

Violence in schools: Perspectives (and hope) from Galtung and Buber

Abstract: Research into violence in schools has been growing steadily at an international level, and has shown alarming and increasing levels of violence. Given the seriousness of the problem, finding ways of dealing with this issue in schools becomes an imperative for educationists. In this article we engage with this problem by defending the view that whilst violence might be endemic in schools, there are also real possibilities for working towards a resolution of this problem. Firstly, we discuss Galtung's understanding of violence and peace, paying particular attention to his concepts of *structural and cultural violence*, *peacekeeping*, *peacemaking*, and *peacebuilding*. Secondly, we connect Galtung's notions of peacemaking to Buber's philosophy of dialogue, in order to make a case for an 'epistemological shift' which might enable individuals and communities to achieve 'peace'. Finally, we direct our argument to the education context and put forward some concrete proposals for peacemaking in schools.

Introduction

Research into violence in schools has been growing steadily at an international level (Devine 1996, Olweus 1999, Smith 2003, Cowie & Jennifer 2007, Msibi 2012, Silva and Salles 2010). In 2003, for example, Smith reviewed levels of violence in schools in Europe through an initiative of the European Commission under its Fifth Framework programme of research activities, which aimed to gain an overview of violence in schools in the fifteen member states at the time, and two associated states. Smith's research showed alarming and increasing levels of student-student and student-teacher violence. In French secondary schools, for example, during 1999 a total of 240,000 incidents were registered with central government, with 6,240 of these regarded as serious. The aggressors were mainly students, as were the victims. The Portuguese government Security Cabinet saw up to 14% increases in reports of violence between 1995 and 1998. In Austria, studies found that around 12% students admitted to bullying other students regularly or often. In the Netherlands a nationwide random survey found that 22% students had been victims of sexual harassment by boys at least once, and 43% had been a victim of intentional damage to property.

It appears, then, that there is a real problem with violence in schools. Harber (2004) suggests, however, that this may be only the tip of the iceberg. There are two reasons for this. Firstly, research into direct teacher-student violence is lacking and may not be as rare as many would hope. Secondly, indirect violence may be even more endemic and debilitating. He points out that schools have always sanctioned and legitimized direct violence against children, and that corporal punishment in schools is still regularly used in between one third and one half of all countries in the world, including in some parts of the USA. In the Rwandan genocide of 1994 when up to a million people were murdered in the space of a few weeks, teachers from a Hutu ethnic background commonly denounced their Tutsi students to the militia or even directly killed them. Harber links schooling with sexual abuse, and gives examples from sub-Saharan Africa, Ireland, Britain and Japan. In Japan reports of sexual misconduct by teachers in schools rose tenfold between 1998 and 2000. A South African Medical Research Council survey carried out in 1998 found that among those rape victims who specified their relationship to the perpetrator, 37% said their school teacher or principal had raped them.

Harber (2004) goes further to suggest that indirect violence is ubiquitously connected with cultures of schooling. Drawing on Galtung and Buber, this article also argues that indirect structural and cultural violence are endemic, but that there are real possibilities for working towards positive peace in schools. The article is divided into three sections. Firstly, we discuss Galtung's understanding of violence and peace, paying particular attention to his concepts of *peacekeeping*, *peacemaking*, and *peacebuilding*. Secondly, we connect Galtung's notions of peacemaking to Buber's philosophy of dialogue, in order to make a case for an 'epistemological shift' which might enable individuals and communities to achieve 'peace'. Finally, we direct our argument to the education context and put forward some concrete proposals for peacemaking and peacebuilding in schools.

Galtung: *Violence and Peace*

John Galtung, the Norwegian scholar and one of the founders of the International Peace Research Association, is one of the most prominent figures in the field of peace education, being considered by many as the founder of the field. However, peace education has a long history and some scholars have traced it back to as far as the work of Comenius (1642/1969), the Czech educationist, who argued that peace could only be achieved through a universally shared knowledge, and Immanuel Kant (1795/1970) who argued in his essay *Perpetual Peace* that violence could be controlled by a legal system with "checks and balances based upon

courts, trials, and jails", thus advocating "peace through justice" (cf. Harris 2002:7). We could take the origins of peace education even further by mentioning the works of Buddha, Baha'u'lla (the founder of the Baha'i) and Jesus Christ (cf. Harris 2002:5).

