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ABSTRACT

This research study reviewed several disciplinary fields and their conceptualizations of conflict. The primary guiding question was, *what is the best conflict education that is required for youth and adults to live in the world of a "culture of violence" in the 21st century?* The general purpose of the study was to provide a critique that would initiate an expanded conflict imaginary, as educators and lifelong learners face a world of growing complex social and cultural conflicts.

The "case" under specific critical analysis was identified as *conflict management education* (CME). CME provided the primary subject (text) for a critical discourse analysis of its conceptualizations of conflict. The main purpose of the study was to determine the hegemony of discourse in the text of a "representative" sample of 22 contemporary CME handbooks and manuals for youth and adults.

CME was found to be a new social movement with a powerful "social technology" to change attitudes and behaviors, in order to diminish or eliminate violence. This study found there are virtually no systematic critiques of CME and no significant critiques that focus on the conceptualization of conflict itself. The discourse of CME's conceptualizations of conflict tended toward an ideological bias of consensus, unity, cooperation, 'peace and harmony;' and located within a politically conservative, pragmatist, social psychological discourse. The entire domain of conflict knowledge from critical pedagogies and the sociological conflict theory tradition was largely ignored in CME text. This has significant political and sociocultural implications in the biased shaping of *conflict knowledge* and the concomitant power relations of teaching, learning, and the constructing of 'democracy' itself. Without a critique of its own discourses, CME has limited means, as a discipline of knowledge, to establish how it may be perpetuating the very violence it is attempting to eliminate. *Conflict* pedagogy is offered as an alternative to constructing a critical conflict education as
counterhegemonic to CME. This report closes with a discussion of reflections on the study and recommendations for further research.
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CHAPTER ONE
QUEST FOR CONFLICT KNOWLEDGE

Introduction To Education, Conflict And Violence

A Conflict Journey: Self Reflection

The journey I have walked could be identified within the realm of radical education. Giroux (1983) argued that the traditional leftist (and Marxist) politics has to be renewed to incorporate the subtleties of cultural capital and cultural politics, where it is no longer so easy to identify, in some unified theory, exactly where oppressors and the oppressed exist. In particular, Giroux's (1983) distinction between education and schooling (training) is important in this thesis research. He wrote,

Education has a direct link to the creation of alternative public spheres, and it represents both an ideal and a strategy in the service of struggling for social and economic democracy. As the embodiment of an ideal, it refers to forms of learning and action based on a commitment to the elimination of forms of class, racial, and gender oppression. As a mode of intellectual development and growth, its focus is political in the broadest sense....education, as used in this context, takes place outside of established institutions and spheres.... it represents a collectively produced set of experiences organized around issues and concerns that allow for a critical understanding of everyday oppression.... In effect, education represents the central category in the development of alternative public spheres. It refers to critique and the restructuring of social experiences based on new forms of communicative interaction.... (p. 239)

The overarching guiding, and problematic question throughout this study was what is the best conflict education that is required for youth and adults to live well in the world of a "culture of violence" in the 21st century? Emphasis here is on best and not the best. The search for the best quality in education is not, by some necessity, oppressive in a totalizing
manner to a diversity of best ways of thinking and acting in educative sites. This improved quality in regard to understanding and dealing with conflict and violence is, by necessity, I believe, a direction which leads to an improved conflict imaginary -- where neither conflict nor violence shrink our imagination from healthy and sustainable means of living together.

Giroux's notion of education, from a critical (conflict) theory perspective, is challenging to systems of power relations that maintain the status quo of oppression of various kinds. This education focuses on social conflict and violence. It looks to create a pedagogy (art and science of teaching and learning) that is immediately a social activism, and to create "alternative public spheres" where new forms of communications can take place. Giroux points to critique as central, in this radical education. Although I agree, critique, arguments and criticism are incomplete on their own to ensure a healthy democracy (cf. Tannen, 1998 and her critique of the "argument culture"). There is conflict that has to be dealt with whenever we are critical of others. It is the former, more than the latter, which is the foundational interest in creating a 'conflict' pedagogy (beyond the critical pedagogy3 of Giroux, Giroux and McLaren (1989), and many others). A 'conflict' pedagogy, emerging from this thesis research, is a beginning toward an educative focus in using and creating conflict sites as critical locations for teaching and learning, in the formation of just democracies.

The overarching question above was born out of my eight years of Canadian experience as a program planner and therapeutic-counsellor, dealing with violence and abuse with families in crisis in rural and urban Alberta during the mid 1980s-90s. The troubling male youth, between 12-18 years of age, in the open-custody residential treatment programs were masters of conflict-creation and slaves of violence. The various school staff and communities where these youth lived were completely unable to deal with the conflicts effectively. They most all thought the youth have the problem and ought to be "treated" for their violence -- preferably far away from the community. I guess they did not want to know the reality of contemporary social life -- American statistics reveal: "Homicide is the leading cause of death

A second overarching question informed the direction of this thesis, that is, what theoretical resources do educators draw upon when dealing with social conflict and violence in educative sites? American leadership revealed President Clinton, speaking on national news in the midst of the American-led bombing raids on Kosovo, telling the youth of America to learn to manage your anger and look for alternatives to violence as a solution to your conflicts. What are we teaching about conflict and conflicts in schools, workplace conflict resolution training, parenting skills courses, anger management, nonviolence trainings, law schools, neighborhood justice institutes and mediation certification, community development and post-secondary institutions? Do we stop to critically reflect upon our good intentions as leaders, teachers, facilitators and trainers, and question that maybe our understanding and prescriptions regarding conflict(s) may be a little biased-- if not harmful itself-- if not ingenuous, when looked at in context of a "culture of violence" which we have created and continue to perpetuate daily? Perhaps, "There is violence because we have daily honored violence" (Harris, 1967, p. 246). There are still over 40 wars "... currently causing misery on the planet" (Barbara, 1996, p. 8).

Despite some 25 years of conflict resolution/management and peace education programs in North American schools and communities, with estimates of over 8500 conflict resolution programs in American schools (Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. xiii), a rash of student-led mass rage murders in secondary schools created the context which haunted the data collection and writing of this thesis. In retrospect, there were no conflict resolution programs going on in those days working with youth. I never heard about them. Maybe I never looked hard enough for them? Maybe our staff and I, working in the trenches with marginalized peoples, did not believe the youth and families were going to be helped with packaged ideas and programs about conflict and violence? Maybe we didn't trust the assumptions, implicit righteousness
and privileged power of those "nice" middleclass do-gooders who write, publish and administer such universal programs?

Psychological models of behavioral modification, social role modeling, reality (control) therapy and cognitivism ruled as the dominant methods and thinking of how to change conflictual troubling behavior into so-called "cooperation and harmony." The apparent "peace," attained from these approaches, never lasted-- and more importantly, it was not a solution to the deep hurt and terrorization these families and communities experienced. The conflicts never went away but rather flowed underground, until the next eruption. In retrospect, I wonder what guiding conceptualizations of conflict and the link with violence, was in the minds and culture of these people. What were mine? Would different ideas about the nature of conflict itself, have made a difference in how the course of so many destroyed relationships seemed unstoppable?

My long interest and involvement in various grassroot liberation movements and social activism since the 1970s, led to the conclusion that social conflict not handled well, both between groups and within groups, was the universal phenomenon that was most destructive to human relationships (and planetary ecosystems). My work as an ally for women's support groups and reading in the women's (and feminist) movement literature proved to be a strong case example of how forming "Alliances between women, both groups and individuals, are hard-won, contingent and often fraught with conflict [and violence]" (Roy, 1997, p. 260). Hirsch and Keller (1990), leading feminists, expressed this problematic around conflict within social justice move-ments, with their long experience in the contradictions of feminist theory with actual practices. They wrote,

Most importantly, we felt a certain urgency about identifying better strategies for practicing conflict.... Discussions within feminist theory today are racked by intense conflicts. While feminists have in principle tended to agree that difference is a more productive theoretical and political category than either universalizing consensus or
divisive opposition, in practice, actual differences within feminist discourse have tended to erupt in separate [enemy] camps [cf. Detloff, 1997 "Mean spirits: The politics of contempt between feminist generations." cf. Fraser, 1997 re: split in the Left]. At this moment... some of these conflicts have proven so divisive that they seem to foreclose rather than stimulate debate, even at times appearing to threaten the very viability of contemporary feminism as a political and theoretical venture. (pp. 3-4)


In my own experience, much like Hirsch and Keller, in grassroot activist groups and graduate adult education courses, most conflicts were denied and repressed within the groups. Leaders and teachers of these groups seemed incapable of engaging with the subtle violence, the conflicts, and incorporating a theory that guided learning processes in the 'heated' sites of social conflict. For grassroot activists, the obvious focus for conflict and rage was directed toward the 'enemies' of injustice 'out there.' But that focus outward was never controllable and eventually the violence occurred within the groups' relationships. 'Splits' divided groups, factions formed, and this in-fighting toxified and fragmented coalition possibilities. So often in my graduate experience, classroom environments of trust, curiosity, and equality of 'voice'
became places of mistrust, silencing, denial, contempt and resentment-- not unlike my past formal schooling and training in institutions of diverse kinds.

These conflicts were not merely disagreements about simple needs or interests that could be negotiated or resolved. The conflicts were often ideological and political, where differential power relations and coercive 'games' of rank and privilege riddled the learning contexts between administrators and staff, teachers and teachers, teachers and students, and students and students. The conflicts, on the surface were simple, but beneath were held intractable violent histories of racism, ethnicism, religionism, ageism, classism, sexism, and all other forms of systemic oppression and memories of being hurt.

Quick-fix individualist psychological-based models of conflict resolution and management, or educative interventions of "discussion" or "dialogue" continued to be regularly lame in all the experiences above. When rarely invoked, these methods served to treat symptoms, inadequately engaging the deeper conflicts and wounds both psychological and structural (political). Mostly, conflict was ignored or simply not recognized. I agree with Black (1998) that the most common form of conflict that leads to violence, often unacknowledged, is simple unengaged and unspoken "avoidance." Happy notions of a collaborative "learning community" were assumed in polite non-problematic rhetoric and commonly written about in adult education (e.g., Grace, 1997; St. Clair, 1998). I prefer the wisdom of building authentic community through what I call conflictwork, as in the writing, for example, of Pratt (1991, 1993), Peck (1988), Mindell (1993, 1995), Graff (1992) and Summers (1994).

We were functionally dysfunctional. I doubted, that any conflict (or community) was ever isolatable from the larger 'isms,' and to pretend they were was an act of violence itself, in the commission of neglect of the historical, sociocultural and political complexities of human relationships and conflicts. This thesis is based on approaching human conflict and conflict practices as inevitably embedded in contexts of the larger 'isms'-- that is, social conflicts or
communal conflicts— that is, a "culture of violence." To hold to my own integrity in linking
theory and practice, I encourage readers to take my critique (and sometimes criticism) of
thinking and conflict practices in this thesis, as an invitation to enter conflict processes with
me. As a follower of the Sacred Warrior tradition (Trungpa, 1985) and a warrior pedagogue
(cf. Regnier, 1995), if one swings the 'sword' of criticism, one must honor the 'sword' which
slices back. Hit-and-run critical tactics have caused more than enough hurt and ruin both in
the academic community and general social life.

The Nature Of The Study

Chapter One begins with some personal background and reflections on the growing
interest to bring conflict and pedagogy together. The remainder of the chapter is divided into
five parts: (a) A Few Key Definitions, (b) Problem Summary And Purposes Of The Study, (c)
Peace vs. Conflict Knowledges And Approaches, (d) Brief History And Some Critiques Of
Conflict Management Education (CME) and, (e) Summaries Of Thesis Chapters.

This thesis has two parallel streams of inquiry moving throughout this report: one,
involves a general interpretive attempt to understand the nature of 'conflict' itself and how it
has been conceptualized in various interdisciplinary fields; the second, involves a direct
empirical analysis of the conceptualization of 'conflict,' as depicted in the conflict resolution/
management documents studied (cf. Chapter Two and Three).

Conceptualizing And Locating A Few Key Terms

Knowledge Formation As Social Practice

This research is a sociocultural, political and educational response to violence and the
global crisis or world problematique. The focus of the study is on identifying some of what
constitutes knowledge about conflict and how that conflict knowledge may be biased,
particularly within the "case" of conflict management education (CME is defined below). It is
assumed that such knowledge may strongly influence our conflict practices. Like this thesis, Rapoport (1974) places conflict in a cultural and symbolic context of understanding. He wrote,

The nature of the symbolic environment is such that it depends in great measure on what men [sic] say or think about it. In particular, what men think or say about human conflict... has a great bearing on the nature of human conflict and its consequences... we shall have to examine various conceptions of conflict... these conceptions make human conflicts what they are. (p. 7)

Fry and Fry (1997) argued that "... human conflict and conflict resolution are cultural phenomena. The ways that conflicts are perceived and handled reflect a culturally shared set of attitudes and beliefs" (p. 10). Furthermore, Featherston and Nordstrom (1994) similarly assumed in their research that "Strategies of conflict management are inextricably tied to theories [and ideas] about the causes of conflict" (p. 1). "How human nature and its impact upon conflict are understood carries profound implications for how conflict is handled" (Tidwell, 1998, p. 30). I decided to focus almost exclusively on the ideas, conceptualizations and definitions of conflict rather than on the strategies and techniques of conflict resolution and management per se. The latter, would take a much larger study to do justice to. Although, I believe (following a Foucauldian view) that how we conceptualize conflict (i.e., construct conflict knowledge) is an equally important method of resolution and management-- that is, a social conflict practice itself.

**What is Violence?**

Although this study did not investigate the concept of violence per se (cf. footnote 9 for an indepth definition), an immense topic, the radical and innovative "pure" sociology of conflict (Black, 1976, 1989, 1995, 1998, 1999; Cooney, 1988, 1997, 1998; Senechal de la Roche, 1996) draws on vast data from historical and cross-cultural anthropological research,
and has recommended a complete deconstruction of traditional understandings of what 'conflict' is and its relationship to what 'violence' is. Black, the leader and founder of this unique synthetic theory of conflict, wrote that "... violence presently belongs to the jurisdiction of diverse fields and is studied by diverse specialists who do not recognize it as part of a single field: conflict." (Black, 1998, pp. xiv-xv). Black views violence in terms of morality, law and the ubiquitous universal battle between 'right' and 'wrong.' He has applied these notions to the sociology of law, crime and justice systems. Cooney (1998), most simply, summarized Black's view on violence. He wrote,

Black's (1983) insight that violence is a form of morality contains several unexplored empirical implications.... violence is, for this perspective, a means of handling conflict found under certain social structural conditions. (p. 136)

Senechal de la Roche (1996) argued, using Black's paradigm, that "collective violence" is a form of "social control," which Black calls "conflict management." The controversial outcome of Black's paradigm, is that violence is a form of conflict, which is a form of conflict management in the attempt to make a 'wrong' a 'right' (when certain social structural and political factors are operating). This view of violence, is a way to avoid "blaming" individuals and their behaviors of "violence" as isolated from the social structural and political context of any situation. This points toward a different sense of morality around violence and responsibility.

Black's view is not psychological but a "pure" sociology of conflict. This study generally takes Black's epistemological orientation to avoid overly moralizing and rigidifying a superficial, individualist, behavioral, psychological and fixed notion of violence. Rather, the initiative is that of seeking to understand it in relation to the larger social phenomenon of conflict (both, which are not well understood, as Black reminds us-- thus a humble attitude is required to gain understanding of the dynamics, as opposed to the usual attempt to merely "stop" them). The context of a culture of violence, used in this thesis, is therefore an
acknowledgement that both *culture* (*a la* Bourdieu, or Stuart Hall, etc.) and *violence* are continuous sites of conflict. Violence, among other forms, is a social conflict practice embedded in the larger oppressive 'isms'.

**What Is Conflict?**

This thesis report is partially a self-reflective initiative, whereby I, as a (white heterosexual male) former environmental science worker, human service worker, former school teacher and now adult educator or "worker with adults" (Edwards, 1997, p. 166), may critically re-evaluate the understandings of conflict I have collected. Of what quality is our current conflict knowledge? Whose knowledge is it, in terms of origins and, who benefits? How could conflict knowledge be improved, and on what basis would that improvement be judged? This report begins to address these problematic questions in Chapters Three and Four.

*Conflict knowledge* is the experiential knowledge gained and shared through conflicts (struggles), as well as conceptual knowledge gained through thinking about ideas of what 'conflict' itself may be. Conflict is intimately related to violence. What that exact relationship is (*a la* Black), has been left open for some post-modernist doubt and debate, as the definition of 'conflict' itself is left open for doubt and deconstruction/reconstruction in this study (cf. footnote 13).

"More has been written on conflict than on any other theme except God and love..." (Rapoport, 1991, p. xiii, citing R. Duncan Luce and Howard Raiffa in "Games and Decisions"). Canary et al. (1995) remarked that "Although many students [of conflict] recognize the importance of conflict, few understand what it is and how it functions to preserve or to erode [relationships and social life]..." (p. ix). There is no precise all-purpose definition of conflict (Canary et al., 1995, p. 4, citing Weiss and Dehle, 1994). Psychologists may utilize a definition like:
Conflict- an extremely broad term used to refer to any situation where there are mutually antagonistic events, motives, purposes, behaviors, impulses, etc. (Reber, 1995, p. 151)

And furthermore, may add to this psychological conception claiming conflict involves "... incompatible or opposing needs, drives, wishes, or internal demands" (Gall, 1996, p. 8). Researchers in conflict or peace studies say "Conflict is the product of unmet needs and unrecognized differences" (Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University web site). Others defined conflict as "perceived divergence of interests" (Ruben et al., 1994, cited in Fry and Bjorkqvist, 1997, p. 1). Whether "real" or "perceived," the commonality of so many cursory definitions of conflict is undeniable. The idea of opposing interests is foundational in most of the conceptualizations of conflict in the literature across disciplinary domains (e.g., anthropology, some sociology, cognitive-behavioral psychology, communications and rational choice theory).

Social psychological conceptions may infer conflict is present but unseen in social relations but "... arises from the presence of a difference or because the existence of a disagreement brings it into the open..." (Lindzey and Aronson, 1985, p. 353). Conflict sociologists, like Collins (1994), argued that domination is going on all the time in social life, and if conflict is not going on at the surface, then domination is controlling its expression as a result of domination (oppression). However, the most famous social psychologist of conflict, Morton Deutsch, drawing on some 60 years of social psychology research and theory, claimed that,

Perhaps the most obstructive idea is that conflict occurs because people have opposing interests. In this view, conflict inevitably means that people are working against each other; .... A much more useful definition, based on the work of Morton Deutsch of Columbia University, is that conflict involves incompatible behaviors: one person is interfering, disrupting, or in some other way making another's actions less effective. While this difference [between a competitive definition (the former), or a cooperative
definition] may seem minor and academic, it has vast practical implications. People with compatible, cooperative interests can be in conflict as they argue about the best means to accomplish their common tasks, distribute the benefits and burdens of their cooperative effort, and determine how they are to treat each other.... Our studies suggest that within organizations most conflicts occur when people have cooperative interests. (Tjosvold, 1993, p. 7)


This valuing bias places cooperation above competition, although attempting to claim, conflict itself is neither positive or negative—it depends on how a conflict is handled that would initiate the labelling of "positive" or "negative" (the latter being destructive, violent, competitive, and so forth—that which is to be eliminated if possible in these conflict theorists' view). This valuing bias toward a "win-win" approach (cf. Fisher and Ury, 1983) to conflict resolution/management, has been dominant over the interest to understand conflict itself and to critically evaluate conceptualizations of conflict. The emphasis in this movement of conflict positive thinking is based on a pragmatics of managing and resolving, thereby, defining conflict predominantly as "conflicts" (noun form) in operational behavioral terms. Generally, these theorists are drawing on social psychology and the research on intragroup dynamics, where there is often already a relatively large degree of conformity and group cohesion (for e.g., in a business organization).

To counterbalance, broaden, and challenge, this conflict positive thinking (win-win) approach to conceptualizing conflict and how best to handle it, we could turn to a less benign paradigm of conflict knowledge formation provided by sociology. For example, sociological
conflict theorists like Dahrendorf, Simmel and Coser, provided a conceptualization of conflict (less subjectivist, psychological and perception-based than Deutsch) which could be defined as,

Social conflict may be defined as a struggle over values or claims to status, power, and scarce resources, in which the aims of the conflicting parties are not only to gain the desired values but also to neutralize, injure, or eliminate their rivals.... Intergroup as well as intragroup conflicts are perennial features of social life. (Coser, 1968, p. 232)

From this brief overview, it appears "Conflict is a term used to mean a variety of things, in an assortment of contexts" (Tidwell, 1998, p. 30). Tidwell (1998) offers a good review of the types of theories of conflict that have influenced conflict resolution/mangement. The point of most interest, after examining conceptualizations of 'conflict' across several disciplines, is that there is a decided bias to focus on the conceptualizing of 'conflict' as a concrete noun. Ubiquitously, the writing moves from talking about conflict to conflicts (or a conflict), without problematizing that such a shift in discourse may have a profound impact on the conceptualization bias of what is conflict ('conflict')? All the types of theories reviewed by Tidwell, are of minor interest in this research, because they ignore a critical analysis of 'conflict' itself-- rather, they focus on the discrete, behavioral event, and operational aspects almost exclusively-- ultimately, under a privileging motivation to resolve and manage the conflictual behaviors (event). They do not engage in a critique of their own text discourse on conflict, nor consider that a deconstructive approach to 'conflict' may be of value. This study, more or less, prefers the orientation of Tidwell's (1998) critique of conflict resolution, and his reminder "... that conflict is not a discrete event [i.e., conflicts] in life, but rather informs and influences everything people do." (p. 175).

Figure 1 shows the different emphasis of this thesis (bottom half) contrasted with the ubiquitous tendency of most writing in the field of conflict management/resolution (top half). Tidwell himself, following John Burton's legacy of theorizing in conflict analysis and
Figure 1  Domains And Concepts Of Focus
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Adapted from: Burton's view of CONFLICTS and DISPUTES as separate processes (Tidwell, 1998, p. 9)

Fisher's view of 'Conflict' itself as a social phenomenon
resolution, makes the commonly regarded definitional distinction between dispute and conflict but then titles the diagram as "Burton's view of conflicts and disputes as separate processes." He moves from conflict to conflicts unproblematically, similar to all the writing examined in this thesis research. Typically, Tidwell gives relatively less attention to the larger circles (dispute, conflict) than to the background context of conflict management/resolution analysis and methods. This greatly influences the framing of conflict knowledge and everything else about 'conflict' in the fields of conflict and peace studies and conflict management/resolution (including what I call "conflict management education"—see below). My own preference, for purposes of this study, emphasized 'conflict' as the important subject, and the fields of conflict management/resolution and conflict management education as "cases" (or domains) within which to study 'conflict.'

What is Conflict Management Education (CME)?

The terms conflict management was preferred in this thesis to conflict resolution to accompany the word education, because the reality is that conflict (distinct from a dispute) is infrequently "resolved" successfully, and more often "managed" reasonably successfully in many cases (cf. Tidwell, 1998).

Conflict management education (CME) was created for this study, and chosen as an umbrella concept for a diversity of approaches to schooling/training and education that deal with conflict and violence, some more implicit, while others are explicit in advertising their "educational" agenda. For purposes of this study CME refers to:

- all forms of schooling/training or education, where the aim is to improve understanding of conflict and develop skills to handle conflict so as to avoid or minimize violence.

Commonly included in this conceptualization of CME here are:
conflict (dispute) resolution, alternative dispute resolution (ADR), conflict resolution education, conflict management, negotiation training, conflict studies/science (polemology), peace studies/science, conflict education, peace education, cooperative education, collaborative education, and other variants on these general types.

Several other educative special interest areas are more or less interested in conflict and how to deal with it educatively. These were not included in this CME definition (due to limitations of the scope of this study): feminist education, postcolonial education, African-American education, anti-racist education, anti-violence education, diversity education, multicultural education, aboriginal/First Nation education, union (labor) education, transformation education, popular education and so on. Clearly, there is no intention to suggest that all of these types of "education(s)" are static or uniform, and in future developments of a 'conflict' pedagogy these areas are important contributions, if not epistemological "standpoints" that would alter the meaning of 'conflict' and pedagogy in diverse contexts. Research in conflict or peace science, communications studies and various forms of psychology, anthropology, sociology, law, social activism etc., are considered loosely "education" in terms of the creating of conflict knowledge for the purposes of informing conflict practices and influencing the ideas (or, conflict imaginary-cf. Appendix I) of others by some educative (in some cases propagandizing) means. Conflict knowledge may be distributed or taught by non-governmental organizations, governments, businesses or other organizations as well-- all which would come under the CME category.

As part of a loosely "post-modernist" approach to diverse knowledges and "disputatious community" in scholarly research (cf. Paulston, 1990, 1996, 1998), a mapping of the 'battleground' of competing knowledges of 'conflict' study was undertaken (Figures 2 and 3). CME is located as one form of 'conflict' study. This thesis approach to knowledges takes an integral or a perspectival perspective (cf. Wilber, 1977, 1995), where it is acknowledged that
Figure 2 MAPPING THE FIELDS OF 'CONFLICT' STUDY: An Integral Perspective
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each form of 'conflict' study (discipline) provides some part of a larger 'picture' of the "reality" of the phenomenon in question-- that is, 'conflict' itself. An aperspectival perspective is consistent with a transdisciplinary\textsuperscript{22} approach. Following Wilber's (1997) \textit{critical integral theory}\textsuperscript{23} (and epistemology of knowledge), all views are valid but not necessarily equal in accuracy or importance in the quest for a "complete" (or best) view of a phenomena or concept.

Figure 2 indicates the four major fields (spheres) of interest in 'conflict' study. These spheres are contextualized in the various terms of "culture" (outside the spheres) to indicate the background assumption of this study (see description of "culture of violence" below). The size of the spheres is somewhat relevant\textsuperscript{24} in order to show the hegemony\textsuperscript{25} of where the most knowledge about 'conflict' (and its resolution/management) is currently derived-- that is, in the Social Sciences-Field of Conflict [Peace] Studies (see Figure 3 for details of that field and its bias toward emphasis on the concept of \textit{conflict resolution} rather than \textit{conflict} itself). The Interdisciplinary Spheres (e.g., anthropology, law, communications research, sociology, psychology etc.) are not shown on this map but include a vast array of ways of knowing 'conflict.'

The Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Spheres have led to 'conflict' knowledge which informs and supports the "professionalization of conflict"-- meaning, the forming of professions, like conflict and peace researchers, government diplomats of peace, lawyers, mediators, therapists, conflict resolution trainers, conflict or peace educators and so on, who, for the most part, gain direct economic payment from dealing with \textit{conflict regulation} (management and administration) in some way-- as part of maintaining social order. This \textit{professionalization}\textsuperscript{26} has had an impact on the shaping of "peoples in conflict," and their responsibility and skills (\textit{conflict literacy}\textsuperscript{27}). This has an influence on "interests" of the researchers and practitioners in terms of their power and epistemology (way of knowing) in regard to making and using conflict knowledge. This impacts and biases their conflict
practices. CME is seen as a "social technology" of peace (cf. Olson, 1996) and a part of the new social movements (e.g., peace movement, civil rights and law reform via the ADR movement). These movements have their own "pedagogy" and applications of educative processes (or propaganda) in the interest of furthering their cause and, in particular to CME, to resolve or manage conflict. Figure 2 shows how this CME sphere is attached to the Social Science and Interdisciplinary Spheres from which it is predominantly informed by and mutually informs.

Across the 'bridge' in Figure 2 is the Education Sphere. Two fields are found here: (1) the larger field of Critical Pedagogy (and its variations) and, (2) the almost nonexistent emerging field of 'Conflict' Pedagogy. All the terms used in the two fields are actually utilized by various researchers and theorists in education, although it ought to be kept in mind that both fields (of the critical/conflict tradition) are minor (subdominant and marginalized, if not oppressed) within the general field of Education and pedagogy. Generally, from the perspective of the status quo field of Education, both these fields are likely to be seen as politically (too) 'radical.' Often, conflict, in these two fields is seen as an important form of "resistance" to the status quo hegemony. This is a complex topic for the last chapter. What is important to note, is that these educational marginalized fields are informed somewhat by the Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary studies of conflict-- less so Critical Pedagogy. The diagram shows the desire to develop the 'Conflict' Pedagogy sphere as an integrated conflict knowledge joining the left and right sides of the map. These two fields of Education (spheres) are shaping a conceptualization of 'conflict' very differently, if not in contradiction, from the Social Science and Interdisciplinary Spheres (including CME). The integral approach to knowledge in this study, is an attempt to build the 'bridge' where these fields of conflict knowledge/practices can come together in a dialogue (and/or important 'battle' for a "theory of conflict"-- "conflict theory"). The rest of this thesis shows how there is a huge 'gap' between CME and the pedagogies of the critical (conflict) tradition. No sufficient conflict education.
'conflict' pedagogy) or *conflictwork* practice can exist to deal with the *domination-fear-conflict-violence* (DFCV) cycle\(^{34}\) if it has not integrated all the conflict knowledges, more or less, on this map (across the 'bridge').

**'Peace' Vs. 'Conflict' Knowledges And Approaches**

... all knowledge is forged in histories... [of] social antagonisms [conflict],

Intellectual life is first of all conflict and disagreement... Intellectual conflict is always limited by focus on certain topics, and by the search for allies. Not warring individuals but a small number of warring camps is the pattern of intellectual history. Conflict is the energy source of intellectual life.... (R. Collins, 1998, p.1)

The nature and location of this thesis research cannot be understood, unless the larger context is understood-- that is, a context of a 'battleground' of power/ knowledge dynamics or relations (a la Foucault, cf. Chapter Two). Following the post-structuralist and strategic postmodernist approach of McLaren and Sleeter, and a conflict sociological perspective of Collins, the assumption made here is that conflict knowledge is created, formed, and transformed because of a constant 'battle.' There is also conflict over 'conflict,' which involves ideological\(^{35}\) positions and the politics of domination and subordination. Knowledge about conflict and how best to deal with it, is therefore, embedded in contestation-- or simply, ought to be seen as a 'battle' itself. To deny this 'battle' exists as the matrix of constructing (or teaching) conflict knowledge is a distortion of the intellectual history of ideas of conflict and the social epistemological (a la Popkewitz's Foucauldian view) "reality" of knowledge production as cultural capital (a la Bourdieu). Such a denial, when accompanied by the teaching about conflict and how *best* to handle it, is cause for a serious charge that any such teaching is more propaganda than education. Propaganda, with its "hidden curriculum,"\(^{36}\)
falls within the definition of violence, as defined in the first part of this chapter. A major concern of this study, is that CME, or any peace or conflict education has a hidden curriculum which reproduces the DFCV cycle in its attempt (explicitly or implicitly) to benignly pretend to only help eliminate violence.

Specific to the study of CME text here, this encompassing 'battle' context involved the choosing of a culture of violence as the social "reality" in which to begin a critique of CME text discourse, and build a CCE and 'conflict' pedagogy. As is evident from the brief discussion below, this context is controversial as a starting point for educational analysis and curriculum development. Many "peace advocates," in contrast to "conflict advocates," will likely have serious concerns with this chosen context and foundation for a critical conflict education (CCE) and 'conflict' pedagogy.

Two main domains of inquiry (and discourse) were seen to articulate conflict knowledge: (1) "peace studies" and, (2) "conflict studies." Although, often these overlapped in their interests in conflict and conflict management/resolution, there is enough evidence to question why are there two labels and domains of inquiry in regard to conflict knowledge? These two domains are discussed below as peace sciences/education vs. conflict sciences/education. Granted this is a complex topic, beyond the scope of this study and space limitations here, it is a simple dichotomy, albeit problematic, still worthy of further exploration.

The 'Peace' Discourse Hegemony

Searching the Education Resource, Instruction and Curriculum (ERIC) data base (including all Silverplatter data bases for all years back to the mid 1970s) turned up 73 entries under the search term "conflict education" and 793 entries under "peace education." Several entries showed up under both labels but most all of the conflict education entries were focused on peace education explicitly, with only a rare few focusing on "conflict education"
as a subject label. To my knowledge, the strongest American promoters of "conflict education" (Webster-Doyle's, cf. footnote 33) were not included in the above ERIC database. "Conflict resolution education" had 48 entries and "conflict management education" had 11 entries, most all involved schools and training programs. The conflict management education entries were all administrative in nature— that is, how to manage conflict in education sites. The peace education literature is over ten times more numerous than the conflict education literature.

What differences in pedagogy and politics, if not contradictions in assumptions, may appear in those who promote and teach others "conflict education," compared to those who favor "conflict management/resolution education," or those who prefer "peace education" and a "pedagogy of peace" (e.g., Rohrs, 1994)-- rather than a "pedagogy of conflict" or 'conflict' pedagogy? The language used, and categories emphasized, are part of a discourse that is likely significant to outcomes. What term or concept gets the most attention likely reflects deeper ideological investments and values. It appears many contemporary educational writers prefer a "cooperation," "consensus," and "harmony" means and method to creation of conflict "management," "resolution," and "peace." These discourses tend to make "competition," "aggression," and "fighting" absolutely bad, wrong, or violent-- yet, they embrace that conflict is a part of life and not bad, wrong, or violent itself. This was discussed earlier as a conflict positive attitude and approach toward conflict but 'conflict' itself is not given much attention (cf. Figure 1, --as we shall see in Chapter Three). This preferred valorisation of certain traits (notions of what is "human" and "civilized" etc.) strongly influences the shaping of the conceptualization of 'conflict' and prescriptions about how best to deal with it. The classical dichotomy between "hawks" and "doves" in regard to "peacemaking" or "conflict resolution" has led many writers to distinguish between "non-violent conflict resolution" and "violent conflict resolution." The conceptualization of 'violence' and 'conflict' are in question, debate, and in 'battle' amongst these extreme views with their particular focus and values.
What should we be focusing our research, teaching, energies and dollars on, in the pursuit to end violence? Should we focus on "How to better cooperate?," say some of the peace-loving side (e.g., Beal, 1996; Johnson et al., 1988), or "How to fight better (healthier)?," say some on the conflict-loving side (e.g., Arnold et al., 1996; Mindell, 1995)? Cross-cultural research on perceptions of conflict in Duryea (1992), indicated that "... conflict is almost universally seen as negative, undesirable and unsavory." (p. vi). This negative reaction is corroborated in this thesis, as the 22 CME training manuals and handbooks indicated this as a "problem," and that training programs ought to aim to change this attitude to one of being conflict positive. This is seen as a progressive, albeit suspect, core aspect of contemporary CME. As well, there are numerous books on the market that continue with this biased (if not prejudice) discourse, for example: "From conflict to consensus: A conflict intervention process" (Ballek, 1997); "From conflict to cooperation: How to settle a dispute" (Potter, n.d.). Tidwell (1998) critiqued the conflict resolution field for this general bias, whereby "resolution" is favored to "conflict," because of the constriction of the term "conflict resolution."

In regard to schools, organizations, and organizational or "school cultures," there follows, as part of a 'peace' hegemony, to always seek consensus, cooperation and harmony as a sign of a healthy "culture"-- which, Leonard (1999) claimed is a highly spurious association of conceptions. Giroux (1983) challenged educational theories generally for their 'peace' and consensus functionalist hegemony. He wrote,

Rather than celebrating objectivity and consensus, teachers must place the notions of critique and conflict at the center of their pedagogical models. Within such a perspective, greater possibilities exist for developing an understanding of the role of power.... (p. 62)

In both its conservative and liberal versions, educational theory has been firmly entrenched in the logic of necessity and efficiency and has been mediated through the
political discourse of integration and consensus. This becomes clear if it is recognized that notions such as conflict and struggle are either downplayed or ignored in the discourse of traditional educational theory and practice. \(^{43}\) (p. 73)

*Conflict education*, rather than peace education, is likely to follow Leonard's and Giroux's challenge and conception of education and culture as conflict-laden. *Conflict education*, would also challenge the promotion of peace education where the motivation is "cooling the climate of schools" (Jeffries and Harris, 1996) or cooling the climate of any social life, when the "heat" may be much more preferred to bring about the needed social changes in the big social conflicts or 'isms.' It is also important to be cognizant that social conflict initiatives in youth or adult institutional settings may not always be constructive resistance to oppression but rather, merely another form of reproduction of one of the types of oppression (cf. Willis, 1977).

**Educating For A Culture Of Violence**

The objective of the peace movement is of the highest order-- what sane person can disagree with the noble goal of 'peace on earth'.... (Hon. Preston Manning, cited in Gould, 1997, p. 14)

Indeed, with its 'apple pie nature': (who is against consensus and harmony?).... (Duryea, 1992, p. 13)

Ideals are an actual hindrance to our understanding.... (Krishnamurti, 1953/81, p. 26)

The interest in *conflict education*, specifically CCE and a 'conflict' pedagogy, in this thesis, is a reflection of the shift in 'camps' I have undergone in the past few years. I am no longer identified as a "peace educator." I prefer the term *conflictworker* to describe the research and practices I'm involved in currently. The pursuit and focus of an ideal like 'peace' is highly problematic both conceptually and as practice. Smith (1998) wrote,
Perhaps the least analyzed aspect of the peace process in general is the term 'peace.' There is often an assumption in the wider debate that peace is an intrinsically virtuous condition. It is not. It is an exceptionally complex notion that cannot be reduced to the idea that it denotes a benign situation. Peace is a highly contestable political end-state. To put it another way, the peace process is, by its very nature, a politicized process.

Ultimately, the process is, like the conflict itself, a dispute about political ends. (p. 366)

It is too unproblematic to use 'peace' as a focus in peace education, peacemaking, conflict resolution/management and CME generally. This 'peace and harmony' discourse, as I call it, is amplified in the context of common rhetoric amongst educators and organizations that promote a social life/global culture characterized as a "culture of nonviolence" (Barbara, 1996), "culture of peacefulness" (Bonta, 1996), "culture of peace" (UNESCO, cf. Breines, 1998), "peace culture" (Boulding, 1992; Nagler, 1999) and the UN declaration for 2001-2010 as "The Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence for the Children of the World." It is an ideal like the best 'apple pie,' and tends, therefore, to divert or exclude criticism and deconstruction of its own essentialist assumptions and bias (with the exception of Nagler's, 1999 critique). It is an 'apple pie' based on, and within, embedded conflict and politics, according to the conflict perspective and that of any CCE or 'conflict' pedagogy.

This study takes a view of social life, for all humans, as embedded in a vast flow of 'rivers of conflict' that are toxified by millenial patriarchal histories (cf. Eisler, 1987) and memories of violence (i.e., the big 'isms' of social conflict). There is no escape, nor is violence likely to disappear in any foreseeable future. CCE and 'conflict' pedagogy are not a pedagogy of "hope," because, hope is so often despair in another 'dress' (cf. Trungpa, 1985). To fully understand 'conflict' as a social phenomenon (epistemologically speaking), we best go into it, sit in it, dance in it, learn to fight healthily in the 'fire' and 'heat,' rather than try to "cool it," change it, manage it, manipulate and control it, or "win" anything in it or from it--the latter which tend to try to move away from conflict, to some ideal goals of cooperation,
resolution, consensus, harmony and peace, and so on. No one likely really wants violence or social conflict as a "first choice"—but each of us likely will, under oppressive circumstances, follow a path of violence as a "forced choice" (a contradiction). These are some of the emerging assumptions behind a conflict perspective, CCE and 'conflict' pedagogy. The implication of this view, is to acknowledge a world and "culture" of violence, 'fear' and terror, as indicated by several astute observers.

