that rather than viewing them as isolated events, they need to be understood within the broader context of the conflict as a whole, but this must be done
without necessarily condoning the actions. How can teachers ensure that students understand the context of violent conflict while at the same time avoid justifying and condoning the violent act? Is it enough for a teacher to ask students to put themselves in the shoes of the perpetrators of violence, yet verbally reinforce how violence is never the answer? This would be an interesting topic for future study.

Another way that we can contextualize conflict is by exploring our own connection and complicity to global conflicts, which was an idea that emerged in several surveys and interviews. One on my survey respondents discussed the need for students to get in the habit of not only reading the newspaper on a regular basis, but also start to have a basic understanding of the ways in which their own lives are connected to events or processes that, on the surface, appear far away or disconnected from their immediate experiences. Another survey respondent made the point that students have to understand American complicity in global conflict by citing the example of how one cannot study conflict caused by famine in Somalia without first looking closely at U.S. agricultural policy. This same respondent, a professor of international relations at a private university in the Northeast, emphasized that we should not try to solve problems in which we are complicit unless we first remove our complicity. So from this, a question that educators can apply to global conflict emerges: In what ways is our country complicit in this conflict and how do we as a nation rectify this complicity?

A Chicago-based international studies professor proposed a thought-provoking way to contextualize conflict in our interview; in short, identify a conflict-related theme, such as the relationship between capital and labor, indigenous land rights, or resource-
based conflicts, and then explore that theme through both local and global case studies. In this way, students can make connections between local and global contexts. In effect, this method is another way of teaching students that conflict is not just “out there,” but right here as well, and it enables them to draw comparisons between the local and global contexts of conflict. The professor I interviewed teaches a class called Global Chicago in which her students look at Chicago as a global city in terms of ideas, specifically, conflicts between capital and labor over the last two centuries. They study the anarchists, the Chicago fire, the Pullman Strike, and the Haymarket riots and analyze the ways in which the media elicited fear among the public in order to justify a violent form of city governance. Then students perform their own research on media representation of a conflict between capital and labor anywhere in the world; her students’ projects included a bus strike in Singapore, a general strike in Sweden in the early 20th century, the Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia, and the match girl strike in London in 1888. Being very focused on a set of ideas and finding case studies that demonstrate those ideas can be a powerful way to make connections between the global and local. In this particular assignment, students even were able to go so far as to discuss how these ideas eventually became part of political platforms, and thus turn into ideologies.

Teach to Think or Teach to Act (or Both?)

Oxfam International developed a global citizenship education program that contends that the idea that people can make a difference in the world is a crucial attitude to be cultivated among young people because it includes a willingness to learn from our
mistakes, a belief that we can improve and become better people, and a willingness to
work towards a more just and equitable future (Oxfam Development Education
Programme, 2009). Of all the topics and themes that emerged in my interviews, this was
the most controversial. The question of whether we are responsible for teaching students
to take action on issues of global significance did not make it onto my survey because the
question did not actually emerge until I noticed it come up time and time again in
International Studies Association Convention panels and roundtables. So I decided to
add this question to my interviews because it not only seemed to elicit strong reactions at
the ISA Convention, but it is also a question that I have struggled with since I started
teaching. Are we responsible to teach students to think or teach them to act, or both? As
I expected, my interviewees were all over the board on this question, each with their own
unique and compelling arguments.

I interviewed a professor and International Studies Association Pedagogy Award
winner from a private university in the Northeast. In our interview, he told me how he
does not think our role is to prepare students to be activists, much to the chagrin of his
colleagues:

I don't think it's our job and I've gotten into a lot of trouble with my colleagues at
the university on this issue, therefore I'm known as the Dragon of Doom. I
actually don't think that we should bring activism into our classroom. Preparing
students to be activists is also not our job. Our job is simpler than that. For the
three or four years that we get them in [our classrooms], there is an opportunity to
develop a critical self-consciousness. Once they leave high school and college, it's
over. I invest a lot of energy in making sure they just sit and theorize and think
about these things.
A former American diplomat who is now an international relations professor agrees with this position. She told me that she believes that our main job is to teach students how to make solid arguments. She told me, “I don't think it's our job to tell anybody to take action. I think it's our job to help them decide what they think about it. My job is not to tell them to go join a revolution, my job is to teach them how to make a good argument.” This professor went on to discuss that what is problematic about taking action locally to stop global conflicts is that often times, people engage at the wrong level. Sometimes you need to be in the government to fix problems created by government. Sometimes you need to be involved at the level of international governance, such as NATO or the United Nations. She said that fighting at the wrong level is often fruitless.