That said, Galtung's work remains extremely relevant because it provides us with some very insightful understandings. Bickmore (2011) notes that Galtung suggested that the best way to characterise peace is to contrast it to violence, its antithesis. Thus, Galtung makes a distinction between the notions of *direct violence* and *indirect violence*. *Direct violence* is conceived as physical aggression and violence, which can lead to severe injury and ultimately death and massacre. *Indirect violence* finds expression in two ways, structural and cultural. Structural violence is the kind of violence that is present in societies, rendering them socially unjust (e.g. death by malnutrition). Cultural violence occurs in support of structural violence, masking it (e.g. indifference or support of domestic violence) (cf. Cremin et al 2012:430). It is arguable that structural and cultural violence are interdependent as the structures of society might provide the foundations for cultural violence (e.g. a section of the population being denied some of their rights), and cultural values might provide support for the continuation of structural violence (e.g. being acceptable to discriminate against a section of society). Moreover, and depending on the context, violence against the Other always involves one or more of these three elements.

Galtung's characterisation of violence seems to be very similar to that of Fanon's, one of the most prominent thinkers on African decolonisation. On commenting on the issue of colonialism Fanon argues that it makes use of *physical*, *structural* and *psychological* violence to oppress native populations. *Physical violence* means injuring human beings and the ultimate form of injury is death; for Fanon colonialism is preceded, established and maintained by the use of physical violence, which is used to subjugate local populations in accepting the coloniser's rule and order. *Structural violence* is a kind of social-economic violence. This kind of violence is implemented by the harvesting and plundering of local resources by colonisers, who use these resources in their own favour and in favour of the *metropole*, to the detriment of local populations and of the colony. This generates a situation in which the local population lives in dire poverty and the coloniser in affluent wealth. *Psychological violence* is injury to a human being's *psyche* and includes brainwashing, indoctrination and treats, which are used to break and to appease the local population's will for self-determination. This kind of violence injures the very idea of selfhood and of identity of local populations, and causes a pathological condition in which the local population only

has a sense of self in the face of the coloniser; that is, the colonised only attains a sense of selfhood and of identity in the face of the master and coloniser. The implications for cultural confidence, self-value, and pride are enormous—the colonised are deprived of these (cf. Fanon 1963; Jinadu 2003; Morgan and Guilherme 2013:59-61). The difference between Galtung's and Fanon's account is that Galtung understands *cultural violence* to be connected to *structural violence*, and vice versa, both of which are typified by him as forms of *indirect violence*. However, Fanon, who was a trained psychiatrist, seems to take this further because he identifies the implications of *cultural imperialism* on colonised populations by arguing that it is a form of *psychological violence*; that is, Fanon draws our attention not only to forms of violence, but also to the *psychological damage* they do to individuals, affecting their sense of identity and of pride. Table One summarises what this might look like in practice in a school.

Table One: Direct and Indirect Violence in Schools, drawing on Galtung and Fanon

Type of violence	Direct / physical violence	Indirect violence	
		Structural violence	Cultural / psychological violence
Description	Aggression, physical or verbal attack.	Violence that is built into the way things are done. It includes exploitation, unfairness, colonization and the denial of human rights.	Violence that is built into cultures with profound and psychological effects.
Examples in schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporal punishment • A teacher using humiliation or verbal aggression to discipline a student. • A teacher being assaulted. • A parent insulting a teacher. • Name calling • Sexual abuse of children 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social and educational exclusion of students who do not conform to the normative standards of dominant social groups • Poor infrastructure and provision, lack of toilets, clean water, vandalism etc. • Students becoming ill with stress, excessive homework and tests • Rote learning and lack of dialogue and engagement in lessons. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students from certain cultural, social or colonized groups not doing as well in school as others • Girls and some boys not having as much space to play as popular boys playing ball games • People not learning about other faiths and cultures, or the achievements of women, indigenous and Black people • People not being taught things that will prolong their lives, such as the importance of using a condom • Ideology and colonialism dictating an impoverished