In contradistinction to consensus theory and a 'peace and harmony' CME discourse, CCE adopts a historical context of "systems of domination" and a sociocultural context of a "violent society" (Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. 8), "culture of violence" (Brendtro and Long, 1995; Dill and Haberman, 1995, p. 69; Galtung, 1997; National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1993, p. 80; Olson, 1996, p. 75), "performativte terror of the state" (Yeatman, 1994, p. 117), "culture of terrorism" (Chomsky, 1988), "terrorism and everyday life" (Lefebvre, 1990, p. 202), and an overall "... saturation of social space by fear" (Massumi, 1993, p. ix) and what has been called a "culture of fear" (Corradi et al., 1992; Fisher, 1998; Furedi, 1997; Massumi, 1993, p. ix). CCE, therefore, is a counterhegemonic discourse constructed in conflict theory (actually many theories of the conflict tradition, cf. Collins, 1994). The consensus-conflict debate (battle) of social knowledge and theory has a history of a few millenia (cf. Bernard, 1983), and ought not to be ignored in any discussion about 'conflict.'

From a conflict theory perspective, and a "culture" of violence, conflict, fear and terror, is it not reasonable to assume that people would have a predominantly 'negative' association with conflict? Maybe, their 'negative' attitude toward conflict is intelligent in the context of lived experience in oppressive societies? Should educators of CME be attempting to change this attitude without changing the nature of the oppressive society which shapes our conflict practices? Are CME text and conflict practices part of the very violence, which they purport to be "managing" and eliminating through the promotion of 'peace and harmony'? Should we
as educators, be concerned that the CME texts in this study are nearly completely absent of any mention that conflict theory (the conflict tradition) exists as an alternative (possibly better) way to understand conflict? CME text in this study have not questioned assumptions about the political nature and pedagogical impact of their own hegemonic ideological discourse.

The CME dominating discourse and goal of creating "win-win"49 "safe learning environments" (e.g., Bareham and Clark, 1995; Lehr and Martin, 1994) and being "conflict positive" (e.g., Johnson and Johnson, 1995; Tjsvold, 1991) is problematized and challenged in this study. The social psychologist, Morton Deutsch has been a founding and popular theorist of much of the CME discourse in handbooks and training manuals. Deutsch's work has led to the strong influence of the "cooperative learning movement" in the field of schooling education and conflict resolution (Girard and Koch, 1996, pp. xxii-xxiii). Who is the theorist in CME to rally for "resistance" and an "uncooperative learning movement" when that is necessary? Collins (1994), the leading promoter of conflict sociology, summarized well the political conservatism in most social psychology (a la Deutsch and others),

... social psychology also had political resonances. American sociologists were liberal reformers, not radicals nor conservative cynics; they wished to see America as a land of equality and opportunity, and social psychology was conveniently focused on the individual and the small group [cognition, attitudes, behavior etc.], and thus, away from embarassing questions about the larger structure of stratification, wealth, and power [conflict]. (p. 43)

The "hidden" division in the field of CME comes clearer to the surface when the focus of pedagogy is symbolically directed to the popular book titled Educating for a Peaceful World (Deutsch, 1991)50 and not a book titled Educating for a Violent World (my preference).
Brief History And Some Critiques Of CME

Some Historical And Current Roots/Routes Of CME

The handling of right and wrong, known in sociology as social control or conflict management, occurs throughout the social universe, wherever people intermingle. It includes phenomena as diverse as litigation, violence, mediation, gossip, ostracism, psychotherapy, sorcery, sabotage, and suicide... [and] covers everything from a glance of disapproval to the bombing of a city. (Black, 1998, p. xxiii).

In Black's "sociology of conflict" and conflict management, the history of CME would be embedded in the history of "educative" (socializing) attempts to bring about social control. In its most competitive and destructive form, conflict resolution equates with warfare [as social control].... The resolution of conflicting interests between nations by making war is a long-standing tradition (Sweeney and Carruthers, 1996, p. 328). This would extend our analysis to the beginning of teaching and learning in social groups, long before the terms "conflict management," "mediation" or "justice" were used. Black's theory and a social history of conflict management/resolution is far beyond the scope of this study. The history of CME is restricted here to contemporary forms of Northwestern (and Australian) conflict management/resolution that have been labeled as such.

Tidwell (1998) reported that conflict resolution... has its tradition in three different areas: organizational development and management science; international relations and the peace movement; and alternative dispute resolution" (p. 8). He acknowledged that there have been many other influences but these are the three "most consistent and powerful influences." The "... field of conflict resolution is divided.... where the division in the field comes through is found in the definition [conceptualization] of conflict (p. 17). Thus, depending on the conceptualizations of particular terms in this field, the intellectual debate (battles) tend to reflect "... the difficulty in knowing whose history of conflict resolution is being examined" (p. 9).
Despite these problems of "divided" (conflictual) interpretations of "whose history," Tidwell (1998) reviews the three 'roots' beginning with the pioneer American organizational development leader, Mary Parker Follett, in the early 1920s, who emphasized "... the view that conflict had a positive place in organizations. Instead of trying to eradicate conflict from the workplace, she advocated using conflict positively" (p. 10). This was very influential in management sciences to follow. Blake and Mouton (1964), authors of *The Managerial Grid*, emphasized the problem-solving component, and typology of the different ways of dealing with conflict. In general, in the early part of the 20th century, management sciences developed important conceptual tools for analysing conflicts. Labour vs. management disputes played an important role in shaping common ways of conceptualizing and dealing with conflict. Tidwell (1998) wrote,

Many of the processes of addressing conflict, such as mediation, arbitration and facilitation, grew in relation to their application to organizational needs. Mediation, for example, did not become commonly used in the USA until after the federal government brought mediation to the settlement of labour-management disputes. In fact, labour-management relations have played a major role in the evolution of methods for addressing conflict. Yet the usual discourse of labour-management relations has included little that aims at understanding conflict, but has focused on making conflict less costly and more efficient. (p. 12)

"In the study of societal and structural sources of conflict the study of international relations has played a vital role. The UN Charter provides for the use of mediation and conciliation in the resolution of disputes" (Tidwell, 1998, p. 12). The League of Nations and the UN arose from the post World War devastation, and a search for new "... peaceful resolution of conflicts through dialogue, negotiation, and cooperation" (Sweeney and Carruthers, 1996, p. 329). "It was in the period after World War II and the start of the Vietnam War that interest in conflict resolution crystallized" (Hocking, 1996, p. 124). Tidwell
believes the UN has been a dismal failure on this front. Citing Burton (1986), Tidwell argued that the academic community, interested in conflict in the mid-20th century, was greatly divided between those who utilized a traditional "power view" (or structural social-political conflict perspective) and those who preferred a "behavioral view" (or internal psychological perspective, based on human needs and interests) (p. 12-13). Burton's approach, which was very influential in the field, was not focused on superficial quick-fix "negotiation" between parties, but more a search for better "explanation" and "analysis" (in terms of a social scientific investigation).

Alongside the analytic work on conflict resolution, there was in the 1960-70s a burgeoning social activism from religious and peace activist sectors of civil society. The Quakers and Mennonites are noted by Tidwell (1998):

The Quakers' long-standing pacifism created the necessity to look for alternatives to conflict. Mennonites, in a similar vein... also sought the creation of alternatives.... Kenneth Boulding, himself a Quaker, was a key participant in the early conflict resolution movement.... Anatol Rapoport, Herbert Kelman, Quincy Wright and others joined forces in the mid-1950s.... In 1957 the Journal of Conflict Resolution (JCR) was first published.... Yet it is limited in its appeal by its continued perpetuation of its founder's intentions to pursue a study of conflict through quantification (e.g., game theory). There are many who view this as antithetical to the effective study of conflict. (pp. 14-15)

"The kinds of social values associated with ADR, the human potential movement, and the work of the Mennonites also supported the development of a peace culture" (Hocking, 1996, p. 133-- cf. Stomfay-Stitz, 1993 for a review of "peace education" in America between 1828-1990). The divergence of spiritual and peace initiatives in social activism and the professionalization of conflict resolution, the latter, with the creation of a social scientific study (quantification approach in JCR), is another division (battle) in this field, with
important methodological and ideological implications for "education" about conflict and how to best handle it.

In the mid-1970s, in Australia, and spreading rapidly in America, was the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) movement, which many believe grew out of the "... dissatisfaction with the methods used to administer justice and resolve community disputes" (Tidwell, 1998, p. 15). ADR is a legal reform movement with a long history in "informal justice" (cf. Pirie, 1998, p. 508). In America, "The end of the 1970s saw the establishment of neighborhood justice centers in at least six major cities. It is estimated that there are over four hundred of these centers today" (Girard and Koch, 1996, p. xxv). With the general trend to "community-based" justice, law reform, policing and so on, this number is now likely doubled. These centers teach CME in various forms, and have expanded their agendas, in some cases to that of creating "safety" and security in a climate of increasing crime, fear, and violence. Tidwell (1998) noted that in these community-based ADR contexts,

Conflict resolution, for some, appears to offer alternatives to what seems an otherwise dangerous and threatening world... [and the focus has been on] techniques or methods by which conflict can be handled.... [the scale of most of this conflict resolution is] individual actors, or a small collection of actors.... (p.1)

It appears adults involved in the community conflict resolution education programs, like the Justice Institute of British Columbia, are primarily self-focused with "inner work" in their conflict practices, in order to apply skills in the context of their personal and family lives (cf. Hocking, 1996, p. 128). Investigation in adult education literature for this thesis, indicated that conflict resolution skills are constructed as "needed" by today's adults and should be part of workplace training (e.g., Gershwin et al., 1996; Marsick, 1998; Shmerling, 1996; Western Sydney Institute of TAFE, 1995).

School-based CME, with its encompassing and varied goals and benefits, "... emerged out of the social justice concerns of the 1960s and 1970s" (Girard and Koch, 1996, p. xxv).
Although, a case could be made that progressivist educators in the early 20th century, calling for citizenship education models in classrooms, were interested in teaching problem-solving, critical thinking skills, encouraging informed dissent, and taking other's viewpoints while engaging in conflictual dialogue as essential to a pluralist democracy (e.g., Dewey, 1930). Tracing the origins and history of CME in schooling is a complex topic and beyond the scope of this study. In the past 30-40 years in America there are some historical highlights worth mentioning:

While some groups, such as the Quakers, had long supported the teaching of problem solving and peacemaking to young children, a broad spectrum of religious and peace activists adopted this cause in the mid to late 1970s, and teachers began incorporating dispute resolution instruction into their curricula. In the early 1980s, Educators for Social Responsibility organized a national association that took as its central question the examination of how students could best learn alternative ways to deal with conflict. The Children's Creative Response to Conflict, the Community Boards Program, and the Peace Education Foundation led the development of the field of conflict resolution with their efforts in elementary schools. Another concurrent development was the inclusion of law-related education in the social studies curriculum. Through this new curriculum component, students took on larger roles in instruction and classroom governance and gained a better understanding of dispute resolution mechanisms in our society. The growth of conflict resolution instruction and programs in the schools and the expansion of mediation and other alternative dispute resolution services in other sectors led to a joint meeting of educators and mediators in 1984 to consider how best to lay a foundation for teaching conflict resolution skills in the schools. A network and clearinghouse for information and training, the National Association for Mediation in Education (NAME) [now is called the National Institute for Dispute Resolution
(NIDR), was formed and has been active ever since. In 1984, approximately fifty school-based conflict resolution programs existed... Eleven years later, NAME and NIDR estimate that there are well over five thousand. (Girard and Koch, 1996, p. xxv). [Bodine and Crawford (1998), and NIDR estimate this has grown to over 8500; and since the outbreaks of mass rage murders led by students in schools in early 1999, this number has likely grown substantially]

Some germane critiques of CME

A systematic review of all the literature falling under the umbrella of CME is far beyond the scope of this study. However, it is reasonable to assume from reports of writers in this field (e.g., Lederach, 1995; Pirie, 1998; Tidwell, 1998) and outside of this field (e.g., Delattre, 1991), that there are virtually no substantial and systematic critiques of CME (Tidwell, 1998 is somewhat of an exception but his writing has little focus on “education”). No systematic critiques of CME’s use of “conflict” as a concept itself, were found.

The exaggerative and evangelical tone of the promoters of CME (especially in school-based programs) has been critiqued directly by Delattre (1991), McEwan (1986) and Tidwell (1998). NIDR, one of the most powerful corporate-backed non-profit advocacy groups in the U.S.A., linked their universal conflict resolution programs with both the global reform of society and the very defining of what it means to be “human.” Their CME training manual concluded,

... We who learn about conflict resolution through pre-service and in-service programs will be able to introduce improved problem-solving skills at every level of our nation’s schools. In doing so, they will lay the foundation for a society of highly skilled peacemakers and a new century that embraces the values and behaviors that most rightly mark us as human... (Girard and Koch, 1996, p. xix)
The evangelical tone of these CME advocates has gone further to suggest that conflict resolution (skills) and "education" are the "Fourth R" (e.g., Benenson, 1995; Davis and Porter, 1984 cited in Webster, 1991, p. 113). The Hon. Preston Manning, leader of the Opposition (Reform Party) in Canada, has his own version of the final "cure" for conflicts that have transcended the "normal democratic methods." Gould (1997) reports that Manning's 100 page document has 22 pages of Biblical references, where he attempts to use Christ's crucifixion as a universal model for conflict resolution (Figure 4). Dr. Andrew Pirie, law professor and former Director of the University of Victoria Institute of Dispute Resolution, skeptically wrote,

You can imagine what the discourse looks like in law as the legal profession tries to situate itself as the leader in ADR. The best for me was an article in a lawyer mag calling ADR 'The Second Coming of Litigation'! (personal communication, July 14, 1999) (underline added for emphasis).

Tidwell (1998), like Burton (1988) has stated that conflict resolution is not "value neutral" but rather is based in politics with histories. The history of conflict resolution, at least in America, has shown the good intentions of various interest groups, is embedded in mostly white middle class values and interests. They usually write the CME training manuals and handbooks. This has led to the most systematic and strongest critique in CME in recent years with the challenge to the ethnic and racial bias in conflict resolution practices (e.g., Lederach's work cited in Duryea, 1992). Duryea (1992), Tidwell (1998), Lebaron et al. (1998), Pirie (1998), Salem (1993) and Rupesinghe (1996) among others have critiqued CME in various ways that commonly assert that a greater cultural-sensitivity is required to conflict resolution/management practices. Although, none of these "cultural" critiques of CME discussed the implications of cultural differences (or class or race differences etc.) and how they may directly impact the educational process of learning and teaching (i.e., pedagogy) about conflict and conflict resolution. The main focus of CME literature invariably is on the
"The Fourth 'R' Project" is the title which seems most appropriate for this image/discourse, which has multiple layers and metaphors of meanings. Without drawing these out here, what seems valuable is to make the circumstantial, if not inevitable, link between the 'R' symbol in the image with the social movement of ADR and the booming reform "industry" of conflict resolution training programs in N.A. public school systems. Some significant leaders of this new social movement (see Chapter One) are calling conflict resolution the "Fourth 'R'" in education (e.g., Benenson, 1995, Davis and Porter, 1984).
conflict resolution processes and techniques of intervention, at the expense of direct pedagogical self-critique.70

Lederach (1995), "... one of America's leading scholars of conflict resolution" (Solomon, 1997, p. xi), has called for CME trainers and facilitators to begin to move beyond their own narrow circular feedback loop of "technical" dominated pedagogy.71 Writing from within conflict transformation (and Mennonite mediation experience), Lederach connected this technicism with managerialism when he wrote,

Some years ago, conflict 'management' entered... heavily Western in conception, management pointed toward the idea that conflict follows certain predictable patterns and dynamics that could be understood and regulated.... But experience tells us we do not really control human action and interactions, nor is the object of our work to simply reduce volatility. Thus 'management' only partially depicts the goal and work of mediators. Transformation suggests we do not eliminate or control, but we do impact the path of conflict. (Lederach, 1989, pp. 51-52)

Salem (1993) critiqued the "hidden assumptions" behind Western conflict resolution and its "utilitarianism," which Pirie (1998) continues in his criticism of ADR which locates much of CME as an ideological "... new hegemony of social control..." (p. 514), with a "... preoccupation with consensus." (p. 541), or what Nader (1983) called a "harmony ideology" (cited in Pirie, 1998, p. 514). Olson's (1996) pride in conflict resolution as a "social technology of peace" is criticized here as an overly rationalistic, positivist and technicist model of dealing with people and education processes via managerialism and the goal to create social "harmony" at all costs. What privileged individual(s) group(s) 'in power' does that hegemonic discourse benefit?

Concurrent with the "cultural" diversity critique of CME, was an emerging methodological critique. One of the earliest signs of this came from Duryea (1992) in
describing the general criticism coming out of the Interdisciplinary Seminar on Culture and Disputing at the University of Hawaii in 1987. She wrote,

... [participants] were very critical of the positivist orientation toward dispute resolution found in the U.S. They favored instead a naturalistic paradigm of inquiry. The naturalistic perspective views dispute as embedded in a 'longer story that is anchored in a rich and specific history and culture' (p. 57) (citation is from Milner and Shook, 1987, p. 32).

Milner and Shook (1987) noted the tendency in social sciences, and its often dominating positivism, to create exploitative relationships in both studying and practicing dispute resolution. This methodological critique became part of the "cultural" critique (above) which Milner and Shook recommended be accompanied by "... consideration of fundamental epistemological questions." (p. 37). Delattre's (1991) critique echoed this same concern, from his political philosophical view of the conflict resolution/management field.

Pirie (1998) challenged ADR's assumptions in terms of power/knowledge and a Foucauldian critique, similar to this thesis. He argued the informal ADR movement is arguably, a "mask" for state power, and the more subtle styles of social control that the state welcomes. He wrote of ADR's political hidden agenda,

This new hegemony of social control reflects Foucault's philosophy of power. Power is located in socio-legal concepts and understandings rather than primarily in official punishment or simple brute force. However, the intimate relationship between ADR and social control should not be surprising. The rise of ADR often is equated nostalgically with the demise of traditional sources of authority and control such as churches, schools, and the family.... If ADR strengthens the state's monopoly on social control, it would not be unusual to find 'insiders' or elite professionals in formal legal institutions [and schools, or corporate institutions] busy in the movement toward informalism. (pp. 514-515)
Utilizing a Weberian (conflict perspective) sociological analysis of the relationship between law and capitalism, Pirie further argued that ADR has moved to making conflict individualized and privatized "By de-emphasizing legal rights and emphasizing [individualistic] party interests and needs, ADR depoliticizes law." He believed that ADR "... reframing disputes from rights-oriented problems to interpersonal or psychologically based problems, may reproduce societal differences in power and privilege.... Who are the people who want better justice through informality rather than the authority of the state to enforce their rights?" (p. 517).

In a somewhat similar Foucauldian view, Thomas Popkewitz, who studied school reform as social power/knowledge dynamics, wrote, "I have always been perplexed with the peace education [CME] literature that turns to psychologizing the problem of war/peace..." (personal communications, December 6, 1999). And the conflict sociologist, Randall Collins, a left neo-Weberian, critiqued the "sociological weakness" of the "pragmatist liberal reformers" who tend to "regard conflict as arising from misunderstanding among individuals." The general ignoring of economic class and power positions in social conflict, leads Collins to conclude that CME generally,

... stays with the immediate situation and its psychological dimensions, and does not look for the deeper structural background of inequalities and organizational structures. That is why the 'conflict tradition' in sociological theory and research seems to operate on a different level of analysis than the literature of conflict resolution. It seems to me that a more realistic conflict pedagogy could be built if it incorporated more of these structural concerns. (personal communication, July 31, 1999). (underline added for emphasis)

Mindell (1995) summed up what the above authors have implied, that is, "Western thought is biased toward peace and harmony. That's why many non-mainstream [oppressed] groups consider the very idea of 'conflict resolution' a mainstream fabrication." (pp. 36-37).
Salem (1993), an Arab professor of Political Studies at the American University of Beirut, critiqued the "triumphant West" and its over virtuous thinking about "peace" and its underestimation of the "virtues of battle." He argued that one hidden assumption of Western conflict resolution is based in "Utilitarianism and the comfort culture of the 20th century," which "... relies heavily on the assumption that pain is bad and pleasure, or comfort, is good." (p. 364). Perhaps, this managerialism, if not colonialism, of Western CME, is depicted best in an image from an American educational journal that had a special issue on conflict resolution in schools. Figure 5 shows how this movement has constructed a new youth identity formation, called "conflict managers."

Problem Summary And Purposes Of The Study

The main purpose of this study is to develop critical conflict knowledge and educational praxis which examines our biased conceptualizations of 'conflict;' and how such biases may influence the perpetuation of the DFCV cycle. This study is therefore a contribution toward expanding the current conflict imaginary. The specific problem and purposes of this study are embedded in the thesis that there is a general uncritical utilization of CME knowledge and inadequate challenging of the ideological discourses and assumptions behind CME teaching, training, programs and research in the Northwestern world (including Australia). This study therefore, attempts to show this is a problem. With regard to the foregoing, the problems of this study are:

1. to identify the dominant and sub-dominant discourses on conflict in a "representative" sample of conflict management education (CME) handbooks and training manuals for youth and adults,
2. to problematize those dominant discourses as hegemony and critically analyze their sources, meanings and implications within, historical, cultural and sociopolitical contexts.
Figure 5 Constructing Images of "CONFLICT MANAGERS"

This image comes out of an issue of *Educational Leadership* (a professional American periodical) that presented an entire issue on conflict resolution and violence in schools. There were many photos of individuals involved. This particular image stood out and could provide a multi-layered, multiple interpretation of messages constructing the idea of conflict management (i.e., peer mediation) and of conflict managers (peer mediators). These black young women are uniformed in a white shirt, both conforming well to the viewer/photographer/gaze of a periodical that is predominantly filled with articles from white Eurocentric males. The article itself was written by two (presumably) white male researchers, who specialize in conflict resolution/management programs (cooperative education) with a "conflict positive" orientation. Any black feminist theorist, or woman, or critical theorist would deconstruct the racist colonial imagery presented. The control of a minority group, such as black woman youth (3X oppressed via race, gender and age) by the conformist attire and stance, gives the reader the impression of the politics so easily hidden in the curriculum of CME.
Two longterm, general purposes of this study are:

(3) to develop a rationale for inclusion of the study of 'conflict' and CME as part of a critical sociocultural topic within adult education and schooling education—especially to create and encourage a critical dialogic exchange and cross-fertilization of ideas between CME and critical (conflict) traditions/pedagogy in regard to 'conflict' and how best to deal with it,

(4) to direct attention toward further research in developing a 'conflict' epistemology as the foundation of a critical conflict education (CCE), and 'conflict' pedagogy, which reflects an emerging neo-conflict theory that informs conflictwork for living in a violent world.

The latter two purposes are discussed in Chapter Four, with several recommendations for future studies.

Alongside this specific analysis of conceptualizations of 'conflict' in the above, a longterm study of critical pedagogy and critical adult education literature was taking place under a guiding question of how do criticalists' theorize conflict in relation to teaching and learning? As well, a review of the major critiques of CME was undertaken. These two initiatives occurred before the specific analysis of CME, and therefore influenced the thinking that went into the design of the CME text analysis. There were deductive and inductive processes applied to this study and this allowed for an evolving "design" to data collection and interpretation frameworks (cf. Chapter Two for details). The criticalist view of educational writing placed a biased viewpoint on the study, in which no attempt was made to take the CME data as "value-neutral" or "apolitical," or even potentially so. And no attempt was made to interpret the CME data descriptively alone, thus a large normative aspect is included in this thesis. CME is continually put under challenge as a political hegemonic discourse, which is contradicted by an emerging counter-hegemonic CCE discourse in the development of a 'conflict' pedagogy.
Summaries Of Thesis Chapters

Chapter One introduced concepts of education, conflict and violence as they are utilized in this thesis within a conflict perspective and a "culture of violence." Guiding questions were articulated with the study's rationale from personal experiences. Rationale is explicated for why 'conflict' and discourses of conflict are important. The nature of the study is outlined with discussions of key definitions, problem summary, purposes and methodology of the study. The "division" and conflict about conflict knowledge is emphasized in studying peace-focused writing vs. conflict-focused writing and a brief history and summary of germane critiques of conflict management education (CME) concluded this introductory chapter.

Chapter Two details the methodology of the study, describing and locating the kind of research undertaken with basic assumptions. Design rationale and a critical discourse analysis are explained with a review of Foucault's poststructuralist analysis as a valuable tool for applying to conceptualizations of 'conflict' in 22 CME training manuals and handbooks for youth and adults. The chapter ends with a review of the developing 'conflict' epistemology as a basis for the emerging 'conflict' pedagogy and critical conflict education (CCE) proposed in this thesis.

Chapter Three introduces the reader to understanding conflict and the conflict-violence connection and the various themes of discourse that showed up in the CME text surveyed. The CME text data is then interpreted from several perspectives, including a sociological conflict perspective, an interdisciplinary/comparative analysis and a Foucauldian analysis.

Chapter Four is designed to further interpret the results of this study and place them in the context of an emerging 'conflict' pedagogy. Results are interpreted which indicate a biased hegemony of CME discourse that is explainable, to some degree, within the ideological and historical dimensions of CME as a new social movement. The results indicate that a systematic critique of CME, in general, is required. Reflections on the study are offered and recommendations for future research explicated.
workers," Edwards's (1997, p. 156) "reflexive worker," or Agger's (1992) "literary workers." Conflictworker is a critical role that challenges the current fashionable notions of the "knowledge worker" (Pinchot and Pinchot, 1986). The theoretical position is taken in conflictwork, but with an equally strong theoretical foundation.

It is important to note that a critical position taken in regard to the conflict that being critical brings up in people. My interest is to begin formation of a "new" critical or radical tradition which takes a generally similar focus) and how schools may well support oppressive dominant-subordinate relations of "social reproduction." He wrote, "... stressing domination, oppression, and conflict as the central organizing basis of explanation in social life." (p. 11). And Collins (1994) clarified, "Its main argument is not simply that society consists of conflict, but the larger claim that what occurs when conflict is not openly taking place is a process of domination.... The conflict vision of society is rarely popular. Conflict sociologists have usually been an intellectual underground.

Prevailing views [functionalism/consensus theory] have usually stressed a much more benign picture, whether based on beliefs in religious beings underpinning the social world, or on secular beliefs in the goodness of one's rulers and the charitable intentions of established elites. To conflict sociologists, these kinds of justifications are ideologies cloaking real self-interests of groups hiding beneath them. To point this out, obviously, does not usually make one very welcome in mainstream society." (p. 288). And Smelser (1988) adds, that the conflict perspective is found "... stressing domination, oppression, and conflict as the central organizing basis of explanation in social life." (p. 11). And Collins (1994) clarified, "Its main argument is not simply that society consists of conflict, but the larger claim that what occurs when conflict is not openly taking place is a process of domination.... The conflict vision of society is rarely popular. Conflict sociologists have usually been an intellectual underground.

This term is used by several authors, to follow in Chapter One. Throughout this thesis, I use "culture" in a Bourdieusian sense, as Grenfell and James (1998) defined it: "... the world of knowledge, ideas, objects which are the products of human activity. Education is part of culture...". (p. 10). Like Bourdieu, McLaren (1988) conceptualizes culture as a symbolic economy of knowledges and images which circulate to create stratification and oppression-- i.e., domination-subordinate relations and the violence and social conflict associated with that) in societies. McLaren (1988) defines culture as "... a field of struggle in which the production, legitimation, and circulation of particular forms of knowledge and experience are central areas of conflict." (p. 171). See also Bourdieu and Passeron (1977). With this term "culture of violence" I do not mean that all of the culture, in any case, is reducible to only violence.

1 This term is used at this point in a loose sense, as 'a view or perspective' (theoria L.). See Collins (1994) and Turner (1986) for a sociological summary of the conflict theory tradition and how the critical theory of Marx and neo-Marxism (a la Habermas and the Frankfurt School, which Giroux and many other critical pedagogues rely on) are seen as part of conflict theory. Gouldner (1971), Lyotard (1984, p. 11) and Chambliess (1973, p. 2) note that two great currents/traditions have influenced sociological thinking and what Lyotard called "basic representational models of society." Collins (1992) further defined conflict theory as, "... theory [which] explains social structure and changes in it by arguing that actors pursue their interests in conflict with others [more so than by cooperation and consensus as found in the functionalist or consensus theory of which is the other contrasting, if not contradicting, representational model of society] and according to their resources for social organization. Conflict theory builds upon Marxist analysis of class conflicts, but it is detached from any ideological commitment to socialism." (p. 288). And Smelser (1988) adds, that the conflict perspective is found "... stressing domination, oppression, and conflict as the central organizing basis of explanation in social life." (p. 11). And Collins (1994) clarified, "Its main argument is not simply that society consists of conflict, but the larger claim that what occurs when conflict is not openly taking place is a process of domination.... The conflict vision of society is rarely popular. Conflict sociologists have usually been an intellectual underground.

2 Theory is used at this point in a loose sense, as 'a view or perspective' (theoria L.). See Collins (1994) and Turner (1986) for a sociological summary of the conflict theory tradition and how the critical theory of Marx and neo-Marxism (a la Habermas and the Frankfurt School, which Giroux and many other critical pedagogues rely on) are seen as part of conflict theory. Gouldner (1971), Lyotard (1984, p. 11) and Chambliess (1973, p. 2) note that two great currents/traditions have influenced sociological thinking and what Lyotard called "basic representational models of society." Collins (1992) further defined conflict theory as, "... theory [which] explains social structure and changes in it by arguing that actors pursue their interests in conflict with others [more so than by cooperation and consensus as found in the functionalist or consensus theory of which is the other contrasting, if not contradicting, representational model of society] and according to their resources for social organization. Conflict theory builds upon Marxist analysis of class conflicts, but it is detached from any ideological commitment to socialism." (p. 288). And Smelser (1988) adds, that the conflict perspective is found "... stressing domination, oppression, and conflict as the central organizing basis of explanation in social life." (p. 11). And Collins (1994) clarified, "Its main argument is not simply that society consists of conflict, but the larger claim that what occurs when conflict is not openly taking place is a process of domination.... The conflict vision of society is rarely popular. Conflict sociologists have usually been an intellectual underground.

Prevailing views [functionalism/consensus theory] have usually stressed a much more benign picture, whether based on beliefs in religious beings underpinning the social world, or on secular beliefs in the goodness of one's rulers and the charitable intentions of established elites. To conflict sociologists, these kinds of justifications are ideologies cloaking real self-interests of groups hiding beneath them. To point this out, obviously, does not usually make one very welcome in mainstream society." (pp. 47-48). See further details in Appendix II.

3 McLaren (1989) wrote about critical pedagogy and the questions critical educators ask when analyzing life in school cultures [could include adult work cultures/organizations etc.]. He noted their focus on "status and class positions" (i.e., power relations) (cf. Collins, 1975, 1985, 1994, as a conflict sociological analysis and the conflict tradition which takes a generally similar focus) and how schools may well support oppressive dominant-subordinate relations of "social reproduction." He wrote, "... the conflict or resistance theorists [critical or radical educators], such as Giroux and Paul Willis,... [pay attention to school culture] and the role of conflict and contradiction within the reproductive process itself." (p. 187). "Critical adult education [which I would generally locate this study, critique, and myself as a worker with adults] positions itself in society as a cultural practice and depicts its practitioners as 'cultural workers' (Westwood, 1980, p. 44)." (Plumb, 1995, p. 157).

4 Feminist critics of militarism (e.g., cf. Walker, 1983, pp. 1062-63) would argue these homicide (killing) statistics for youth (especially males) are skewed and underestimated-- that is, in light of the numbers of youth who are sacrificed (in nationalistic infanticide) as soldiers and civilians in war zones.

5 Conflictwork, a term borrowed from Mindell (1995), is an attempt to move conflict practices beyond conceptualizations within heavily biased terms like "conflict resolution," "conflict regulation," "conflict management," or "conflict transformation." This is a complex topic, beyond the scope of this thesis. But it is important to note that a critical theoretical position is taken in conflictwork, but with an equally strong theoretical position taken in regard to the conflict that being critical brings up in people. My interest is to begin formation of a notion of a "new" role-- conflictworkers-- for educators (and others) similar to Giroux's (1992) "cultural workers," Edwards's (1997, p. 156) "reflexive worker," or Agger's (1992) "literary workers." Conflictworker is a critical role that challenges the current fashionable notions of the "knowledge worker" (Pinchot and Pinchot,
political and social problems..." (Boshier, 1996, p. 3). Today, the concept of "globalization" is intimately related to this problematique.

The major conflict sociologist in North America working "mainly on violent conflict now," Randall Collins, only for Criminal Justice at Harvard Law School. He is currently professor of sociology at the University of Virginia.

Inquiries among academics I know. Apparently, in the 1980s Donald Black was Assistant Director of The Center interconnected, these forms are embraced in the "fear" pattern virus" metaphor (Fisher, 1995, 1997, 1998) and the metaphor of a vast network of toxifying "violence in rivers of conflict." (Franssen et al., 1998); to oppression and toxification of all life forms and planetary ecosystems via anthropocentrism; to racism, sexism, classism (and many other forms); to the more subtle forms of "ideological violent conflicts" (Graff, 1992, p. 169), and "intellectual violence" (Miller et al., 1998, p. 393) from "paradigm wars" (Gage, 1989) and "symbolic violence" (Bourdieu, 1979) to the "violence of abstraction" (Sayer, 1987) "... when we begin forcing the world to fit our truth [theories] ..." (Plumb, 1995, p. 171); to the seemingly evanescent spiritual abuse, yet insidious "spiritual dualism" of consciousness which "... does violence to the very universe it seeks to understand." (Wilber, 1977/82, p. 45)— otherwise known in secular philosophical traditions as "misplaced concreteness" (a la Whitehead) or the fallacy of "reification." All interconnected, these forms are embraced in the "fear" pattern virus" metaphor (Fisher, 1995, 1997, 1998) and the metaphor of a vast network of toxifying "violence in rivers of conflict."
briefly mentions Black's work in his book (Collins, 1994). In personal correspondence, Collins identified Black's work on conflict and violence with high regard: "Another analytical work of great importance as a synthetic theory of conflict (if not especially micro) is Donald Black, The Social Structure of Right and Wrong...". (Randall Collins, personal communications, March 17, 1999).

12 Black talks about social space and a geometry of "conflict structures." This is quite complex but Black (1998) is a good place to start. His main model involves predicting conflict (violence) through a five dimensional geometry of analyzing social spaces. He is not interested in studying individuals but how individuals (and groups) respond and behave in conflict depending on the dynamic characteristics identifiable in his geometrical analysis of social space (social life). Environmental-geographer types and perhaps some "postmodernist" thinkers, would likely be attracted to Black's theories, as they are a strong attempt to show the moral aspect of conflict and violence without being a moralistic analysis.

13 As a formal convention, the (') marks on this term (also on 'peace') indicate that the definitions, conceptualizations and meanings of 'conflict' are being deconstructed in this research. Therefore, no preconceived dictionary, encyclopedia, normal, or common meanings of this term are regarded as privileged in accuracy over any others at this time. When the term is used without the (') marks, this refers to the overall everyday use of the word in the dominant culture(s) (i.e., primarily white Eurocentric). This deconstructive attitude toward conflict is an epistemological strategy to attempt to open up new spaces and possibilities for improving our understanding of conflict as a concept and social phenomenon. It is assumed that a historically predominant way of seeing, imagining and constructing the meaning of conflict is a significant part of the problem of increasing violence (i.e., the domination-fear-conflict-violence (DFCV) cycle). Black (1998), in his radical "sociology of conflict," has challenged current Western conceptualizations of conflict as mostly inaccurate and misleading. He has called for a renewed view of conflict and a new discipline of "pure sociology" to study conflict systematically. Black's work deserves future examination as part of the theoretical framework for an emerging 'conflict' pedagogy (and neo-conflict theory) which is proposed in this thesis. See later in Chapter One for a brief discussion in reference to Black et al.

14 Doubt and the deconstructive attitude (a la Lyotard, Derrida, Lacan, etc.) toward 'conflict' in this thesis are consistent with a postmodernist attitude (cf. Burbules, 1995). Although, the term postmodernist or postmodern are highly problematic and varied, I concur with Harvey's (1989) general assessment of the attitude or approach that these concepts (and times) bring to social science research and knowledge production. Harvey cited Terry Eagleton, "Post-modernism signals the death of such 'meta-narratives' [such as modernisms 18th century ideas of a universal, rational, shared cultural view point on progress, equality, peace, goodness, development, liberation, justice, success etc.], whose secretly terroristic function was to ground and legitimate the illusion of a 'universal' human history. We are now in the process of wakening from the nightmare of modernity, with its manipulative reason and fetish of the totality, into the laid-back pluralism of the post-modern, that heterogeneous range of life-styles and language games which has renounced the nostalgic urge to totalize and legitimate itself.... Science and philosophy must jettison their grandiose metaphysical claims and view themselves more modestly as just another set of narratives." (cited in Harvey, 1989, p. 9). And Lemert (1997) continues, "...postmodernism is a culture that believes there is a better world than the modern one.... Postmodern is a culture that prefers to break things up, to respect the several parts of social world [local situations]. When it speaks of culture it prefers to speak of cultures." (p. 22). This is somewhat consistent with a general post-structuralist approach of analysis a la Foucault (cf. Chapter Two). Some critics will immediately attack the 'conflict' pedagogy notion proposed in this thesis as sounding universalist (if not modernist). For theoretical purposes, in the early part of this development, this universal quality of a 'conflict' pedagogy is required, I believe, to later be taken by others from various identity-formations, marginalized groups, and a varied assortment of locales-- all of whom are most welcome to take 'conflict' pedagogy and apply it to their unique interests and situations. I am not a postmodernist, nor am I advocating such a position in its entirety. It also has a "shadow" and destructive pathological-side (tendency to extreme relativism and nihilism), like modernity. I prefer Lemert's (1997) classification of "radical modernism," "radical postmodernism," and "strategic postmodernism." This study is embedded in radical modernism and strategic postmodernism (like Agger, Wexler, McLaren, Giroux and others). However, the "ism" classification is not one I prefer to use period. I reserve "isms" as a labeling for when a healthy movement (e.g., postmodernity) turns to pathological ideology (e.g., postmodernism).

15 Hall (1996) gives a sense of the culturalist/postmodernist approach to analytical strategy used in this study of 'conflict.' He wrote, "Unlike those forms of critique which aim to supplant inadequate concepts with 'truer' ones,
or which aspire to the production of positive knowledge, the deconstructive approach puts key concepts 'under erasure.' This indicates that they are no longer serviceable—'good to think with'— in their originary and unreconstructed form. But since they have not been superseded dialectically, and there are no other, entirely different concepts with which to replace them, there is nothing to do but to continue to think with them—albeit now in their detotalized or deconstructed forms, and no longer operating within the paradigm in which they were originally generated (cf. Hall, 1995)." (p. 1).

16 George Mason University is one of the older, highly recognized conflict analysis educational programs in America. See http://www.gmu.edu/departments/ICAR/ICAR_philosophy.html

17 According to Tidwell (1998), Deutsch is an American social psychologist "... who has made significant contributions to the study of conflict resolution. Central to his work has been the issue 'not [of] how to eliminate or prevent conflict but rather how to make it productive' (Deutsch, 1973, p. 17). (p. 67). ... Deutsch may be credited with making the strongest link in conflict resolution theory between the understanding of conflict and its resolution [compared to Simmel, Coser or Lewin]." (p. 69).