Two of my other interviewees responded that it is indeed the responsibility of teachers to teach students how to take action. The peace studies and social movements scholar and sociology professor that I interviewed discussed the importance of teaching students how to be leaders and how to work together to solve the world’s biggest problems. Her ideas were particularly compelling, particularly her model social forum project that she assigns to one of her international studies classes. This professor told me:

I think we have to help students know how to take action, and I’m increasingly convinced that that is our main job. And it goes back to the question of how do we teach in this moment when the United States is in decline, the capitalist system is in decline, and [economic] crises are making everything have to change? So how do you teach students to deal with this world when the conventional pathways are not there? The jobs that they are expecting to get when they graduate or not there. They're not going to be there. So how do we prepare them for a world that we don't even know? We have to teach them how to be leaders. I talk to them about what it means to be a leader and have them think about what leadership is in their
social context. One of the exercises that I do is a model social forum. They really struggle with it because it doesn't fit their models of how to do things. It requires a different kind of thinking and work. But by the end when they write their reflection papers, you can see that they've really learned how to work in groups, they've learned about the diverse skills that people bring to the group, they learn about individual responsibility and leadership, and I have forced them to think outside of the box in this exercise. They have to really confront what's wrong. For example, is it really going to solve climate change if you just get individuals to reduce their own carbon emissions? Some of them actually go into depth about the larger social questions like democracy. So beyond the issue that they've learned, they're learning about the ways that social movements are trying to respond to that issue. They also learn a lot about themselves and how change happens. We're taught, as teachers, how to keep things the same. We really need to be more mindful about how to confront the roles that we've been given.

The professor of international studies from Chicago explains that it is the philosophy of her department to encourage students to take action:

In our international social movements class, [students] have to pick a social movement to analyze in Chicago. The idea is it's all very well and good to talk about the Maoists in China or India, but when you see a social movement as tackling a problem in your own city, perhaps even on your block or in your neighborhood, that forces you to engage in a different way with whatever it is they're doing. And then later on we have [students] extrapolate from the bottom up more generally. And sometimes they get really involved in the movement, like Girls on the Run that keeps intercity girls active and running. And some of them got really involved with an inner-city spoken word group, and I can see that from their activities on Facebook that they're still involved.

I have gone back and forth on this question throughout my career so far. In my sophomore Global Studies class, when we study the Israel-Palestine conflict, we analyze the history and current state of the peace process on the governance-level, and then students work in groups on a project that explores what grassroots peace organizations are doing on the ground. That’s where the true inspiration to act comes from, and that’s also where much of the hope exists. The Israel-Palestine conflict is particularly complex with divergent and often conflicting paths to resolution, so I find it
absolutely essential to ensure that my students don’t leave that unit feeling like there will never be hope for a resolution. The conclusion that I have come to in terms of my own practice is to focus on teaching students how to think, how to confront their own assumptions, and how to turn their gaze inward as well as outward. I also feel like I need to teach them about the ways in which people have taken and continue to take action to confront issues of global significance; however, I do not rally them to support a cause or join a protest movement, because I want that to come from within them, and I also do not want to alienate students who do not share that inclination. The model social forum idea, as well as the exploration of local social movements/organizations, appears to be quite applicable to secondary students.

*Analyzing the complexity of conflict before finding a solution*

Teachers must be cautious about presenting broad metanarratives about the nature of peace and violence that ignore local conceptions, unique histories, and contextualized struggles (Bajaj, 2008). Teachers need to engage students in the complexities and messiness of conflict, peace, and human rights struggles in ways that are age-appropriate and foster engagement rather than disillusionment (Bajaj, 2008). This theme is particularly compelling because we live in a society with a great propensity to want to fix things. In my earlier discussion of humanitarianism and humanitarian intervention, I discussed how common it is for my secondary students to want a quick and easy solution to global problems (and often it involves raising money and sending it to an NGO). My hunch is that they are enculturated in a society who tends to do the same. They are also
being taught in an education system that has so often emphasized breadth of knowledge rather than depth of knowledge that deep analysis of the complexity of global issues, global conflicts in particular, is rare.