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The reproduction of inequality in and through education.	curriculum
--	--	--	------------

In the light of his discussion on violence, Galtung also conceived the notions of *negative peace* and *positive peace*. *Negative peace* is achieved by averting war or by removing the threat of direct violence, but without resolving the issues of structural and cultural violence. *Positive peace* implies encouraging conditions in which the causes of violence, whether direct or indirect, are removed; and this requires the development of democratic relationships and structures so that conflict is dealt with in a constructive and just manner (Cremin et al 2012: 430). We quote Galtung (1975:29):

[T]wo concepts of peace should be distinguished: negative peace, defined as the absence of organised violence between such major human groups as nations, but also between racial and ethnic groups of the magnitude that can be reached by internal wars; and positive peace, defined as a pattern of cooperation and integration between major groups.

Further, Galtung (1975; 1976) connected the earlier notions of *violence* to that of *peace* by advocating a differentiation between *peacekeeping*, and *peacemaking*, *peacebuilding*. Gill and Niens (2014:11) commented that Galtung:

[i]ntroduced the notion of peacebuilding, and distinguished peacemaking and peacekeeping as the immediate responses to conflict from peacebuilding as a means to build a sustainable peaceful future. Peacebuilding thus goes beyond the notion of ‘negative peace’ (as an absence of war) and involves the development of ‘positive peace’ characterised by conditions in a society that promote harmony between people, including respect, justice and inclusiveness, as well as ‘sustainable peace’ that incorporates processes to address the root causes of violent conflict.

That is to say, *peacekeeping* is something reactive and it is necessary when either i. violence has already occurred or ii. there is the potential for the occurrence of violence between parties, which are better kept apart because there is either i. a lack of willingness by one of the parties, or ii. by both, to engage in *peacemaking* or *peacebuilding*. As such, *peacekeeping* is connected to *negative peace*, and the mere aversion of immediate conflict, without dealing with its roots. *Peacemaking* is also something reactive and it involves helping conflicting parties to deal with violence that has already taken place, and it involves

bringing about, and providing the right conditions, for the development of dialogue between them. Finally, *peacebuilding* is something proactive and it occurs after *peacemaking* because it requires engaging in a culture of peace, making the occurrence of violence less likely. Both *peacemaking* and *peacebuilding* are connected to the notion of *positive peace* because they aim to deal with the very roots of violence (cf. Cremin et al 2012). It is arguable that whilst each of these three manifestations of reducing conflict and violence emerge in different situations and moments, there is a real danger for long lasting peace between parties if only *peacekeeping* is encouraged between them. This is so because *peacekeeping* is a form of *negative peace* and as such it does not deal with the causes of the problem. The danger here is that *peacekeeping* will become a tool for maintaining the status quo and the continuation of structural and cultural/psychological violences. As Gur Ze'ev (2010:319) noted there is a danger that "peace education...is one of the most advanced manifestations of these violences and is a serious threat to human edification". Thus, the importance of also encouraging and engaging in *peacemaking* and *peacebuilding*.

However, we note that whilst these notions of *peacekeeping*, *peacemaking* and *peacebuilding* are quite helpful to understand various stages of conflict resolution between individuals and communities in conflict, they do not explain what we call the 'epistemological shift' that is necessary at the individual and community level to ensure that the Other ceases to be viewed as an aggressor or enemy, and to promote the conditions for long-lasting peace. Buber's philosophy of dialogue is very helpful to us in explaining this 'epistemological shift', especially in connection with processes of successful peace-making (cf. Guilherme and Morgan 2009; Morgan and Guilherme 2013a; Morgan and Guilherme 2013b). It is to this that we turn our attention now.