18 The term conflict theorist (or conflict theory) is very controversial. Much of the literature does not distinguish between theorists who write and research about conflict and conflict resolution (e.g., Follett, Deutsch), and the traditional sociological conflict theorists, like Marx, Hegel, Simmel, Coser, Dahrendorf etc. Dahrendorf (1959) is credited with initiating the term "conflict theory" (Johnson, 1995, p. 52) and the conceptualization of "power conflict"—as the conflict theorists in sociology (cf. Collins, 1994) are most interested in classism, and other forms of big 'isms' as part of conceptualizing conflict. Dahrendorf "... argued that conflict centers primarily on power, on the division between those who control others and those who are controlled." (Johnson, 1995, p. 52). This contrasts with Follett, Deutsch, Tjvold, Johnson and Johnson and the like, who do not centralize their thinking on notions of power and oppression within larger social structural and cultural dimensions. I believe "conflict theory" and "conflict theorists" are terms that ought to be reserved for their meaning within the conflict tradition of social theory (cf. Bernard, 1983) and sociology. For theorists who study and write about conflict, the terms "theory of conflict" or "theorists of conflict" are more accurate and respectful of the analytical, philosophical and political distinction in the two 'camps'. From this point forward, these distinctions are upheld in this thesis.

19 Fisher and Ury (1983), in their popular books, of which Getting to Yes, has been most influential in influencing the field of conflict resolution and ADR (alternative dispute resolution) (Tidwell, 1998, p. 8). These authors from Harvard Law School, do not attempt to even define conflict in their Getting to Yes, book. They do, as professionals working with negotiation and conflict resolution, seem to prefer a conception that "... conflict is a growth industry." (p. xi). I have grave concerns about conflict becoming a commodity for business capitalists.

20 Tidwell (1998) noted the theories of conflict are usually divided into three groups: interpersonal, group, and social (e.g., Kriesberg, 1982)− but he preferred, a schema of theories "... into which are largely functional−holding that conflict serves a social function; those that view it as situational−finding expression under certain situations; and those who hold it to be largely interactive." (p. 32). It ought to be evident, that this thesis study is not interested in all the different typologies of theories of conflict, or types of conflicts. This is because they are operationalized in these literatures to such a degree, that the focus of the operationalization is determined toward resolving and managing conflict(s)− and 'conflict' itself is virtually ignored. This ought to come more clearly out, with more analysis, in the rest of this thesis.

21 Conflict− describes a long-running, deep-rooted battle, which is difficult, if not impossible to resolve in some cases. Dispute− describes a short-term and more easily negotiable situation (Burgess and Burgess, 1997, p. viii). These are problematic and ambiguous distinctions conceptually, and in lived reality. They are terms not always consistently distinguished in the various literatures surveyed in this study. My complaint, is that both terms are still focusing on "conflicts" and not on 'conflict' itself.

22 Transdisciplinary is distinguished from multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary (cf. Bailey, 1984; Romey, 1975). Aperspectival mind (or "vision logic," as Wilber, 1995 calls it, is from Jean Geber's work− cf. Karpiax, 1997 also, as she applies this to adult and continuing education) is a form of consciousness or awareness that is developmentally capable of going beyond merely 'taking multiple points of view' in a rational manner. Wilber (1995) wrote, "... rationality can indeed take different perspectives, as we saw. But vision-logic, or the integral-aperspectival mind, adds up all the perspectives tout ensemble, and therefore privileges no perspective as final: it is aperspectival.... in other words, is holonic thorough and through: contexts within contexts within contexts forever." (p. 187). Transdisciplinary, in simple terms, is deconstructive/reconstructive, where bringing the multiple perspectives together is part of an intention to outstrip their limitations, transcend them, and move
toward transforming the very way of seeing—transform the very methodologies themselves—transforming habitual and disciplinary ways of seeing—creating "new" ways of seeing (new consciousness, awareness). I would argue, that this study is transdisciplinary because it is difficult to situate within any discipline, and it is creating and transforming disciplinary knowledges continually with "new" inventive concepts and means of knowing 'conflict' itself. Because this approach is preferred and attempted here, does not necessarily mean that this was successful, or this thesis is exemplar of the best way of taking this approach.

23 See Crittenden (1997) for a good review of this unique and potentially powerful (largely unknown) epistemological methodology. This is a theory that goes beyond and avoids the pitfalls of eclecticism.

24 The 'Conflict Pedagogy' sphere is overly exaggerated in size. It would be relatively much smaller. But logistically, in order to read the words inside the sphere it had to be made larger.

25 "Power as a form of cultural domination has been captured in Gramsci's (1971) concept of ideological hegemony, a concept that helps to reassert the centrality of the interconnection among politics, culture, and pedagogy.... The implications of this concept for teachers become clear if the notion of culture as ideological hegemony is qualified. Hegemony does not simply refer to the content found, for instance, in the formal curriculum of schools [or disciplinary knowledges]. It is that and much more; it also refers to the way such knowledge is structured. In addition, it refers to the routines and practices embedded in different social relationships..." (Giroux, 1983, pp. 196-197). See similarities with discourse (a la Foucault) and discussion of "Relation Of Discourse And Ideology" in Chapter Two.

26 Foucault (1980a) links this to power and production of truth and wealth. He wrote, "Power never ceases its interrogation, its inquisition, its registration of truth: it institutionalises, professionalises and rewards its pursuit. In the last analysis, we must produce truth as we must produce wealth [capital], indeed we must produce truth in order to produce wealth in the first place." (p. 93).

27 This is a highly problematic term, in light of the growing critiques of "literacy" generally. However, in the future this may prove to be useful as part of critique of CME discourse. I only found this term used once in the literature reviewed-- that is, in Wenden (1994).

28 I am using this term as Welton (1993) articulated it: "In contemporary social theory the term 'new social movements' has gained 'wide currency' (Cohen, 1985, p. 663), and it is standard practice to identify peace, feminist, ecological, and local and personal autonomy movements as exemplars.... Any collective actor or social movement, must have a clear self-image or identity (collective identity), know decisively who they are against (an antagonistic relation to an opposed group), and struggle for the control of the development of the sociocultural lifeworld..." (p. 153) (also cf. Newman, 1995). I am most interested in this link between CME and new social movements because of the link of "soft" reform and revolutionary change (in new social movements) with pedagogical interests in these conflict sites of learning and teaching (cf. Finger, 1989, Holford, 1995; Welton, 1993).

29 Some writers in CME refer to the field of conflict (dispute) resolution as a "movement" (Bowen and Gittler, 1991; Harty and Modell, 1991) or "social movement," (Hocking, 1996), for example, Olson (1996) wrote from a sociological perspective, "The interest in researching conflict, violence, and war has grown to the point where YOU are now a part of an international movement to build a Social Technology of Peace. Together we can work to reduce the frightening lag in the field of conflict resolution." (p. 3). No writers reviewed in this study have referred to CME (or conflict resolution/management) as a NSM explicitly. Although, indirectly CME falls into the new social movement categories (Newman, 1995; Welton, 1993) in regards to it being implicitly part of the "peace movement" generally-- and ADR as part of legal reform movements (according Pirie, 1998), and as part of the "civil rights movement." The third strand in the development of conflict resolution according to Burgess and Burgess (1997) can be traced to "... the civil rights and other popular empowerment movements of the 1960s." (p. viii). ADR is regularly written and spoken about as the "ADR movement" (e.g., Hocking, 1996; Pirie, 1998).

30 Many of these theorists are mentioned throughout this thesis, but not all. Chapter Four mentions some of their names and work to some degree.

31 These two terms critical tradition (i.e., critical theory) and conflict tradition (i.e., conflict theory) are highly problematic and complex. There is no one definition that would fit for the variety of thinking and methods in these theory traditions (or perspectives). Appendix II includes the overview of Collin's (1994) interpretation of the conflict tradition, and in which many authors of the critical theory tradition (e.g., Habermas and the Frankfurt School) are included within. In this thesis I will use the conflict tradition for simplicity, while acknowledging most, but not all, critical theory would fall in this tradition.
In Chapter Three, *power and conflict* (power conflict a la Dahrendorf and Weber) are examined in relation to each other to bring a Foucauldian post-structuralist and conflict theory perspective together as integral knowledge-making. *Conflict* (tactics of struggle and opposition), was not dealt with by Foucault to my knowledge, as he rather preferred the term *resistance*— concluding that wherever there is *power* there is *resistance* (cf. discussion in McHoul and Grace, 1998, p. 84). Giroux (1983, p. 165) argued that resistance is the "... active side of hegemony, it also provides the basis for a radical pedagogy that would make it the object of a critical deciphering and analysis." Giroux thus leads us to theorizing about resistance as conflict, related to power, when he wrote, "Teachers must attempt to understand the meaning of the contradictions, dysfunctions, and tensions [conflict] that exist in both schools and the larger social order. Moreover, they must focus on the underlying conflicts in both schools and society and investigate how these can contribute to a more dialectical theory of citizenship education." (p. 199). He cites Johnson (1979) who pointed out the dialectical nature of domination and resistance [conflict] (p. 199).

32 *Conflict education* in italics refers to a generic label for any education which highlights an interest in conflict and violence. "Conflict education" with (") marks indicates specifically the work of J. & T. Webster-Doyle (1997) (Atrium Society) and their followers like Fitzell (1997), who take a moderately radical (highly inner consciousness) approach to working with conflict in education settings. The Webster-Doyle material can be found on their web site http://www.atriumsoc.org/organization.html

33 In simple terms, I assume that 'conflict' cannot be well understood unless it is studied within this domination-fear-conflict-violence (DFCV) cycle complex (which is discussed further in Chapter Four). The DFCV cycle conception, created for this thesis, is backed up, somewhat, by Collins's (1994) conflict sociology position that stated "Its main argument is not simply that society consists of conflict, but the larger claim that what occurs when conflict is not openly taking place is a process of domination." (p. 47). As well, my own research into the link of 'fear' and violence supports the DFCV cycle conception as being worthy of further study (cf. Fisher, 1995, 1997, 1998).

34 In simple liberal terms, "ideologies" in education (for youth or adults), be it formal, informal, or nonformal, are "... competing [conflicting] patterns of ideas and beliefs [values, assumptions] about education." (Meighan, 1981, p. 20). Gage (1989) argued these become "paradigm wars" in education research, practices and policies, often with disastrous fragmenting results. In this study, ideology, albeit problematic in its diverse definitions and uses, is used in the radical sociological sense of most critical theorists (conflict theorists)— that is, "... any system of ideas which justifies or legitimates the subordination of one group by another" (Jary and Jary, 1995, p. 306). Havel (1990) wrote, "Ideology is a specious way of relating to the world. It offers human beings the illusion of an identity, of dignity, and of morality while making it easier [as a discourse] for them to part from them. As the repository of something 'supra-personal' and objective, it enables people to deceive their conscience and conceal their true position... both from the world and from themselves.... It is a veil behind which human beings can hide their own 'fallen existence', their trivialization, and their adaptation to the status quo." (p. 50).

35 *Propaganda* used in this context refers to "... ideas, facts, or allegations spread deliberately to further one's cause or to damage an opposing cause...". (Websters New College Dictionary, 1981, p. 916). From a post-structuralist and conflict perspective of knowledge networks, the furthering of one's cause (to make central) is implicated necessarily in a marginalizing of 'other'. This theorizing of "othering" has been radically disturbing in terms of "identity" construction and constitutive analysis (cf. Butler, 1993; Derrida, 1981; Hall, 1996; Laclau, 1990-- cf. also Bhabha, 1994). As othering is applied to theorizing about identity constitution, I would assume that othering is applicable to theorizing about concept constitution— that is, to the conceptualizing processes involved in concepts like 'conflict.' But I don't regard all othering (differentiation) as necessarily violent (as I often hear). This ferreting out of distinctions of differentiation and dissociation processes (loosely and problematically called "othering") is beyond the scope of this study, but it is important to acknowledge in my own theorizing about violence. *Hidden curriculum* "... is a term used to refer to those aspects of learning in schools [or elsewhere, as used in this study] that are unofficial, or unintentional, or undeclared consequences of the way teaching and learning are organized and performed...". (Meighan, 1981, p. 34).

36 *Discourse* has many different meanings, depending on the discipline and context in which it is being defined and used. Further details are given in Chapter Two. Throughout this report "Discourse then, consists of recurrent statements and wordings across texts (Foucault, 1972)." (Luke, 1995-6, p. 15). "... discourses are not simple groupings of utterances or statements, but consist of utterances which have meaning, force [power], and effect within a social context." (Mills, 1997, p. 13).
deterrance, contracts and so on. This would include both violent forms of conflict resolution and nonviolent development. Some see conflict resolution as any process by which conflicts are handled— that is, through "knowledge" and "dialogue" (Sweeney and Carruthers, 1992). However, does not necessarily emerge in a smooth, orderly fashion, devoid of conflict, but is actively created and contested against competing visions and values. (p. 28).

In social theory and sociology, the debate between consensus theory (very closely related to functionalism) and conflict theory will be taken up in Chapter Three and Four— as this debate is related to "peace" and "conflict" educational discourses, respectively.

Anyon's (1979, 1980) extensive studies of current social studies textbooks "... conclude that such books are dominated by themes such as (1) an over-valuing of social harmony, social compromise and political consensus, with very little said about social struggle or class conflict; (2) an intense nationalism and chauvinism; (3) an almost total exclusion of labor history..." (cited in Giroux, 1983, p. 69).

Nagler (1999), a long-time peace researcher, provided a good critique of why the "peace movement" and "peace culture" have failed in undermining violence. His argument supports my thesis that a culture of violence is the actual context which we have to educate and research within. Those steeped in 'peace' rhetoric and idealism too often forget how "non-violence" and "peace" discourses are so quickly appropriated (if not inevitably) into a culture of violence (cf. Nagler).

The UN declaration was taken from a classified advertisement in Common Ground, Issue 95, August, 1999.

Leonard (1999) argued that the over emphasis on consensus and harmony in definitions of "school culture" in the literature are problematic. She wrote, "Such definitions may also serve to 'reduce the complexity of culture to an almost absurd level of simplicity by emphasizing only that culture creates consensus' (Angus, 1996, p. 976). Culture, however, does not necessarily emerge in a smooth, orderly fashion, devoid of conflict, but is actively created and contested against competing visions and values..." (p. 28).
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forms]. Others, however, have developed more narrowly defined meanings. Burton, for example, argues that
conflicts concern only situations where human needs satisfaction is denied. Resolution of such conflicts occurs
only after relationships have been re-examined and realigned [in terms of mutual need fulfillment].” (Tidwell,
1998, pp. 8-9).
54 For another view of the history of conflict resolution as a movement, see Harty and Modell (1991).
55 “... the track record of the UN in resolving conflicts has been so dismal that it is arguable that the
organization has provided a model showing the alternatives to be avoided. A major criticism of it is that it has
not really provided an alternative to power politics at all, but rather has provided only another method through
which power politics may be played out. Power was one of the key points of criticism offered by a group of
international theorists.” (Tidwell, 1998, p. 12). This critique of the UN, echoes my own mistrust and critique of
the UN’s ‘apple pie’ advertisements of the decade of the years 2001-2010 as “The Decade for a Culture of Peace
and Nonviolence for the Children of the World”, mentioned earlier in this chapter. The UN has not included
aboriginal/First Nations groups, I am told, and this hardly is a foundational policy for peace and nonviolence.
56 Burton (1986) noted that this “behavioral view” is not to be confused with the ‘behavioral’ or quantitiative
57 The Mennonites began one of the first Victim-Offender Reconciliation Projects (Hocking, 1996, p. 137). The
East Mennonite University, Virginia, now has an extensive internationally recognized program in “Conflict
Transformation” (cf. Lederach’s work).
58 “The first conflict resolution movement was associated with the University of Michigan during the 1950s
when the Journal of Conflict Resolution and the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution were founded
(Harty and Modell, 1991, p. 721). The goal of this movement was to bring together a group of professionals who
would develop conflict theories that would serve policymakers in maintaining peace. Others who supported
conflict resolution and programs of nonviolence joined forces during the 1960s with social rights activists in
the context of the civil rights movements. Conceptions of peace began to take on hopes for social change and human
rights as well as the cessation of war.” (Hocking, 1996, p. 124).
59 Due to limitations of this study, “peace education” literature was not thoroughly examined, and therefore, a
more indepth historical understanding of conflict resolution as a social movement would be gained through a
review of the history of peace movements and peace education per se.
60 Webster (1991) argued the ADR movement formed in response “... to the growing conviction that our
country’s justice system had reached a crisis point. In reaction to this belief, trained community members began
to serve as facilitators in the resolution of interpersonal conflicts that ranged from quarrels between two people
to disputes affecting entire neighborhoods. The goal of the centers was clear: to resolve disputes without using
the court system.... Some of the early community programs were staffed by law professors and their students...
and some were sponsored by the American Arbitration Association.” (p. 114).
62 It appears the latest versions of the neighborhood Justice Institutes (e.g., the one in Vancouver, BC, Canada)
have expanded their goal to “Helping to provide training for safer communities” (excerpt from the Justice
Institute of British Columbia, 1999 brochure)-- “... to resolve differences and build harmonious relationships.”
(Huber, 1999-- excerpt from the "Mission" statement of the Center for Conflict Resolution (“A Message From
The Director”), the Justice Institute of British Columbia, Calendar Jan.-Aug., 1999).
63 “From the beginning, the broadest goal of conflict resolution programs in the schools has been to teach
better problem-solving strategies and decision-making skills. These are life skills that enhance interpersonal
relationships, provide the necessary tools for building a climate within a school that is more cooperative and
conducive to learning, and offer a framework for handling differences in ways that may lead to improved
communication, greater understanding, and less fear. Through law-related education, conflict resolution
approaches to classroom management, and school-wide peer mediation programs, students have the opportunity
to strengthen their self-esteem, learn to appreciate diversity, improve their communications and analytical skills,
and avoid disciplinary problems. Schools as a whole may benefit as these programs support staff and parents’
abilities and willingness to cooperate and solve students’ problems. Research on conflict resolution programs in
the schools, while limited, does suggest that they have helped decrease violence and fighting, reduce name-
calling and put-downs, decrease the number of suspensions, increase the self-esteem and self-respect of peer
mediators, enable staff to deal more effectively with conflicts, and improve the school climate.” (Girard and
Koch, 1996, p. xxvi). Typically, this is NIDR publicity material, if not propaganda, which unfortunately, does not
problematic CME as a form of conflict knowledge.

There is no intention to suggest Dewey was a fan of a conflict perspective or 'conflict' pedagogy— the contrary is likely more true. Niu (1995) comparing Mao and Dewey's social philosophies, wrote, "... Their view on class, class struggle, and revolution are quite different... [Dewey rejecting Marxian ideas]. Dewey's "democracy" was reached not through class struggle [conflict], "... but through the solidarity of social force, not by conflict but by cooperation." (p. 145). Ratner (1939) wrote in criticism of Dewey, "To say that all past historic social progress has been the result of cooperation [a consensus theory explanation] and not of conflict would also be exaggeration." (p. 445).

"There is a dearth of useful critical literature on ADR developments generally...". (Dr. Andrew Pirie, Faculty of Law at the University of Victoria, BC., personal communication, June 11, 1999).

NIDR is funded by the Ford Foundation, the Hewlett Foundation and the MacArthur foundation (Girard and Koch, 1996).

Peace III (1991) wrote, "Liberal peace reform is identified with conflict resolution, international law, and world order designs...". (p. 23). CME, as a new social movement, and liberal peace reform agenda, cannot be underestimated in its universalizing programs for a new world order.

Manning ran a consulting business, specializing in conflict resolution, before he entered politics (cf. Gould, 1997).

Preston Manning's report called The Reconciliation of Parties in Conflict: The Theory and Application of a Model of Last Resort was written and "... distributed in 1983 to clergymen and fellow travellers of the religious right in Canada and the United States.... Manning calls 'the Initiator' [God]... 'the Mediator' [Jesus Christ].... Presumably this is the model Manning would follow in resolving conflicts between management and labour, or oil companies and aboriginal people.... In the paper, Manning makes grandiose claims for his theory of last resort. He asserts it may be as powerful as the laws of nuclear physics or the biological sciences [a naturalizing discourse of scientific authority for religious authority-- that is, racism, ethnicism, religionism, and basic colonialism]. Manning retained his faith in the theory enough to repeat its central tenets in his 1992 book The New Canada." (Gould, 1997, p. 10).

This is a general claim based on a small sample of literature, and it is not meant to underestimate the great initiatives of these cultural critiques of CME, and their attempts to deal with conflict practices differently with people of varied cultural backgrounds. Indirectly, teaching approaches have been self-critiqued in some of this literature, but the emphasis is not on pedagogy (learning and teaching as a science and art) but on teaching conflict resolution processes per se.

Lederach (1995) opens the way for adult education to interact with CME discourses. He argued that conflict resolution as a field needs to draw lessons from experiences in popular (adult) education, appropriate technology, and ethnography, "... as useful alternative and conceptual bases for any pedagogical project." (p. 7).

Wilson and Cervero (1997) launch a similar critique of rational-technical approaches that have dominated adult education planning and practices in the West for over 50 years. Managerialism as used here, refers to management approaches that become ideological and hegemonic.

Duryea (1992) further noted, that in the naturalistic paradigm, "Disputeing is seen as inseparable from other things happening simultaneously, such as changes in the community, other attempts to resolve the issue and the nature of the family relationship. The positivist, in contrast, views reality as single, tangible and fragmentable. The knower and the known are independent, a dualism in a positivist's perspective. Time and context-free generalizations and value-free inquiries are possible for positivists, but not for naturalists." (p. 57). The naturalistic paradigm alternative and criticism of positivism, is one that links closely with a feminist perspective and critique of CME practices. Feminist critiques apparently are rare in this field. Cordula Reiman, a graduate student in Peace Studies at Bradford University, England, wrote, "... the practice and theory of conflict management have always been a 'gendered discourse'... In turning a blind eye on the 'gendered' underlying assumptions of conflict management as theory and practice, conflict/peace research perpetuated and indirectly enforced the exclusionist power structures and power hierarchies among society: by 'managing' or 'continually resolving conflicts', conflict management as theory and practice remains caught in the logic and practices of reconstruction, which excludes the constituting impact of material, discursive and institutional underpinnings of violent conflicts/wars as social constituencies." (personal communication, January 6, 1999). I also acknowledge that First Nations (aboriginal peoples) critiques of Western "white" conflict resolution and justice are not included here because of the limitations of this study-- where there was not time to engage respectfully (cf. Duryea, 1992...
and LeBaron et al., 1998 for further references).

Pirie (1998) argued, "Social reform is thus inhibited [by ADR]. Conflict is individualized because similar experiences by other members of a social group, particularly a group lacking political and social power, become irrelevant. The conflict becomes private, often excluded from public scrutiny, and loses any of its public interest features." (p. 517).
CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL RATIONALE: TOWARD A 'CONFLICT' EPISODEMOLGY

Introduction

Theory is 'the net we throw out in order to catch the world- to rationalize, explain, and dominate it.' (Popper, 1935, cited in Dahrendorf, 1959, p. 73)

... any form of education that concerns itself with a part and not with the whole of man [sic] inevitably leads to increasing conflict and suffering. (Krishnamurti, 1953/81, pp. 28-29).

This chapter reviews the basic assumptions behind the construction of the problem, and the basic assumptions behind the methodological and theoretical rationale for approaching the problem. As seen in earlier sections, simplicity turns quickly to complexity when topics such as conflict and violence are engaged with in any serious way that does not attempt to reduce the "whole" to the "parts." The thesis in this chapter confronts the ethical challenges to theoretically and methodologically construct a "holonic" (part/Whole) approach (cf. Wilber, 1995); whereby, violence is not created in the name of creating knowledge-- and where Popper's criticism of theory's domination effect is minimized.

The disconnection and separation (dissociation) of part-knowledge and whole-knowledge, as classically part of the shadowy underside of modernity and sciences, is referred to by some feminist scholars as the foundation of "evil" (Noddings, 1989) or "sin" (Welch, 1985). Arguably, part and whole are inherently in a 'tension' which requires attention. This entire study, analogous to an 'organization' has the task of "... determining how this tension between parts and wholes is dialectically resolved." (Foster, 1986, p. 142). As well as this more subtle self-reflexive background to methodology, this chapter presents some of the traditional scholarly "checks" on reliability and validity of the data presented, which assist the researcher and reader to assert an
intelligent cautiousness and criticality in regard to the claims that are to follow in Chapters Three and Four.

This chapter is divided in two general parts, which are not completely distinguishable because of their interweaving holonic interrelationship: (1) the elucidation of the empirical study of the conceptualizations of conflict in CME and, (2) the developing of theoretical conceptualizations for a potentially "better" way (epistemology) to study and know 'conflict,' than what has currently been done. The reality of this study is that both parts have mutually evolved together, and this chapter attempts to give some of the content for this interplay of the deductive and inductive aspects, while also, perhaps offering some of the texture of the abductive aspects which have promoted the most creativity in this research and report.

To begin to fulfill the study's main purposes, a customized CDA was created consisting of three parts: (1) a Foucauldian analysis, (2) a sociological conflict perspective analysis and, (3) an interdisciplinary/comparative analysis. These are described below and provided with a rationale for their choice in this study.

The focus of the CDA is specifically on conceptualizations of 'conflict' within texts from CME and indirectly, the disciplines of anthropology, sociology, communications, cognitive-behavioral psychology and social psychology. This locates this study as a distinct, and unique, initiative to better understand social conflict and how to critique discourses on social conflict. This is not a study about people but rather, the textual productions of their discourses and the possible impacts those productions may have.

A major assumption behind this initiative, is that 'we' do not understand social conflict very well, and therefore are not able to deal with it well-- thereby, the DFCV cycle is not effectively interrupted or undermined. This means, domination is turned to violence-- while conflict (as social practice), attempting to mediate in between domination and violence is 'overwhelmed,' (overloaded) misconstrued, and ultimately appropriated to become a part of the 'pathology' of people continuing to hurt other people-- justified, by every form of dominating,
violent rationalization and ideology one can imagine. 'Our' conflict practices are mostly habitual (unconscious) and embedded in violence discourses themselves. CME is a worthwhile initiative to undermine the DFCV cycle but lacks the theoretical and methodological depth to critique itself and ensure that it is not part of the continuation of the "teachings" of the embedded violent discourses.

Chapter Two explicates the design rationale of this study and the limitations of this design and procedures utilized. Some important definitions are provided. This chapter is divided into the following sections:

1. What Kind Of Research Is This?: Some Basic Methodological Assumptions
2. Design Rationale: Methodology And "Case" Sample
3. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA): A Unique Approach
4. Review Of Foucault's Postmodern Analysis And Key Ideas
5. 'Conflict' Epistemology?: The Politics Of The Production of 'Conflict' Knowledge

What Kind of Research Is This?: Some Basic Methodological Assumptions

This research study of CME training manuals and handbooks is undertaken within the following basic five methodological assumptions:

(1) CDA of the CME text discourse is both empirically-based and interpretive -- that is, there is a quantitative and qualitative aspect involved, with a tension between the methodological stances (below),

(2) CDA (Foucauldian) is a poststructural approach to knowledge and ... is a shift from questioning whether or not a discourse gives us a 'true' representation of the 'real world'-- a continuation of the modernist scientific approach-- to an examination of the ways in which discourse constructs 'truth' and the consequences of accepting it as true-- a form of cultural analysis .... The focus on
discourse, therefore, has been associated with recognition of the heterogeneity of meanings and powerful consequences that are engendered in the use of language and narrative processes. Meaning is itself a site of contest [conflict]. (Edwards, 1997, p. 6)

(3) This study is located in a general critical theory/tradition which Guba and Lincoln (1994) cogently summarize: "Critical theory's dialogic/dialectical methodology [is] aimed at the reconstruction of previously held constructions" (p. 112). Conceptualizations of 'conflict' are deconstructed and reconstructed, more or less, utilizing a three-in-one CDA (see below).

(4) In general, a "fallibilist" or "critical realism," is maintained, which according to Palys (1997), "... can be seen as a mid-way resolution that acknowledges some truth in both realist and social constructionist perspectives. Like the constructionists, critical realists acknowledge that 'reality' is indeed constructed and negotiated, but they also assert that reality is not completely negotiable, i.e., all explanations are not equally viable. In other words, we can be 'wrong'... [meaning] there must be a reality out there that exists independent of our opinions of it." (p. 412)

(5) "The most that any inquiry into human beings and their behavior can hope for is deeper understanding or [what Weber called] 'verstehen'. In social science research therefore, any quest for fundamental truth, let alone absolute proof, is misguided" (Parrott, 1996, p. 48). However, if an inquiry is conducted, as is this one, into "knowledge" and not "human beings" as the subject, I believe the above assumption may be itself, somewhat misguided or inapplicable.
Design Rationale: Methodology And "Case" Sample

From reading through the CME literature it was evident that social order and control are inevitably central in any form of conflict management/resolution process (social practice). Social theory and sociology have both had a long history of interest in social order and social change. Therefore, the conflict perspective and consensus perspective became important resources to give a reference for thinking about social order and social change in CME discourses.

I am interested in documenting "patterns" of ideas to see how authoritative text used in CME (training) are constructing ideas about social conflict, and what hegemony of ideas are evident. The impact of this hegemony and explanations for its historical and political roots, were of most concern in this study. CDA (a la Foucault) was seen as the best method to approach the data (see below).

There is no attempt to be overly "descriptive" in analyzing the data. This is a "normative" study with prescriptive and value-biased intentions, which involved a search for a CCE which was decidedly attempting to undermine the DFCV cycle, and that was conscious, simultaneously, of its own practices of social injustice/violence. The methodology of such a CCE, in my view, would have to include a critical theory orientation (e.g., Giroux, 1983; hooks; Lather; McLaren etc.) which is critically self-reflexive in terms of a social epistemology, 'conflict' pedagogy and political activism.

Rationale For Studying CME Handbooks And Training Manuals: Some Limitations

In order to better understand 'conflict' as a subject itself, a particular "case" was chosen where conflict was a central concept utilized in social practices involving teaching and learning. As an educational researcher, a study of conflict had to engage with the various disciplines interested in conflict, but ultimately, a study (thesis) had to focus on conflict in an educational setting. The field of conflict resolution/ management education (CME) was a first choice. CME handbooks and training manuals were an efficient way to investigate how conflict was
conceptualized and being taught to others. This source of text was ideal for a Foucauldian discourse analysis.

CME handbooks and training manuals are discussed here within a general Foucauldian perspective on power/knowledge (see later in this chapter). Italicized words are key ideas of Foucault and his analysis. For brevity I use "manuals" for both handbooks and training manuals (which are defined later in this chapter). Manuals are perhaps the most succinct form of authoritative (expert-derived) knowledge produced in any field or discipline. They are given implicit status within a field or discipline as the "standard" of knowledge, skills, attitudes by which practitioners are to be judged. Although, the judging, evaluation and certification process in trainings may be complex, the training manuals are a concrete ground of knowledge documented in objective (product) form— and sealed and approved by some authorities.

Training texts and discourse (including behaviors) combine into a complex of normalizing processes, whereby a field or discipline may be regulating, and the trainers and trainees are self-regulating. Power is thus being enacted in a system of power relations linked intimately with knowledge, discourse and regimes of truth. The training manuals (text) serve as the normal, regulating set of rules and social practices which govern certification (approval and reward) processes. CME manuals are thus likely to attempt conformity, consensus, unity, 'peace and harmony', and have little encouragement for resistance, disruption, conflict and the personal construction of subjugated knowledges from the clients, students, participants and learners. Variations, differences or challenges to the dogma within the manual texts and the tradition they stand for, have little privilege in changing discourse and knowledge formations within the sub-culture of the teaching and learning about conflict management/resolution.

Often the tradition, which CME manuals represent, are important for consistency and social control. The material to be learned is both consistent in formation as is the way the learner is formed by subjection processes. The manuals are reprinted year after year to maintain efficiency, performativity, and standards, with only small gradual changes (typical of consensus
theory/functionalism) as the norm. Deviation and deviancy from the norm are often quickly declared, explicitly or implicitly, as taboo or pathology and a threat to stability and accountability of the whole/tradition. Learners (which included teachers/trainers), like manuals, are re-presented by authorities and imprinted year after year. The overall practice is administrative power and a form of governmentality. One's identity, formally as a professional, or informally, is often linked to the tradition in which these referent manuals belong. In some cases the authors of the manuals are left out and long forgotten, as the authority is now impersonal and greater than personal ('bigger than life'). Identification with that transcendent quality of 'bigger than life', feeds the ego/self structure to become 'bigger' than others who don't have the power/knowledge and status and privilege that go with the regime/tradition. The discourse of training is linked to "success" as long as one is disciplined and punished (failed) to carry out the rules and regulations that construct the nature of that technical measurable "success."

The information, is given only as if it is necessary information. The politics of the knowledge and discourse are evaded and denied, in most cases. The information in manuals may be questioned by participants but characteristically, the information is made to be delivered, absorbed, and regurgitated (practiced) at will upon the authority's request (and tests). The manuals are a regime of truth embedded in a techno-rationalist thinking and "transmission" learning and teaching model\(^8\)-- whereby, "effective delivery of content" is of prime value and concern (cf. Pratt and Associates, 1998, p. xiii). Sometimes, manuals are "officially" approved by boards, agencies and government bodies (state). They may be, in some cases, documents that are "legal" and "ethical" in terms of professionalism and the qualifications for competent practitioners. For these reasons, and there are others, the manual is potentially an ideal resource for Foucauldian analysis (Foucault used them himself). The value (and power) of text as narrative is justified in this study based on new thinking in cultural studies.
I agree with Edwards (1997) that, "Social practices such as education and training.... can be seen as text..." (p. 5), which construct social reality. CME text is itself social practice and inevitably bound up in education and training. This notion of text as social practice, ought to challenge critics ideas who believe text is "only words" and "abstraction"-- and thus, such critics can not so easily claim unproblem-atically, that this thesis is "only theoretical" and not practical.

Limitations of this study begin by stating this study is not:

(1) an analysis of people and their conflict practices, nor persons who authored or authorize CME manuals,

(2) using evidence from CME text to support or reject CME practices or the field of conflict resolution/management as a whole.

This chapter and the next two apply a three-in-one analysis of CME text (conceptualizations of conflict), in which Foucauldian analysis is very important but only one part of the three. This study is limited further, in that it is not using evidence to either "test," "validate," or "invalidate," either conflict theory(ies), or Foucault's work and what is called here, a "Foucauldian Analysis." Neither, is this study suggesting, the way both of these traditions are utilized in critical analysis, in this study, are the best or only correct way to use them. In this manner, this study is an "experiment" in bringing together diverse, often seen as incompatible, critical frameworks of analysis and applying them to CME manuals and their conceptualizations of conflict. Figure 6 provides a schematic diagram of the potential "integral approach" to understanding the relationship between power, knowledge, conflict, domination, and violence--within a modernist (conflict (critical theory) tradition analysis) and a postmodernist analysis (a la Foucault). This diagram emphasizes the suspected value of 'conflict' as a concept to bring about (catalyze) this integration of vast domains of analysis and knowledge in the social sciences. The concept of the conflictworker, preferred over conflict manager, is also highlighted. Further discussion of this diagram is found in Chapter Four. Feedback from readers and practitioners across disciplines and over time, will provide the evidence for "testing" the value of
Figure 6  Power- 'Conflict' Relationship: Outline For Conflictworker Conceptualization
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this experiment. Chapter Four offers further problematic reflections on this study and recommendations for further research.

"Casing" The Study And "Case" Sample Descriptions

Before going into the details of the 22 CME manuals chosen for this study, this introduction reviews the process of "casing" that has gone on behind the scenes, so to speak. The research decisions of casing the subject(s) and object(s) is critical to any research study. Casing is a term used by Ragin (1992) to describe the process of making a "case" or "case study" as an ongoing part of research planning and decisions. Ragin (1992a) discussed the problems in the social sciences of defining a "case" and how the term is used by different authors in many different ways. Casing is the process of "concocting cases" to "delimit or declare cases," as a basic research tactic (Ragin, 1992, p. 217). Ragin (1992) wrote on the power of ideas and the impact on how and what we study,

It is impossible to do research in a conceptual vacuum. Whether it is viewed as given or socially constructed, the empirical world is limitless in its detail, complexity, specificity, and uniqueness. The fact that we can make any everyday social category problematic... is testimony to the complexity of the empirical. We make sense of its infinity by limiting it with our ideas. In effect, theoretical ideas and principles provide ways to see the empirical world and to structure our descriptions [and prescriptions] of this world.... In short, ideas and evidence are mutually dependent; we transform evidence into results with the aid of ideas, and we make sense of theoretical ideas and elaborate them by linking them to empirical evidence. Cases figure prominently in both of these relationships.... [he asks the reader to see "cases" not as "empirical units or theoretical categories"-- thus, "cases" are best seen] as the products of basic research operations. Specifically, making something into a case or 'casing' it can bring operational closure to some problematic relationship between
ideas and evidence, between theory and data. Casing, viewed as a methodological step, can occur at any phase of the research process.... (pp. 217-218)

If I understand Ragin correctly, this study so far has involved several casings. These casings have influenced the way the various data (literature and ideas) have been collected, sorted and concocted to support various research goals. Figure 7 provides a cursory view of the basic casing process to this point. Beginning at the top: a first casing of vast amounts of reading and notes could be put under the delimited category of "Social Movements." Without going into all the detail of this section, suffice it to say, that the development of a 'conflict' pedagogy, as the long term aim of this thesis, is most likely going to interest people (in social movements) who are involved in a lot of conflict (more or less). The next casing is "New Social Movements," as this was an attempt to find a category out of the first casing, to then link the data in adult education literature (and NSMs) on conflict within the concept of Welton's (1993) notion of NSMs as "revolutionary sites of learning." The NSMs focus was also a good casing move because NSMs, according to Agger's (1998, p. 36-37) list, are one characteristic of postmodernity. This fit well with the emerging poststructuralist Foucauldian CDA that is used in this study of CME. The remainder of Figure 7 is self-explanatory, with three more casings to arrive at 'conflict' as a concept for investigation. The Foucauldian analysis and the right-facing arrow is largest, to exemplify the focus of this research, with the conflict (critical) tradition/ theory analysis less predominant (left-facing arrow). Gramsci, is merely one example of a theorist who, along with his concepts of ideology and hegemony, are brought into later chapters. Bourdieu's concept of habitus is mentioned least, but forms a minor part of the later discussions. The last chapter discusses the casing of new "Sphere[s] of possibilities for..." the conceptualizing of 'conflict' in different disciplines, other than CME-- as part of a search for ways to improve the conflict imaginary of all peoples.

The 22 CME training manuals and handbooks (all written in English) were divided into two general groups: A. School Handbooks/Training Manuals (Table 1, n=10) were written for youth
Sample "Case"

A. School Handbooks/Training Manuals


and adults that work with youth primarily in public school settings (with the exception of #9 which was based for work within human services and care settings). Two of the books were particularly designed for working in Early Childhood settings (#4 and #6), seven were designed for working in Lower-Mid Elementary grades (#1, #2, #5, #7, #8, #9, #10) and one for Highschool and Post-secondary levels (#3). Twenty percent are Canadian and 80% American. Publishing dates range from 1987-1998, with 70% after 1991 and 30% between 1987-1988.