One of my interviewees, an international relations professor, discussed the impatience we have in the Western world with fixing things, and offered an interesting metaphor for this propensity:

I don't teach about peacekeeping. I don't have anything in that course that talks about resolutions or peace. I'm pretty engrossed with the notion that there is an impatience that comes with fixing things. There is a Western propensity to want to fix things. One of the problems with wanting to fix things is that you never face the power of the full problem. And one of the ways I talk about that metaphorically is that I tell my students that they think they are on an Appalachian hike but they don't realize that they are on a Himalayan trek. So they don't come prepared and they want solutions and they become overburdened by anxiety. The anxiety prevents them from thinking through the problem completely.

Another international relations scholar that I interviewed explained how she engages her students in the complexity of global conflict. She begins her undergraduate international relations class by telling her students that they are going to spend 10 weeks finding out what the problem is, rather than the solution. Then, she sends students to the library to find 10 sources of information analyzing a particular conflict. Each student has 10 templates onto which they record bibliographic information and discuss the importance, relevance, and value of the source. When twenty students come back with ten sources each, then they begin to have a discussion about what they have found and begin an analysis of what the problem is. Students who have found the same source often view that source through a unique lens and have different things to say about it. In this
way, not only are students engaged in the complexity of the conflict rather than finding solutions. But the end of the 10 weeks, they will have, perhaps accidentally, put together a research paper.

As a follow-up to this, I asked these two scholars how to prevent students from leaving class feeling completely hopeless and depressed about the complexity of global conflicts if they do not discuss the solutions. One scholar told me never to underestimate the resilience of my students. He told me that what seems like depression is only temporary. He said, “I'm far less interested in holding them up. The only optimism that I allow is that they can see that I'm not morbid and depressed…It important to recognize that a certain amount of depression is productive and necessary and they are far more resilient than you think. They will be okay.”
CONCLUSIONS OF THIS FRAMEWORK

This framework is essentially a grassroots, teacher-driven, effort at creating global education standards. It involved no policy makers, publishing corporations, or testing companies. I used my passion for global education as the inspiration for the project. I sought out international relations and international studies scholars from a variety of institutions and disciplines around the world to provide insights about their own pedagogies. I extensively reviewed the literature on global citizenship education and teaching conflict, and I fused this research with my own practice teaching globally over the last 8 years.

Although the themes, objectives, and methods contained in this framework emerged from thinking about teaching conflict specifically, many of these ideas can be applied to various topics of global significance. Whether we are studying global economics, human rights issues, or global environmental issues, teachers can shift the outward gaze inward, explore colonial origins and legacies, challenge students’ assumptions, shift binary ways of thinking, connect the global to the local, and explore the complexities of all of these issues and the ways in which they are all intertwined. The complexity of the globalized landscape is like a web; if you touch on part of the web, the entire web reverberates.

This framework emphasizes specific critical thinking skills rather than specific content. Although critical thinking is a buzzword in the education community, this framework seeks to articulate what critical thinking looks like in terms of global
education. Each person who explores these ideas may have his or her own case studies or content that could serve to help students meet these objectives. There are myriad ways to explore each objective, which have only been briefly explored in this paper. My hope is that these themes, objectives, and methods are used, shared, explored, and further developed, and that what eventually emerges is a more formal articulation of global citizenship education standards created for teachers by teachers.
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APPENDIX A

“Responsibility to Protect” Doctrine

from United Nations World Summit Outcome (2005)

Responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing
and crimes against humanity

138. Each individual State has the responsibility to protect its populations from
genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. This responsibility
entails the prevention of such crimes, including their incitement, through appropriate and
necessary means. We accept that responsibility and will act in accordance with it. The
international community should, as appropriate, encourage and help States to exercise
this responsibility and support the United Nations in establishing an early warning
capability.

139. The international community, through the United Nations, also has the
responsibility to use appropriate diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means,
in accordance with Chapters VI and VIII of the Charter, to help to protect populations
from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. In this context,
we are prepared to take collective action, in a timely and decisive manner, through the
Security Council, in accordance with the Charter, including Chapter VII, on a case-by-
case basis and in cooperation with relevant regional organizations as appropriate, should
peaceful means be inadequate and national authorities are manifestly failing to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. We stress the need for the General Assembly to continue consideration of the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity and its implications, bearing in mind the principles of the Charter and international law. We also intend to commit ourselves, as necessary and appropriate, to helping States build capacity to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity and to assisting those which are under stress before crises and conflicts break out.

140. We fully support the mission of the Special Adviser of the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide.
APPENDIX B

The ideology of terror

By Olivier Roy

Published: Saturday, July 23, 2005 in The New York Times

PARIS — While Thursday's explosions on London's subway and bus lines were thankfully far less serious than those of two weeks ago, they will lead many to raise a troubling question: has Britain (and Spain as well) been "punished" by Al Qaeda for participating in the American-led military interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan?