Buber: *Dialogue and Conflict Resolution*

In *I and Thou* Buber (2004) establishes a typology describing different kinds of human relations. For Buber, human beings:

- i. are relational beings;
- ii. are always in a relation with either other human beings, or the world, or God;
- iii. possess a two-fold attitude towards other human beings, the world, or God, which is indicated by the *basic words* I-It (*Ich-Es*) and I-Thou (*Ich-Du*).

The *basic words* are a "linguistic construct created by Buber as a way of pointing to the quality of the experience that this *combination of words* seeks to connote" (Avnon 1998:39) [*our emphasis*], so that I-It and I-Thou are read as 'unities' indicating one's state of Being and attitude towards the *Other*, the *World* and *God*. This means that there is no *I* relating to a *Thou* or to an *It*; rather, what exists is a kind of relation encapsulated by the unification of these words. Avnon (1998:40) comments insightfully that "one may summarize this point by suggesting that the difference between the I-You and the I-It relation to being is embedded in the hyphen". The hyphen of I-Thou indicates the kind of relation that is inclusive to the Other whilst the hyphen of the I-It points to the sort of relation that is not inclusive to the Other, that in fact separates the Other. As such these *basic words* are pivotal for a proper understanding of Buber's thought, and consequently of his views on education.

In more detail, the I-Thou relation is an encounter of equals, who recognise each other as such and it represents an *inclusive* reality between individuals. Buber argues that the I-Thou relation lacks structure and content because infinity and universality are at the basis of the relation. This is so, as when human beings encounter one another through this mode of being, then an infinite number of meaningful and dynamic situations may take place in that which Buber calls the *Between*. Thus, it is important to note that any sort of preconception, expectation, or systematisation about the Other prevents the I-Thou relation from arising (cf. Theunissen, 1984: 274–275; Olsen, 2004: 17) because they work as a 'veil', a barrier to being *inclusive* towards the Other. Within I-Thou relations, the 'I' is not sensed as enclosed and singular, but is present, open to and inclusive towards the Other (cf. Avnon 1998:39). Despite the fact that it is difficult to characterise this kind of relation, Buber argues that it is real and perceivable, and examples of I-Thou relations in our day-to-day life are those of: two lovers, two friends, a teacher and a student at different moments in time.

Contrariwise, in the I-It relation a being confronts another being, objectifies it, and in so doing *separates* itself from the *Other*. This is in direct contrast with I-Thou relations because the "'I' of I-It relations indicates a separation of self from what it encounters" and "[b]y emphasising difference, the 'I' of I-It experiences a sensation of apparent singularity - of being alive by virtue of being unique; of being unique by accentuating difference; of being different as a welcome separation from the other present in the situation; of having a psychological distance ('I') that gives rise to a sense of being special in opposition to what is" (Avnon 1998:39). Thus, when one engages in I-It relations one separates oneself from the Other and gains a sense of being different, special and arguably, superior at the same time.

Buber understood that human existence consists of an oscillation between I-Thou and I-It relations and that the I-Thou experiences are rather few and far between. It is also important to emphasise that he rejects any sort of sharp dualism between the I-Thou and I-It relation. That is, for Buber there is always an *inter-play between* the I-Thou and the I-It rather than an *either-or* relation between these foundational concepts. I-Thou relations will always slip into I-It relations because I-Thou relations are too intense and we live in a worldly reality, requiring to use people to fulfil our basic needs; but I-It relations have always the potential of becoming an I-Thou relation, if we remain *on the watch*, open and inclusive of the Other. This oscillation is very significant for it is the source of transformation; that is, through every I-Thou encounter, the I is transformed and this affects the I's outlook of the I-It relation and of future I-Thou encounters. Putnam (2008: 67) notes that "the idea is that if one achieves that mode of being in the world, however briefly ... then ideally, that mode of being ... will *transform* one's life even when one is back in the 'It world'".