From a total of 18 known authors (re: gender) involved, 28% are males and 72% are females. All books were published and sponsored by an organization or project (non-governmental), except #2 which was independent of any organization. B. Professional Handbooks/Training Manuals (Table 2, n=12) were written for adults only, mainly in professional capacities (primarily in law) but also general community and workplace skills training. Five are Canadian (although, #4 is Australian originally), five are American and two are from Australia. Publishing dates range from 1978-1998, with ten published in the 1990s, one in 1988 and one in 1978 (a classic 11). From a total of 12 known authors (re: gender) involved, 41% are males and 58% are females. All books were published and sponsored by an organization (non-governmental as far as I can tell), except #4 which was independent of any organization (in its Canadian printing).

The sampling procedure is non-probabilistic. There is no intention in this study to have a statistically representative sample, in order to make probabilistic generalizations about all CME training manuals and handbooks. However, the sample selected was intended to be conditionally "representative" in terms of gathering the more popular, and thus, presumably influential CME training manuals and handbooks available in university and public libraries (including the BC Justice Institute library). A "convenience sampling" procedure was utilized, which "... involves little more than 'getting [what]ever you can.'" (Palys, 1997, p. 136). I searched for what books were most easily available. These would most likely be the same books that a teacher, or community member would pick up off the shelves of the types of libraries stated above. They are likely the books most in use, although, I have no way of knowing that for sure. Part of this
Table 2

Sample "Case"

B. Professional Handbooks/Training Manuals


selection involved a phone interview with Marg Huber, Director of the Conflict Resolution program at the BC Justice Institute in Vancouver in July 1999. She helped me select some of the books she thought were generally most in use at the time. By searching the reference lists in each manual or handbook I found, I was able to get a good sense of the most cited manuals and handbooks and ensure that I was able to gather and include the most referred to (cited) ones. The number of books in the sample ended up as 22, but there was no significance to this number, other than it was the number that reflects the most convenient number of books available. Other CME training manuals and handbooks are available but they were not easily accessible beyond this sample of 22.

Books were identified as CME training manuals or handbooks if the words "training manual," "handbook" or "guide" were in the titles. In some cases these words were not in the titles and by reading the introduction, or back (or inside) covers, it was evident the book was intended as a sourcebook for the purposes of guiding training and/or guiding readers to the fundamental knowledge and practices of conflict management/resolution (or mediation and so on).

Procedures Of Data Collection And Organization: Reliability And Validity

There is no one way or standard way to do a Foucauldian type CDA. This makes reproducability of the study and reliability and validity of results problematic. However, there is in this study a procedure in collecting and sorting the data which could be reproduced by other researchers using the same CME training manuals and handbooks. This allows for results to be checked and compared, either in a repeated analysis of the same material, or by another researcher using the same material. The procedure could also be applied to other similar material (CME knowledge products). The amount of data in any such book is enormous. This study was originally intended to analyze both the conceptualizations of 'conflict' and prescriptions of how to best handle 'conflict.' It was unwieldly to work with so much data in such a limited study. The
focus was then given to the former and some notes were collected on the latter. As Chapter 3 reveals, the CME training manuals and handbooks (and most other books generally on the topics) are heavily weighted in attention to conflict resolution/management and procedures of how to deal with 'conflict.' Little attention, characteristically, is given to understanding 'conflict' per se. As well as amount of data being a factor in studying 'conflict' over and above how to best deal with 'conflict,' the other rationale in this priority selection involved the assumption that how 'conflict' is conceptualized may be the most significant influence on the prescription of how best to deal with 'conflict.' This made intuitive sense to me.

The procedure for collecting data from a book involved: (1) recording all pertinent information on title, authors, background of authors, dates, influential people and theories that informed the authors, organizational sponsorship (and mission statements, philosophy of such organizations), general notes of mission and philosophy of author(s) regarding 'conflict,' violence, and how best to deal with them and, (2) scanning the text for conceptualizations of 'conflict' (defined below) and recording these quotes (with notes: page number and pertinent context, accompanying figures or images).

The procedure for categorizing data from a book included: (1) distinguishing between a definition of conflict and a conceptualization of conflict. The concept of 'conflict' is the focus of interest in this overall study. However, as pointed out in Chapter Three, most writing refers to conflict or conflicts without any interest to deconstruct and reconstruct the term conflict in any way. Therefore conflict or conflicts is the predominant (mostly commonsense/common use) way 'conflict' is being written about in these texts. One way to understand the concept12 of conflict is to define it as a "nominal" (sometimes called "constitutive") definition which "... involves articulating what you mean by the concept under scrutiny. It's a bit like supplying a dictionary definition, although the nominal definition may be linked to one's theoretical stance" (Palys, 1997, p. 62). I assume in this study that every definition is, more or less, linked to one's theoretical (and political13) stance. The conceptualizing process itself, is arguably political, as is
the process of operationalizing a nominal definition (and concept). Palys (1997) clarifies the relationship,

Following from the nominal definition is the operational definition, which is more closely linked to what we will do. The operational definition involves giving specific empirical meaning to a concept. We delineate the specific indicators or operations that are to be taken as representative of a concept.... [choosing] one or more indicators that best approximate your nominal definition. The nominal definition articulated what you were after; the operational definition specifies how you propose to capture it [and write about it, and prescribe about it in the case of managing and resolving conflict (i.e., with conflict as the concept)](p. 63).

Clarifying the distinction between a definition of conflict (both nominal and operational) and conceptualization of conflict, may be illustrated in the examples from the CME texts. A definition (or part thereof) of conflict is most easy to spot in scanning a text. Often a glossary of terms is included and the word "conflict" is defined. A definition of conflict is one that includes usually a statement of the following form, where the word "is" has a definitive directive to provide a nominal definition, for example, "Conflict is a form of competitive behavior involving actual or perceived differences in interests or limited resources." (Coates et al., 1997, p. 9) or, "Conflict: controversy or disagreement; to come into opposition" (Schrumpf et al., 1991, p. 148). The 'dictionary feel' to these nominal definitions is evident. Then, the CME manuals contain many "definitions" that are not so clearly of this type-- and we could call them an operational definition, for example, "When our perceptions of fairness differ, conflicts result." (Sorenson, 1994, p. 98), or "When conflicts arise, most people either react with verbal or physical aggression, ignore the situation, or withdraw from it..." (Sorenson, 1994, p. 1). These operational type definitions are common in the texts. I have then placed them into 11 categories/themes. By adding the nominal definition to the 12 categories of operational type definitions, I have constructed a 12 category list which appears to include all the ways of
"defining" conflict in the CME training manuals and handbooks investigated in this study. These 12 categories are referred to as Conceptualizations of 'Conflict' (below). Therefore, when this report speaks of a conceptualization of 'conflict' (conflict), the context is specifically referring to one (or more) of the 12 categories, which include:

CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF 'CONFLICT': 12 EMERGENT CATEGORIES

1. **Definition**- usually a statement referring to "Conflict is..." (or something similar), for example, "Conflict: [is] controversy or disagreement; to come into opposition." (Sorenson, 1994, p. 148). [i.e., dictionary-like, a nominal definition]

2. **Description**- usually a statement referring to "Conflict as..." (metaphorical, or list of qualities, characteristics, or referring to the nature of, what it may mean/represent, or is associated with), for example, "Conflict is[as] therefore a double-edged sword which we both live and die by." (Condliffe, 1991, p. 16).

3. **Classification**- usually a statement referring to distinctions, taxonomies (formal or informal), continuums, components of, for example, "A conflict can be as small as a disagreement or as large as a war." (Johnson and Johnson, 1995a, p. 15).

4. **Location**- usually a statement referring to locating or placing and norming of, for example, "... conflicts within and between the other sub-parts of the mind." (Sorenson, 1994, p. 11, supplement 14).

5. **Origins**- usually a statement referring to the origin of conflict, such as "Conflict is caused by...," for example, "When our perceptions of fairness differ, conflicts result." (Sorenson, 1994, p. 98).

6. **Moral Status**- usually a statement referring to the 'good' or 'bad', 'positive' or 'negative' valuation (valorisation) (what is, what should be), for example, "... assumes that conflict is a ... positive force...". (Schrumpf et al., 1991, p. 1).

7. **Effects/Affects**- usually a statement referring to "Conflict effects/affects...," for example, "When conflicts arise, most people either react with verbal or physical aggression, ignore the situation, or withdraw from it...". (Schrumpf et al., 1991, p. 1).

8. **Behavior**- usually a statement referring to the dynamics of conflict in action, for
example, "Conflicts arise...". (Sorenson, 1994, p. 78).

9. **Role**- usually a statement referring to the sociopolitical function or role of, for example, "Conflict can be a positive force for personal growth and social change." (Schrumpf et al., 1991, p. 7).

10. **Self-reflexive**- any discussion of the problematics of the 'conflict' discourse, [of which none were found in the sample, but Lederach (1995) provides a good representation: "... we need to explore critically at a much deeper level both the content and the approach to conflict resolution training...". (p. 6)].

11. **Value-reframing**- any statement that refers to how the value and meaning of conflict is directed/prescribed, for example, "We learn and grow from conflicts-- they are a necessary part of our learning experiences." (Sorenson, 1994, p. 7).

12. **Theory**- any discussion of a coherent or fragmentary theory of conflict, for example, "Glasser's book Control Theory...". [which was used to support and discuss the understanding and conceptualization of conflict(s)] (Schrumpf, et al., 1991, p. 7, 9).

All these categories are not entirely distinct. There is some overlap but they allow for a useful first gross form of descriptive (non-critical) categorization of discourse. A second more critical (and prescriptive) categorization of the discourses in the texts involved: (1) writing out all the quotes from the 12 categories of conceptualizations of 'conflict' onto 'paste-it' notes, so that individual quotes from each category could be moved around independently and, (2) placing 'paste-it' notes onto a quadrant grid (Figure 8)-- using a subjective interpretation (with more "objective" referent data on consensus/order vs. conflict perspectives, see Figure 9, and Appendix III) of each statement, with the discourse in which the statement was thought to be embedded. For example, a statement from the texts was "A conflict exists when incompatible activities occurs" (Johnson and Johnson, 1995a, p. 15). This statement was placed on the four-quadrant grid in the upper right corner of the lower left quadrant-- that is, it was interpreted as having an objectivist (scientific-like) quality (epistemologically speaking), and a consensus/order perspective because there is no indication of a challenge (i.e., conflict perspective) to the status
Figure 8
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Figure 9
ORDER & CONFLICT PERSPECTIVES (adapted from Horton, 1966)

["The order and conflict models as outlined represent polar ideal types which are not consistently found in the inconsistent ideologies of actual social research and political practice. If the models have any utility to social scientists, it will be in making more explicit and systemic the usually implicit value assumptions which underlie their categories of thinking." p. 707 cited in Horton, John. (1966). Order and conflict theories of social problems as competing ideologies. The American Journal of Sociology, 71(6): 701-713.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDER</th>
<th>CONFLICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image of Social Reality</strong></td>
<td>* a system of action unified by shared values, communication, &amp; political organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Society</strong></td>
<td>* transcendent entity which is greater than and unique from the sum of its parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Nature</strong></td>
<td>* half animal (nature) - half socialized in need of restraints for the collective good; morally superior are more socialized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>* optimum capacity of individual to adjust to roles &amp; standard values of the social system and its maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Problems &amp; Pathology</strong></td>
<td>* caused by lack of social control or inadequate socialization and dis-equilibrium of the social system; failure of individuals and groups to meet society's needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment for Social Problems</strong></td>
<td>* increase social control and more efficient institutionalization of social values; adjustment of individuals (deviancy) to system needs; working within the system; administrative solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associated People</strong></td>
<td>* professional establishment and administrators in power controlling the central social system (owning class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Orientation</strong></td>
<td>* conservative (focus on the 'Whole')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
quo of social order/society. This allowed a physical means of mapping the statements (quotes) and discourses on a gross level, in terms of epistemological and sociological-political (ontological?) contexts. This classification within the quadrants was not always easy but was generally obvious in most cases. I tested for reliability by placing several quotes on the quadrant, mapping them and then removing them. They were mixed up and then, after a day, placed back up on the quadrant. Results were compared with the first placement. They were very similar. I sensed this was fairly reliable but not entirely, as subjective factors heavily influenced the placement of some quotes, while others were less dubious.

Part of the problem in consistency of placement involved the ability (and development thereof) to learn the consensus/order perspective and the conflict perspective (e.g. Appendix III). With practice and reviewing results in repeated reliability trials, I would guess that there would be a fair amount of consistency over time within a researcher's selections. Further research would have to be done for inter-rater reliability between researchers. But for a gross categorization of discourse, this quadrant procedure was useful to start to become familiar with dominant discourses of the conceptualization of 'conflict' (cf. Chapter Three results).

If reliability could be established in this procedure, then validity could also be challenged. Validity is dependent on reliability, though reliability is not sufficient to it, and together they demand a researcher establish overall "data trustworthiness," as Lather (1986, p. 66) called it. The collection of quotes from CME texts is concrete empirical evidence, with little contention as to its existence. It can be easily verified for its reliability by others. The subjective interpretation of those quotes, in CDA, is much more qualitative and challenges validity of the results, especially when the researcher, as in this case, is overtly stating the research is normative, rather than descriptive. I have aimed for a modicum of rigor in categorizations and interpretations of the data from the texts. Like Reason and Rowan (1981) I wanted an "objectively subjective" approach, and this I believe is partly achieved by utilizing a discourse analysis of concepts from three different "objective" referents (below): (1) CDA (Foucault), (2) conflict perspective
(sociology), (3) interdisciplinary/comparative data. The possibility for validity through triangulation and repetitive reflexivity (*a la* Guba) are more likely with this three-in-one discourse analysis (integral) approach.

With a qualitative (subjectivist) focus, Lather (1986) provided a review of the issue of validity in social sciences research, and reconceptualized validity "... appropriate for research openly [*"ideological"*]15 committed to a more just social order" (p. 66). Validity ought to attempt to falsify propositions made from data, rather than try to support interpretations. This gives the qualitative research trustworthiness (cf. Lather, 1986, p. 67, citing L. Cronbach). This current study is weak in face validity because the authors of the texts surveyed in the CDA were not consulted as to their meanings and conceptualizations of 'conflict,' nor were other experts in the CME field given the opportunity to "member check" the interpretations. This lack of interaction with people in this study also makes construct validity impossible to test, although, I have attempted to not create constructs, nor impose theory in collecting the particular data from the CME texts. There is some descriptive data gathering in the analysis, where 12 emergent themes of conceptualization of 'conflict' were "arbitrarily" decided upon based on an inductive approach. The data were then filtered through the various conceptual and theoretical lenses in a deductive approach. However, arguably, the consistent effort to not pre-define 'conflict' as a concept (or 'reality') is likely to assist in the prevention of the tendency to impose theory on the understanding of 'conflict,' both in the CME texts, and 'conflict' as a phenomenon. No catalytic validity is possible as no people were involved in the study. Although my concern of good research, is that its efforts "... produce social knowledge that is helpful in the struggle for a more equitable world..." (Lather, 1986, p. 67). It is too early to be able to tell what the impact (catalytic) and effects of this conceptual research will be.
Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA): A Unique Approach

After the two procedures of organizing and categorizing data, CDA is applied generally using a Foucauldian-type methodology (see below). However, more generally, a brief discussion of CDA sets the context for Foucault's approach and the other two referent's analyses for this study.

What Is CDA: As Method?

When examining texts in educational research, one can utilize content analysis and/or critical discourse analysis (CDA). To understand CDA, it is useful to distinguish it from content analysis. Petrina (1998) describes these two forms of text analysis,

Content analysis provides a quantitative treatment of issues of quality. It is a systematic method in the social sciences by which manifest and latent contents of spoken or written text are determined (Babbie, 1983; Kirppendorff, 1980; Rosengren, 1981; Weber, 1990). Uses for this method in education have ranged from detecting textbook difficulty to exposing biases and propaganda. In simple form, this method involves identifying units of analysis and counting the number of times particular words, or units, are used, within semantic contexts. These units form categories which provide another level of analysis where coding frameworks can be used. Conceptual and operational codes, like conservative or radical, and economic or cultural help to give latent meaning to analysis of manifest content. Critical discourse analysis provides a means of dealing with latent issues of text quality, such as ideology and symbolic meaning. Discourse refers to recurrent statements, themes and wordings across texts, which represent orientations to the world. Discourse analysis is a method of text analysis in which the 'text' can represent the spoken or written word, an image, narrative or media; text is the artificial representation of the world (Ettinger & Maitland-Gholson, 1990; Janks, 1997; Lindkvist, 1981; Luke, 1995; Patterson, 1997). It is a method that assists the researcher in linking text to structural
formations and relations of power. Questions central to critical discourse analysis are: 'How is the text positioned or positioning? Whose interests are served by this positioning? Whose interests are negated? What are the consequences of this positioning?' (Janks, 1997, p. 329).

This method draws historically from hermeneutics, linguistics, rhetoric, and semiotics, or more generally from critical and post-structuralist theory. On one level this involves a critical reading of how texts are constructed. On another, it involves a critical reading where text and content are culturally located and interests identified. Critical discourse analysis is a means of tying texts together and of demonstrating the political and powerful nature of seemingly mundane statements and symbols. In education, uses have ranged from demonstrating how schools govern through surveillance and moral regulation to how textbooks embody sexist and racial discourses and structure thought processes (Janks, 1997; Luke, 1995). (pp. 30-31)

Janks (1997) further summarizes CDA, which,

... stems from a critical theory of language which sees the use of language as a form of social practice. All social practices are tied to specific historical contexts and are the means by which existing social relations are reproduced or contested and different interests are served. (p. 329)

This study follows Fairclough's (1989, 1995) basic design for CDA (cf. Janks, 1997). The rationale for not choosing content analysis or a combination of both content analysis and CDA (like Petrina, 1998, for example) is based on three issues: (1) the entire study of social conflict and its implications for the development of a 'conflict' pedagogy are embedded in a poststructuralist and conflict perspective-- thus, Foucault's interest in power (and resistance= conflict?), and the conflict perspective's focus on power and conflict, are better suited with CDA and the focus on power/knowledge discourses, relative to content analysis which has broader less "critical" focus as a methodology and, (2) the focus of this study is not directed on the "content" of the CME training manuals and handbooks, rather the focus is on an analysis of CME
discourse as part of a new social movement and form of "education" and, (3) unfamiliarity with content analysis theory and methods, and time limitations, restricted the use of a time-consuming content analysis and/or combination with CDA. A content analysis, regarding the interpretation of conceptualizations of 'conflict,' perhaps, would have empirically (quantitatively) strengthened some of the claims made in this study.

Foucault: Poststructuralist Analysis

Introduction: Personal Note

I am a beginner to Foucault. Although, he was important as a radical voice in the 1980s when I was studying theories of the sociopolitics of disability (i.e., mental health and other oppressed groups called "disabled"), I never read his work. Coming to university after tens years working in the field of adult education, I was resistant to read Foucault once again, for at least two reasons: (1) his work was becoming the fashionable thing in critical analysis in universities (and I generally avoid the fashionable of the day) and, (2) his ideas I heard in classes, and from hardcore Foucauldian's, were difficult to grasp (sounded philosophically "elitist") but more so, were too historical for me, abstract, and difficult to accept as useful-- mainly, because he was so anti-modernist/progressivist and against critical theories of liberation-- he seemed to paint a relativistic, if not nihilistic, picture of social reality and the future, which turned me off. Later, postmodernism as a general attitude of the late 20th century, similar to Foucault, was to also turn me off for somewhat similar reasons. I offer this to readers who may feel the same feelings, have the same kinds of thoughts, either now, or when they engage with Foucault and the poststructural and postmodern temperament in academic writing and literature.

Studying adult education in graduate school, led me to read of Foucault and postmodernism, and their emerging impact in discussion and critiques of adult education (e.g., Bagnall, 1994; Edwards, 1994, 1997; Edwards and Usher, 1996; Inglis, 1997; Jansen and van der Veen, 1997; MacLean, 1996; Pietykowski, 1996; Tisdell, 1998; Usher and Edwards, 1994;
General schooling educators and sociologists of education have apparently been ahead of adult education, in regard to engaging with postmodernism and Foucauldian post-structuralist thought.

After studying the critics of CME, it was clear that they had not taken, for the most part (except Pirie, 1998), a postmodernist analysis or Foucauldian analysis. It seemed early on in this thesis, that a great benefit may be gained by applying a Foucauldian and postmodern-type analysis to CME and the problem of understanding 'conflict' in discourses. I was being led, by Foucault's method and analysis of discourse to become more of a "historian" than I thought would ever be appealing. It was a good surprise. Unfortunately, an examination of Foucault and postmodernism came very late in this study. Foucault, as I have come to understand his work through secondary sources primarily, has made history alive for me— that is, the history of ideas— unfolding and impacting our everyday lived experiences in both actions and in text.

Through the past year of graduate studies, I've become aware of the political criticisms forming to challenge Foucault and postmodernism (especially from feminist writers, cf. Nicholson (1990), and critical adult educators (cf. Welton, 1995). I have been influenced by scholars like Agger, Popkewitz et al., Wexler (1983), who were taking Foucault and postmodernism and integrating it with critical (conflict) traditions. This led to my interest (Fisher, 1999) to bring together Foucault and postmodernism with conflict theory as part of the critical analysis of CME— and part of an attempt to find a 'new' way to understand 'conflict' and the DFCV cycle. Seidman (1998) has attacked this integrating, suggesting the two forms of analysis are incompatible for the most part. Dr. Richard Edwards, Open University in the UK, argued that there are a lot of criticisms launched by "purist" postmodernists at critical social theorists (e.g., Agger) and critical pedagogues (e.g., Aronowitz, Giroux, McLaren) for attempting to appropriate inadequately parts of postmodernist thinking, while remaining within the critical (conflict) tradition (personal communication, August 11, 1999). Therefore, there is a tension and
problematic involved in this thesis methodology, which is beyond the scope of this study to address fully.

**Foucault And His Work**

Foucault, Michel (1926-84)- a major figure in the great French philosophical debate on reason, language, knowledge and power, who's work was influenced by Marx, Freud and Nietzsche. (Jary and Jary, 1995, p. 241)

It is interesting from the point of view of integrating Foucault (and post-modernist analysis) with conflict theory analysis, that three of these 'big' theorists that influenced Foucault are "conflict theorists" (less so Nietzsche\(^{18}\))-- but with Marx and Freud, they had ideological roots that Foucault would reject as "grand narratives" totalizing, and trapped in biased "deep" structural explanations of reality-- a reality, that they believed was 'out there.' Language and discourse was not yet to be influential with these 'big' three as it was for Foucault, within the context of the "linguistic turn" in late 20th century philosophy.

Foucault's ideas, not unlike postmodernism as Harvey (1989) describes the latter, [are] "... to be wrestled with... a battleground of conflicting opinions and political forces" (p. 39). To understand Foucault's work he has to be compared to post-structuralism and postmodernism. Lemert (1997) provides an interesting typology in his book called *Postmodernism is not what you think*. He wrote,

... it is impossible to talk about postmodernism and its social theories without also talking about modernism.... I include a discussion of radical modernism along with two different kinds of postmodernisms-- one that considers modernism done with (radical postmodernism) and another that considers modernity at least in need of a thorough remaking (strategic postmodernism). (p. 20)
To essentialize and speak as if there is 'one' postmodernism, is greatly problematic. This study is embedded in the radical modernism + strategic postmodernism of Lemert's scheme. However, these categorizations into 'isms' is likely to be seen by "postmodernist" writers as another attempt to overgeneralize, universalize and totalize something that cannot be done without committing the very kind of errors that postmodernity has attempted to critique in modernity. With the exception of Lyotard, major "postmodern" thinkers, like Foucault, Derrida and others, have rejected placing themselves and their writing in postmodernism (Dr. Richard Edwards, personal communication, August, 11, 1999). Although, it is generally agreed that Foucault could be called a "postmodernist" thinker.

Postmodernity as a condition we are now in is an important concept, as it is a "... condition under which there is no operative consensus concerning the ultimate or transcendental grounds of truth and justice" (Yeatman, 1994, p. 107). The postmodern political attitude is doubt, suspicion, and a challenge to the idea of a universal, rational, shared cultural view of life, progress, peace, goodness and so on. For some like Terry Eagleton a description of postmodernism is a dramatic slicing 'sword' which challenges the powers of modernism's symbolic/narrative violence. Eagleton wrote,

Post-modernism signals the death of such 'metanarratives' whose secretly terroristic function was to ground and legitimate the illusion of a 'universal' human history. We are now in the process of wakening from the nightmare of modernity, with its manipulative reason and fetish of the totality, into the laid-back pluralism of the postmodern, that heterogeneous range of life-styles and language games which has renounced the nostalgic urge to totalize and legitimate itself.... Science and philosophy must jettison their grandiose metaphysical claims and view themselves more modestly as just another set of narratives.

(cited in Harvey, 1989, p. 9)

It may be worthwhile to turn attention to postmodern analyses (as cultural analysis) which leads us to discuss post-structuralism and the movement of cultural analysis (particularly Foucault).
Cultural Analysis

...postmodernism is a culture that believes there is a better world than the modern one. In particular it disapproves of modernism's uncritical assumption that European culture (including its diaspora versions in such places as South Africa, the United States, Australia, and Argentina) is an authentic, self-evident, and true universal culture in which all the world's people ought to believe. Postmodernism is a culture that prefers to break things up, to respect the several parts of social world. When it speaks of culture it prefers to speak of cultures. (Lemert, 1997, p. 22)

Wetherell and Potter (1992) position Foucault and describe his general approach\textsuperscript{19} to historical and post-structural (post-ideological) cultural analysis,\textsuperscript{20} Foucault is probably best seen as a historian of science, although this designation also proves too narrow.... His general procedure within this domain is to take a clump or complex of knowledge and related institutional practices and ask about the 'grid of intelligibility' which makes this complex possible (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982, p. 121). What are the statements here, how are they placed in relation to each other, what do they order and what objects and subjects emerge as a consequence? How, in other words, is knowledge constituted and what else is created in the process.... There is no stance or platform 'outside' discourse, or, in Foucault's later work, power/knowledge.... He does not think it is possible, therefore, to take the privileged vantage point the concept of ideology [e.g., Marxism] seems to imply.... he wants to substitute for this kind of historical narrative a study of vantage points in themselves. The result is what Foucault calls archeological or, later, genealogical studies which look at how the conditions for knowledge, including historical knowledge, become produced. (pp. 79-81) [underline for emphasis]

Foucault's overall rethinking of his field--"...the history of ideas, or 'the history of systems of thought,' as he preferred to call it..." (McHoul and Grace, 1998, p. 1) is of interest in this thesis research on the ideas (and discourses) of 'conflict' in a body of knowledge called CME (a new
social movement)-- a system or set of systems of thought about 'conflict' and how best to handle it. What narratives are being told about the "regimes of truth" about 'conflict' and who do they best serve? His early archeological and genealogical methods applied to the history of ideas, could be summarized (my own words) in the following: (1) the attempt to unbury the hidden, marginalized and repressed discourses ("subjugated knowledges" or "discourse formations") which 'properly' represent subjugated persons (e.g., prisoners talking about their own experience and definitions of being a prisoner, as opposed to merely theories about crime, delinquency and imprisonment created by the privileged and powerful knowledge-makers), (2) he explores the conditions which preceded and contributed to the formation of a specific "discourse formation" (or discipline of knowledge)-- and he asked questions about these discourse formations or disciplines to find out what they are about in terms of power and social control-- in order to see (partially) 'outside' of these discourse formations, he would ask what would exist in its place if the particular discourse formation did not exist?, (3) look for how the discourse formation and disciplines of power/knowledge construct a 'subject' (and objects) (for e.g., how does medical knowledge construct a woman's body and thus 'woman' or 'women' and, (4) how do knowledges act as 'normalization' processes, and thus create arbitrary moral distinctions which greatly shape societies, organizations, bodies, selves, souls and so on-- and such normalization constructs certain 'normal' (acceptable) knowledges with more privilege and thus rationalizations to impose irrational or inhumane treatments (practices like "law") upon others less privileged (i.e., the "abnormal"). See Appendix IV for a review of some of Foucault's major concepts useful to discourse analysis.

What is Discourse?: Locating Foucault's Methodology

Foucault's work cannot simply be applied, but can be considered as a set of theoretical [and conceptual] tools that can be used. Foucault himself, 'spoke of theory as a tool-box of concepts' (Rajchman, 1995, p. 14). (Comber, 1997, p. 390)
Although *discourse*, as a concept, has already been briefly defined in this report, and defined with some caution due to the complex and varied uses of the term, some further clarification of Foucault's use of discourse (and its methodological location) is appropriate in this methodology section. The very definition of discourse itself situates the methodological interest and rationale of this study. Hicks (1995-96) wrote,

... a focus on socially situated meanings is a necessary interpretative stance if one wishes to explore relations between discourse and processes of teaching and learning.... the term discourse implies communication that is socially situated and that sustains social 'positionings' [stratification]: relations between participants in face-to-face interaction or between authors and reader in written texts. (p. 49).... The term discourse implies a dialectic of both linguistic form and social communicative practices. One can talk of discourse in terms of oral and written texts that can be examined after the fact and socially situated practices that are constructed in moment-to-moment interaction (Fairclough, 1992; Gee, Michaels, & O'Connor, 1992). (p. 51)

This study involves the CME written texts that are examined "after the fact" but that are directly a part of "socially situated practices." Discourses are "... not fixed but are the site of constant contestation of meaning" (cf. Pecheux23, 1982, cited in Mills, 1997, p. 16). Discourse is not something abstract, merely ephemeral, or inconsequential. Discourse has a material-like life of its own. Wetherell and Potter (1992) wrote of this materiality of discourse in why they chose "mapping" to critically analyze the language of racism as discourse and exploitation,

Gramsci (1971) has argued that the starting point for any critical account must be the historical process in which identity and self-consciousness are constructed: 'the infinity of traces deposited without leaving an inventory'.... [oppression is] mediated through patterns of signification and representations of others.... Discourse seems insubstantial and transitory compared with the people, objects and events which furnish our world. Yet the metaphor [of map] forces us to see racist language in a new way. It emphasizes that
discourse does have substance, it is a material which can be explored and charted.... In focusing this book primarily on discourse-- on meanings, conversations, narratives, explanations, accounts and anecdotes-- .... we are not wanting to argue that racism is a simple matter of linguistic practice. Investigations of racism must also focus on institutional practices, on discriminatory actions and on social structures and social division.... (pp. 1-2)

If the reader substituted the word social conflict in place of racism in the above quote, the approach of Wetherell and Potter is very similar to the approach to discourse taken in this study, albeit, limited to text in the latter. Wetherell and Potter are also interested in a discourse analysis as critical social psychologists of white majority groups. They critique social psychology in its attempts to analyze racism, arguing that social psychology often has "... played a double role--investigating racism but also sustaining some of the ideological practices of racist discourse" (p. 2). In parallel, CME (and its reliance on social psychology generally) has to be culpable to this same criticism. Chapter Four examines the specific case of CME discourses on 'conflict' within a broader analysis than racism alone.

Relation of Discourse and Ideology

This study has a non-empirical value bias underlying the choices made to design the research. In this sense, I agree with Palys (1997), "There is indeed, then an ideological component to the sort of research [in natural and social sciences] in which one engages" (p. 30). In simplified terms, research has a politics, comes out of a politics and manufactures a politics (ideology and its power/knowledge implications). Foucault, does not necessarily state a political position distinctly in his writing but he is embedded within a critical French philosophical discourse that is challenging of the authority of the status quo and elite. His interest was primarily practical, with the intention of exposing the political and strategic nature of knowledge formations or "regimes of truth," in contemporary W. societies (McHoule and Grace, 1998, p.
In terms of a particular tradition of methodology, Foucault is neither a "realist" ("determinist"), "idealist," or "dialecticist." Rather, he prefers to slip inbetween these approaches, more with an interest in "calculating strategies" (McHoul and Grace, 1998, p. 53) of how to transform the dominating power relations based on discourses. He is not very interested in the "truth" as the methodologies listed above generally can be. Foucault (1980) links the necessary relationship of discourse to power-knowledge. In a society such as ours, but basically in any society, there are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterise and constitute the social body, and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse. There can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth which operates through and on the basis of this association. We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth. (p. 93)

Clearly, Foucault's "... writing on power cannot be discussed outside his investigations of the production of 'truth'..." (McHoul and Grace, 1998, p. 57).

'Power' and 'truth' are of epistemological interest and ideological interest to us in this study. Discourse is intimately linked with both interests. Earlier in this report it was mentioned that discourse, as used in this study, is very similar to ideology, as used in this study. Although, this is a very complex topic, well beyond the scope of this thesis, it is worth exploring briefly. Is CDA an ideological analysis? Is an ideological analysis, inevitably a CDA? It appears that Gramsci's interest in ideology (hegemony) is not too far from Wetherell and Potter's (1992) interest in discourse analysis. Further exploration of definitions of these two terms indicates that they are commonly related to an analysis of power/domination relations in social life. But Havel's (1990, p. 50) definition of ideology, like most sociological accounts, tends to place the core focus of ideology around the distinction between "false" consciousness and "true" consciousness. As well, ideology
tends to focus on a simplified dichotomy between dominators and victims. Jary and Jary (1995, p. 306) wrote that the sociological meaning of ideology is "... any system of ideas which justifies or legitimates the subordination of one group by another." When Foucault's notion of power is examined, he moves the concept into metaphors beyond dichotomies of dominators and victims, and he is not interested in proving or speculating about which is "false" or "true" consciousness. McHoul and Grace (1998) summarized Foucault's notion of power,

Power is not to be read, therefore, in terms of one individual's domination over another or others; or even as that of one class over another or others; for the subject which power has constituted becomes part of the mechanisms of power.... We can therefore refer to a terrain of power which, for Foucault, is not to be taken as merely 'ideological' in the weak sense, where that term refers to any aspect of individual or collective consciousness (p. 22).... [re: Foucault's notion of "discipline", likewise] Thus we cannot say that discipline is guided by a 'false' or ideological conception of the human body. (p. 69)

McHoul and Grace (1998) contrast the methodology of Foucault's analysis with other critical theorists and traced the reasons for Foucault's unique analysis of power beyond the discourses of power that were previously available in Europe-- due to the political climate with a conservative side of politics and a radical Marxist left side. They state it was this political situation that prevented a Foucauldian idea of power because "Both sides remained content to 'denounce' power as the global property of the 'other side'" (p. 87). Power is the result, not the cause, of dominant-subordinate relations, according to Foucault. It appears that a focus on ideologies, and not local micro-practices and 'conditions' for knowledge, misses the relation dynamic of how power flows through actors in fields and "terrains," at times in impersonal and somewhat arbitrary ways. McHoul and Grace (1998) concluded,

As such, Foucault recommends an ascending rather than descending analysis of power. Hegemonic or global forms of power rely in the first instance on those 'infinitesimal' practices [discourses].... Finally, Foucault stresses that the types of apparatuses of
knowledge associated with the exercise of power cannot be considered systems of 'ideology'. Elsewhere, he argues, 'discourses are not once and for all subservient to power or raised up against it... (1979a:101). While ideological productions certainly exist, they are much less important than the instruments and procedures which produce them, and what may be called the historical 'conditions' of this knowledge. (p. 90)

If I understand this distinction and difference between Foucault's discourse and critical theory's ideology, it is evident both are important in the analysis of power/knowledge and dominant-subordinate relations (for e.g., the DFCV cycle). However, they have major differences in methodologies and focus of interest in approaching social analysis. That is why this study has chosen a "three-in-one" approach to CDA (see below), to ensure discourse and ideology are both included in the critique of CME.

What Is 'Conflict'? Entering The Symbolic Environment & Culture

The nature of the symbolic environment is such that it depends in great measure on what men [sic] say or think about it. In particular, what men think or say about human conflict... has a great bearing on the nature of human conflict and its consequences. Therefore, in discussing conflict as a feature of man-made environment, we shall have to examine various conceptions of conflict, not only with the view of estimating to what extent the concepts are accurate (as one does with scientific theories) but also with the view of seeing how some of these conceptions make human conflicts what they are. (Rapoport, 1974, p. 7)

Rapoport, a renowned international scholar on conflict, provides important support for the value of doing a conceptual analysis of 'conflict', especially, within the socially constructed world of the symbolic environment of language, texts and symbols. However, this study does not take a pre-given epistemological position that concepts can necessarily be known in terms of a scientifically accurate truth. Foucauldian analysis is not interested in the truth about what 'conflict' is or isn't. Poststructural or postmodernist analyses are typically antipathetic to
investigations and methodologies that attempt such an essentialist or naturalistic answer (e.g., cf. Edwards, 1997). Foucault's approach to concepts and discourses about concepts (e.g., power) is more oriented to how we "tell the truth," about such things; and how we actually carry out practices that reinforce certain tellings of the "truth" and exclude other "forbidden knowledges" or tellings about the "truth." Who is the 'we' in control of these tellings is important. The historical, sociopolitical and economic basis of these inclusions and exclusions of tellings (knowledge formations) is of great interest in CDA (and Popkewitz's approach to analysis of discourse as social epistemology). This symbolic focus is most appropriate to use with CME training manuals and handbooks. The reference sources of information in any specialized or disciplinary field of knowledge, are generally seen to be the best "truth" in a particular field (see discussion on authoritative knowledge earlier in this chapter- "Rationale For Studying CME Training Manuals.").

New Social Conflicts: The Battleground Of Representation

The social, political and economic context for 'doing' CDA in education is nicely summarized in Luke (1995-96), as he emphasized the important changes of post-WWII demographics, socioeconomics and information technologies. He sets out the emphasis in a postmodernist world of language, discourse and difference as central aspects of research in a sociology of knowledge and the politics of knowledge. Texts images, and representations, ... have become both the means and objects of processes of commodification (Baudrillard, 1981). This situation has raised public and professional debate over the kinds of textual and literate competence required for economic productivity and democratic citizenship (e.g., Lankshear & McLaren, 1993). It has also succeeded in making texts and images the new battlegrounds for a politics of representation. (p. 5).... [noting the battleground of cultural control] It should not be surprising, then, that many of the new social conflicts [within new social movements and elsewhere] are about representation and
subjectivity. In terms of representation, they involve the production and consumption of texts [and images], access to and legal control over texts, and the rights to name, to construe, to depict, and to describe. In terms of subjectivity, they involve how one is being named, positioned, desired, and described and in which languages, texts, and terms of reference. (Luke, 1995-96, p. 5-6) [underline for emphasis]

Although Luke is apparently describing mostly the mixed multi-ethnic/racial composition of many societies today, his ideas are very applicable to the construction of knowledge and subjectivities about anyone in any discipline. His ideas are applicable to the formation of 'conflict' knowledge and what is 'conflict'? CME discourses (text and images) in training manuals and handbooks are herein subjected to many of these questions and ideas from Luke and others (see below). What marginal or sub-dominant discourses are not included in CME? Why not? How knowledge of 'conflict' or conflict resolution/management, or peer conflict managers are depicted and controlled is of longterm interest in this study. The focus of this research however, is dedicated to conceptualizations of 'conflict' per se in CME texts. Domination and violence go together and may work in the physical world as well as the "symbol-saturated environments" (Luke, 1995-96, p. 5) of a postmodern world.