While this is a reasonable line of thinking, it presupposes the answer to a broader and more pertinent question: Are the roots of Islamic terrorism in the Middle Eastern conflicts?

If the answer is yes, the solution is simple to formulate, although not to achieve: Leave Afghanistan and Iraq, solve the Israel-Palestine conflict. But if the answer is no, as I suspect it is, we should look deeper into the radicalization of young, Westernized Muslims.

Conflicts in the Middle East have a tremendous impact on Muslim public opinion worldwide. In justifying its terrorist attacks by referring to Iraq, Al Qaeda is looking for popularity or at least legitimacy among Muslims. But many of the terrorist group's statements, actions and non-actions indicate that this is largely propaganda, and that Iraq, Afghanistan and Palestine are hardly the motivating factors behind its global jihad.

First, let's consider the chronology. The Americans went to Iraq and Afghanistan after Sept. 11, not before. Mohamed Atta and the other pilots were not driven by Iraq or Afghanistan. Were they then driven by the plight of the Palestinians? It seems unlikely. After all, the attack was plotted well before the second intifada began in September 2000, at a time of relative optimism in Israeli-Palestinian negotiations.

Another motivating factor, we are told, was the presence of "infidel" troops in Islam's holy lands. Yes, Osama bin Laden was reported to be upset when the Saudi royal family allowed Western troops into the kingdom before the Persian Gulf war. But bin Laden was by that time a veteran fighter committed to global jihad. He and the other members of the first generation of Al Qaeda left the Middle East to fight the Soviet Union in Afghanistan in the 1980s. Except for the smallish Egyptian faction led by Ayman al-Zawahiri, now bin Laden's chief deputy, these militants were not involved in Middle Eastern politics.
Abdullah Azzam, bin Laden's mentor, gave up supporting the Palestinian Liberation Organization long before his death in 1989 because he felt that to fight for a localized political cause was to forsake the real jihad, which he felt should be international and religious in character.

From the beginning, Al Qaeda's fighters were global jihadists, and their favored battlegrounds have been outside the Middle East: Afghanistan, Bosnia, Chechnya and Kashmir. For them, every conflict is simply a part of the Western encroachment on the Muslim ummah, the worldwide community of believers.

Second, if the conflicts in Afghanistan, Iraq and Palestine are at the core of the radicalization, why are there virtually no Afghans, Iraqis or Palestinians among the terrorists? Rather, the bombers are mostly from the Arabian Peninsula, North Africa, Egypt and Pakistan - or they are Western-born converts to Islam.

Why would a Pakistani or a Spaniard be more angry than an Afghan about American troops in Afghanistan? It is precisely because they do not care about Afghanistan as such, but see the U.S. involvement there as part of a global phenomenon of cultural domination.

What was true for the first generation of Al Qaeda is also relevant for the present generation: even if these young men are from Middle Eastern or South Asian families, they are for the most part Westernized Muslims living or even born in Europe who turn to radical Islam.

Moreover, converts are to be found in almost every Qaeda cell: They did not turn fundamentalist because of Iraq, but because they felt excluded from Western society (this is especially true of the many converts from the Caribbean islands, both in Britain and France).

"Born again" or converts, they are rebels looking for a cause. They find it in the dream of a virtual, universal ummah, the same way the ultraleftists of the 1970s (the Baader-Meinhof Gang, the Italian Red Brigades) cast their terrorist actions in the name of the "world proletariat" and "Revolution" without really caring about what would happen after.

It is also interesting to note that none of the Islamic terrorists captured so far had been active in any legitimate antiwar movements or even in organized political support for the people they claim to be fighting for. They don't distribute leaflets or collect money for hospitals and schools. They do not have a rational strategy to push for the interests of the Iraqi or Palestinian people.
Even their calls for the withdrawal of the European troops from Iraq ring false. After all, the Spanish police have foiled terrorist attempts in Madrid even since the government withdrew its forces. Western-based radicals strike where they are living, not where they are instructed to or where it will have the greatest political effect on behalf of their nominal causes.

The Western-based Islamic terrorists are not the militant vanguard of the Muslim community; they are a lost generation, unmoored from traditional societies and cultures, frustrated by a Western society that does not meet their expectations.

And their vision of a global ummah is both a mirror of and a form of revenge against the globalization that has made them what they are.
18th September was the day for solidarity with victims of the September 11th terrorist attack on the U.S. I joined the millions to observe two minutes silence at 10:30 a.m. for those who lost their lives in the assault on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon. But I also thought of the millions who are victims of other terrorist actions and other forms of violence. And I renewed my commitment to resist violence in all its forms.