However, Buber also understood that there are situations in which *I-It* relations become so prevalent that they suppress *I-Thou* relations and this has serious implications for human relationships. We argue that socio-political instability can easily lead to *I-It* relations gaining a stranglehold on human relations and thus suppressing *I-Thou* relations. First, such situations devalue human beings and human existence because they do not account for the richness of the human condition; that is, they do not account for the fact that human beings are capable of both *dialogical I-Thou* relations and of *objectifying I-It* relations. Second, such situations have significant moral implications. That is, if one ceases to say *Thou* to fellow human beings then one ceases to see *Them* as *persons* and they become merely *objects*, they become *means to an end*, as we said earlier. As the *I-Thou* relation requires a mutual attitude of recognition, if one is unable to establish a *dialogue* with one's fellow human beings, if one is unable to say *thou* to one's fellow human beings, then one also becomes an object for them because one will not hear the call *Thou* from *Them* (Babolin, 1965: 197; Tallon, 2004: 62; Okshevsky, 2001: 297–298; cf. Morgan and Guilherme 2013).

In the light of this, how does Buber's philosophy of dialogue help us make sense of the 'epistemological shift' that takes place in Galtung's *peacekeeping*, *peacemaking* and *peacebuilding*? The 'epistemological shift' means to be able to switch from I-It to I-Thou relations; that is, to cease seeing the Other as an It and realising that the Other is a Thou. It is only when this 'shift' occurs that conflict resolution can take place. Accordingly, it is

arguable that in *peacekeeping* parties are already treating each other as Its, rather than Thous, and there is a real danger that this will worsen through the use of violent means; as such, parties need to be kept apart so that they do not hurt each other. In *peacekeeping* the 'epistemological shift' is not ready to occur, and parties seem to be incapable of seeing each other as Thous rather than Its.

In *peacemaking* parties have treated each other as *Its*, and this may have deteriorated into violence, but they have now reached a stage in which they are capable of engaging in meaningful dialogue; that is, there is a need to provide the right conditions for I-Thou relations to arise so that they do not deteriorate again into I-It relations. Thus, in *peacemaking* parties are ready to experience the 'epistemological shift' and to cease treating each other as Its. In conflict theory this is referred to as non-adversarial dispute resolution (Fry & Ury, 2012, Coleman et al., 2014) and the work of mediators and others is to encourage the parties to move away from attacking each other towards attacking the problem at the heart of the conflict. It is a move away from competition and hostility towards cooperation and problem-solving. Energies engaged in fighting are redirected towards communication, empathy, creativity and resolution. However, in peacemaking the right conditions need to be in place for the 'shift' to occur.

Finally, in *peacebuilding* the conditions exist for the proactive prevention of destructive conflict, and the harnessing of the transformative power of constructive conflict. Parties are ready to engage in I-Thou relations, despite the challenges that they may face, and the inescapability of I-It relations at times. Thus, in *peacebuilding* the 'epistemological shift' has already occurred as parties have ceased to treat each other as Its, and are addressing each other as Thou.

Dealing with Conflict in Schools

As we stated in our introduction there is a perception that direct violence is getting worse in schools, and this is even without proper consideration of teacher-student and indirect structural, psychological and cultural violence. Thus, how do we apply Galtung and Buber's insights in a school setting?

In the case of *peacekeeping*, that is, if violence has already occurred at the school or there is a perception that violence may occur, then some strategies have been used, such as the installing of CCTV cameras in strategic places and the keeping of pupils who have had a

fight apart. In connection to this, Taylor (2011) notes that 85% of schools in the UK have installed CCTV as a way of 'controlling pupils' behaviour', 'monitoring pupils' behaviour', and 'tackling bullying'. Cremin et al (2010) found that the use of CCTV cameras, locks, fences and surveillance of both pupils and teachers in a secondary school created a prison culture, and that pupils felt criminalised, marginalised and 'forgotten'. She has argued elsewhere (2010) that other strategies such as zero tolerance and the use of inflexible sanctions and rewards are equally to blame for creating negative peace in schools through compliance, extrinsic motivation and processes of pacification. As we have argued above, this involves teachers and students treating each other as Its, rather than Thous, and therefore this strategy merely avoids an escalation of violence but it does not deal with its causes. That is, it remediates it but it does not solve it.