CME, like any new social movement, is challenged to acknowledge the cultural battle for control of knowledge formation and the politics of power/ knowledge ideologies that go with its "educational" (or "propagandist") agenda. Education, like knowledge production, is not value-neutral. New social movements as "educational sites" or "revolutionary sites" are ultimately conflict zones of cultural, political and economic consideration. CME is a unique conflict zone of "new social conflicts" (a la Luke) that creates and disperses conflict knowledge itself. This CDA is a methodology which attempts to critically unveil what has not been systematically examined, from a poststructuralist view, in CME discourses-- at least, not to my knowledge (if it exists, it is virtually inaccessible).
Three Approaches In One: Toward An Integral Framework

Luke (1995-96) traces the historical roots and dominant approaches to discourse analysis in education since the early 1980s and the "linguistic turn" in the social sciences. The hegemonic methodology in these studies was "scientific" and principally focused "... on the study of language development and use per se rather than on the relationship between discourse and larger social formations" (p. 8). Luke noted that the earlier studies, distinguished from his view of CDA, were most often attempts to explain individual behavior and motivations—what, I have referred to as a psychologism bias. CDA is "... derived from poststructuralist, neo-Marxian, and feminist theory and from critical linguistics" (p. 8), in which a social and political dimension is emphasized in understanding the construction of discourses. Luke (1995-96) wrote of how Foucault's work is a major contributor to CDA;

Foucault described the constructing character of discourse, that is, how both in broader social formations (i.e., epistemes) and in local sites and uses discourse actually defines, constructs, and positions human subjects. According to Foucault (1972, p. 49), discourses 'systematically form the objects about which they speak,' shaping grids and hierarchies for the institutional categorization and treatment of people. These knowledge-power relations are achieved, according to Foucault, by the construction of 'truths' about the social and natural world, truths that become taken-for-granted definitions and categories by which governments rule and monitor their populations and by which members of communities define themselves and others. (p. 8-9)

Several critical concepts of a Foucauldian analysis are summarized in Appendix IV. These serve as the basic concepts by which to critique CME discourses on 'conflict.' Luke's (1995-96) important paper on CDA draws attention to the sociological analysis component in some discourse studies in education. In particular, he noted that although the microanalytic text analyses are very important, other important studies have called for "Discourses," with a capital 'D' (Gee, 1990); whereby, "... the large-scale ideological formations and 'forms of life',..."
(Luke, 1995-96, p. 10) are studied in pedagogies (e.g., Donald, 1992; Gore, 1993; Luke, 1989—all cited in Luke, 1995-96, p. 10) with their histories and practices. This 'form of [social] life,' of the macro aspect of social reality is of great interest in this thesis. The idea indicated here, is that Discourses take on a life of their own at the institutional and collective level of organizations and societies. This harkens to the sociological theories of Weber and Durkheim, especially. Agents and their actions are necessary embedded in this macro level of social life, but the Discourses of "large-scale ideological formations" are not of the same categorical, or logical type as micro scale formations. One way of seeing the big 'D' in social analysis, is to read what people say or write as text-- which is text writing the people (subject). In simple terms, one could say that what we speak and write is not necessarily our own-- it is a discourse "truth" with a long sociocultural and political history.

This study takes a general CDA approach, as does Luke (1995-96) when he wrote,

I want to explore the potential and value of discourse analysis explicitly tied to a sociological analysis of how educational knowledge, competence, and curriculum contribute to the differential production of power [conflict] and subjectivity.29 (p. 11)

This sociological emphasis of Luke, leads into the next approach utilized in this study. After Foucauldian analysis, the second approach in building an integral critical discourse framework for this study, is the conflict perspective. The basic ideas and history behind this perspective in social theory and sociology have been mentioned in Chapter One briefly. Appendix IIII provides the basic concepts and discourse of conflict theory vs. cooperative theory (cf. also Figure 9). These concepts and discourse from sociology and social theory provide the base for a critique of CME discourses as well. There is no need to repeat this information at this point, other than to remind the reader that these two approaches, Foucauldian analysis (poststructuralism) and conflict theory (structuralism) tend to be seen generally as incompatible by many social theorists (e.g., Seidman, 1998). This problematic has been referred to a few times throughout this report. The sociological conflict perspective provides a contrasting discourse with the consensus
perspective, and they are a useful referent to apply to how the CME discourses may be dominated with either of these two perspectives.

Finally, the third approach in this unique critical framework is that of an interdisciplinary/comparative analysis of discourses on 'conflict' from anthropology, sociology, communications, cognitive-behavioral psychology and social psychology. The discourses on conceptualizing 'conflict' provided a referent basis within major disciplines, for how "best" to define 'conflict.' CME discourses are compared across these disciplines, and evidence is provided as to which disciplines may be providing the dominating discourse to CME constructions of 'conflict.'

The three-in-one conception here for an integral framework of CDA is based, somewhat, on the critical integral theory of Ken Wilber's transpersonal psychology and philosophy (cf. particularly, Crittendon, 1997). Although, it is beyond the scope of this study to elaborate the epistemological and ontological dimension behind Wilber's synthesis and critical integral theory, suffice it to say that "integral" is an important conception in Wilber's research and writing. It is basically, a term used to indicate that there are many ways of bringing together diverse, and sometimes contradictory theories and ideas, and integrating them (critically) into a new synthesis. This integrating is very different, and in opposition, to functionalist or consensus theory's conceptualization of "integration."

The integral notion of Wilber, although somewhat neo-Hegelian, is far beyond the limitations of Hegel, and much less deterministic. Wilber basically argues there are likely many different approaches and methodologies among the various disciplines for a good reason-- yet, they are all attempting to seek the same truth(s) about the deeper structures of reality. His "spectrum" notion is part of "critical integral theory," and it serves as a metaphor to make room for all of the discourses on any subject (e.g., cf. Wilber, 1977; 1981) on his integration of all the different forms of consciousness and psychological-therapeutic subdisciplines). All the parts (and ways of approaching knowledge) have a place in the making of the whole-- but for Wilber (1995), are always part/wholes (i.e., holons). Wilber (1995) argued, integral vision (or
aperspectival consciousness\(^3\) is a form of thinking that allows for bringing all the diverse, and sometimes contradictory, approaches to knowing together but without a "flat" eclecticism (perspectivism\(^3\))--because we still require critical analysis. The three-in-one concept here, is based on the assumption that all different ways of conceptualizing 'conflict' are valid and important in understanding 'conflict'--although, some knowledges in this diversity may be more "integrative" (expansive in their embrace of wider and deeper knowing) than other forms. All knowledges are still valuable and essential to a more complete and integrative knowing.

'Conflict' Epistemology?: The Politics Of The Production Of Knowledge

Epistemology And Dialecticism

Dialecticism as a methodology for knowing (and epistemology) was mentioned earlier as the most traditional epistemology for the conflict perspective (\textit{a la} Hegel and Marx). There is little room in this thesis to elaborate on how important dialectical means and concepts (like, contradiction) are in understanding. A thorough investigation of this epistemological method would likely prove very useful for knowing 'conflict' itself. Ring (1991), a feminist political scholar, has opened up this path in her "minimalist dialectics" approach (which avoids the overly ideological determinism of Hegel and Marx, but retains the dialectical method of these important W. thinkers of the conflict tradition). Ring has criticized feminist theoreticians for being afraid of "conflict" and leaving their epistemology open to an overly harmonious unity-focused and muted form. She concluded that, "... all three [Jagger, Harding and Fox Keller] minimize the role of conflict that is at the essence of dialectical learning" (Ring, 1991, p. 27). But at this point, Popkewitz et al. provide an important postmodernist epistemology that deserves most attention in this thesis because of the emphasis on Foucault.
Epistemology And The Crisis Of Knowledge

This entire study has assumed the best context for studying CME discourses is a conflict perspective and/or postmodernist view of a world in crisis. Social sciences are in crisis (Willinsky, 1999, p. 71). Knowledge ("as power and product"\textsuperscript{32}) is also in crisis. Thereby, this study assumes, that CME and its construction of 'conflict' knowledge is also in crisis because of this larger social and political context. Some may not see the crisis or believe it exists. Some may argue, that the methodological approach of this study itself, constructs and creates the crisis.

My purpose here is to support this conflict perspective and crisis view through methodological considerations that come from the sociology of science and knowledge. To keep this short, Palys (1997) gives a good outline of the paradigm shift and valuable contribution the sociology of science has offered in the past few decades. Foucault's work emerged in parallel with this critique from the sociology of science. Palys (1997) argues that with the constructivist view in social sciences emerging in the 1960s and 1970s, there has been less homogeneity, less clear "standards" to judge "validity" and "truth"-- because "objectivity" has been highly contested in research methodology. More marginal 'voices' from various ethnic and racial groups, feminists and others brought forth their own knowledges, ways of knowing (epistemology) and questioned the hegemony and power/control of dominant groups (and science). He wrote of the academic atmosphere of the those times,

But with growing heterogeneity, the consensus model (which positivist approaches pretty much take as a starting point) that had dominated sociology and underlay psychology suddenly came in for intense scrutiny. [a "crisis of confidence," Elms, 1975-- cited in Palys, 1997, p. 32). [underline for emphasis]

Within constructivism and the new politics of knowledge, "social facts" and the domination of positivism\textsuperscript{33} were challenged and seen as anything but factual, real, or empirical (alone). 'Reality' and 'truth' are not merely "out there." Palys (1997) commented on the paradigmatic shift
to a sociologically constructed 'reality' less of consensus and more consistent with a conflict perspective and/or postmodernist view. He wrote,

'Knowledge' came to be seen as bound by the perspective [worldview] of the research that had generated it. The constructed nature of science and knowledge became obvious when many new participants made clear that they would construct truth another way. Reality became negotiable. (p. 32)

The sociology of science, and Kuhn's (1970) work attempted to sensitize "scientists" and other knowledge-makers that ".. scientists' theories embody a worldview, and that observation, the cornerstone of scientific practice, is 'theory-laden' rather than 'theory-neutral' (as the positivists had maintained)" (Palys, 1997, p. 31). 'Reality' and 'knowledge' became, for many academics, consciously associated with power/ knowledge dynamics and conflict. Foucault's work brought this to the foreground even more. Reality as "negotiable" was perhaps a liberalist euphemism for what was going on. This conflict of knowledges has grown into what Palys (1997) suggests "... are tense times in academe." (p. 34)-- what other researchers in education, perhaps more honestly, have called "paradigm wars" (Gage, 1989), "culture wars" (Graff, 1992) and powerfully hurtful practices related to methodology and a "paradigm gap" in academic research (Miller et al., 1998).

Epistemology is a central issue often in the battles for 'truth,' and 'reality.' Becker (1996) remarks that these epistemologies and knowledges become similar to an encounter between "cultures." CME, like this study, are embedded in discourses in conflict/battle-- and this becomes even more intriguing when the content of the discourses analyzed are directly about the nature of 'conflict.' How do we best research and understand 'conflict'? This is the initial question that leads this study toward a search for a possible 'conflict' epistemology (or 'conflict' standpoint theory). Albeit, this is a large question beyond the scope of this study. The social epistemology of Popkewitz et al. (below) offers some guidance in considering an epistemology suited to
understanding 'conflict'— and that challenges, in a Foucauldian manner, the consensus-positivist-modernist hegemony in traditional methodologies of the natural and social sciences.

**Social Epistemology**

Politics reside not only in subject matter but in the discourse of the classroom. (Shor, 1992, p. 14)

The study of discourses of *social conflict* in CME training manuals is part of a deconstructionist effort to challenge all current definitions and conceptualizations of 'conflict.' An important part of that challenge has to do more with the way the conceptualizations of 'conflict' are produced as a social practice, than with the actual concept of 'conflict' (e.g., social conflict) that is presented by any author, group or social movement. The interest to challenge how 'conflict' is conceptualized is primarily an epistemological concern. A guiding question throughout the analysis of this report is *what is the best way to know 'conflict'?* It appears throughout a search in the CME literature that this epistemological question is rarely addressed in a systematic way. More practical interests in "resolving" or "managing" conflict take priority over questioning the ability of the methodology and methods by which 'conflict' is known (or thought to be understood). This raises the research question of *how good is the conflict knowledge that is utilized to teach, train and inscribe learners who partake in CME programs of any kind?* This is a very large question and only a small part of it can be addressed in this limited study. Recommendations for what is 'good' (more complete, integral, or better) conflict knowledge are presented in Chapter Four. The work of Popkewitz et al. on social epistemology may provide some useful Foucauldian approaches to improving the critical analysis of CME.

Popkewitz and Brennan (1997) wrote, [re: the political project they are promoting] "... we call a 'social epistemology.' Our interest is to consider knowledge as a social practice that generates action and participation [via power]" (p. 289). Popkewitz (1991) is interested in a political (historical) sociology of knowledge, of change, and reform in schooling and teacher
education practices. Specifically, he is interested in the relation of "... knowledge and power that structures our perceptions and organizes our social practices" (p. 1). Popkewitz (1998) asks what are "... the systems of reasoning that organize the practices of 'success', 'empowerment,' and 'voice'? (p. 4)-- or, in this study could be asked in terms of what are the systems of reasoning that organize (via rules and regulations) the practices of conflict resolution/management? How are those systems of reasoning embedded in historical and sociopolitical agendas and who is best served by them?

There is little space here to outline all of the work of Popkewitz et al., It is important to emphasize the significance of social epistemology in the most basic terms. Popkewitz and Brennan (1997) summarize,

The significance of a social epistemology is that it helps us recognize that when we 'use' language it may not be us speaking .... Speech [and text] is ordered through principles of classification that are socially formed through a myriad of historical practices. When teachers talk about school as management, teaching as production of learning, or children as being 'at-risk,' these terms are not 'merely' the personal words of the teacher, but are produced in the context of historically constructed 'ways of reasoning.' The 'reasoning' inscribed in systems of ideas order 'seeing,' talking, and acting. (p. 293) [underline for emphasis]

This idea that "when we 'use' language it may not be us speaking" is more than merely thinking of educators as social agents/actors playing out roles or games. Although, roles and games are part of discourses, the challenge of critical analysis and social epistemology is to extend to a deeper political and historical analysis of the language/text/speech/images, that we both produce and reproduce in everyday social practices. Once power (and conflict) are included as core variables in the knowledge utilized in language/text/speech/images (including actions), then discourse has a meaning and a social epistemology that offers political salience to undermining the DFCV cycle in curriculum and educative sites.
The text and speech of curriculum as "historically formed knowledge" is critical to the social epistemological analysis. In this study of CME discourses, the CME curriculum is also under investigation as a Discourse (capital 'D') itself-- that is, a discourse of social order/control and regulation. Popkewitz (1997) wrote,

I view curriculum as a particular, historically informed knowledge that inscribes rules and standards by which we 'reason' about the world [about social conflict] and our 'self' [as conflict managers] as a productive member of that world. The rules for 'telling the truth' in curriculum, however, are not only about the construction of objects for our scrutiny and observation. Curriculum is a disciplining [social] technology that directs how the individual is to act, feel, talk, and 'see' the world and 'self.' As such, curriculum is a form of social regulation [administration, governmentality]..... My use of epistemology is to give reference to how the systems of ideas in schooling organize perceptions, ways of responding to the world and conceptions of 'self.' The social in epistemology emphasizes the relational and social embeddedness of knowledge, in contrast to an American philosophical concern with epistemology as a search for universal knowledge claims about the nature, origins and limits of knowledge. (See Toulmin, 1972 and 1988 for a discussion of science that relates to my usage of epistemology) (p. 132)

Particularly attractive, is Popkewitz and Brennan's (1997) combining interest in Foucault's "regimes of truth" and Pierre Bourdieu's36 "habitus" and an interest to go beyond Marxist [conflict and critical theory] notions about power and politics of change. Their interest is "... with a view of power that is both different from and, at certain points, complementary to that of the structuralism of Marxist theories"37 (p. 288). This complementary (integral) aspect of their social epistemology may be useful to my own interests in bringing together the conflict perspective in sociology and postmodernist thinking, in the development of a neo-conflict theory and eventual 'conflict' epistemology.
Chapter Summary

Chapter Two reviewed the purposes of the study and locates the type of research undertaken with five basic methodological assumptions. The study is both empirical and interpretive, quantitative and qualitative, and the results are meant to have an "objectively subjective" quality. Design rationale are explicated with details of the sample "cases" (10 school-based CME training manuals and handbooks and 12 adult-professional-based CME training manuals and handbooks). Procedures of data collection and categorization of data are explained in the context of issues of reliability and validity. A discussion of "trustworthiness of data" (validity) is examined in light of this research involving what Lather refers to as "openly ideological research." Strengths and weaknesses of the methodology and interpretation of results are suggested.

An overview of Foucault's work and CDA is undertaken with the purpose to locate Foucault's methodology. Definitions are given for key terms like discourse and ideology and their similar and different aspects to each other as concepts. A unique approach to CDA is outline as a "three-in-one" method of analysis in this study. It involves: (1) Foucauldian analysis, (2) conflict perspective analysis and (3) interdisciplinary/comparative analysis. The combination of these three forms of analysis are thought to improve possibilities for an integral conflict knowledge and analysis of discourses in CME texts. This approach is contextualized in terms of Wilber's critical integral theory.

The Chapter closes with a discussion of the importance of considering a 'conflict' epistemology in relation to the study of 'conflict' and its conceptualizations. The context of this discussion reiterates the Foucaudian concern (and Popkewitz's) regarding the politics and crisis of the production of knowledge, particularly in the social sciences and education. Implications of Popkewitz's work on a social epistemology are considered as part of the analysis of discourses in this study, as well as a potentially powerful approach to developing a 'conflict' epistemology in the long term.
Equally problematic is the inflation of "parts" to "wholes." This point is raised in the text to merely raise the awareness of the problem, contestation and battle that goes on in knowledge-making. This accent is footnoted here also because of the interplay of consensus theory (functionalism) and conflict theory and their long battle for reality and the best ways of knowing and explaining social reality. "... both the term 'function' and the functionalist perspective retain widespread significance in sociology, for they involve a concern with the crucial issue of the interrelationship of parts to wholes in human society and the relationships between social structure and human agency...". (Jary and Jary, 1995, p. 249). Appendix IV shows several authors who write that the consensus (functionalist) theory tends to valorize and emphasize the "whole" over the "parts," and the conflict theory tends to valorize and emphasize the "part" over the "whole." Although, this is an oversimplification, I believe it still has a lot of salience in any investigation into the politics and power of knowledge and constructions of how best to structure organizations and societies. Both consensus and conflict theories can fall into their own dissociation from each other and over-valorize and over-emphasize one or the other aspect of social reality and knowledge formation. Detecting this "over-" (or pathological) component in both theoretical positions and in discourses, that is of great interest to me. The holonic or integral approach (epistemology) of Wilber (1995, 1997) is likely to bear fruit on this problem, as has been pursued in early sociology writing on the principle of the problem of "synecdoche ... a confusion of the whole with its parts..." (Demerath III, 1967, p. 502).

Scheff and Retzinger (1991) present a description of how C.S. Peirce's "abduction" serves as an important sociological methodology (between induction and deduction), integrating micro-macro frames and part/whole processes of seeing and working with interpreting and creating ideas from data and developing hypothetical formulations.

Generalizations and grouping diverse peoples into one group is always dangerous. I am not intending to speak "for" anyone. I speak only as part of the whole ("we"). I am particularly referring to a 'we' or 'our' generically as educators in N.A. I do think adults of all kinds and locations are, relatively, and potentially important educators— albeit, not all are professionals. I also acknowledge, the multiple problematics of my own background, writing as a white Canadian male of European ancestry, in that these have been oppressive dominator locations of privilege for many centuries. Being raised poor working class, and "choosing" to live as a well-educated working class person, I feel I can speak to issues of violence and oppression from first hand experience as both oppressor and victim.

The DFCV cycle dynamic is further elaborated in Chapter Four.

Arguably, a case could be made that of the three primary methodological traditions in the human and social sciences, dialecticism is the choice methodology (rather than positivism or idealism) for a critical (conflict) theory position, as that taken in this study. "Dialectical theories assume that the history of human society reflects qualitative changes resulting from contradictions within earlier societies [or organizations] and that contradictions will continue to be found in the future. These theories attempt to explain contradictions as processes of change." (Boguslaw and Vickers, 1977, p. 181). I acknowledge that dialectical methodology and theories of social change and transformation are diverse and problematic (e.g., Hegelian and Marxist "metaphysics"). Some further discussion of dialecticism and contradiction as part of a 'conflict' epistemology can be found at the end of this chapter. Dialectical methodology is appealing to a study of 'conflict' because it highly valorizes conflict in social change within a political
Clifford Geertz, in the domain of "Cultural Analysis" as opposed to "social analysis." He argues that "... the study of..."

Wilber (1995) places Foucault, along with Peter Berger, Mary Douglas and Jurgen Habermas, Charles Taylor and Clifford Geertz, in the domain of "Cultural Analysis" as opposed to "social analysis." He argues that "... the study of...

10 #11 has (a) and (b) manuals but these are counted as one, because they are by the same author and published by the same organization.

11 Personal communication with M. Huber, Director of the Conflict Resolution program at the British Columbia Justice Institute, July, 1999).

12 In this study *concept* is used as follows: "... a *concept* is an abstraction from observed phenomena; it is a word that states the commonalities among those observed events and situations and distinguishes the phenomena from other events and situations. Concepts are used in place of descriptive phrases... Concepts, however, are more than the [value-neutral] accumulation of data regarding people, incidents, participant language and participant 'meanings.'" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1989, pp. 94-95).

13 Palys (1997) gives an example of the politics of constitutive definitions, that is more than merely a difference due to different disciplinary knowledges. *"As the preceding paragraphs suggest, variations among researchers in the constitutive definition of theoretical variables may reflect ideological, theoretical, or disciplinary differences among those researchers. I noted earlier, for example, that a crime might be defined as 'any violation of the criminal law.' Although this is obviously a reasonable and defensible definition, many would argue that such a choice reflects tacit agreement with status-quo interests, and should be replaced with a broader, narrower, or even totally different focus.... one's choice of constitutive definition affects how one goes about conceptualizing one's research strategy [as well as how one attempts to deal with the problem called 'crime'-- of which, could be substituted the word/concept of *conflict*.']" (p. 63). Palys here is indicating there are status quo-maintaining definitions and status challenging-changing (revolutionizing) definitions-- all, with their different, if not contradictory, outcomes in doing research and in attempting to solve social problems. This is supportive of the assumption behind this study in regard to the political and social importance of analyzing the conceptualization of *conflict.*

14 Sorenson (1994) consisted of two books, one for adults/trainers and a "Supplement" for students.

15 Lather (1986) is using the term *ideology* in a neo-Marxian (a la Gramscian, and M. Apple) way. She wrote, "*This notion is opposed to orthodox Marxist usage which sees ideology as a distortion of reality, protective of existing power arrangements.... Gramsci theorizes that ideology comes in progressive as well as oppressive forms...*." (p. 78). This is not the same usage of the term in this report (based on V. Havel). Reason (1981) uses *ideology* as "*preferred sociological norms*" (p. 48) in a non-Marxian way.

16 Fairclough's 3-dimensional model of discourse and discourse analysis (as outlined by Janks, 1997) involves text-description (text analysis), discourse practice-interpretation (processing analysis) and explanation- (social analysis) sociocultural practice.

17 Perhaps, it could be argued, that Duryea's (1992) initiative in bringing a cultural diversity critique to CME (along with others) was a breakthrough to beginning to recognize many or marginal 'voices' (oppressed groups) and their value in constructing conflict knowledge.

18 For many authors, like Harvey (1989), Nietzsche is an early root to postmodernist thought, it is he (like Foucault) in particular "... that emphasizes the deep chaos [conflict/battles] of modern life and its intractability [unyielding to rational managerial control] before rational thought." (p. 44).

19 For an indepth review of Foucault's overall project and methods, see Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982).

20 Wilber (1995) places Foucault, along with Peter Berger, Mary Douglas and Jurgen Habermas, Charles Taylor and Clifford Geertz, in the domain of "Cultural Analysis" as opposed to "social analysis." He argues that "... the study of
human 'sociology' (especially Anglo-Saxon countries) has usually been the study of the observable behavior of social systems (or 'social action systems'). Something is a 'really real' science if its data can be seen empirically... it has been so hard for sociologists to buck the positivistic trend of studying only behavior-oriented action systems [external], and to study not just society but also culture, or the shared values that constitute the common worldviews of various social systems— that is the interior of the social systems." (p. 13). Wilber notes these theorists of the interior and interpreted realm have not been part of the mainstream of social sciences— rather, they are directed to investigating meaning, symbolism, language and discourse. Wilber categorizes Foucault within "structuralism" (p. 124). Mills (1997, p. 75) regards Barthes and Foucault's work on discursive structures (especially in Foucault's archeological period of investigations) as "structuralism." However, Wilber qualifies this, arguing that Foucault's early work (archeology of actual existence) was a "... nestructuralist reworking of the traditional structuralist's analysis.... Foucault bracketed not only the truth of linguistic utterances— the standard phenomenological move— but their meaning as well...". (p. 598). McHoul and Grace (1998) referred to Foucault's philosophical path as a steering away from, rather than between realism and idealism (p. 2). Wilber's critique of Foucault is too complex to elaborate, other than the important point he is making that Foucault's work is not all of one type or location, as Foucault wrote over a period of a few decades and evolved as he worked out his own methodology. Jary and Jary (1995) noted that "Although, sometimes referred to as a 'structuralist,' he usually rejected this label. He is perhaps best seen as a 'poststructuralist' in the sense that he wished to discover the nonrational scaffolding of reason, but without any commitment to either an underlying order or a finally determinant power in the construction." (p. 241). Although, Foucault would have agreed with a socially constructed 'reality,' that is contextual and relative, like the structuralists, he would not likely have agreed there is any underlying "deep" structure (power, entelechy, telos) that can be used to explain the way "reality" is. He also was not interested (but very critical) in the interpretive schools of philosophical and social analysis that gather under the name of hermeneutics (cf. Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982). Foucault and his work have many critics, Wilber (1995), Habermas and some feminist writers (cf. Nicholson, 1990) are a start for the beginning reader.


22 Foucault, is acknowledging that such essentializing of 'woman' or 'women' goes on all the time, but he does not necessarily endorse it, but rather wants to deconstruct it, and see how it is defined by a privileged majority under certain conditions.

23 "Pecheux's work is important in that he stresses more than Foucault the conflictual nature of discourse. He stresses the fact that ideological struggle is the essence of discourse structure....". (Mills, 1997, p. 14).

24 "Foucault, then, is more than dubious about notions of absolute truth, or indeed of definitive philosophical answers to political questions. And he is far from believing that it is the task of intellectuals to provide such things. But this does not mean that 'there is no truth.' On the contrary, there can sometimes be many, each with its own rationality. But the question is [for Foucault]: which of these, at any given period, comes to predominate and how?" (McHoul and Grace, 1998, p. 19).

25 Plumb (1995) critiquing critical adult education, from a postmodernist view, traces the historical and ideological importance of commodity and commodification from Marx, to Habermas to Baudrillard. For our purposes, commodification is a process which emphasizes cultural and symbolic reproduction (via representation, signification) where no longer is a product produced for its traditional (original) values and meanings and or money/profit alone— but in a postmodern world, is reproduced for "... the ideological battle for cultural control....". (Plumb, 1995, p. 168) to manipulate and legitimate knowledge, power and privilege of those who have the most resources (e.g., access to the media) to use discourses (texts and primarily images). For example, cf. Plumb (1995, p. 167) on how the bourgeois "... resors to the manipulation of culture [symbolic environment and representations] to ensure its [classist] perpetuation...". "The commodification of culture only occurs when capitalists realize that money can be made producing signs and when they actually begin to produce them as commodities." (p. 173) (cf. Hebdige, 1988). Plumb's critique begins with the assumption that pervasive commodification of culture (via globalization) is having immense negative impacts on society (albeit, he mentions some poststructuralists believe it is a good way to resist domination as well for some parts of the culture). He noted, "The commodification of culture generates such a proliferation of signifiers that it undermines the capacity of individuals or groups to locate themselves in an action-coordinating system of norms." (p. 179). He believes social movements will be hampered as political forces in the lifeworld (a la Habermas). His concern is that adult educators have not taken up a significant or systematic study of the
importance of contemporary culture in critical adult education (p. 169). Lyotard's (1984) notion of performativity is closely related to commodification, with the former representing the ideology that is dominating the postmodern world and education. As Boshier (1996) explains performativity, [it is] "... the notion that only education [usually training] that contributes to the economy is of value. Hence, the task of colleges and universities is to create skills, and no longer ideals... The transmission of knowledge is no longer designed... [or] capable of guiding a notion towards its emancipation, but to supply the players capable of acceptably fulfilling their roles at the pragmatic posts required by its institution' [Lyotard] (1984, p. 53)." (p. 93-94). See Briton and Plumb (1993) for a review of the commodification of contemporary adult education. All of these concerns could be applied to CME.

26 Luke (1995-96) in particular focuses on "... educational claims of cultural minorities and indigenous peoples and of girls and women, and the inclusion of linguistically diverse students into classrooms [schools]...". (p. 7).

27 Recall the definition of violence in Chapter One, and especially Sayer (1987) and Bourdieu (1979) on symbolic violence.

28 "These are histories of ideas documenting the emergence of pedagogic discourses, ranging from those of Reformation Protestantism and educational progressivism to contemporary neo-Marxism and feminisms. That is, they describe and critique larger formations of statements across broad fields of institutional life. But these and many other recent Foucauldian works stop short of detailed, close analyses of the linguistic or technical features of written and spoken texts." (Luke, 1995-96, p. 10).

29 "These have been and remain central issues in the sociology of education and in curriculum studies (Apple, 1985, 1993; Wexler, 1987)." (Luke, 1995-96, p. 11).

30 See Karpiak (1997) for her application of Wilber's "integral vision-logic" to adult and continuing/higher education theory and practices. Aperspectival refers to a type of critical cognition (a la Jean Gebser) that Wilber (1995) discussed at length-- a level of consciousness which is beyond eclectic perspectivism-- the latter, which liberalists like to bandy about as indicative of their tolerance to diversity (e.g., see Palys, 1997, p. 34 below, who equates perspectivism with "liberating epistemology")

31 Palys (1997) argues the "liberating epistemology" we need today as researchers is one where diversity and tolerance are at the forefront of our methodologies (p. 34). His eclectic approach to research is typified in his prescribed "perspectival diversity"-- that is, "None is best" -- each has its own advantages and disadvantages, and so on (p. 34) (see in contrast with Wilber's (1995) "aperspectival" view of critical integral theory). The latter, is preferred in this study. Palys's prescription that "None is best" is an ideological and hierarchial "best" of another kind-- that is, for him, eclecticism is best. He doesn't seem to see that.


33 See Palys (1997) p. 35. "... Becker (1996) describes it, the use of positivist criteria as an academic yardstick is more a statement of power than of logic." (Palys, 1997, p. 35). Positivism, usually is associated with quantitative research designs, and "realist epistemology" but not always (Palys, 1997, p. 35).

34 I don't pursue this option here but it is taken from the concept of a feminist epistemology called "feminist standpoint theory"or what Jaggar (1983, p. 385) called simply a "women's standpoint." In gross but simple terms, a 'conflict' standpoint theory would view social reality and experience from a conflict perspective (i.e., neo-conflict theory)-- what I sometimes have argued is a "rebel's view."

Deconstructionism, albeit, is a very prolemanic and complex term, with several meanings. The work of Derrida is most usually associated with the postmodernist view of deconstruction as a methodology of pulling apart text and meaning. I have no experience with Derrida per se, but I take the 'spirit' of his work and others of this movement as valuable to re-interpret what any concept or text may mean, from many different perspectives. I therefore, use the term very loosely.

36 Popkewitz and Brennan (1997) noted that before Bourdieu-- the 'big' sociologists, like Durkheim and Weber were also interested in "habitus." (p. 290).

37 See also the re-visionist and strategic Marxism [conflict perspective] emphasized in Stuart Hall (1986) and what he called "a Marxism without guarantees" (cited in Popkewitz and Brennan, 1997, p. 289).
CHAPTER THREE

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT EDUCATION: DISCOURSES ON CONFLICT

Introduction

[critical discourse analysis leads to] ... looking for... patterns that I can use to establish hypotheses about discourses at work in society (Janks, 1997, p. 331).

The CME training manuals and handbooks (hereafter also called CME text1) provide a glimpse "case" study of a new social movement (NSM). This particular CME, as a NSM, is generally directed at managing, preventing or undermining violence. The diversity of CME text among the 22 manuals and handbooks studied is underlayed with common "patterns." Chapter Three is intended to review the data collected on the conceptualizations of 'conflict' (conflict) and interpret (via hypotheses) the patterns as discourses, created by, and supporting these conceptualizations. Chapter Four discusses these hypotheses, and attempts to explain the results in relation to the critical theoretical frameworks used in this study.

Generally, this Chapter and the next plot results of the CDA in a repeating form or developmental sequencing from: (1) text analysis (description), (2) processing analysis (interpretation) to, (3) social analysis (explanation), loosely following Fairclough's (1989, 1995) model for CDA. The twelve emergent themes of conceptualizing 'conflict' in CME text2 are discussed selectively, with differential attention. There simply is not enough space to give all twelve themes, and their relevant quotes, attention within the limitations and purposes of this study.

Understanding Conflict

The more we learn about conflict, the greater the chance of learning from them, reducing unnecessary ones, and managing future ones with more confidence. (Hart, 1991, p. i).

We can and must learn from our conflicts. (Hart, 1991, p. 1-9).
As part of the teaching of conflict resolution/management, the CME text regularly refer to the importance of first understanding conflict(s). CME text often set goals which include, "... to enhance our understanding of conflict and conflict management" (Condliffe, 1991, p. xiii). Hence, conflict is distinct (though overlapping) from conflict management—two conceptions of sociocultural phenomena. This distinction is assumed, universally, in the CME text studied. But in the Hart quotes above, we can see there is a potential confusion in CME text as to whether one is talking about understanding conflict or conflicts.

Understanding is gained through learning, and thus, conflict resolution/management training and facilitation is fundamentally educational. This apparent (rhetorical) prioritizing of learning and understanding before resolution/management, involves the beginning of text that would build and support a conceptualization of conflict. This understanding invariably begins with several statements about the "nature of conflict" or "definition of conflict." Thirteen themes emerged from the study of CME text in regard to this conceptualizing conflict for the purpose of understanding conflict (cf. Chapter Four). As well, there is a continual, sometimes explicit, and mostly implicit, theme that conflict is related to violence— that is, if we understand conflict we will understand violence and be able to stop violence.

There is another goal of understanding that goes beyond the content of the CME text and the nature of 'conflict' itself. For example, there is an explicit or implicit goal for training that leads to the "... ability to develop/encourage greater understanding, and reduce interpersonal conflict" (Haddigan, 1997b, n.p.). This improved or "greater understanding" is often stated in the context of cultural diversity but also general differences between people and their goals, values, beliefs, needs, interests and so on. The understanding is also to be learned through various conflict practices, in the case of conflict resolution (Haddigan, 1997b), where one major learning objective is to "... gain an understanding of conflict approaches and styles...". (p. 13) of oneself, and others that one is observing or attempting to utilize in helping resolve a dispute/conflict. Often, the search for understanding in the attempts to resolve or manage
conflict is a search for "origins" or "causes" of the identified conflict(s) or dispute(s) (i.e., "diagnosis"). Infrequently, the CME text makes reference to power and its importance in understanding the origin or cause of a conflict (e.g., Condliffe, 1991, p. 155). Conflict (and violence?—see below) are, therefore, directly linked in CME text to inadequate "understanding" (or misunderstanding) at both the level of content (re: the nature of 'conflict' itself), and the level of human diversity and difference (re: the nature of relationships and communication).

The CME text inherently presents the impression that through learning both content about the nature of conflict, and practicing the practices of conflict resolution/management, virtually any student/person/group/organization may improve the quality and nature of interpersonal relationships and general healthy functioning. This improvement, it is assumed, is related to improving democracy in our communities, societies, organizations and the world at-large. As this analysis proceeds, the various authors recommend the general reduction of conflict (or what some call "destructive conflict" and "violence"), in one form or another, as part of the overall improvement and "progressive" discourse toward greater cooperation and democracy.

Bodine and Crawford (1998) summarize a central role of understanding,

When conflict is understood, it can become an opportunity to learn and create. The challenge for people in conflict is to apply the principles of creative cooperation in their human relationships. [cited from Bodine et al., 1994] (p.xiii).

Despite the almost universal emphasis in CME text on understanding conflict there is usually only a very small percentage of pages devoted to this directly as discussion. For example, in a 151 page manual on peer mediation and conflict resolution in schools, 3.5 pages are on "Understanding Conflict" and 2.5 pages of practice/activity are devoted to it (Schrumpf et al., 1991). In a 160 page manual on conflict management in schools, 1.5 pages are on theory "Understanding/Origin" and 6 pages on practice activities on understanding conflict as a phenomena (Sorenson, 1994). Girard and Koch (1996) included 25 pages on theory re: "The Nature of Conflict," out of 187 total pages. The discussions about understanding conflict are
typically more about understanding "conflicts" and reactions to conflicts (conflict styles). It is not uncommon to have less than one page devoted to understanding conflict and theories of conflict. The emphasis in CME text is clearly on "how to" handle or deal with conflicts in the concrete/behavioral sense. The text is consistently dominated by practical application of techniques and conflict practices oriented to conflict management/resolution.

Conflict-Violence Connection: Locating 'The Problem'

No one is teaching children how to manage conflicts constructively through example or through indirect methods, such as moral codes and patterns of living. Some communities directly promote violence as a way to resolve disputes. Inner-city children typically grow up surrounded by teenagers and adults who are themselves deviant, delinquent, or criminal. The result is youth who have been directly and painfully taught to be violent when faced with a conflict. (Johnson and Johnson, 1995a, p. 3)

Johnson and Johnson (1995a), have studied conflicts in schools for over 30 years as researchers, and have been part of the initiation for "schools as safe havens" (cf. also Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. 8 and others) and schools as "conflict positive organizations" (a la Tjsvold). Johnson and Johnson's claims above are strong, if not extremist, as they assert their "expert" knowledge about 'others' in the margins of society. Issues of classism and racism are immediately apparent in their quote, but these 'isms' are not addressed directly in the CME text by them. They located the problem of "violence" with inner city life, marginalized groups (e.g., "deviants" or 'at-risk' children), with poor role models and unlearned and unskilled knowledges of "constructive conflict"-- as distinguished from "destructive conflict" (following in the theories of Deutsch and Lewin's social psychology of conflict).

Kessler (1978), following Deutsch (1973), claims, "Violence is yet another, more primitive way, of settling disputes.... Unfortunately, violence is still a popular means of settling unresolved conflict..." (p. 2). Kessler's claim that violence is a conflict management strategy,
albeit, a destructive and "primitive" one, has many possible implications which could be
problematic. However, it is the oldest CME text (a classic) in the field and this idea appears
not be taken up by other authors in this study (cf. Black, 1998; Duryea, 1992; for a similar
view).

In the professional adult CME text "violence" is almost never mentioned, except in
Condliffe (1991), where he cites Rummel (1976) who wrote, "The bad consequences of
conflict are many and include violence...". Five of the 12 professional adult CME
books had no explicit mention of violence and several had implicit connections. Most
commonly there is a connection of the potential of conflicts to turn into what Deutsch (1973)
distinguished as "destructive conflict" (as opposed to "constructive conflict") (Haddigan, 1997;
Hart, 1991; Peachey et al., 1983) or "destructive behavior" (Coates et al., 1997). Kessler (1978)
noted that repressed conflict that is not dealt with turns to what Deutsch called "conflict
pathology" (p. 2). A strong value-bias, if not ideology, seems to implicitly accompany the
CME text, whereby it is "better" to have "constructive" rather than "destructive"
conflict/behavior (outcomes). Hart (1991) poignantly remarked, "... you need to help others
realign their attitude toward conflict so they view it as constructive" (p. 1-8). This value-bias, if
not ideology, is typically a discourse of the "individual" and their "attitudes" as the focus (i.e.,
psychologism), rather than a sociocultural or political focus of the meaning of "destructive"
conflict/behavior for various people located in various positions/stratifications within a society.