At 10:30 a.m. on 18th September, I was with Laxmi, Raibari, Suranam in Jhodia Sahi village in Kashipur district in Orissa. Laxmi's husband Ghabi Jhodia was among the 20 tribals who have recently died of starvation.

In the same village Subarna Jhodia had also died. Later we met Singari in Bilamal village who has lost her husband Sadha, elder son Surat, younger son Paila and daughter-in-law Sulami. The deliberate denial of food to the hungry is at the core of the World Bank Structural Adjustment programmes. Dismantling the Public Distribution System (PDS) was a World Bank conditionality. It was justified on grounds of reducing expenditure. But the food subsidy budget has exploded from Rs. 2,800 crore in 1991 to Rs. 14,000 crore in 2001. More money is being spent to store grain because the Bank required that food subsidies be withdrawn. This led to increase in food prices, lowering of purchase from PDS and hence build up of stocks. The food security of the nation is collapsing.

While observing 2 minutes silence in the midst of tribal families who are victims of starvation even while 60 million tonnes are rotting in the godowns, I could not help but think of economic policies which push people into poverty and starvation as a form of terrorism.

Starvation deaths in Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Orissa are a symptom of the breakdown of our food systems. Kashipur was gifted with abundance of nature. Starvation does not belong here. It is the result of waves of violence against nature and the tribal communities. It is a result of a brutal state ever present to snatch the resources of the tribals for industry and private corporations, but totally absent in providing welfare and security to the dispossessed tribals.

The starvation deaths in Kashipur and other regions are a result of the ecological plunder of the resources of the region, the dismantling of the food, security system under economic reform policies and the impact of climate change which caused two years of
crop failure due to drought and this year's crop failure due to excessive and unseasonal rain.

Twenty years ago, the pulp and paper industry raped the forests of Kashipur. Today the herbs stand naked, and the paper mills are bringing Eucalyptus from neighbouring Andhra Pradesh.

The terrorism of the pulp industry has already left the region devastated. Now the giant mining companies - Hydro of Norway, Alcan of Canada, Indico, Balco/Sterlite of India have unleashed a new wave terror. They are eyeing the bauxite in the majestic hills of Kashipur. Bauxite is used for aluminium - aluminium that will go to make Coca Cola cans and fighter planes.

Imagine each mountain to be a World Trade Centre built by nature over millennia. Think of how many tragedies bigger than what the world experienced on Sep 11th are taking place to provide raw material for insatiable industry and markets. We stopped the ecological terrorism of the mining industry in my home - the Doon Valley - in 1983. The Supreme Court closed the mines, and ruled that commerce that threatens life must be stopped. But our ecological victories of the 1980s were undone with the environmental deregulation accompanying globalisation policies.

Mining has been "liberalised" and corporations are rushing to find minerals wherever they can. The Aluminium companies want the homelands of the Kashipur tribals.

But triabls of Kashipur refuse to leave their homes. They are defending the land and earth - through a non-violent resistance movement -- the movement for the Protection of Nature and People". As Mukta Jhodia, an elderly woman leader of the movement said at a rally on 18th in Kashipur,

The earth is our mother. We are born of her. We are her children. The mining companies cannot force us to leave our land. This land was given to us by God and creation, not by the government. The government has no right to snatch our land from us.

This forced apportion of resources from people too is a form of terrorism - corporate terrorism.

I had gone to offer solidarity to victims of this corporate terrorism which was not only threatening to rob 200 villages of their survival base but had already robbed off their lives when they were shot and killed on 16th December 2000 by the police.

Abhilash was one of the victims killed in the police firing. His wife Subarna Jhodia was expecting a baby when he was shot. When I went to meet her in her village Maikanch, she was sitting on the doorstep of her hut with the baby girl who was born after the father
was brutally killed. I asked her what she had named her child, she asked me to give her
daughter a name. I named her Shakti - to embody power in peaceful form - to carry in her
the `Shakti' her father and his tribal colleagues have displayed over a decade of resistance
against the terrorism of mining companies and a police state and one combined shakti to
fight all forms of terrorism.

50 million tribals who have been flooded out of their homes by dams over the past 4
decades were also victims of terrorism - they have faced the terror of technology and
destructive development.