Peacemaking is different because it starts to deal with the causes of the problem, the source of violence, and as such, it is an important part of any education process. As per our previous discussion, in this situation parties are ready to stop treating each other as Its, and to starting addressing each other as Thous. One such strategy to bring about peacemaking is peer-mediation (Cremin 2007) which encourages young people to develop the skills, values and attitudes to facilitate each other to resolve conflict cooperatively. Another is Restorative Practice, which enables young people in schools to be held to account for any harm that they have caused to others, and to make reparation for their actions (Sellman et al, 2013). Building on concepts of shame, reintegration and reparation in indigenous cultures, especially Maori culture, Restorative Justice (Restorative Practice or Restorative Approaches in schools) has been found to significantly reduce reoffending in criminal justice settings, and to build cultures of peace in schools.

Examples of both of these strategies have been recorded by Cremin (2012) in her report of a restorative intervention in a secondary school in the UK. In one example, Jamie, a 13-year-old boy had been cautioned by the Police for assisting a burglary of his former primary school, and a restorative meeting took place between Jamie, his mother and the head teacher of the primary school in the local community hall. The meeting was facilitated by a support worker attached to the secondary school who had been part of the restorative training programme. Prior to the restorative meeting, Jamie had acknowledge the harm caused to his mother, his new school and his old school, especially the headteacher. The meeting commenced with ground rules, and went on to ascertain that both Jamie and the headteacher wanted to repair the situation. There was further acknowledgement of the harm caused and

an apology was given. Jamie's mother spoke of her feelings of shame, and was supported by people in the meeting, including Jamie. An agreement was reached whereby Jamie wished to clear litter from the school site and to talk with his friends about stopping the ongoing vandalism of the school. Formal legal proceedings were avoided, and all parties were supported to move out of adversarial I-It relations in the interests of healing and community cohesion. The 'epistemological shift' that occurred was transformational and deeply moving for all of those who experienced the meeting.

In the same school, a peer mediation meeting took place when three 15-year-old girls had a disagreement with a fourth girl (Selma). The disagreement was caused by Selma passing on some private information about one of the others to the rest of the group. The girls felt that she was now untrustworthy and had secluded her from their friendship group. All four girls were positive about using mediation, and fully engaged in the process. Selma was honest and apologised sincerely for her actions. The others accepted her apology, and agreed that they would move on from the incident and be friends again. When asked later about the process, all four girls said that the mediation had allowed them to understand each other's points of view. They appreciated the opportunity to speak to each other in a safe and controlled environment with the support of the mediator, rather than being left to their own devices. This was especially true for Selma who was reluctant to speak to the others outside of mediation. The girls felt that the mediation helped to strengthen their friendship, and no further conflict occurred between the girls. Once again, an 'epistemological shift' occurred in which horizontal I-thou relations replaced adversarial and objectifying I-It relations.

Finally, *peacebuilding* builds on peacemaking as it seeks to be proactive about peace. That is, it seeks to tackle potential sources of violence and conflict even before they become an issue. As such, it is important that schools provides a good standard of education, which provides pupils with critical thinking, and is inclusive, which avoids categorisation of certain sections of the community of students. The use of talking circles and cooperative group work in problem solving tasks also able to generate a collegial atmosphere and a sense of interdependence between teacher and students and between students.

An example of peacebuilding was recorded as part of the restorative intervention in the secondary school highlighted above. A teacher engaged with the local primary schools prior to the new intake arriving in September in order to support students at risk of exclusion to make a successful transfer. This was a voluntary process supported by parents. Students

who had been in trouble in their primary school were invited to workshops over the Summer to reflect on ways of improving their behavior and making a fresh start in their new school. Strategies such as Circle Time¹ were used to promote empathy, cooperation and creative problem-solving. Students considered how they could be supported to make different choices in the future. These discussions were used by students to create individual behaviour support plans. This resulted in a lower number of incidents being recorded for these students during transfer than had been the case for similar students in previous years, and no exclusions. This had been a real problem in the past. These ventures encourage and facilitate I-Thou relations, avoiding the permanent deterioration into I-It relations, the very source of violence and conflict.