Condliffe (1991) (an Australian, teaching professional conflict management) is less of this
"constructive" and "positive" camp of authors, and does acknowledge "There is no doubt that
some conflict is counterproductive or destructive" (p. 16). However, Condliffe provides a list of
types of conflict, of which two of the categories are "Structural" and "Cultural & Ideological"--
naiming in these categories the 'big' sociopolitical oppressions of classism, sexism, racism
(although he avoids using the 'isms'). But neither he, nor the other authors use "violence" in
their discussions. Why is "destructive conflict/behavior" utilized very frequently but not the term "violence?" This is particularly, not the case in the school and youth CME text.

School and youth CME text (other than Kalmakoff and Shaw, 1987; Kew, 1988) continually introduce the topic of conflict management/resolution as part of an attempt to intervene in the unacceptable increasing amount of violence (and discipline problems\(^9\)) among youth, and in our communities generally. Bodine and Crawford (1998) wrote, "The current data on youth violence give us some insight into using conflict resolution as a prevention strategy" (p. xiii). Concerned Teens, Inc. (1988) developed exercises for youth to look at how "violent" heroes in the media use "violence" as their method of resolving conflict (recall Kessler above). A few authors linked conflict (not dealt with well) as part of a continuum that ends up as nuclear war (Concerned Teens, Inc., 1988) or war generally (Johnson and Johnson, 1995a, p. 15).

Most of the youth CME text included notions of Deutsch and the distinction between "destructive conflict" and "constructive conflict." Johnson and Johnson (1995a) clarify, that Deutsch was talking about how conflicts are "managed" and that is the functional feature that leads to one calling the outcome "destructive" or "constructive." This is regularly linked to Deutsch's theory\(^{10}\) about attitudes and approach to conflicts-- distinguishing, "competitive" vs. "cooperative," respectively with "destructive" and "constructive." Johnson and Johnson (1995a) specifically wrote,

Conflict resolution education is based on underlying principles of cooperative problem solving [they called "constructive problem-solving skills"] not competition. (p. xv)

Girard and Koch (1996), Sorenson (1994) and Levine (1994) emphasize this Deutschian dichotomy. These terms, and the social psychological theory of Deutsch on conflict, are fairly ubiquitous in the CME text.
Johnson and Johnson (1995a) also promote the utilization of conflict resolution as a "discipline program" in schools, which also importantly acts to reduce "stresses." Patterson (1995) in the Foreword to Johnson and Johnson (1995a) wrote,

Can schools invest in strategies other than a police force, surveillance equipment, and metal detectors to manage violence and conflict? [and reduce "stresses"] (p. v)

Levine (1994) prefers to distinguish and separate discipline and conflict resolution in her initiative for "peaceable classrooms" (p. 58). Levine (1994) also makes a strong claim about the inadequacies (conflict illiteracy? or peace illiteracy?) of people in these violent times. She wrote,

There is a growing awareness that more and more children are not developing the skills they need to live together in peace or to resolve their conflicts in nonviolent ways.... Few adults have adequate, if any, preparation for dealing with the effects on children of increased violence in society, much less for teaching children how to live with others peacefully.... (p. 5).

Sorenson (1994), preferring cooperation and consensus, attempts to challenge a postmodernist, or conflict/crisis perspective on social reality, as well as the inevitability of "competition," in the goals of his conflict resolution programs. He wrote, "We are seeking to establish an environment of cooperation--to change the idea that we must constantly be in conflict with one another" (p. 8). This consensus framework is ubiquitous throughout most of the CME text (less so in Condliffe, 1991, in the professional adult CME text). The conflict-positive, consensus, cooperative and collaborative thinking (i.e., "harmony ideology") of most all CME text points to making a distinction between "conflict" and "how conflict is handled." In other words, the problem the CME texts address is violence (more or less stated explicitly) and its destructive aspects. The problem however, is typically not "conflict" but rather, the managing of it. For example in the youth CME text, Johnson and Johnson (1995a) wrote,
"Conflicts are not the problems— they are part of the solutions..." (p. 13). Bodine and Crawford (1998) complement this idea by noting,

... conflict in and of itself is not positive or negative. Rather, the actions chosen turn conflict into either a competitive, devastating battle or else a constructive challenge... (p. 44) [cf. Girard and Koch, 1996, p. 1 for a similar statement].

Notice the shift in language with "battle" becoming "challenge." This is very popular, generally, in the conflict-positive writing in CME text. Similarly, in the professional adult CME text, Haddigan (1997b) wrote, "Conflict itself is neither good nor bad; how people interact in conflict influences whether it leads to desirable or undesirable outcomes" (p. 32). Coates et al. (1997) similarly, wrote, "It is not conflict per se that matters; it is how effectively and efficiently the parties resolve conflicts which naturally occur that really matters. (Kochan & Osterman, 1994, 51)" (p. 7). And Wisinski (1993) wrote, "The main issue with conflict is not so much that it occurs, but how you manage it when it does" (p. ix). Hart (1991) wrote, "... what is most important is how we understand, resolve, and learn from them [conflicts]" (p. 1-9).

Peachey et al. (1983) wrote, "What is important is that conflict be handled in ways that prevent or minimize destructive results" (p. 2.1). Clearly, most CME text is biased toward this pragmatic action-side ("how to"/performativity) of the phenomena of social conflict— and the more effective and efficient the results/outcomes, the better. Reduction of "destructiveness" (violence) is the ubiquitous goal of CME text and programs. No author questioned that this biased view, or the techniques themselves used to undermine violence, are explicitly, or potentially violent or destructive. Haddigan (1997b) provided the most explicit acknowledgement of the program's bias in values and resultant limitations of application but this does not question the violence (or potential of ) in its own methods and value-bias.
Self-Reflexivity: Self-Critical Theme

Conflict is the sine qua non of reflection and ingenuity. (Dewey, 1930; cited in Condliffe, 1991, p. 8)

Reflection is the internal processing of the conflict. It can occur after the conflict is resolved or in the pauses during a conflict resolution process.... (Haddigan, 1997b, p. 39)

As a trainer or facilitator, you need to re-examine your own attitude toward conflict so you will confidently convey a positive attitude. (Hart, 1991, p. 1-9)

To be effective in the mediator and problem-solver roles, we must become aware of how we handle our own conflicts. We must become more aware of ourselves, knowing ourselves is a prerequisite to helping others.... (Sorenson, 1994, p. 10)

The above quotes are representative of a common theme in the CME text. The application of the reflexivity (reflection) upon one's actions and work is completely aimed at the practical helping-side (i.e., "professionalism") of CME. No use of the reflexive process was found to be dedicated to discussion of the problematics of either conflict discourse or the conceptualization of conflict itself as a concept or phenomenon. One example approached this theoretical and conceptual reflexivity. Wade (1995), in the Foreword of Charlton and Dewdney (1995) writing for practitioners, emphasized the value of interdisciplinary contributions and reflective practitioners in mediation. The functional value of the reflective practitioner (a la Schon, 1983) is described by Wade,

Reflective practitioners constantly swap horror and wonder stories, practical hints, adapted 12-step processes, statistics true or not so true, grand visions and reworked theories.... The authors [Charlton and Dewdney] are to be congratulated for this outstanding contribution to the tradition of reflective mediator practitioners who theorise, practice, critique, adapt theory and adapt practice cyclically. (p. viii)

Neither Wade, nor Charlton and Dewdney are part of the sample for this study. Hart (1991) is the only author to explicitly challenge the teacher/facilitator/trainer to look at their
"Philosophy about Conflict?" She wrote, "Once you are clear on your assumptions, be sure to state them to your participants... when you introduce your program on conflict" (p. 1-9). But she offers no framework of how to systematically be self-reflexive or self-critical of that philosophy, nor does she encourage equally participants elaborate and deconstruct their own philosophy about conflict-- or to problematize the issue of having a philosophy of conflict when one doesn't know what possibilities for conceptualizations of conflict are available.

There was no evidence in any of the CME text, that serious, or systematic reflection and self-critique was applied to the conceptualization of conflict itself, and its implications for prescriptions of how best to handle conflict. Theorizing and critique of theory was not encouraged by the readers (or trainees). In most CME text, especially for youth and school communities, there was no disclosure of the theoretical sources upon which the training was based.

Theory Theme

The theory theme is divided into a) formal theory and, b) informal "theory" or fragments of theory. The brief overview below is focused on text that deals directly with conflict not conflict resolution/management. For most school and youth CME text, any theory was meagre. In regard to formal theory, Schrumpf et al. (1991) was the only book to bring in an "Overview of the Basic Theory of Conflict" (i.e., Glasser's Control Theory). Glasser's theory informing a view of conflict is based on needs (genetic-biological) and psychological dimensions (generally excluding social and cultural dimensions). Bodine and Crawford (1998) also make a small reference to Glasser's work, through a strong assertion that,

Control theory [Glasser] explains why (and to a great extent how) all living organisms behave.... The purpose is always to attempt to satisfy basic needs that are built into our genetic structure. (p. 36)
The emphasis was on "control" and individual perceptions and choices that lead to "control" (i.e., regulation of one's behaviors within appropriate social norms). Deutsch's social psychological theory of conflict was most commonly used at a cursory level, re: "competitive" (destructive) and "cooperative" (constructive) concepts for conflict behaviors and attitudes. Johnson and Johnson (1995a) use Deutsch's (1973) theory of conflict to claim, "One incompatible activity prevents or interferes with the occurrence or effectiveness of a second activity" (p. 15). Whether, it is Glasser or Deutsch, the emphasis of theoretical understanding about conflict is focused on behaviors/outcomes-- that is, what is observable in the simplest, physical, empirical way; albeit, cognitive-behavioral (rational) elements are discussed in these theories. Importantly, neither of these theories is interested in the problematics of conceptualizing conflict per se, nor do the CME text problematize Glasser's or Deutsch's theory and their biases. No critical literature of such theories or approaches to social knowledge are introduced as references for the curious critical reader/student.

In professional adult CME text, there was no formal theory given regarding conceptualization of conflict per se. These authors were more interested in theories and models of conflict resolution/management, conflict cycles and so on. The informal theoretical-type of claims were found throughout all the CME text, with examples like: "Many theories of conflict are based on cycles of change that demonstrate how conflict emerges and resolves" (Haddigan, 1997b, p. 19); "... the dimension of conflict relating to our interpersonal wants is helpful in linking conflict to the idea of personal and social aspirations. All of these elements are useful... for the exploration of the nature of conflict" (Condliffe, 1991, p. 3); "The beginning of the process is the perception of conflict. This is the stage of a conflict.... The conflict is often latent during this phase and may remain so for a long time" (Condliffe, 1991, p. 9)-- [informal theory examples, in school CME text:] "Almost every conflict involves an endeavor by the disputants to meet the basic psychological needs for belonging, power, freedom, and fun" (Bodine and..."
Crawford, 1998, p. 39); "To understand conflict and perceive it positively, the knowledge that no two people can have exactly the same wants is central" (Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. 38).

**Definition-Location Theme**

The nominal, and somewhat dictionary-like, definitions of conflict are central to uncovering the conceptualization of conflict in the text. The location theme provides contours of the initiative to locate, place or norm-reference some qualities associated with the conceptualization of conflict. Both themes directly address answering the question *what is conflict?* Understanding conflict is essential to a program of managing and resolving conflict. Within the school and youth CME text, Schrumpf et al. (1991) wrote, "A definition of conflict" is a core part of a program (p. 24). Unlike most CME text, Girard and Koch (1996) echo this concern and the complexity of defining conflict (albeit, they believe a "clear definition" is possible to achieve for students),

This module enables learners to develop a clear definition of conflict.... There are many definitions of the word *conflict*. Formal definitions range from the more abstract-- 'a state of disharmony'-- to those that signal a more concrete event. (p. 2) Notice, that although it is acknowledged in the manual (and teaching) that there are "many definitions" of conflict, this is not further problematized, nor are other definitions provided or encouraged.

Some, typical, and common definitions of conflict in CME text include (school/youth text in italics and professional adult in non-italics): *Conflict: controversy or disagreement; to come into opposition*" (Schrumpf et al., 1991, p. 148); "Conflict or dispute- to engage in an argument, to struggle over, quarrel" (Concerned Teens, Inc., 1988, p. 64); "A conflict exists when incompatible activities occurs" (Johnson and Johnson, 1995a, p. 15); "Deutsch (1973), for example, states that 'conflict exists when incompatible activities occur' (p. 10) (Girard and Kock, 1996, p. 2); "Conflict is a discord of needs, drives, wishes, or demands" (Bodine and
Crawford, 1998, p. 33); "Conflicts are disagreements or problems people have with one another that usually lead to negative reactions and feelings" (Levine, 1994, p. 57); "Hocker and Wilmot (1991) go further, defining conflict as 'an expressed struggle between at least two interdependent parties who perceive incompatible goals, scarce resources and interference from the other party in achieving their goals' (p. 12)" (Girard and Koch, 1996, p. 2); "Here 'conflict' refers to an ongoing series of disputes of severe intensity which have occurred over an extended period of time" (Boulle and Kelly, 1998, p. 13); "... we define conflict simply as 'the existence of incompatible goals, either real or perceived" (Peachey et al., 1983, p. 2.1); "Conflict is essentially a clash of interests, emotions, and values" (Condliffe, 1991, p. 155); "Conflict- the actual or perceived opposition of needs, values and interests between people resulting in unwanted stress or tension and negative feelings between disputants" (Haddigan, 1997b, p. 16); "Conflict is a form of competitive behavior involving actual or perceived differences in interests or limited resources" (Coates et al., 1997, p. 9); "... a form of relating or interacting where we find ourselves (either as individuals or groups) unders some sort of perceived threat to our personal or collective goals.... These perceived threats may be either real or imagined" (Condliffe, 1991, p. 3); "Conflict occurs when individuals or groups are not obtaining what they need or want and are seeking their own self-interest..." (Hart, 1991, p. 1-4); "Conflict- ... it exists because we have differences.... Occurs when we think our differences are in opposition" (White, 1990, p. 4).

From this overview of definitions of conflict it is obvious that they are all very similar, if not virtually identical in basic pattern of conception. In a few cases definitions are drawn from "expert" authors but most CME text define conflict(s) without such qualifying references. A few books had no definition of conflict (e.g., Kalmakoff and Shaw, 1987; Kew et al., 1988; or Wisinski, 1993; Kessler, 1978; Federal Emergency Management Agency, 1991).

No author above suggested their definition was problematic or incomplete, and that trainees ought to be encouraged to create their own definition, and/or to revise the one
offered. In all cases, the proposed definition was an "operational" pre-established device to then launch into the predominant text on conflict management/resolution theories and techniques. A common pattern in most CME text was to immediately, and unproblematically, move from talking about a definition (or the nature of) conflict to talking about defining "a conflict" or "conflicts"—for examples,

To create conflict positive schools, educators first need a general understanding of conflict.... What conflict is.... What is a Conflict? (Johnson and Johnson, 1995a, pp. 13-15)
The more we learn about conflict, the greater the chance of learning from them.... (White, 1990, p. i)
Kalmakoff and Shaw (1987) offer children an exercise: "In group discussion.... [we] will define conflict on the basis of their own experience." The examples illustrated are of conflicts (conflict situations).

Girard and Koch (1996) wrote,
Conflict is part of the hidden curriculum in all our educational institutions. It exists in classrooms, lunchrooms, and teachers' lounges.... Taking charge of what learning occurs from the conflicts that surround us is an important and crucial responsibility of all educators. (p. 1)
Most manuals and handbooks only conceptualized conflict as conflicts (of various numerous kinds). The emphasis in CME text is on a concrete, behavioral event, or action that can be easily diagnosed and defined in terms of oppositional interests (i.e., "conflict of interests" or values). This bias is not considered, by this author, as directly involved in a critical reflection upon, or understanding of the concept of conflict itself.
Locating conflict(s) as a social phenomena was common in all CME text. Two main sub-themes emerged: (1) ubiquitous, frequent and inevitable existence and, (2) natural, normal and necessary. Sometimes these sub-themes overlapped in the same statement. Some examples of these attempts to locate conflict(s) included (school/youth in italics, professional adult in non-
italics): Sub-theme (1) --"... conflict is perpetually present..." Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. 18); "inevitable conflict" (Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. 12); "Conflicts occur all the time. They are a normal and inevitable part of school life" (Johnson and Johnson, 1995a, p. 13); "... conflict are an inevitable part of living..." (Sorenson, 1992, p. 2); "Everyone experiences conflict..." (Girard and Koch, 1996, p. 28); "Conflicts are a daily occurrence in all schools" (Schmidt et al., 1992, p. ii); "Conflicts are inevitable..." (Sorenson, 1994, p. 90); "conflict-positive schools" "... recognize that conflicts are inevitable..." (Johnson and Johnson, 1995a, p. 13); "We live in a pluralistic and conflictual society constantly being changed and transformed..." (Condliffe, 1991, p. 8); "Beliefs underlying the collaborative approach:

Conflict is part of an ongoing cycle of change; it is to be expected as a part of human interaction" (Haddigan, 1997b, p. 32); "Conflict is not simply inevitable; rather, it is the nature of complex organizations.... (Putnam, 1995, 183-4)." (Coates et al., 1997, p. 1); "... conflict ... as a fact of life.... The common reality of conflict..." (Boulle et al., 1998, p. 46); "Conflict is an inevitable aspect of life" (Condliffe, 1991, p. xiii); "Truths: 1. Conflict will occur. Without question. It is a natural dynamic when interacting with others" (Wisinski, 1993, p. 3); "Conflict, therefore, far from being something that will go away if we try hard enough or if things get better, will tend to be ever-present in groups and organizations..." (Condliffe, 1991, p. 155); "Conflict is inevitable in organizations...". (Federal Emergency Management Agency, 1991, p. 7); "Conflict... is inevitable..." (White, 1990, p. 4); "... people who live together, work together, or interact frequently have ongoing conflicts..." (Peachey et al., 1983, p. 2.2); [re: Dahrendorf's view] "He sees social change in terms of group conflict which in his view is always present" (Condliffe, 1991, p. 160); "Conflict in organizations is as inevitable as organizational member's interests and perspectives are diverse. Conflict is also pervasive...

(Allred, 1997, p. 27)— Sub-theme (2)— "Underlying a conflict resolution program are certain precepts: - conflict is natural and normal..." (Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. 47); "... conflict as organic to the human condition, as a natural phenomenon..." (Girard and Koch, 1996, p. 2); "Conflict is a
natural vital part of life" (Schmidt et al., 1992, p. 5); "... a natural, vital part of life" (Schrumpf et al., 1991, p. 5); "Conflict is a natural part of everyday life" (Sorenson, 1992, p. 7); 3 key principles in a conflict resolution program, include [conflict] "... is a natural part of life" (Girard and Koch, 1996, p. 1); "Conflicts of interest are common-- they occur naturally and are deliberately created" (Johnson and Johnson, 1995a, p. 15); "... conflict is normal..." (Girard and Koch, 1996, p. 2); "... conflicts-- they are a necessary part of our learning experiences" (Sorenson, 1994, p. 7); "Belief statements ... a basis for achieving consensus.... [for program] Conflict is a natural part of everyday life" (Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. 161); "Conflict is a natural, vital part of life" (Bodine et al., 1994, cited in Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. xxiii); "... conflict exists and is not going away..." (Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. xxviii); "Assumptions about conflict: 1. Conflicts are a normal and healthy part of life" (Hart, 1991, p. 1-9); "... we assume that conflicting interests are a natural part of the employment relationship (Kochan and Osterman, 1994, 51)" (Coates et al., 1997, p. 7); "... conflict is a universal experience, occurring naturally, ..." (Peachey et al., 1983, p. 2.1); "Conflicts are a natural part of living..." (Hart, 1990, p. i); "... phases of conflict are as natural as phases of peace and harmony" (Haddigan, 1997b, p. 19); "... if we look around at how our society, and indeed any society, functions, it is through the expression of certain levels of conflict" (Condliffe, 1991, p. 16); "Organizational experts tell us that conflict is normal and natural and of course, it is" (Wisingiski, 1993, p. 1).

Throughout the CME texts, almost exclusively, there appears a need (desire?) to make a distinction implicitly between "destructive" and "constructive" conflict, and at the same time, conceptualize conflict generally, as healthy, natural, normal and essential to social life and organizations. Clearly, the term "conflict" or "conflicts" is being used loosely without declaration to the "type" of conflict as either "destructive" or "constructive"-- the latter two conceptualizations tending to declare the way conflict is handled, and the former declaring the nature of conflict as (if) somehow distinct from how it is handled by humans. Locating
conflict(s) in a category of "natural" and "organic" has powerful philosophical implications. This is not problematized in any of the text. All the benefits of conflict are given commonly in the texts but this is not taken up in this study due to limited space. The more general locating and "Moral Status" themes (see below) are given focus here.

Moral Status Theme

These are statements that attach moral value/status to claims about the conceptualization of conflict(s). Below are several examples (school/youth in italics and professional adult in non-italics): "If used appropriately: conflict can be good..." (Concerned Teens, Inc., 1988, p. 12); "Conflict positive schools... Conflicts are not the problems-- they are the solutions... Unfortunately, most schools today are conflict negative; they should aspire to be conflict positive" (Johnson and Johnson, 1995a, p. 13); "... conflict in and of itself is not positive or negative" (Schrumpf et al., 1991, p. 9 and Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. 44); "... conflict, its neutrality..." (Girard and Koch, 1996, p. 14); "Of all these formal definitions, none denote conflict as either positive or negative" (Girard and Koch, 1996, p. 2); 3 key principles to a conflict resolution program- "I... conflict is not inherently positive or negative..." (Girard and Koch, 1996, p. 1); teachers and students need to make "... commitment to approach conflict in a positive way" (Schrumpf et al., 1991, p. 6); "... assumes that conflict is a... positive force..." (Schrumpf, 1991, p. 1); "It would be a rather dull life without conflicts" (Sorenson, 1994, p. 7); "... conflict can have either creative or destructive results" (Schrumpf et al., 1991, p. 7); "... when it comes to conflict the perceptions of most people are quite negative [negative perceptions]..." (Schrumpf et al., 1991, p. 5 and also Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. 35); "Many people have negative attitudes toward conflict..." (Haddigan, 1997b, p. 19); "... as a society and as individuals we simply do not like conflict..." (Coates et al., 1997, p. 14); "... we often think of conflict as being a negative or destructive force in our lives.... [but it is also] positive..." (Condliffe, 1991, p. xiii); "Conflict is not necessarily a negative phenomenon.
Conflict is often regarded as being symptomatic of a pathology..." (Boulle et al., 1998, p. 47); "Beliefs underlying the collaborative approach:... conflict itself is neither good nor bad; ..." (Haddigan, 1997b, p. 32); "In mediation... conflict is seen less negatively... if it is handled constructively..." (Boulle et al., 1998, p. 47); court/litigation history in American society "... is giving conflict a bad name" (Kessler, 1978, p. 2); "Key Conflict Management Principles:.... that conflict will occur and that conflict is not a bad thing" (Coates et al., 1997, p. 2); "Conflict is often seen as a bad thing.... Conflict can be productive.... In this manual conflict is not viewed as being intrinsically bad" (Peachey et al., 1983, p. 2.1); "... organizational values must encourage... seeing conflict as a positive opportunity..." (Coates et al., 1997, p. 14); "Conflict in the workplace used to be perceived as a negative.... something to be avoided at all costs. Today, conflict is viewed much differently [as positive, constructive, functional]" (Wisinski, 1997, p. 1).

Generally, CME text attempts to give a neutral moral status to conflict(s), although, with the term used very loosely, there are times when it is decidedly seen as positive and good. There are repeated statements that claim many people in society (societies?) do not like conflict and perceive it as negative rather than positive (cf. Duryea, 1992 in Chapter One). The literature of CME ubiquitously attempts to turn this around, and in Hart (1990) she outrightly states the educational purpose of programs, that is, "... you need to help others realign their attitude toward conflict so they view it as constructive" (p. 1-8). This seems to imply a dysfunctional "moral" attitude toward conflict(s) is an important part of the internal cognitive and psychological change/ transformation required in some CME. Bodine and Crawford (1998) cite Johnson and Johnson's research over the decades, remarking that, "Untrained students [without the conflict resolution program] uniformly had negative attitudes toward conflict. After training, students had more positive attitudes toward conflict" (p. 105).
Role (Sociopolitical) Theme

Under this theme conflict(s) are conceptualized as part of social life (or organizational life). Below are several examples (school/youth text in italics and professional adult in non-italics): "Without conflict, there would likely be no personal growth or social change" (Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. 35 and Schrumpf et al., 1991, p. 5); "... conflict can enrich and strengthen our school community..." (Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. 12); "Conflict stimulates not only economic and scientific change but also the..." (Condliffe, 1991, p. 8); following Coser (1956, p. 31) "... a certain degree of conflict is an essential element in group formation and the persistence of group life" (cited in Condliffe, 1991, p. 155); "For Coser conflict is a useful instrument of social integration. Conflict helps to facilitate communication, define structures and create conditions for equitable and effective settlements (Coser, 1956, 121)" (Condliffe, 1991, p. 155); "... the expression of that conflict and its attempted resolution or management is important for the realisation of a more equitable (just) society" (Condliffe, 1991, p. 16); "Conflict stimulates... the overthrow of old norms and institutions" (Condliffe, 1991, p. 8); "... it is the struggle for change through conflict that raises the consciousness of various groups in society to their predicament (Coser, 1974, 458)" (Condliffe, 1991, p. 9); re: Dahrendorf's view-- "He sees social change in terms of group conflict which in his view is always present. Society can only be understood when one considers coercion and constraint [and their resistance as conflict] as well as unity and coherence..... Change in structures [according to Dahrendorf] will depend upon the conflict that occurs" (Condliffe, 1991, p. 160); conflict(s) function as an "informer" and other positive processes for "Opportunity for creative change both personally and organizationally" (White, 1990, p. 2).

Clearly, the school/youth CME text deals very little with the sociopolitical realm and the relationship to the role of conflict(s). The professional/adult text is also typically barren of statements in this Role (Sociopolitical) Theme. Condliffe (1991), by far, provides the most text devoted to this theme. He continually draws on a wide variety of theories and authors but
utilizes, unlike other CME books in this study, the conflict theorists from sociology (Dahrendorf and Coser) who write about conflict from the conflict tradition/perspective.

CME Text From A Conflict Perspective

The first discourse interpretive device applied to the descriptive data in CME text is a conflict perspective. This involved using sociological criteria based on the consensus theory and conflict theory distinction (and contradiction or debate—e.g., cf. Figure 9). This is not intended to be a descriptive "neutral" sociological classification of the data, as I was looking at the data within a critique from the conflict perspective. This means I was very critical of how the quote and its context may or may not qualify as a conflict perspective. This critique emphasis is based on the evidence in sociology and sociology of (adult) education literature that argues the conflict perspective is the common sub-dominant discourse and the consensus perspective the dominant discourse. This sociological evidence is taken in general, and is problematic, but serves as a beginning to offer a basis for a normative critical assessment of discourse in CME text.

With most CME text the differentiation between the two sociological perspectives was very easy. In some instances it was very difficult to distinguish the perspectives, as there were blends of both. In some instances I suspected the consensus perspective, as a discourse, was attempting to appropriate the conflict perspective in part, but without the substantial inclusion of the sociopolitical 'spirit' (or completeness) of the conflict perspective (see examples below). Figures 10 (youth/school) and 11 (professional/adult) provide a view of the CME text organized along a horizontal gradient of subjectivist to objectivist epistemology and along a vertical axis from consensus to conflict view ontologically (cf. Figure 8). The data was also organized within three epistemological spheres of 'it', 'I', and 'We' based upon Wilber's (1995) integral theory (a la Habermas)\textsuperscript{15}. 
Figure 10  Conflict Management Text: Youth/School

Note: Sample includes data from Schrumpf et al. (1991); Sorensen (1994); Johnson and Johnson (1995a)
Figure 11 Conflict Management Text: Adult/Professional

Note: Sample includes data from the first nine manuals/handbooks only.
In Figures 10 and 11 a solid black dot or an open circle represents one quotation of CME text. Open circles are used on the conflict side only. Figure 10 (youth/school), although, a limited sample of all the CME books, is likely representative, in that such consistency in conceptualizations (definitions) has already been found in the descriptive analysis of the data previously. Figure 10 shows that the consensus discourse is very predominant (95%). The conflict discourse (5%) is barely in the conflict perspective half of the figure. No significant difference in the frequency of subjectivist and objectivist discourses were found; nor did the distribution between 'it', 'I', and 'We' appear significant. Figure 11 (adult/professional) included a selected sample of nine out of 12 CME books. It again, is likely representative for the same reasons as the youth/school text. Figure 11 shows that consensus discourse is very predominant (87%). The conflict discourse (13%) is nearly three times higher in frequency than in the youth/school text. There is an appreciable difference in that 18% of the conflict discourse occurred in the objectivist domain and 7.5% in the subjectivist domain. This objective conflict discourse is due to Condliffe's (1991) writing alone. If Condliffe's book was not included in the sample of adult/professional text, the two figures would look virtually identical.

There is another difference between the two samples in terms of distribution of consensus discourse, where a heavier proportion of the quotes are in the 'it' (objectivist) area in the adult/professional text, relative to the youth/school text. But, this latter difference is highly subjective and marginally of significance or reliability. More significant and reliable, is the difference of the conflict discourse placement near the extreme end of the vertical continuum in the adult/professional sample; relative to the marginal conflict discourse placement near the mid-way of the vertical axis in the youth/school text sample.

"Classic" and "Modified" Conflict Perspective

This section gives some examples of quotes representing the two sociological discourses in Figure 10 and 11. As well, there are examples given where there appears to be a blending
and/or appropriation of a consensus discourse into a conflict discourse. This was significant enough in the data to make the distinction of "classic" and "modified."

First, a few examples of quotes from the youth/school text which are located in the four quadrants of Figure 10: **Lower Left (consensus-objectivist)**: "Students will learn that conflict is a potentially positive force..." (Schrumpf et al., 1991, p. 43) and "... positive life force" (Schrumpf et al., 1991, p. 5); "The synergy of conflict... [in nature]." (Schrumpf et al., 1991, p. 5); "... conflict act as a destructive force..." (Schmidt et al., 1992, p. vii). The rationale and obvious criteria for locating these quotes within the Lower Left quadrant includes the physics-like scientific language of "force" as if it is "life" itself, or of nature (recall the "natural" quotes in CME text in regard to conflict, earlier in this chapter). The term "synergy" is a systems science term which involves "energy" dynamics (and cooperation to synergize) and again, a reference to the elemental discourse domain (de-politicizing) of systems and nature (moving toward an organic location as we saw in a few quotes earlier in this chapter)-- all of these of which are 'typical' of a consensus discourse. **Upper Left (conflict-objectivist)**- "Causes of conflict. Sometimes when there are shortages of certain resources... conflicts result..." (Sorenson, 1994, p. 8); "Conflicts also result when there are shortages of certain resources such as time, space, money, power, influence, and position" (Sorenson, 1994, p. 90; Sorenson, 1992, p. 12). The latter quote regarding power, influence and position (implicitly, stratification and oppression?), as well as mentioning money (implicitly, classism and capitalism?) provide a sociopolitical context to the discussion of conflict as a concept. Although, these are descriptive statements and thus, minimally a conflict perspective, with little reference to changing the status quo in a normative discourse. **Lower Right (consensus-subjectivist)**- "... conflicts within and between the other sub-parts of the mind.... internal conflicts reside within us..." (Sorenson, 1992, p. 11); and Schrumpf et al. (1991) use of Glasser's cognitive-behavioral theory emphasizing conflict "within," "... conflicts-- they are a necessary part of our learning experiences" (Sorenson, 1994, p. 7). The consensus-subjectivist discourse in these quotes is
given because they are more involving "inner" parts of social reality, where mind/thought/choices are emphasized, along with experience. There is no political challenge to social power relations in these quotes to place them in the conflict perspective. Upper Right (conflict-subjectivist)- "If used appropriately: conflict... helps make change" (Concerned Teens, Inc., 1988, p. 12). The close link of conflict to change has a potential to enact a conflict discourse, but very minimally, because "change" could be anything-- including, maintaining the status quo for a change in a revolutionary condition.

In the adult/professional text the examples for each quadrant would be similar to the above. What is important, however, is to foreground some of Condliffe's (1991) quotes as examples of a decidedly conflict discourse in terms of conceptualizations of conflict (at least partially so)-- for example, Upper Left (conflict-objectivist)- "... change in structures [according to Dahrendorf] will depend upon the conflict that occurs" (p. 160); "Conflict can be seen to cause change either within the social system or of the whole system" (p. 9); "Conflict stimulates ... the overthrow of old norms and institutions" (p. 8) and Kessler (1978) noted that crimes are often a result of "unresolved conflict" (p. 2). The conflict perspective is most apparent as a discourse when conflict is connected to attempts to change the status quo, or act in ways that are deemed crime, rebellion, deviant, by the status quo that does not want to change its privileged status and domination of less-privileged.

Next, an analysis of "classic" and "modified" discourses on conflict were sorted. "Classic" refers to an explicit statement which is easily recognized by this author as either of the consensus or conflict perspective/theory discourse. "Modified" refers to a statement that has an implicit (less obvious) reference to either the consensus or conflict perspective/theory discourse. This exercise of sorting was carried out with all CME text using the following themes: "Definition," "Description," "Classification," "Location," and "Moral Status." Although, this data is not shown in this study, it was useful to pick out one example of where the blending and/or appropriation of discourses is evident. The critical interest in blending
and/or appropriation is due to the tendency of dominant discourses (e.g., consensus theory) to usurp and incorporate challenging and/or contradictory discourses (e.g., conflict theory).

A classic conflict perspective is very rare in the CME text, and those have already been documented under the Condliffe (1991) quotes above. A blended perspective comes from Putnam (1995, 183-4) as cited in Coates et al. (1997, p. 1). They wrote, "Conflict is not a breakdown of a cooperative, purposeful system." The conflict discourse emphasizes conflict is not pathological in systems. We saw plenty of evidence of this positive attitude toward conflict conveyed earlier in quotes (although, some authors prefer to keep conflict itself as neutral, and rather, to label destructive and constructive conflict in terms of practices/outcomes). The classic consensus discourse was to pathologize conflict, deny it for the most part, and focus on cooperation and consensus as the most important and essential part of social systems/societies. Deutsch (1973), a social psychologist, saw the only "conflict pathology," as the inability to deal with conflicts well (and he meant in a cooperative, constructive way). But Deutsch and the conflict positive generation of social theory and thinking tends to follow a discourse that is partly consensus and partly conflict (see Coser's "conflict functionalism" especially, as used in Condliffe, 1991). The maintenance of a discourse of consensus is maintained in these theorists by their assumption that the largely "cooperative and purposeful" social system is always in place as the ground upon which conflict(s) can be somewhat functional (especially, "useful" when they are handled well). This blended, if not appropriated, discourse is what has been termed "modified."

Almost all the quotes taken in this exercise above, have been shown to be "modified." No author takes the classic consensus (functionalist) position that conflict is pathological in social life. However, in later discussions (Chapter Four), the "modified" discourse of consensus is shown to be highly problematic in its biased conceptualization of conflict. No CME authors in this study, not even Condliffe (1991), have mentioned the consensus-conflict debate and its
implications for conceptualizing conflict and the impact of sociological discourse on prescribing how best to deal with conflict(s).

Interdisciplinary/Comparative Analysis Of CME Discourse

The sub-theme of inevitability of conflict can be found in many conceptualizations of conflict across the disciplines reviewed in this study. Frequently, in CME text, inevitability claims about conflict are linked to claims of conflict being natural, normal, essential, creative, and healthy in an essentialist, unquestionable, absolute way. Other CME text tend to stay "neutral" and focus on conflict being neither "positive" or "negative" in itself. Such judgments are made and labeled upon conflict situations based upon the way human beings handle the conflict—that is, either "constructively" (cooperatively) or "destructively" (competitively). The "problem" with conflict is in how humans deal with it, via their attitudes, their actions and so on. This discourse of inevitability has profound implications and problems re: conceptualizing conflict in social life.

From earlier chapters, conflict is seen in various disciplines as inevitable in social life because there are "opposing" or "divergent interests" in some form or other whenever groups of people are together—for example: (1) Anthropology—Levi-Strauss's notions have partially influenced the thinking that conflict is ubiquitous in all cultures but they each have different ways of managing conflict; Bjorkqvist (1997) sees this inevitability from a functionalist perspective (following sociological theorists like Parson's, Smelser and Coser—of which only Coser is a 'minor' politically conservative conflict theorist, and the other two are more theorizing from within a consensus perspective); Fry (1996) sees conflict as inevitable but aggression is not, a view similar to Fetherston and Nordstrom (1994)—both Fry and Fetherston and Nordstrom tend to include subjectivist type language re: "human needs" and "perceived divergent interests," respectively, when conceptualizing conflict and its origins, (2) Sociology—a little less subjectivist than anthropological conceptions of conflict, sociology tends to
emphasize "opposition" and "competition for shortage of resources," often within a materialist-objectivist framework but this is less Marxist in views within conflict sociology (a la Collins and his Weberian interest in power, competition and conflict); Simmel and Coser and Dahrendorf generally see conflict as inevitable and particularly Coser attempted to make conflict functional, in that it may stop the breakdown of consensus in societies— it is not dysfunctional or pathological inherently— although, Coser's definition of social conflict included violent aspects; Collins (1992) sees the inevitability of conflict and its role in shaping the "... distribution of power, wealth, and prestige..." (p. 288) but his view is less benign than the consensus perspective. Communication— this field generally sees conflict as a "fact of life" where it can be both positive and sometimes negative depending on how people socially constructive it, and handle it— conflict originates from "... opposing interests, views, opinions" (Cahn, 1990, p. xii; Nicholson, 1991); Ogley (1991) sees conflict can be "healthy" or "natural" but a destructive violent side is possible too. Cognitive-Behavioral Psychology— implicitly states the obvious inevitability and functionality of conflict in individual choices, functioning of the mind, in responses to stimulus, and interrelations generally— although, some psychopathological links with conflict are more characteristic of thinking in the 1970s and in depth psychoanalytical traditions. Social Psychology— assumes an inevitability of conflict as part of group dynamics and choices of "approach" or "avoidance" (K. Lewin), which are thought to be related to "laws of nature." Deutsch focused on "incompatible activities" amongst the conflict parties but a subjectivist psychological interest (and "social behaviorism" a la G. H. Mead) dominates in the conceptualization of Deutsch and most mainstream social psychology. Deutsch preferred to define conflict as "cooperative," rather than "competitive" (the latter which had dominated a lot of 19th century social thinking in the northwestern world).
Conflict-Positive Reform In CME

Generally, then, CME text on the inevitability and naturalness and/or functionality discourse as part of conflict conceptualizations, is consistent with a lot of the literature reviewed across disciplines. Sociology is the only discipline, particularly the conflict perspective, that does not specifically comment on conflict as "natural" or justifiable by "natural" or "scientific" laws or principles. From the literature reviewed in this study, the larger context of historical, ideological, social and political contexts is particularly important in sociology (and less so in anthropology), in terms of conceptualizing conflict. However, all disciplines neglected a systematic analysis of conflict as a concept itself and the problematics of how to best know what 'conflict' itself is. The individualism and psychologism in many of the definitions of conflict in communications, cognitive-behavioral psychology and social psychology seem to be used in CME text frequently (especially Deutsch). Social psychology discourses, and their politically conservative liberalism (Collins, 1994, Fox and Prilleltensky, 1997; Wetherell and Potter, 1992) are particularly evident in CME text. The functionalist and consensus perspective is dominant, with functionalism, pragmatism, utilitarianism, rationalism, modernism and white middle classism (see Wetherell and Potter, 1992). CME text, although beginning to look at cultural diversity and hegemony of its approaches to conflict and conflict management, still has not utilized the conflict perspective in sociology nor the challenging skeptical views of anthropology in regard to the North American naive assumptions that 'peace and harmony' and consensus are always best (e.g., Avruch, 1998; Colson, 1995; Moore, 1995).