For the 30,000 thousand people who died in the Orissa Supercyclone, and the millions
who will die when flood and drought and cyclones become more severe because of
climate change and fossil fuel pollution, President Bush is an ecological terrorist because
he refuses to sign the Kyoto protocol.

And the WTO was named the World Terrirrost Organisation by citizens in Seattle because
its rules are denying millions the right to life and livelihood.

The tragedy of September 11 provides us with an opportunity to stop all forms of
terrorism -- militaristic, technological, economic, political. Terrorism will not be stopped
by militarised minds which create insecurity and fear and hence breed terrorism. The
present "war against terrorism" will create a vicious cycle of violence. It will not create
peace and security. We are already witnessing a xenophobic wave sweeping across the
U.S., with Indians, Asians and Arabs being attacked and killed. We are seeing
fundamentalists of every hue emboldened by the mood for 'revenge'.

Terrorism can only be stopped by cultures of peace, democracy, and people's security. It
is wrong to define the post September 11th world as a war between "civilisation and
barbarianism" or "democracy and terrorism". It is a war between two forms of terrorism
which are mirror images of each other's mindsets - mindsets based on this that can only
conceive of monocultures and must erase diversity, the very pre-condition for peace.
They share the dominant culture of violence. They used the same weapons and the same
technologies. In terms of the preference for violence and use of terror, both sides are
clones of each other. And their victims are innocent people everywhere.

The real conflict is between citizens across the world longing to live in peace and security
and forces of violence and terror - denying them peace and security.

The tribals in Jhodia Sahi had lit a lamp for me at the village shrine - a small stone. These
tribal shrines are insignificant when one measures them in physical terms against the twin
towers of the World Trade Centre. But they are spiritually deeply significant because they
embody a generous cosmology of peace - peace with the earth, peace between people,
peace within people. This is the culture of peace we need to reclaim, and spread.
The whole world repeatedly watched the destruction of the World Trade Centre towers, but the destruction of millions of sacred shrines and homes and farms by forces of injustice, greed and globalisation go unnoticed.

As we remember the victims of Black Tuesday, let us also strengthen our solidarity with the millions of invisible victims of other forms of terrorism and violence which are threatening the very possibility of our future on this planet. We can turn this tragic brutal historical moment into building cultures of peace.
CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSIONS

A review of global citizenship education literature found several prominent themes. The standardization movement in the United States has taken the form of the Common Core State Standards, which emphasize critical-thinking skills but do not address global issues specifically. Furthermore, existing social science standards in the United States do not adequately address issues of global significance. Meanwhile, young Americans lack crucial knowledge about the world despite the fact that advocacy for global education dates back to the post-World-War-II era. The idea of global citizenship itself can be conceptualized in many different ways, and global education encompasses varied pedagogies. Postcolonial critique forces an inward gaze towards Western complicity for global issues, whereas multiculturalism emphasizes the appreciation of diversity. Global citizenship education can be implemented and organized in a variety of ways ranging from a single internationally-focused class to whole-school international programs. Since teachers often feel unprepared to teach issues of global significance, specifically issues pertaining to war and violent conflict, strong rationale exists for the creation of objectives and/or standards for global citizenship pedagogy.

My passion for global education inspired this project, but a review of existing literature provided the impetus and focus for the creation of a pedagogical framework containing themes, objectives, and methods for teaching conflict at the secondary level. In order to inform my framework, I consulted international studies scholars and
researchers in the form of interviews and surveys. Themes, objectives, and methods emerged from my original qualitative research, and I merged my data with the existing literature as well as my own experiences teaching global studies at the secondary level.

The pedagogical framework consists of two parts: themes and objectives for teaching conflict, and methods and attitudes for teaching conflict. Themes and objectives contained in this framework include humanitarianism and humanitarian intervention, gender and conflict, conflict’s colonial origins and legacies, Western complicity in global conflict, the role of identity and ideology in conflict and terrorism, and cultural demystification as conflict prevention. Methods and attitudes for teaching conflict include the following: challenging students’ assumptions; shifting binary ways of thinking; contextualizing conflict and connecting the global to the local; teaching to think vs. teaching to act; and addressing the complexity of conflict.

This project is just a step towards creating comprehensive and interdisciplinary learning objectives for global education. Similar sets of learning objectives are necessary in the areas of teaching international trade/aid/investment, global belief systems (ideologies, religions, philosophies), human rights and social justice, global environmental issues, international political institutions, population (growth and movements), race/ethnicity, global technology and communications, world cultures, and global interconnectedness. Additionally, this framework (focused on conflict/war/terrorism), can be expanded to include additional objectives and considerations.
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