Final Thoughts

At the start of our discussion we mentioned that research into violence in schools has been growing steadily at an international level, and has shown alarming and increasing levels of violence. This presents us with a serious problem that must be addressed by the education system. Finding positive ways to respond to violence has become imperative.

In our discussion we also, however, drew attention to the multi-faceted nature of 'violence', demonstrating that it should not be understood as something merely direct and physical in nature, but as having structural, cultural and psychological manifestations. We also argued, following Galtung, that there are three types of peacemaking, namely *peacekeeping*, *peacemaking*, and *peacebuilding* that could be used as responses to the issue of 'violence', and its various expressions.

It is our contention here that those involved with the education of others should become fully aware of all expressions of violence and peacemaking in order to offer an education that is fit for purpose for the twenty first century. This may take place in schools or elsewhere in wider society. In contemporary cultures of schooling, there is a propensity for direct physical violence to be identified at the expense of more indirect but no less harmful forms of violence. This has the result that *peacekeeping* is often pursued, to the detriment of other more positive and proactive forms of peacemaking. Such a strategy would be problematic

¹ Circle Time is a teaching strategy that involves students sitting in a circle to engage in various activities designed to develop social and emotional skills. Students use a talking object to symbolize trust and basic ground rules. These ensure that everyone gets quality listening time and is not ridiculed or disrespected.

because it does not encourage the 'epistemological shift' that enables individuals, or sections of society, to stop treating Others as Its, and to starting addressing them as Thous. Further, it does not build towards long-lasting peace. Finally, such a simplistic approach to the issue of violence (i.e. physical) and peacemaking (i.e. *peacekeeping*) presents us with a major issue because, and to paraphrase Gur Ze'ev (2010:319) again, peace education might become "one of the most advanced manifestations of these violences and is a serious threat to human edification". That is, this approach does not deal with the causes of the problem and perpetuates more nuanced, but nevertheless insidious, forms of violence.

Bibliography

Avnon, D., (1998), *Martin Buber: The hidden dialogue*, Lanham, USA: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Babolin, A., (1965), *Essere e Alterità in Martin Buber*, Padova: Editrice Gregoriana.

Bickmore, K., (2011), "Location, Location, Location: Restorative (Educative) Practices in Classrooms", Paper presented as part of the *Restorative Approaches to Conflict in Schools Seminar Series*, Edinburgh, February. Available at <http://www.educ.cam.ac.uk/research/projects/restorativeapproaches/seminarfour/>

Buber, M., (2004), *I and Thou*, London and New York: Continuum.

Comenius, J., (1642/1969), *A reformation of schools*, Harlif, S., (trans.), Menston, Yorks: Scholar Press.

Cowie, H. & Jennifer, D. (2007) *Managing Violence in Schools: A whole-school approach to best practice*, London: Paul Chapman Publishing

Coleman, P.T., Deutch, M. & Marcus, E.C. (2014) *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice: Third Edition*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass

Cremin, H., (2003), "Thematic Review: Violence and Institutional Racism in Schools", in *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 6, pp. 929-939.

Cremin H. (2007) Cremin, H (2007) *Peer Mediation: Citizenship and social inclusion revisited*, Buckingham: Open University Press

Cremin, H., Mason, C. & Busher, H. (2010) Problematising pupil voice using visual methods: findings from a study of engaged and disaffected pupils in an urban secondary school, *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 4, pp. 585-603

Cremin, H., Sellman, E., and McCluskey, G., (2012), "Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Restorative Justice: Developing Insights for Education", in *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 60, No. 4, pp. 421-437.

Cremin, H. (2012) *Report on a Restorative Intervention in a Secondary School*, Unpublished (enquiries hc331@cam.ac.uk)

Devine, J. (1996) *Maximum security: The culture of violence in inner city schools*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Fanon, F., (1963), *The Wretched of the Earth*, New York: Grove Weidenfeld.