Ignoring the criticisms of social psychology's assumptions is particularly problematic because many of the assumptions are found in other disciplines (note in Chapter Three, how often Deutsch is cited in other disciplines, although not in the sociology literature and conceptualizations of conflict). From the literature reviewed, it is evident that from Mary Parker Follett (1920-30s), to Deutsch (1940s on), to Coser (1950s on), there is an apparent "progressive" movement in CME to make conflict "positive"— at least in a general way (recall...
the "modified" discussion earlier in this chapter). This has led people in organizational and business fields to talk about the "conflict-positive organization" (Tjosvold, 1993) and "conflict-positive schools" (cf. Johnson and Johnson's work in CME). The CME text is full of implicit and explicit discourse on this move to make conflict a 'positive' event-- or at least, to suggest a conflict-positive attitude is one where conflict is not denied, but dealt with in rational ways. The purpose of course, is to find a solution or resolution, as efficiently as possible. Notice, that this conflict-positive attitude steeped in a consensus-based social psychology, has "common" interests to Collins's (1994) conflict sociology. Collins wrote that the conflict perspective foregrounds conflict, and presupposes that if conflict is not taking place, then domination is. Apparently, the social psychology view is saying it is good to show conflict also. But the differences ideologically between the two are major (see discussion in Chapter Four). The consensus-conflict debate, historically, sociopolitically, and metaphysically (cf. Bernard, 1983), is not taken up in the CME text, social psychology, or any of the other disciplines (other than sociology) that were reviewed.

As part of this move, originating from Follett, Deutsch and Coser, there is a focus on seeing (and constructing knowledge about) conflict as inevitable, necessary, and 'natural' within healthy functioning systems/organizations. Tjosvold (1993) wrote, "Our studies suggest that within organizations most conflicts occur when people have cooperative interests" (p. 7). These conflict educators and theorists have given a strong emphasis on "intragroup" or ("within") conflict. Albeit, Deutsch also studied intergroup conflict. The cooperative over competitive framing seems to work "best," say these authors, for conflict within organizations that have a lot of similar interests in common. Whether that is true or not, the cooperative model and conceptualization to conflict and conflict management is often broad-brushed across all types of conflicts (and disciplines) in the CME text with little, or no critical differentiation as to the applicability of the Follett-Deutsch-Coser functionalist "conflict-positive" framework.
The quasi-experimental research and empirical nature of this conflict-positive discourse, given unproblematically in the CME text, probably makes it more appealing to the practical applications of a means to apply a "social technology"—that is, conflict management/resolution by "managers" and "administrators." Furthermore, the conflict-positive writers (and CME text) do not address the very conflict they are part of in choosing a "cooperative" (consensus theory) over "competitive" (conflict theory\textsuperscript{20}) approach to conceptualizing conflict. They seem to deny their own claim that it is important to deal with conflict up front and as part of life and being conflict-positive. They do not confront the conflict and power/knowledge dynamic of their own positioning in their Follett-Deutsch-Coser theoretical stance. See below, for a further critique of this bias and denial of conflict, from a social epistemological (Foucauldian) view.

**CME Text From A Foucauldian Perspective**

**Introduction**

The third part of the three-in-one CDA involves applying Foucault's analysis of power/knowledge and other central concepts (see Appendix IV). This study is limited to a particular CDA of conceptualizations of 'conflict' in the CME text. Not all CME text has been analyzed but would be important for a more complete analysis. At times, the larger aspects of CME, as a new social movement creating and promoting certain kinds of knowledge, are included as supplemental to the analysis of conceptualizations of 'conflict.' This third part of the CDA is unique from the other two forms of analysis because it is not a focus on the actual definitions or conceptualizations of conflict per se, but is more interested in the way the conceptualizations of conflict are produced as a social and educational practice (a la Popkewitz et al. and the social epistemology of knowledge/curriculum).
No Acknowledgement Of Discourse

The CME text in conceptualizing conflict (and in general) does not enter into a discussion and acknowledgement that everything written in the text is part of a relativist narrative with various discourses. Language, symbol, discursive formations, and discourse are unproblematically accepted in the CME text, with no elaboration of the power/knowledge dynamics involved. In other words, the words and language, their construction and meaning, are not implicated by the authors as part of knowledge formations that carry certain claims about "truth" and the power that goes with that. A Foucauldian awareness in the development of CME text, may include as statement for the readers which suggests the text is laiden with discourses about the nature and role of conflict-- and, that there is uncertainty and ambivalence, contradictions and doubts that are part of the formation of the knowledge of conflict expressed herein.

In Chapter One a few critical authors in CME suggested the knowledge foundations of conflict resolution/management as a field are not always clearly spelled out for readers. In some cases textbooks are very narrow and biased (Burgess and Burgess, 1997). What could also have been mentioned, is that the knowledge consists of discourses with historical and sociopolitical biases. But Foucauldian analysis of discourse, challenges the knowledge formations of CME even further. Discourses are a contested battleground. Foucault (cf. also Pecheux in Mills, 1997, p. 116) argued that discourses are not static and benign (i.e., politically value-neutral)-- meaning, they come out of oppositions historically and politically. They are in battle, competition, and conflict with other discourses. Discourses function within the networks and actions of power in societies and organizations.

There is no acknowledgement in the CME text that the predominant discourse on conflict presented is in an actual battle/conflict for the privilege of its representation in the CME text. If that was acknowledged, then the subjugated (subdominant) knowledges would have been acknowledged and thus power/ knowledge differentials would be exposed in CME as a new
social movement and social educative practice. For example, the conflict theory/perspective and tradition (a la Collins, Black and so on) would have been acknowledged as left out of discussions about the conceptualization of conflict knowledge in the CME text. The consensus-conflict debate (a la Bernard) in social theory and sociology would have been mentioned, as well. The domination of social psychology, as a discipline, and a 'big' power-player in the discourse formation of conceptualizations of conflict, would also have been acknowledged as being largely privileged.

The problematics of how some CME promoters prefer a philosophy of peace education and others conflict education, or methods of cooperation rather than competition (a la Follett-Deutsch) would have been discussed in terms of the politics of these choices. The continual downplaying and rejection of competition and competitive approaches to conflict resolution in much of the CME text could be construed as competitive domination itself. Who benefits from such competition? If cooperation were truly being practiced by the CME authors involved in this study, would they not wish to cooperate with the conflict tradition or a postmodern view? Apparently not. Without these acknowledgements of hegemonic discourses, the reader is left with no easy way to challenge the CME "regime of truth" that is being perpetuated by the authority of the CME text, facilitators, trainers, or educators involved.

In Foucault's terms, there is an "expert knowledge" that is given and largely unquestioned in this neglect to mention discourse. This constructs learners in a way that produces passive recipients of technical expert discursive formations. In other words, the knowledge itself becomes part of a disciplinarity by experts, in which the students are disciplined into conformity with the expert knowledge. The use of certification processes and other methods in CME training may add to the passive subjection of learners. This is particularly a concern in light of Pirie's (1998) criticism that ADR discourse is a "... new hegemony of social control..." (p. 514). As well, there has been evidence offered in critiques in Chapter Two that the dispute resolution literature has a tendency and "preoccupation with consensus" (Harrington and
Merry, 1988) or what Nader (1983) called a "harmony ideology" (cited in Pirie, 1998, p. 514). Lederach's (1995) concern that the conflict resolution field has recently become dominated by managerial approaches, with control and predictability (one could add rationality, modernity and positivistic scientism), is an additional reason to challenge the neglect of CME text to openly acknowledge its discourses. The CME text did not acknowledge that its representation of knowledge about conflict could stir up more social conflict as it is attempting to manage and resolve conflict (cf. Luke, 1995-96 and "new social conflicts").

The hegemony of discourse on conflict comes through in a few examples from CME text. In Sorenson (1994) an exercise is provided for students/teachers whereby they are to engage in "Defining the Conflict." Notice, how understanding what conflict is has been de-emphasized and conflict as a "form" is constructed for the learner, and the learner is allowed to "define" "the conflict," but not allowed or encouraged to question what is "conflict" in the first place. This is the unproblematic transposition (operationalizing) that has been pointed out in this study as moving quickly and pragmatically from conflict as a concept to conflicts as behaviors in a situation. The exercise reads as follows:

How you describe or define [i.e., understand] a conflict affects how you will attempt to resolve it. For successful conflict resolution, it is important to develop a skill for defining conflicts. There are several important steps to follow to define a conflict in a way that will aid in its resolution [assuming this is possible].

1. Describe the conflict in a win/win [cooperative] rather than a win/lose or lose/win fashion.... (p. 150).

In this example (and there are others), the learners have to take the "expert knowledge" (opinion) for granted that it is better to understand and define (conceptualize) conflict as "conflicts" within a cooperative win/win framework, as opposed to other options. It is this
opposition of discourses that is unproblematically by-passed and thus, learners are not encouraged in this exercise to challenge the technique being taught, nor are they informed of the political and power implications of the expert knowledge and its bias-- nor are they told that this move is "forced" upon them to take the "win/win" option because it is actually competing for privilege over other options.

Another common example in several of the CME books studied, was the exercise offered to the learners regarding "understanding" or "defining" conflict. Typically, these exercises involve the teacher or trainer asking students to "define conflict.22" The students write a list of words, situations, and experiences down on paper about what they think conflict is (e.g., Schrumpf et al, 1991, p. 43). Then the teacher is told in the manual to give "the [right] definition" for conflict— meaning, the definition that is used unproblem-atically in the CME text (see all the examples of defining conflict(s) in the earlier discussion). One wonders why, and how much power is given to the students own definition of conflict-- or worse, the definition of conflict elicited was never clarified with the distinction that the concept of conflict is not the same as the description/ experiences of various conflicts the students may have written down. The students are not informed that the way of conceptualizing conflict(s) is based on power/ knowledge dynamics, where some definitions or conceptualizations of conflict are given privilege over others. What might be the implications of this privileging of conceptualizations of conflict? The students/ learners are not (at least textually) encouraged engagement in this question in a Foucauldian manner. Why not? Who privileges from this lack of challenging the power/knowledge relations of the field of conflict management/resolution? or the classroom in which this knowledge is transmitted to others?

**Neglect Of Cultural Sensitivity**

The above approach to conflict, as knowledge and as pedagogy, appears to carry a cultural bias as well. There are no acknowledgements that the conceptualizing of conflict may be
differently understood by people in different cultural groups— for example, a lesbian, a working
class person, someone from Asia and so on. No cultural differences are recognized. There are a
few CME text that recognize briefly the cultural differences in how conflict is handled or
reacted to. But the actual conceptualization of conflict across cultures and cultural identity
groups is not discussed. When one thinks of the diverse ethnic, race, gender, class and cultural
differences in the average classroom of youth or adults today, it is clearly a dominant W.
Eurocentric and modernist conceptualization of conflict that is being represented as a totalizing
universal narrative.

The "scientific" background in the disciplinary knowledges of psychology and social
psychology appears to dictate in dogmatic form the conceptualization of conflict that is best for
learners of all kinds and in all places. This is more problematic, when one examines the basic
definition of conflict(s) across the disciplines and finds a great deal of repetition and
uniformity in defining conflict(s).24 The CME text are even more monolithic in their
conceptualization of conflict(s). Terry Eagleton (cited in Harvey, 1989, p. 9) wrote about the
"terroristic function of metanarratives" in modernist discourse, where only certain people of
privilege are given the voice to define concepts and to define language use, based on ideologies
of power and control over others.25 Most critical theory, Foucauldian, poststructuralist,
postmodernist, feminist and post-colonial critical traditions of knowledge would not accept this
hegemony of discourse without cultural and local-relative sensitivity in the defining and
conceptualizing of conflict.

Monolithic Normalizing And Naturalizing

As mentioned above there is a good deal of monolithic similarity in the CME text in
regard to conceptualizing conflict. This inter-textual similarity could be due to use of a
common language of common sense use as preferred by managers, administrators and those
teachers and facilitators with a practical interest alone to technically manage or resolve
conflict(s). Without a good deal of self-reflexivity in these conceptualizations it is fairly common to see some authors, especially in youth/school CME, using similar statements and sometimes exact statements. It appears they use each others writing to more easily write their own books, and they begin to reference each other and thus establishing a form of self-enclosed, non-critical acceptance of fundamental assumptions in the construction of conflict knowledge.

This monolithic "expert" valorisation of conflict knowledge leads to and reinforces a pattern of CME text that normalizes knowledge. In other words, the CME text begins to be collectively a body of normal knowledge. This normalizing then has the implicit power to make a conceptualization of conflict, either 'normal' (and thus "correct") or 'abnormal' (and thus "incorrect," or dangerous and pathological— i.e., a threat to the status quo stability of normal). Foucault has argued that normalizing creates a useful, and potentially oppressive tool for administrative purposes, for regulating and legitimating certain knowledges and legitimating certain regulatory social practices of institutions (in this study this could be a workplace, school, etc.). Authority is granted to what is 'normal.' Purely by repetition of the same kinds of conceptualizations of conflict throughout the CME text, there is a tendency to construct a normal conceptualization of conflict and to construct the normalizing discourse and its power to dominate 'other' opposing conceptualizations.

The normalizing of text and the discourse of universalizing or totalizing, characteristic of modernity, make this Foucauldian critique one of the most important. To strengthen normalizing one adds naturalizing. These social practices reinforce the power of authority. Two examples of CME text demonstrate the tone and content of linking normalizing and naturalizing: (1) in Schrumpf et al. (1991) (student manual), the section called "Understanding Conflict" is pedagogically more about universalizing dogmatism than education. They wrote,
STATEMENTS ABOUT CONFLICT- People live, work, and play together, and it is important for them to get along. To do so, people must understand the following ideas about conflict.
- Conflict is a natural part of everyday life.
- Conflict can be handled in positive or negative ways.
- Conflict can have either creative or destructive results.
- Conflict can be a positive force for personal growth and social change. (p. 7).

Earlier in this chapter, we saw several examples of CME text, either explicitly or implicitly, claiming that conflict is normal, inevitable and natural. In the above example, there is no question about this claim. Normal is implied and natural is explicitly stated. In the next example the dogmatism is repeated in content and in the tone of unquestionable presentation of the "facts." (2) in Bodine and Crawford (1998) the Chapter on "Understanding Conflict As A Learning Opportunity" they wrote,

Conflict is a discord of needs, drives, wishes, or demands.... Conflict is a natural, vital part of life.... Without conflict, there would likely be no personal growth or social change.... In every conflict, the individual has a choice: to be driven by negative perceptions or to take control of the situation and act positively. (p. 35)

So clearly, these are claims about conflict and conflict practices that are from a viewpoint (albeit well-intentioned) that is privileged by race and class (at least). These claims could both be deconstructed from many places where power and privilege of positionality of the author(s) could be revealed. That detailed analysis is beyond the scope of this study. What is important, is to notice that conflict knowledge is being presented as a relatively consistent normal knowledge about conflict. Conflict itself, is being constructed as normal (everyday) and as natural (reinforced by the "inevitability" text discussed earlier). The move to add natural is very powerful because it legitimates conflict as the way of the whole system, of Nature, of
society\textsuperscript{26}-- without allowing a questioning about the social-cultural-political domination that accompanies conflict (DFCV cycle). Equally problematic, is the jump from claiming the human condition is one of "conflict" but that does not deal with explicating the type of human condition (e.g., under oppressive capitalism and economic globalization) that is being referred to. For others, like myself, the human condition and human nature are not at all of the same category and thus, to claim the human condition is human nature is highly problematic.

It would not be a large stretch to claim that if conflict is natural (or organic\textsuperscript{27}), then domination/violence is natural (a typical social Darwinist claim). Natural implicitly makes this domination/violence OK? (or at least, makes domination/violence "inevitable"?). This is highly problematic and filled with contradictions, as a consensus rhetoric of "whole" and "system" is implied to legitimate knowledge claims; and at the same time, an early traditional "conflict perspective" (or 'competition perspective' \textit{a la} social Darwinism) is implied. This is not surprising as discourses tend to have a 'life of their own' and move in and out of text and language. A detailed CDA would examine these contradictions further and bring forth the challenge of greater self-reflexivity in utterances and text.

The difficulty with these statements above, is that they are given as "the understanding" that is to be learned about the nature of conflict. And notice, there is no declaration, or reminder that the authors are distinguishing between "destructive" or "constructive" conflict. Why is this distinction not being made? Why are all the claims given above written as "Conflict is..." without uncertainty or doubt and without acknowledgement this is only one perspective. The use of privileged expert knowledge above all other knowledges, leads this author to claim this is dogmatic propaganda not education.

**Disciplinarity, Rationality, Governmentality And Moral Responsibility**

The CME text is completely informed with rational and reasonable language. There is no easy way to transmit to the reader this quality. I would refer readers to experience the text and
its logicalness, use of reason and overall "rational" approach to both understanding conflict and conflict processes of management and resolution. *Self* and *other* regulation, control of irrationality (e.g., anger emotions, or desire as non-rationality) is common throughout. The conceptualization of conflict is very unimaginative and, as already stated, is rather technical, rational and scientistic (positivistic), within the disciplinary discourses of psychology and social psychology.

The attempt to make 'conflict,' as a social phenomenon, a controllable and understandable concept or operational construct-- that is, a measurable behavior or event, is ubiquitous and dominant. This is likely to be the very nature of training in conflict management-- where something very complex, is intended to be simplified, reduced and "managed." The managerialism of CME was pointed out in Chapter One. Foucault's work has challenged the human sciences as disciplinary knowledges and their so-called "rationality." He showed, the discourses were often anything but rational and humanistic and rather, they constructed and legitimated social and institutional practices of punishment (e.g., in criminalizing deviance, madness, sexual behavior etc.), a form of violence itself.

The conceptualizing of conflict in this expert-authoritative-disciplinary fashion in CME text may both construct and reflect the disciplinary intention (and punishment?) that is offered in the conflict knowledge and conflict practices prescribed. Most of the CME text is written for use in institutional settings that tend to normalize (naturalize) within the acceptable bounds of that "organizational culture." The power/knowledge dynamics of institutions and bureaucracies are problematic-- none of the CME text deal with this governmentality in their discussions. The context of application of the "techniques" and "knowledge" about conflict are largely ignored.

It does appear, at first glance, that conflict is constructed in these conflict-positive discourses as non-deviant, non-criminal and non-pathological (i.e., the "modified" version of consensus-functionalism). However, there is a definite pattern to control, resolve, manage, and eliminate "conflict" (could read "deviance" or "disruption") at the same time. More
contradictions exist than the authors of these texts are willing to acknowledge. The cooperation, consensus and collaboration agenda is clearly hegemonic over competition. In most of the CME text, implicitly, "competition" is rejected as morally unacceptable. It is assumed that competition leads to "destructive" conflict management—i.e., violence. Most importantly, it appears "conflict" is no longer made morally 'bad' but how one handles conflict is constructed in this morally 'bad' discourse. This is implicit in most all the CME text. The CME is dedicated to "correcting" bad habits, or inappropriate ways of handling conflict. Presumably, these texts, then perpetuate a notion that violence (DFCV cycle) can be intervened with successfully by rational moralistic means. This discussion would take us beyond the conceptualization of conflict. But it is likely that the limiting of discordant and conflicting views of the conceptualization of conflict is part of the rationalizing, moralizing, normalizing and naturalizing pattern of discourse that goes with modernity in its most destructive aspects.

The governmental (as a form of power/knowledge and regulation) is evident in the CME text where conceptualizations of conflict are based on an expert-professionalism and authority to regulate the discordance of views of oppositional definitions and conceptualizations of conflict. This is not explicitly stated anywhere in the CME text. However, there is no encouragement to move beyond the regulating (regulations and rules) about what a student/learner must know and accept as the best understanding of conflict— in order to then best manage or resolve conflict(s). The learner/student must be morally responsible to gain this given knowledge about conflict and then practice the conflict practices following these "rules" and pre-given knowledges from the authorities. Moral responsibility, in terms of violence prevention, is then located in the individual to accept normal conceptualizations of conflict that they did not have power to participate in and challenge. This is another contradiction in terms of constructing civil morally responsible students, which CME texts imply continually. Is the process of constructing both conflict knowledge and conflictworkers in these texts a democratic process? Is it educative or is it propagandist
conditioning in 'fear' that one may be labelled "abnormal," or implicitly excluded from the "morally responsible" majority taking the CME programs-- excluded, because they are not choosing to follow the normative rules and regulations of CME? This moralizing discourse is well "hidden" in the CME text for the most part, but does occur more obviously at times. Although some texts are challenging the moral irresponsibility of violent societies in the introduction, the texts, generally neglect to locate the responsibility for social conflict in the institutions and social practices that are legitimated by the authorities (which is what the conflict tradition theorists would do predominantly). This locating of moral responsibility primarily on individual students/learners is a crucial part of implementing self-regulation in students/learners as part of the governing of their desires and individual critical thinking\(^{29}\) (see more detailed discussion in Chapter Four). Governmentality is not readily evident in the CME text on conceptualizations of conflict but is most recognizable in discussions of how conflict management/resolution practices are prescribed to be done-- as, what Foucault would likely have called social technologies of control (surveillance and self-surveillance). See Appendix IV on pastoral power and its role in governmentality.

**Chapter Summary**

Chapter Three offers an interpretation of the data collected from the CME text. This is done using a three-in-one critical discourse analysis that included: (1) a conflict perspective, (2) an interdisciplinary/comparative perspective and, (3) a Foucauldian perspective. The focus of the interpretation is on conflict as a concept in the CME text and not on the conflict practices of management and resolution. Although, the CME text, as discursive practice and discourse is included as part of conflict practice.

The central role of "understanding" conflict in the CME text is foregrounded, as well as the problematics of the biases involved. The hegemony of "cooperative" ("constructive") approaches over "competitive" ("destructive") approaches to understanding and framing
conceptualizations of conflict is noted; and is related to the consensus-conflict debate in social theory and sociology discourse. This is arguably, a competitive and exclusionary discourse within CME itself but is not acknowledged in the CME text.

Emphasis on conflicts (behaviorally) rather than the concept of conflict itself, is seen as part of a pragmatic social behaviorism with roots in social psychology. Social psychology, in particular, appears to have had, and continues to have, the most influence in the knowledge formations of CME text. The power/knowledge dynamics of how CME text construct the conceptualizations of conflict are analyzed and critiqued. Violence is rarely mentioned in the texts, and the larger social conflicts of sexism, racism and classism (for examples) are not included in the problematics of defining or conceptualizing conflict and presents possibilities of the CME text perpetuating the very violence it seeks to undermine.

*****

1 Text, as used in this report refers to words/language in written form, rather than a text book.
2 CME text in this Chapter 3, refers to the 22 training manuals and handbooks studied in this research.
3 Conflict practices includes any actions, thinking, or feelings, which are part of an aware and intentional practice to either increase conflict(s) or decrease conflict(s). There is no judgement applied to conflict practices as either good or bad, right or wrong. I distinguish this from the use of the term conflict habitus, the latter, which refers to conflict practices that are largely unconscious and conditioned by sociocultural myths, norms, and so forth.
4 From a mediator's viewpoint: "Conflict can be diagnosed... diagnosing the causes of conflict in order to develop a hypothesis regarding possible interventions." (Boulle and Kelly, 1998, p. 47).
5 G. Morgan (1986), writing on the political activity of organizations and groups, suggested "One of the most important ways of understanding conflict is through the medium of power (Morgan, 1986, 158-85). It is through power that members of organisations are provided with means to enhance their interests and resolve or perpetuate conflict." (Condliffe, 1991, p. 155). Critical readers may argue that my claim of "infrequently" is inaccurate. For example, Charlton and Dewdney (1995) both mention power in mediation and claim, "A great deal of the academic literature on mediation focuses on inequalities of power and what mediators should or can do to redress any imbalances." (p. 238-9). These authors use "power" in a non-Foucauldian manner and all the uses of power in the CME text are not within a conflict perspective. For these omissions, and the "thin" use of the word "power," they are not seen as very significant contributions to a power discourse critical evaluation within CME practices or theory. For example, Charlton and Dewdney (1995) refer to quantitative, thing-like conceptualizations of power, when they wrote, "Children and adolescents have tremendous power over their parents.... Lack of knowledge is a prime source of power imbalance....". (p. 239-40) These are not conceptualizations of a rich conceptualization of power in many critical postmodern (a la Foucault, Popkewitz) or conflict perspectives. Girard and Koch (1996) come close to the view of power taken in this study, but they do not develop it. They wrote, "Power is also a constant presence and influence in any conflict situation. According to Hocker and Wilmot (1991), power may flow from expertise, control of resources, interpersonal connections, or communication skills. Institutional
policies, rules, and practices (along with informal controls) give members of one group more power than others..." (p. 83). See also Haddigan (1997a, p. 17) for a somewhat similar conception of power to that of Foucault's.

6 "To create conflict positive schools [also called cooperative school," (p. 29)], educators first need a general understanding of conflict. They need to apply that understanding within the context of a school environment...". (Johnson and Johnson, 1995, p. 13)

7 "Our culture is producing a growing population of hostile, unattached children with weak conscience development. We must have the guts to stand up to those who would discard an entire generation of children in conflict." [they identify "children at risk", "childhood bullies" etc.] (Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. 22). For a critical discourse analysis of "at-risk children" discourses in today's society and educational systems, see Martineau (1999).

8 Conflict pathology describing the condition when "There was no constructive way of dealing with conflict when it did arise." (Kessler, 1978, p. 2).

9 Several manuals for schools try to "sell" CME as a way to decrease discipline problems in schools and the communities. Among the many goals of CME, "... improving the learning environment through better classroom management and more student-centered discipline." (Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. xiii) is common, either implicit or explicit in the text. Sweeney and Carruthers (1996) pointed out that "... early methods of resolving conflicts were often punitive." in many school systems (p. 329). As consultants and counselors in schools, Sweeney and Carruthers have seen the common case "... that conflict resolution programs typically get their start in a school because of staff member's interest in how they may help to alleviate student conflict. It is our experience that school staff members first ask how well these programs operate with students before they begin to ask how the principles and practices apply to themselves.... A study of educational practices in history reveals that methods of conflict resolution in schools have evolved from systems heavily dependent on externally based rewards and punishments to systems that mix external controls with internally based forms of self-discipline." (p. 329). M. Collins (1998) argued that violence prevention has to begin in schools with the adults who run them. Many of the CME manuals mention the need for "violence prevention" and that "students who are at risk" to be violent, will likely benefit from strategies that include "conflict resolution life skills" (e.g., Bodine and Crawford, 1998, xiv). CME is apparently taking place in an atmosphere of "crisis." How does that crisis management mentality impact on the learning process and the construction of conflict knowledge by trainers, teachers and learners? The social control of so called "deviant behavior" is implied in this disciplinarity that is inherent in the CME text studied. The sociocultural and political implications of constructing "deviance" is a large topic that this thesis cannot enter into fully. Although, it is important to keep in mind that with crisis and the fear of violence there is likely an increasing tendency to "use" CME for means, other than what they were intended (as Sweeney and Carruthers, 1996 exemplify in their mild critique of CME tending toward use as a disciplinary strategy in schools that don't fully understand the conflict resolution programs). This attempt to have students internally self-regulate and control their peers through conflict practices, constructed as "positive," requires thorough analysis as to who benefits from such internal self-regulation of conflict? With schools known to serve a conserving function of the state and elite classes in society (Postman, 1979)-- and managing of social order via socialization, discipline and punishment (a la Foucault), CME can be easily problematized (cf discussion in Chapter Four).

10 Johnson and Johnson (1995a) remark that their work is based on the earlier work of Deutsch and even back further to Kurt Lewin (1935, 1948) (both in social psychology of conflict).

11 The most text was devoted to conceptualization of conflicts, which dominate the discussion. Little discussion is ever devoted to conflict as a concept per se (see below under Definition Theme).

12 Although, in a few manuals there is an exercise in which students are asked to write down their view (or associations) with "conflict"-- which, arguably, is a meagre attempt to have them define conflict for themselves.

13 Never does the CME text refer to a "hidden curriculum" of CME.

14 Bodine and Crawford (1998) noted that this statement is the core of the ideas behind the Children's Creative Response To Conflict program in 1972, which grew from the Quaker Community Project in New York City (p. 91).

15 This is an experiment and would require more work and definition in future studies on epistemology and conflict knowledge (e.g., CME text). The three part scheme relates to how 'reality' is being talked about, viewed and studied--as an 'it' (object, 'externality', as in methodological positivism), as an 'I' (subject, individuality) and as 'We' (subject, collectivity)-- with the latter two either of a more external or internal focus.
students/learners and themselves as teachers and facilitators. These various "regimes of truth," as Foucault called them, about conflict, is likely to reflect the dominant discourse of how the CME text "tells the truth" about conflict. How the dominant discourse "tells the truth" about conflict(s) that such a move involves constructing "conflict-positive." The exercise of defining conflict begins by stating the pre-given notion by the instructor of what is conflict: then viewers/participants are asked how they feel, that is, "how the conflict made them feel." The predominant transition to move from talking about conflict as a concept to conflicts as an operational action, behavior or event, is a powerful way of ordering and categorizing a social phenomenon. It could be argued that such a move involves constructing conflict(s) as an object, via reification. This also may involve constructing subjects (learners), in ways which limit their positioning relative to the phenomena of social conflict. That is, the mainstream status quo structures of society are not thought to be generally problematic (i.e., coercive and oppressive).

It would not be a stretch to call the conflict perspective "conflict-negative" relative to the way the CME text constructs "conflict-positive." Obviously, researchers and theorists within anthropology and sociology would not be interested in constructing the concept "conflict-negative." One has to ask, why "conflict-positive" is given such weight in CME text and this social movement generally? I would suggest, it is a discourse that is attempting to promote what looks like a landslide transformation of thinking — progressivism— in attitudes about conflict and how to best handle it. The "transformation" has appropriated discourse and language from the marginal community of oppressed groups, like gays and lesbians. This is highly problematic. The "transformation" is a "reform" at best, and at worst, it is not progressive at all, because of how it leaves out and ignores the conflict perspective on conflict. It is a reform, that more looks like ideology and propagandizing using a very "positive" appropriation of emancipatory language/discourse. "Positive" is the 'in' thing in North American popular culture these days (see the 'new age' literature and most self-help personal growth literature in most any book store).

"Because its roots are so diverse and its applications so widespread, it is difficult for people who are interested in this new field to find information about the conflict resolution 'knowledge base.' Textbooks are available, but each tends to examine only one aspect of the field-- in part because it is so large but also because it is growing so rapidly." (p. viii).

Girard and Koch (1996) set the objective that the students/learners ought to "... develop a clear definition of conflict, acknowledge the pervasiveness of conflict..." (p. 1). Note, these are given as a fact of social life, when the very definition of conflict is already decided by the CME text (the "experts"). On what grounds, is a "clear" definition of conflict possible, preferable (and preferable to what other options), or 'real?' If students define conflict in their own way, does that mean they will necessarily agree that such a "pervasiveness of conflict" is real? What is real? How would they know? The questions not asked in this form of pedagogy dealing with conflict, are as important as the questions asked.

Also, the students are asked to compare their answers to the "given" definition in the manual or on the board, as given by the teacher of the training. There is never encouragement in the CME text to take individual/group constructions and modify or change completely the definition given in the manual or on the board by the "experts." The Federal Emergency Management Agency (1991) trains leaders. The exercise of defining conflict begins (p. iv-2) with staging a conflict (pre-given notion by the instructor of what is conflict) -- then viewers/participants are asked how they feel, that is, "... how the conflict made them feel." The instructions in the manual then say, "Then the instructor defines conflict, inviting input from the participants." But no specification is given as the how that "input" is to be dealt with and the issue of expert-power-knowledge involved in the defining. The overhead for the instructor is also pre-given and is to be shown to the class to take down as notes. The overhead reads: "What is Conflict? Conflict- occurs when goals or preferences of one person or organization are blocked by the actions of another." (p. 7).

The predominant transition to move from talking about conflict as a concept to conflicts as an operational action, behavior or event, is a powerful way of ordering and categorizing a social phenomenon. It could be argued that such a move involves constructing conflict(s) as an object, via reification. This also may involve constructing subjects (learners), in ways which limit their positioning relative to the phenomena of social conflict. This topic is taken up in Chapter Four.

A Foucauldian perspective would look at the "discursive rules" and "regulations" that are explicit or implicit in the CME text, which permit or forbid some statements or types of questions. How the dominant discourse "tells the truth" about conflict, is likely to reflect the dominant discourse of how the CME text "tells the truth" about students/learners and themselves as teachers and facilitators. These various "regimes of truth," as Foucault called...
them, may unveil how we tell the truth about the world condition or organization we are living and/or working within.

26 This is the use of a "transcendental" essential aspect to the conceptualization of conflict that makes it beyond any social structure or cultural conditioning/practices. This has metaphysical implications.


28 What is contradictory in the CME text, is the move to bring about greater individual responsibility in resolving and managing conflict(s) (less institutional and social responsibility?)-- and yet, at the same time the professionalism of institutions (disciplines of knowledge) is dictating what the conceptualization of conflict is and should be. This latter move, taking away the individual responsibility in constructing the understanding of conflict.

29 This is another contradictory aspect of the CME text. The CME text and programs often link conflict management/resolution skills with general abilities of critical thinking skills and problem-solving skills. Apparently, such skills are only to be utilized in a very narrow way, and not to deconstruct the structures of the status quo (i.e., institutions, or big 'D' discourses, that are dictating these CME programs).
CHAPTER FOUR
TOWARD A 'CONFLICT' PEDAGOGY

Education is intimately related to the present world crisis, and the educator who sees the causes of this universal chaos should ask himself [sic] how to awaken intelligence in the student, thus helping the coming generation not to bring about further conflict and disaster.... But in order to do this, the educator must understand himself [sic] instead of relying on ideologies, systems and beliefs. (Krishnamurti, 1953/81, p. 23)

... conflict in and of itself is not positive or negative. Rather, the actions chosen turn conflict into either a competitive, devastating battle or else a constructive challenge.... (Bodine and Crawford, 1998, p. 44)

Introduction

These two quotes exemplify that there is competition and conflict over how best to understand conflict and thus, how best to deal with it. The second quote, typical of most CME text analyzed, suggests that "competition" is itself necessarily a "devastating battle," yet, implicitly denies that its own claim to truth about conflict is in competition with, and sometimes in contradiction to, claims from others. The more I have learned about conflict, the more I believe we ought to realize we do not really know what 'conflict' is. This would be one distinguishing fundamental premise of critical conflict education (CCE) and 'conflict' pedagogy, from CME.¹ Perhaps, at least, this thesis report shows that we have a long way to go in understanding 'conflict' better. This thesis report gives educators some ideas and perhaps new questions about how to be critical of what we think we understand about conflict and conflict resolution/management. At best, this report may shine some light on new pathways to improving systematically how we can create better conflict knowledge that has potential to
undermine the domination-fear-conflict-violence (DFCV) cycle,\(^2\) that is ripping the foundations of sustainable life apart on this planet.

This critical study of the discourses that dominate contemporary conflict management education (CME), rides like a ship on a stormy sea. The stormy question, from the very start of conceptualizing this research, is: \textit{What kind of conflict education is best for the 21st century-- and how does CME stack up in this running?} I have felt that a 'conflict pedagogy' would be a good place to begin the theorizing necessary to start determining what \textit{conflict education} might look like. There is only one author (Graff) in all the literature searched, far and wide, that has used the term "conflict pedagogy" (Graff, 1995; Graff and Looby, 1994). These articles do not systematically lay out a theory or model of conflict pedagogy.\(^3\) There has been precious little written material to guide me, directly-- that is, no formulas, no tried and true models. The most formulated education/training that is interested in conflict and what to do about it is CME. All along this research journey, I felt there was something worthwhile in CME that could, if critiqued adequately, add to other conflict knowledges and critical pedagogies in the building of a critical conflict education (CCE). I was also aware that such a declaration of a \textit{best conflict education} for the 21st century, would likely light some of the hottest intense battles itself. So be it. As Mindell (1995) would say, \textit{we have to sit in the fire of "trouble" and conflict long enough, with awareness and skills (and a lot of floundering and confusion), before true or authentic community}\(^4\) is possible (cf. also Peck, 1988; Summers, 1994). I heartily agree with conflict transformation theorists like Schrock-Shenk and Ressler (1999) or Mindell, that we have to "make peace with war" ("conflict")--"Fewer people will be hurt.... That's the revolution we need" (Mindell, 1995, p. 241).

The first part of Chapter Four locates this research project within a vision for a 'conflict' pedagogy, and then summarizes and interprets the main findings of this study in order to determine the nature of the validity of the thesis, \textit{that there is a general uncritical utilization of CME knowledge and inadequate challenging of the ideological discourses and}
assumptions behind CME teaching, training, programs and research in the northwestern (and Australian) world. The second part of this chapter focuses on reflections and problematics of this study and suggests several recommendations for further study.

Tough Decisions In Dangerous Times

Researching On A 'Conflict' Pedagogy

There is an old story of rescuers who are working night and day to pull an endless series of drowning people from the river as they are swept by. Overwhelmed by the disaster, they begin to develop better technologies for pulling people out, but even so, they cannot keep up with the number of victims. At last they send a party upstream to find out how people are being pushed into the river. This last approach, which offers the greatest prospect of success, is the one we should promote. (peace activist- Barbara (1996, p. 11)

Western thought is biased toward peace and harmony. That's why many non-mainstream [oppressed] groups consider the very idea of 'conflict resolution' a mainstream fabrication. (Mindell, 1995, pp. 36-37)

The peace process is not simply about removing the violent means.... Ultimately, the process is, like the conflict itself, a dispute about political ends.... one needs to look behind the peace process to see the real forces at work. (Smith, 1998, p. 366)

'Peace\(^5\) and harmony' is deeply problematic, as we see from these quotes. Smith (1998) continued,

Perhaps the least analyzed aspect of the peace process in general is the term 'peace.' There is often an assumption in the wider debate that peace [or cooperation] is an intrinsically virtuous condition. It is not. It is an exceptionally complex notion.... (p. 366)

The very same could be said about 'conflict' itself, as one of the least analyzed aspects of CME. The study of conflict and creation of conflict knowledge is not simply a politically-
neutral process. This sociological and poststructuralist investigation of 'conflict' is a challenge to the modernist, techno-rational approaches to understanding and working with conflict.

Conflict sites, that are ubiquitous in most cultures today, ought to be seen by educators as critical sites of learning and teaching— that is, learning in the 'fire' of unsafety, of risk, of the irrational and non-rational. I agree with Mindell (1995) that,

Today, conflict-resolution schools often deal with social issues in an academic fashion and avoid working with the experience of rage. The mainstream [who write and publish the CME manuals] in every country tends to skirt the anger of the oppressed classes (p. 36).