Fisher, P., Ury, W. & Patton, (2012) *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*, Boston: Random House Business Books

Galtung, J., (1969), "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research", in *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 167-191.

Galtung, J., (1975), *Peace: Research, Education, Action. Essays in Peace*, Research Vol. I, Copenhagen: Christian Ejlertsen.

Galtung, J., (1976), "Three Approaches to Peace: Peacekeeping, Peacemaking, Peacebuilding", in *Peace, War and Defense: Essays in Peace Research*, Vol. II, edited by J. Galtung, 297–298. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlertsen.

Gill, S., and Niens, U., (2014), "Education as humanisation: a theoretical review on the role of dialogic pedagogy in peacebuilding education", in *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp. 10-31.

Guilherme, A., and Morgan, WJ., (2009), "Martin Buber's philosophy of education and its implications for adult non-formal education", in *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, Vol. 28, No. 5, pp. 565-581.

Gur-Ze'ev, I., (2010), "Beyond Peace Education: toward co-poiesis and eduring improvisation", in *Policy Futures in Education*, Vol. 8, No. 3 & 4, pp. 315-339. Harris, IM., (2002), "Peace Education Theory", Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, 83rd, New Orleans: LA, April 1-5. Available at

Harber, C. (2004) *Schooling as Violence*, Abingdon: RoutledgeFalmer

Jinadu, LA., (2003), *Fanon: in search of the African Revolution*, London and New York: Kegan Paul.

Kant, I., (1795/1970), "Perpetual peace: A philosophic sketch", in Reiss, H., (ed.), *Kant's political writings*, Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press. pp. 93-143.

Morgan, JM., and Guilherme, A., (2013a), *Buber and Education: Dialogue as Conflict Resolution*, London: Routledge.

Morgan, WJ., and Guilherme, A., (2013), "Martin Buber et Frantz Fanon - Le politique dans l'éducation: dialogue ou rébellion", in *Diogenes*, No. 241, Janvier-Mars, pp. 35-57.

Msibi, T. (2012) 'I'm used to it now': experiences of homophobia among queer youth in South African township schools, *Gender and Education*, 24:5, 515-533.

Okshevsky, W., (2001), 'Martin Buber's 'sacred' way and moral education', *Philosophy of Education*, pp. 297–299.

Olsen, G. (2004), 'Dialogue, phenomenology and ethical communication theory', in *Proceedings of the Durham-Bergen Postgraduate Philosophy Seminar*, II, 13–26.

Olweus, D. (1999) Sweden. In P.K. Smith, Y Morita, J. Junger-Tas, D. Olweus, R. Catalano and P Slee (Eds.) *The Nature of School Bullying: a cross-national perspective*. London & New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Putnam, H., (2008), *Jewish Philosophy as a guide to life: Rosenzweig, Buber, Levinas, Wittgenstein*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Sellman, E., Cremin, H, and McCluskey, G. (2013) *Restorative Approaches to Conflict in Schools: International perspectives on managing relationships in the classroom* London: Routledge

Silva, JMAP. Salles, LMF., (eds.), (2010), *Jovens, violência e escola: um desafio contemporâneo*, São Paulo: Cultura Acadêmica.

Smith, PK., (2003), *Violence in Schools: the response in Europe*, London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Tallon, A., (2004), 'Affection and the transcendental dialogical personalism', in P. Atterton, M. Calarco and M. Friedman (Eds.), *Buber: Dialogue and difference*, Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Taylor, E., (2011), "UK schools, CCTV and the Data Protection Act of 1998", in *Journal of Education Policy*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 1-15.

Theunissen, M., (1984), *The other: Studies in the social ontology of Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre and Buber* (Macann, C., trans.), Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Underwood, MK., (2002), "Sticks and stones and social exclusion: aggression amongst girls and boys", in Smith, PK., and Hart, CH., (eds.), *Blackwell Handbook of Childhood Social Development*, Oxford: Blackwell.

5,864 words