But how difficult it is, if not arrogant, to critique those who are trying to help out with better methods of conflict resolution/management for improving the conditions in a violent world. This research is a critique of discourses, not people and their motivations. Duryea (1992) commented on this difficulty of critiquing conflict resolution and its roots in the peace movement. She wrote, 'Indeed, with its 'apple pie nature': (who is against consensus and harmony?)... (p. 13).

Can we escape from "modernist Western thought," for at least a moment, and create a new space for a lively and fiery conflict imaginary for our times? In Chapter One a metaphoric narrative was suggested which connected two interrelated concepts of interest in this study, that is, conflict and violence. It suggests that all humans live in rivers of conflict and that these rivers are 'flooding' more and more often, with devastating results, in our ever dangerous world of the 21st century. The word crisis has become worn out and a meaningless bore, especially to the youth who have "heard more than enough." Ethnic-cleansing wars, international terrorism, raging mass murders in schools, Y2K causing accidental nuclear war or meltdowns, rape, Oka crisis... an endless list. Although there are many who 'give up' in a state of overwhelmed despair and psychic numbing, some continue to fight to help with solutions— solutions, that sometimes severely conflict. Neo-Nazis have a solution to
unemployment and poverty conflicts. Environmental fascists may have to kill humans to put "Earth First." And, Islamic revolutionary leaders (some call "extremists"), fighting in jihad (holy war) to save Muslims from (an American-led) Christian-Zionist conspiracy, call themselves a "peacemaker," while publicly issuing a fatwa (holy ruling) to their people to become theologically-justified warriors, saying, "... kill the Americans and their allies-- civilians and military-- [it] is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any way, in order to liberate [Islam]..." (cf. Ranstorp, 1998, p. 329). How do we as Americans or Canadian allies, go about teaching and learning in this context as 'enemies' (cf. Newman, 1994/98)?, whether we like it or not, or think we don't have enemies, -- we (non-Muslims or American allies) are enemies, according to the fatwa. Where is there a peace to be found while living in flooding rivers of conflict and on top of that, life-threatening conflicting views and approaches as to how best to control and manage the flooding rivers? Then there are "wars" over who is to blame for causing the "wars" (i.e., causing the floods). I say, there is no such peace-- there is a lot of fear, terror and hurting. No wonder conflict is seen almost universally as something "negative" (Duryea, 1992).

Sometimes out of fear and desperation, sometimes out of love and compassion, many of us have got to do something! Who wouldn't want to help "victims of violence" out of the rivers of conflict? Surely, helping those in need is a 'good' and humane thing. This does not necessarily bring 'peace,' or an end to the cycle of violence itself. The metaphoric suggested, challenges a habitual imaginary that sees the "rivers" and their "flooding" as the problem. Violence/hurting is the toxicity in those rivers-- that is the problem. Trying to manage rivers ('conflict') may in fact, be the last thing we ought to be doing-- especially, in light of the findings in this study that indicate 'conflict' is poorly known, highly contested in some cases, or not systematically (or critically) studied itself-- because there is virtually no research on what is a good 'conflict' epistemology (i.e., way of knowing 'conflict').
It is a tough decision and a dangerous one to choose to leave the helpers group and strike off "upstream" (often alone) as a researcher to look for what might offer "the greatest prospect of success." Not only might the researcher not find anything, or what is found may be seen by the helpers group and the victims as more theoretical b.s.-- more 'big' ideas and "no action," leaving the suffering, from terror and violence, unrelieved. Going "upstream" against the flow, is exactly what this thesis is about. This is a study which criticizes a lot of thinking that informs the heartfelt work that goes into helping in a culture of violence. I pursue a quest for conflict knowledge that may better inform us in our work with violence (DFCV cycle). This is only a small beginning. The danger of not being a "front-line" helper (and pragmatist) in this moment, is that I will be seen as an "expert" (removed from the field of 'fire') trying to tell the front-line workers what is best for them. Easily, I can become the enemy-- the threat--the object (and project) of fear and despair. This is a study about power/knowledge in discourses (a la Foucault), it is not a study about people, or telling people what they should do or believe, as Krishnamurti's quote says so well in the opening of this chapter. All voices need to be heard to produce the best conflict knowledge but even that 'hearing' is not enough (see Recommendations).

**Locating A 'Conflict' Pedagogy: Staying In The 'Fire'**

I've always antagonized people with some things I do. I make enemies as well as friends, and I take strong positions, .... (p. 4) There is another kind of violence ... that is institutionally sanctioned violence. We live in a violent society, a violent world; that is, a world in which force is a vital mechanism used to keep the economic and social system intact.... The laws of the land are supported by the use of violence... to make people obey the law. This is the premise you have to start with.... (Horton, 1990, p. 27)
I look at some currently fashionable adult education theories, concluding that a number mislead or are simply too nice, too unfocused, too inward-looking or too mechanical to help us help others learn in contexts of opposition and hostility. And I look for some principles and processes that might help us help others learn how to identify, define, and then deal with their enemies. (Newman, 1998, p. ix)

Myles Horton (American) and Mike Newman (Australia) are two adult educators that have strongly influenced my thinking about what a 'conflict' pedagogy might be based on, and what a concomitant CCE might look like. As well, another important critical pedagogue is Paulo Freire (Brazil). What Freire has done for education in a conflictual and violent world, is difficult to summarize. His popularity and valuable impact is irrefutable amongst educators and many social justice activists. His "pedagogy of conflict" (cf. Gadotti, 1980; Gadotti, Freire and Guimares, 1985) is a source of inspiration (albeit, problematic), but limited in what I envision as a 'conflict' pedagogy for the 21st century. However, the spirit of Freire's work, long after his death, is a necessary component to the success of a 'conflict' pedagogy. This spirit is perhaps best narrated in the following passage by McLaren and da Silva (1993) (cited in Nhundu, 1995, p. 284),

[Freire's work is] ... a compassionate fire, one in which the bourgeois world of mystification melts away as our critical imagination becomes ignited; it is a fire that heats our spirit even as it softens the solidarity and certainty of existing social relations; it is a fire whose flames of transformation invite us....

CME text in this study never mentions the critical pedagogues and the likes of Freire et al. in their educational discourses. CME text avoids dialogue with the critical (conflict) traditions. In contradistinction to CME, a CCE would necessarily ground itself in a 'conflict' pedagogy and acknowledge what CME text in this study appear to have forgotten (or conveniently, denied)-- that is,
Living [working, learning] in a group can be a painful experience.... There are many reasons for the difficulty we have in living in groups, but one of them must certainly be the tendency for conflict and chaos to arise in them. Dealing with conflict and using conflict resolution methods are most effective with people in reasonable, rational states of consciousness, but how can we deal with highly charged, emotional, rigid, or even violent groups? Almost any bargaining, negotiating, or conflict resolution procedure will work when people have already agreed [often by coercion and 'fear'] to work on conflicts with one another. But how do we work with a group in the midst of turbulence, violence, ecstasy, or insanity, where no one wants to solve anything? (Mindell, 1993, p. 30). [see Recommendations with several adult and higher educators exploring these questions]

Figure 12 locates a 'conflict' pedagogy in relation to CME and several other types of pedagogies that have a relative conflict-focused interest. This diagram, although too complex to explain all the details here (see Recommendations), shows the "spectrum" of educative types of conflictwork that are going on in regard to dealing with violence. The various authors (in References) are identified as writing within each type of pedagogy, with CME curriculum as most based on a "rational" and reasonable, cooperative, harmony, order etc.-- that is, where the definition (conceptualization) of conflict is based on "theories of conflict(s)" in a functionalist, pragmatic, technique-based discourse. The curriculum is apparently based on a high "trust" (at the surface) of human beings and their abilities to manage and resolve conflict (and avoid violence). As this chapter proceeds to review the findings of this research, it may become evident to the reader that this high "trust" is actually a high "mistrust" ("hidden" below the surface) of human beings and their abilities in conflict/battles. A 'conflict' pedagogy (and neo-conflict theory) would be designed from the other end of the spectrum (although, always integrating all of the types of pedagogies below, which are all valid and useful to some limited degree). The diagram shows how CME is very restricted in its integration of conflict
Fig. 12 INTEGRAL DIALECTIC Model: SPECTRUM OF CONFLICT WORK ON VIOLENCE
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knowledges from other pedagogies and conflict theory. This is the basis of the educative curricular critique of this thesis. The question that lurks about CME, is it "designed" to exclude the other pedagogies that have a focused-interest on conflict? If so, why? Who benefits?

The transition from a CME discourse (in this study of 22 contemporary CME manuals) to a "conflictual pedagogy" (Hahn, 1996; cf. for e.g., Bickmore, 1984, 1991, 1993, 1999) is worthy of a note, in order to give a sense of the change that takes place as one moves up the spectrum (Figure 12). Specifically, to look at Bickmore's (1984) "Alternatives To Violence" manual a few phrases of text stand out in contrast, if not contradiction, with anything I read in the 22 CME manuals. For example, Bickmore wrote,

... we will teach far more by the way we [as teachers/facilitators] act (process) than by what we say (content). [she gives a few sentences to "non-oppressive" teaching and "use of circles"] (Preface, n.p.)

The object of this course is not to 'make' anyone here nonviolent, but rather to show you some options you may not have known about.... We encourage skepticism and questions. (p. 1)

[in the 2nd session of the course, a film about Hiroshima-Nagasaki is shown, with the following comment from the instructor shared with the students] "The United States is the only country in the world to have used nuclear weapons.... The United States is a democracy.... (p. 3). [the 3rd session is on "Institutional Violence"]

Bickmore's curriculum is very aware of its own pedagogy and is not merely training or indoctrinating students into conformist techniques to be 'good' citizens who are supposedly morally obligated to always be non-violent. She cites a speech of Martin Luther King for the group in another session. But the main characteristic in her conflict education process is that of critical analysis. And when she teaches that there are many ways to deal with violence and conflicts (and she includes racism etc.)-- then, she teaches, among common conflict
resolution skills, the "practice of active non-violence," as a citizen's right to practice opposition to what is injustice, no matter where that injustice is. She teaches about street political theatre, picketing, strikes, boycotts, civil disobedience, demonstrations and petitioning. Her curriculum does not leave out "social activism" as part of what she calls "creative conflict resolution." Nothing in CME text, in this study, comes close to this discourse, and thus a transition is created in Figure 12 to the other types of pedagogies along the spectrum.  

**New Social Movements: "New Social Conflicts"**

**CME In Need Of A Critique**

Resolving conflict is not a value-free activity; indeed, as the name suggests, resolving conflict is held in high esteem over conflict continuance. (Tidwell, 1998, p. 17)

As Tidwell remarked on conflict resolution, I would say the same for conflict-- that is, defining conflict is not a value-free activity. Conflict itself is a concept that is highly value-biased in the interdisciplinary literature surveyed and in the CME text. This bias has not been nearly adequately addressed in the CME text studied in this research-- nor, was a systematic problematizing of the concept of conflict revealed in the interdisciplinary literature surveyed. These literatures constantly moved from talking about conflict to talking about conflicts without questioning the sociopolitical and cultural bias of the operationalizing of the definition to events and behaviors-- i.e., conflicts. Arguably, it could be said that this pragmatic (applied research\(^1\)) bias in discourses of conflict is part of a behavioral, action-based pragmatism, and de-politicized social psychology that is common in American philosophy and social theory (especially, in contrast to European conflict philosophy and social theory, the latter, which rarely is mentioned in CME text-- with the exception of Condliffe's (Australian) manual for adults/professionals). Indeed, this Americanism discourse is hegemonic partly because over 70% of the CME manuals examined are American-based publications. No systematic critique of the concept of conflict could be found in any of the
literature surveyed for this study. The most systematic critique of CME, by Tidwell (1998), is primarily a critique of conflict resolution.

Youth and adults are receiving knowledge about the conceptualization of conflict as if it were an absolute "given" and unproblematic concept (see the absolute quality of confidence that pervades the definitions of conflict in the CME text (Chapter Two)-- which, does not acknowledge Tidwell's view of a "split" in the discipline that revolves around the "... definition of conflict" (p. 17). The CME text ubiquitously present little questioning or encouragement to doubt the conflict knowledge that is purveyed in the CME manuals. They do not acknowledge their own social epistemology and power in their discourse. Tidwell's conceptualization of conflict comes closest to understanding the nature of the cultural and political implications of how conflict is constructed (beyond merely a behavioral event). He wrote,

It must be remembered that conflict is not a discrete event in life, but rather informs and influences everything people do. (Tidwell, 1998, p. 175).

This thesis concurs with Sweeney and Carruthers (1996) review of conflict resolution education (text) in schools, that,

... too few authors take the time to provide conceptual and operational definitions for basic constructs such as conflict.... Conceptual and operational definitions bring a clarity to the discussion that allows two or more people to make comparisons among or to debate the advantages and disadvantages of different perspectives. We encourage the debate that different perspectives on CR engender.... (p. 340)

There is no 'bridge' (Figure 2) to connect CME with the other forms of conflict knowledges in the spectrum (Figure 12). The value-bias, and 'gap' is not discussed or problematized in the CME text surveyed. I have been critical that the "high esteem" put on resolving conflict in CME, is its weakest epistemological (and sociological) aspect to truly understanding 'conflict' itself. Techniques of how to deal with conflict fill the CME text. But
how can we know, what we wish most highly to "resolve" (i.e., make disappear-- bring quickly to consensus or 'peace and harmony')? This epistemological problematic of CME, as a contributor to conflict knowledge, is taken up later in this chapter. But this quote by Tidwell (above), begins the discussion on why CME is in need of a systematic critique, which is contextualized in a doubt about the sincerity of CME discourses to embrace other forms of conflict knowledge and to attempt to construct a 'bridge' to other conflict knowledges\(^\text{14}\) -- that is, where there might be legitimate and heated debate/conflict. Is CME discourse on conflict and conflict resolution an avoidance of conflict itself, within itself as a discipline-- as a social movement-- as a "culture of conflict"?

This is a "postmodernist" (Foucauldian) challenge to CME to examine its own discourse and power/knowledge in the context of postmodern culture which is, more or less, "... a battleground of conflicting opinions and political forces" (Harvey, 1989, p. 39). It appears generally, that CME as a "culture" and organizational complex (knowledge formation) is assuming, within a consensus theory model, that a strong culture is a homeostatic one (see Chapter Three on the "Monolithic Normalizing and Naturalizing" as part of disciplinarity and governmentality). The critique of such an assumption in regard to "school culture" has been well described by Leonard (1999) who argued the dominant position in schools (could be most mainstream institutions),

... characterizes conflict and disequilibrium as organizational flaws, threatening to an otherwise homeostatic and [thought to be] strong culture. (p. 28)

Certainly, the CME text and Fullan (1993), and other authors on change/conflict in organizational cultures (cf. Tjsvold), speak 'positively' about the nature of conflict for creativity and innovation etc., but there is evidence that CME discourse may actually be saying something else (discussed below). There are still a lot of books and text that have titles like "From conflict to consensus: A conflict intervention process..." (Ballek, 1997); "From conflict to cooperation: How to settle a dispute" (Potter, n.d.\(^\text{15}\)) -- and all the books on conflict
resolution—there is always an implied value-bias away from (against?) conflict and toward "consensus," "cooperation," and "resolution." This discourse and value-bias starts to shape the construction of "justice" and "community" as in the mission statement of a local neighborhood justice institute in Vancouver, BC, that specializes in conflict resolution education/training: "Helping to provide training for safer communities" and "... to resolve differences and build harmonious relationships." This is especially disturbing when almost all of postmodernism, poststructuralism, the feminist movement, anti-racist movement etc. have struggled for the recognition and value of "difference." The discourse is implicitly directing, if not telling, us to move away from conflict ("differences") to something better ("resolve[d]" or more pleasant). This is what critics Nader (1983) and Pirie (1998) have referred to as a hidden "harmony ideology" and "preoccupation with consensus" (Harrington and Merry, 1988). This arguably, is typically part of a hegemonic managerialism (cf. Lederach), functionalism and consensus theory (discourse), that is at least 300 years old in the northwestern world but, as we shall see later (Figure 13), is a much older pattern of discourse (cf. Bernard, 1983).

Chapter One reviewed some of the major critiques that have been launched at CME. Although, all critiques are relatively very new considering how long conflict resolution and management go back in human history. Some of these critiques have been from without, most are from within the discipline itself. Critics like Pirie, Lederach and Tidwell, have especially felt that the field has been lacking solid and systematic self-criticism—a criticism that goes beyond merely self-reflection on "how" things are being done as part of a social technology of stopping violence. They have called more deeply for an ideological criticism of the hidden agenda ("hidden assumptions," wrote Salem, 1993, p. 361) in CME's Western-biased conflict practices (Tidwell, 1998, p. 17).

Duryea (1992) brought forth the multiculturalist criticism first, and this has been picked up by other critics and most recently put within a poststructuralist frame (and
Foucauldian analysis) by Pirie (1998) (albeit, an initial attempt). With Duryea's initiative, she also challenged to some limited degree the pedagogical implications of a culturally-sensitive model of teaching and facilitating CME. Lederach (1995), "one of America's leading scholars of conflict resolution" (Solomon, 1997, p.xi), has made the most profound argument which challenges the entire field to look at how it is educating and who benefits from the dominant approach to training. Lederach (1995) asked two (Foucauldian-type, Popkewitz-type) critical questions of conflict resolution practitioners/trainers/educators: "Whose interests are served, both latent and direct, when culture enters the field of conflict resolution? How does the way we approach training impact our projected goals?" (p. 5). He calls for the field to "... explore critically at a much deeper level..." (p. 6) both the content and the philosophical approach (discourse) to conflict resolution training.

Lederach (1995) argues that practitioners and theoreticians in conflict resolution (CME) need to go beyond rhetoric (discourses) about the good that their work does and move toward, ... a critical examination of training as a project, a socially constructed, educational phenomenon comprised of purpose, process, and content... inherently encompassing culture and ideology. (p. 6)

This thesis has argued that CME, as defined in this study, has generally been neglectful of critical examination of itself as an "educational phenomenon" and has more focused on itself as a "social technology" of peace (cf. Olson, 1996, and his sociological analysis of the field). But a technique to "resolve" or to "manage" is not value-neutral, not merely a manipulation or change of behaviors— it is a powerful political and "educational phenomenon" which is constructing social and cultural reality simultaneously with the techniques it uses for specific goals. Lederach is pointing out that CME is a "culture" itself, with its own discourse and "culture of conflict" (cf. Ross, 1993, Coke, 1999) or "conflict pathology" (?) (a la Deutsch).

If CME text is to shift to the sociocultural level of analysis (beginning with itself), then we would see a shift in the learning objectives. For example, in one CME text for adults the
learning objective is to "... gain an understanding of conflict approaches and styles..." (Haddigan, 1997b, p. 13). This is nearly universal in the 22 manuals. The analytical shift would set the learning objective in such a course/program to also include: to gain an understanding of conflict approaches and styles used in the CME social movement and this particular course/program. Substitute conflict in place of "conflict approaches and styles" and this would add to a Lederachian ideological critical analysis of the conflict knowledge and practices "going on" (as power/knowledge)—not merely, on "how to."

The focus on the educational phenomenon, is of great interest in a 'conflict' pedagogy (CCE). Lederach (1995) points to this neglect in CME to incorporate pedagogical considerations. He stated bluntly that,

... conflict resolution training in the dominant North American culture represents among other things the packaging, presentation, and selling of social knowledge. Whose knowledge, under what package, delivered through what mechanism, and received by what populations are all legitimate and necessary questions for investigation and study if we are to achieve a critical understanding of the training project. (p. 6) [underline added for emphasis]

Lederach's challenge for conflict educators/trainers to begin to move out beyond their own circular feedback loop of "technical" rational discourse and pedagogy, is the essence of this study's critique as well. He then draws on lessons from the experiences of popular (adult) education, appropriate technology, and ethnography "... as useful alternative and conceptual bases for any pedagogical project" (p. 7).20 These fields bring an important critical, theoretical and emancipatory frame of reference to knowledge-making, power and education, which challenge CME to at least expand beyond "... a too-often narrow technical view of our field in terms of training" (p. 7). I would add that Lederach is calling for a dialogue21 with adult (and higher) education discourses from the critical (conflict) tradition (see Recommendations). Lederach could also have added an incorporation of critical pedagogies...
and their knowledge (Figure 1 and 2) to 'bridge' conflict knowledge across an important 'gap' that exists in traditional conflict studies (i.e., the social sciences which feed most of the knowledge about conflict and its regulation, management and resolution to CME practices).

**Discourse Hegemony: Advocacy And The New Social Movements**

Although much could be said about NSMs and their role in adult education and civil society, and epistemology (e.g., cf. Kastner, 1994), a few central points need be raised in this critique of CME. By locating CME as more than a psychological and technical procedure to learn to stop violence through conflict management/resolution, this thesis has suggested a re-socialization, re-culturalization, re-politicization and general update of CME as discourse (social epistemology)-- with a history and bias (hegemony becoming ideology). Calling CME a NSM, with "new social conflicts" (cf. Luke, 1995-96, p. 5-6), there is an opportunity to expand CME analysis into a postmodern and sociocultural dimension. The cognitive-behavioral (e.g., Glasser's control theory) and social psychological (a la Deutsch) views have dominated much of the CME text in this study, leaving the practical responsibility of dealing with new social conflict on "individuals" and a psychologism that often removes participants from a larger encompassing analysis with political implications.22 Randall Collins, a conflict sociologist wrote,

It seems that the contemporary pedagogy of conflict management/resolution is indeed continuing much in the vein of American pragmatist tradition, or at least it has the same limitations. The problem with the sociology of the pragmatist liberal reformers was that they regarded conflict as arising from misunderstanding among individuals or different cultures (especially Anglo vs. immigrant). Their hope was that if the participants could manage to take the role of the other empathetically, they would work out a harmonious compromise. Their sociological weakness was their avoidance of economic class and power positions as sources of conflict; they did not see conflict as based on real
interests. Thus conflict resolution would not call for any structural changes, but only better accommodation to the existing situation.... It stays with the immediate situation and its psychological dimensions, and does not look for the deeper structural background of inequities and organizational structures. That is why the 'conflict tradition' in sociological theory and research seems to operate on a different level of analysis than the literature of conflict resolution. It seems to me that a more realistic conflict pedagogy could be built if it incorporated more of these structural concerns. (personal communication, July 31, 1999)

The concern of this thesis was to identify the dominating hegemonic discourse of CME, and suggest its origins and results. Chapter Three showed evidence for the consensus theory or functionalist bias which dominates the CME discourse on conceptualizations of conflict (see Chapter Three and the CME text emphasizing the 'peace and harmony,' rational cooperation and consensus aspects-- cf. Figures 10 and 11). The conflict theory view, or conceptualization of conflict (and social reality) was the subdominant discourse. Figure 13 shows a subjective drawing of where CME discourse (in light gray) is located in terms of a social philosophy and politics in W. thought. The vertical axis of the diagram shows a continuum of "authoritative" (Foucault's governmentality, disciplinarity) to "rebellious," in terms of preference to use of knowledge and social control/order. The top half of the diagram is "Positivist," in terms of a vision of society as held together by consensus in contradistinction to the "Negativist" (bottom half) discourse. The left side of the diagram are views that are "Liberal" with a trust in a benign human nature, with the right side of the diagram consisting of views that are "Conservative," with a general distrust of a benign human nature (i.e., 'fear' of human nature, especially the irrational and nonrational). This diagram is based on Bernard's (1983) revision of the consensus-conflict debate in social theory and sociology (problematic, with Bernard's emphasis on male social theorists alone). He provides the main social philosophers who have created and promoted a discourse for the
Figure 13  Four Categories of Social Theory on Consensus-Conflict Debate - adapted from Bernard (1983)
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past several hundreds of years in the northwestern world. There are too many complexities in this diagram to discuss them all here.

The central point is to illustrate where the "conflict-positive" and consensus reform discourse in CME text may possibly originate from. I have noted in Chapter Three, that the "classic" consensus view is not generally dominant in the contemporary CME text. But a "modified" consensus or "conflict functionalism" discourse (a la Coser) has become hegemonic. This is where a little bit of the conflict theory tradition is utilized-- that is, making conflict positive (functional)-- while, more or less, discarding the sociocultural and political dimensions of the conflict (critical) tradition (a la Dahrendorf -- "sober negativist" and or more extreme "visionary negativists" like Marx) (Figure 13). The two large arrows in Figure 13 show the contradiction (intense battle) that goes between the two discourse categories B and D. Notice, that CME discourse in the manuals surveyed is primarily B and is virtually absent of engagement with the conflict knowledge (and conceptualization of conflict) in D.

The thesis of this study is verified from the data and critical discourse analysis. There is an uncritical examination of CME text (knowledge) and its ideological discourses and assumptions that are hidden behind the conflict practices. There is nothing in any of the 22 CME text in this study which indicated that there were at least four major realms of discourse in W. thought (Figure 13) which could provide an integral conflict knowledge to inform conflict practices.

It is not surprising that a social movement, such as CME, has arisen to advocate a position on violence, on social order, on social control and democracy, which is highly preferential to one way over others. The very nature of a social movement (social activism) is to advocate and try to change views to its own biased position. I do not have a problem that any NSM attempts this as part of advocacy and civil society. Democracy requires this contestation of views and challenges (cf. e.g., Graff, 1992, Bickmore, 1999; Bickford, 1996;
Mouffe, 1993; Ring, 1991) to the status quo (or dominant discourses which may not be healthy when they become ideology).

The reform movement of CME, is rather conservative ("liberal" conservative\(^{24}\)) and that is not a problem per se. The problem, from a political or pedagogical point of view, is that CME does not acknowledge this hegemony of its discourses. The CME text studied do not let the reader know of the great battle that exists over the conceptualization and defining of 'conflict' within the field of conflict or peace studies. Students are deprived of the critical conversation and historical and political context upon which they are being taught about what conflict is and isn't.

Based on text analysis, CME attempts to "educate"/train in a de-politicized way, utilizing social psychology and cognitive-behavioral psychologism to back up its rationale (and ignores the critiques of these knowledge sources-- see Chapter One). Meanwhile, Foucault and Popkewitz argue, that it is not so much what is included in a knowledge formation, but what is "left out" (ignored, discarded or "subjugated" to the margins)-- that, is where power/knowledge is abused and symbolic (cultural and epistemological) violence occurs. CME as studied here, has apparently been involved in an advocacy and propagandaizing, rather than an education that is open and honest about its political agenda. The very violence that CME manuals attempt to undermine, is perpetuated in their 'good' intentions. Without questioning the nature and role of 'conflict' as part of CME, the "education" is lost and "training" becomes prescriptive advocacy, if not propaganda. What is CME text teaching its learners about learning and open critical inquiry? What kind of conflict imaginary is CME text encouraging-- restricting?-- and who benefits? How can CME believe it is studying and truly understanding 'conflict' when it doesn't engage with the ancient conflict tradition (conflict theory perspective) and challenge its own 'conflict' epistemology?

Figure 14 and 14a provide an initial map of the educational movements and their approximate relationship to each other on a continuum over the past century, in a
Figure 14  MAPPING THE PATH TOWARD A 'CONFLICT' PEDAGOGY
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Figure 14A  MAPPING THE PATH TOWARD A ‘CONFLICT’ PEDAGOGY

This figure is intended to show the paths and types of education in the past 100 years that have an on-going interest in social conflict. There is no intention to privilege in an absolute way, which education has the best theory and practices of conflict resolution/management. Rather, the emphasis on size of letters and boxes, is to show which areas have been of primary interest in this thesis study.
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northwestern perspective. This locates a 'conflict' pedagogy and CCE as the synthesis (albeit, in no way meant as a deterministic, or evolutionary model) of several roots/routes in which conflict knowledges have been created and taught (implicitly or explicitly). Figure 14a shows the political and epistemological 'barrier' that CME has not been able to break through to develop a 'conflict' pedagogy for its conflict knowledge and practices. The shaded boxes indicate three sources which have broken the 'barrier,' but have not been integrated or synthesized as part of CME or part of a focus on 'conflict' and pedagogy— these are: critical pedagogies, conflictual pedagogy and adult education (critical/radical tradition).

In Figure 14 the bottom half of the map shows the likely connection of the social and sociological theory that lies beneath the changing views of 'conflict'— that is, from a 'negative' view with classical functionalism (consensus/order theory), to a 'positive' view with modified conflict functionalism (a minor contribution from conflict theory). The map indicates that a neo-conflict theory based on an integral synthetic 'conflict' epistemology will be required to guide CCE and a 'conflict' pedagogy in the future.

In regards to improving the current conflict imaginary, Figure 14 shows that the moralism which currently dominates the way to look at conflict, needs to change to an epistemological focus (and poststructuralist analysis) which is no longer concerned about conflict as either 'negative' or 'positive' as a concept and phenomena. The more important question of a 'conflict' pedagogy is how best can we know and truly understand 'conflict' before we try to resolve or manage it. The interest is focused on conflict knowledge(s) and how they are created and articulated— how they serve some, and not others? A new conflict imaginary may indeed, completely change the meaning and 'reality' of what 'conflict' is and how best it can be dealt with.

Learning and teaching within the 'fire' of conflict sites may be much more enlightening and fruitful to humanity than current conflict practices, which often seem driven by habitual 'fear'-based reactivity (and moralism) rather than wisdom. The goal of expanding the conflict
imaginary is to allow us fresh creative insights into the domination-fear-conflict-violence cycle. The vision of CCE is to see teachers and educators leading the way as researchers and conflict workers, and no longer merely following the constructions of conflict knowledge/practices "given" from the other disciplines that study peace and conflict.

Some Reflections On The Study

What is this atmosphere or that spirit of the times? Can we know this spirit and work with it, .... (Mindell, 1995, p. 3-4).

A major problematic of this study is the complexity of concepts, definitions and ideas that are wrestled with in a short study and report, as this masters thesis. This stands out above all the other problem areas to follow. The atmosphere or spirit of this thesis is a reflection of the very postmodern world in which it is constructed. I felt, and struggled with, how much complexity could be handled. How much complexity could be made sense of in limited space of linear text with a few images? Would I lose the reader, as I sometimes got lost myself in this 'moorland' (a la Edwards) of a postmodern world of dissolving and reforming-- layering and collaging-- of boundaries and realities-- plural power/knowledge dynamics and mixed intentions? The amount of data in Chapter Three, the study of CME manuals, alone required more interpretation and quantitative analysis. The "double agenda" to both show a CME discourse hegemony, and continually (spontaneously) be creating a foundation for a counterhegemonic 'conflict' pedagogy (CCE) was, at times, an interruption of focus and flow. One part was always competing for attention over the other-- the 'philosopher' in me often winning out over the 'empiricist'. Some arguments are not linked as well as they could be with data, but I believe some are well-linked. If there is confusion and doubt about a lot of things in this thesis, then that is a limitation of the study. But that is also, in part, a limitation of our human mind (our current cultural habitus-- limited conflict imaginary) and linear text modalities to communicate the richness of so many of the topics that ran in the 'rivers'
throughout this report. I don't believe a topic like 'conflict' and violence can be studied without a lot of confusion and complexity, for there are good reasons that violence has not been stopped on this planet, when some of the best minds and hearts have attempted, to little avail, to bring about a sustainable nonviolent culture.

A more systematic stratified random sample of CME manuals, rather than the convenience sampling approach, would have allowed me to make broader generalizations about all CME manuals. Ideally, this would have involved a broader comparison of manuals from continental Europe. This perhaps, would have revealed the differences in the European critical (conflict) tradition influences in CME manuals published in Europe, and American ones published in America. Also, with such an improved sampling procedure there could be an interesting comparative analysis between youth and adult CME texts, which was not feasible in terms of validity problems with the sampling procedure used in this study. To better verify the historical and philosophical placement of CME discourses, the investigation could have included manuals and handbooks earlier than 1978. Thus, a historical approach would be more like Foucault's approach to discourses of power/knowledge and regulation, which change over large historical time periods. A stronger critical historical analysis of CME routes back into the 19th century, along the lines of investigations into "therapeutic [disciplinary] authority" as social control in liberalism (cf. Miller and Rose, 1994), would allow for a more precise rendering of the discourses feeding CME text today. As well, this study never entered far into utilizing Foucault's insights, as a critical analysis, into how subjects (via subjection) are formed by various CME discourses.

The conceptualization of CME is a very broad category of different types of research and educational domains. Although, it was useful to discuss conflict knowledge as a concept, it is arguably too broad and confuses and conflates too much diversity in discourses about conflict and conflict practices. If this criticism holds true over time, then much of the
generalizing about CME in this study is suspect to overgeneralizing and of limited use in critiquing the diverse parts of the whole (i.e., CME).

This entire study is carried out as a rather 'grand' synthesizing (i.e., search for an integral conflict knowledge and methodology). It covers vast domains of knowledge and interdisciplinary knowledge. This alone can leave the specialists in the different disciplines dismayed at how I may have not caught the subtleties of specialized knowledges and methods-- or, the knowing that goes with being in one particular discipline and its sub-culture of meanings that are never fully written down. I was an 'outsider' to many of the disciplines I surveyed, and cannot claim to be a student of CME itself. Although, this 'outsider' view may provide fresh (albeit, sometimes naive) ways of looking at things, it can be problematic, as I may have misinterpreted some specialized knowledges badly. By not engaging fully with scholars from the many disciplines in this study, the accuracy of interpretations and uses of terms may be of limited value to specialists, or even distorted.

Studying only the conceptualization of conflict per se, and not conflict management/resolution (i.e., prescriptions of how to handle conflict) discourses, may have skewed my overall view of CME text and its embedded discourses. As well, the often confusing use of terms in CME text, which were not always acknowledged by authors, left me wondering what was being talked about. How often were they talking about conflicts, and using the word conflict? I was analyzing the conceptualization and definition of conflict but the authors may not have been using conflict as a term in the way I was wanting to interpret it. Without interviewing authors of text, this study again is limited in accuracy of what text (discourse) is actually about-- or at least, what meaning is used from the view of the creator of the text/knowledge.
Recommandations

The following recommendations, based on this study, are offered to further the development of a 'conflict' pedagogy (and CCE) and the improvement of CME,

1. the conceptualization of 'conflict' is to continue to remain problematic within a poststructural deconstructive framework, as this will provide the openness and humbleness required that such a complex concept and social phenomena demands-- this is the backbone of any 'conflict' epistemology,

2. conflict ('conflict') cannot be known on its own, and therefore requires a conceptualization which embraces a complex network of interactions with what are called the 5Cs: change, complexity, crisis, conflict, contradiction (and these are only understandable with the centering of violence-- a culture of violence at the core of social life in the 21st century). Figure 15 shows this relationship and how it ought to be the way to best contextualize schooling education and adult and higher education as sociocultural practices,

3. that an integral conflict knowledge be formulated (ongoing) that utilizes (at least in part) the 4-quadrant diagrams and spectrum models used throughout this study-- as a template, this integral model (a la Wilber) is likely the best way to ensure inclusion of knowledges but without falling into an eclecticism (or flattening of distinctions, hierarchies, contradictions, and critical analysis),

4. that a dialogue be undertaken between CME and critical pedagogies in examining conceptualizations of 'conflict' and conflict practices-- and to examine self-critically why these two large domains of conflict knowledges have not engaged before (i.e., to examine what "advocacy" in their own social movements/"pedagogy" has become ideology and propaganda instead of being motivated by an expanding integral 'conflict' epistemology),

5. a thorough study of "conflict education" takes place in which the various
Figure 15 SCHEMATIC FRAMEWORK FOR 'CONFLICT' PEDAGOGY (5 C's)
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uses of this term in the literature (and programs) is unpacked and problematized (e.g., Brezinka, 1979, 1989)—equally, in distinction with "peace education"—this knowledge is important in creating a critical conflict education (CCE) as a counterhegemonic to CME,

6. a thorough study of adult and higher education be undertaken to look for roots/routes in theorizing about conflict and conflict practices that may further inform a developing 'conflict' pedagogy (and CCE)—for example, I recommend starting with 14 theorists in adult education and higher education (Gadotti, as an exception) cf. References: a) Paulston & Boshier, b) Law & Rubenson, c) Newman & Baptiste, d) Freire & Gadotti, e) Graff & Dixon, f) Cervero & Wilson, g) Collins & Welton,

7. Newman and Baptiste's work on a typology of conflict practices is likely the best educative writing on how to understand a spectrum of conflicts (and violence)—as well, they offer a critique of current adult education theories in regard to their inadequacy for dealing with "hot" social conflict that involves a definition and pedagogy for working with "the enemy" and practices of coercion, as part of social action pedagogy (controversial stuff),

8. that "educators" of all kinds begin a study of their own unconscious habits, informing "theories" and feelings about 'conflict'—that is, I recommend that educators do their own research on what informs and shapes their own conflict practices in personal and professional life— it is time that educators no longer depend on the other disciplines to tell us what it is we should know and believe about conflict and how best to deal with it,

9. Pratt's (1991) notion of the "contact zone" (I would call "conflict site") is an important conception to look at educating (learning and teaching) within the 'fire' of cultural battles in a postmodern world; I recommend educators
begin asking (researching): *conflict as a critical learning site* (this is in combination with Welton and others who are promoting NSMs as sites of "revolutionary learning"-- these concepts and experiences need to be deconstructed and placed within an emerging neo-conflict theory,


11. conduct a systematic investigation into the discourses of the "conflict-positive" (and generally "be positive") reform movement that is sweeping the Northwestern world-- who says this, why, who benefits? -- what impact is this new form of "positivism" having on critical traditions and practices, as well, as the constructing of a civil society or democracy etc.; this would be part of a more indepth critical historical study of CME,

12. further study of the conflict studies above engage with ideas about democracy -- and in particular the works of Mansbridge, Mouffe, Ring, Bickford, etc. (see References)-- as conceptualizations of 'conflict' (and criticality) impact on citizenship education, critical thinking, problem-solving etc.,

13. that sociology of education and sociology of adult education and higher education take up an interest in *conflict* as a foundational concept in educational practices and educational research, curriculum and policy,
and to assist the development of a new *conflict imaginary* in our world as part of a transdisciplinary approach to 'conflict',

14. a sociological study of the ownership, funding, people involved in the CME new social movement be done to assess who is behind this advocacy and whom their "manuals" may best serve?,

15. to engage with the foundational work done on a "pedagogy of peace" which has a good description of some of the interests I envision for a critical conflict education and 'conflict' pedagogy," [substitute *conflict* appropriately]: This document discusses peace education not as a subject but as part of the teaching of various academic subjects depending on the extent to which they lend themselves to this. The intention is to produce educational situations where young [and older] people can develop skills in the art of peace and a peaceful approach to conflict resolution. The pedagogy of peace is understood here as the sum of scholarly and scientific thinking on the nature of peace education and the way it should be organized. The pedagogy of peace is an interdisciplinary branch of science using a broad range of methods, including observation, description, and analysis of peace-educational processes and interrogation of participants with regard to their motives." (Rohrs, 1994, p. 1).

16. that any conflict education, engage seriously with the "Worldwork" and "deep democracy"- conflict transformation, of the Mindell's (see References), and to remember the underlying assumption of CCE would embrace Mindell's (1995) standpoint:

Our mainstream social system tries to hide trouble and pain. It represses the lessons that should have been learned from racism ['big' social conflicts] and history. The democratic world is addicted to peace and harmony; people in the mainstream use their rank and privilege to avoid conflict. (p. 165)
world is addicted to peace and harmony; people in the mainstream use their rank and privilege to avoid conflict. (p. 165)

Future Directions From This Study

In general, this study points to the salience of further critique of CME theory and practices. Empirical research, surveys of practitioners and other forms of inquiry would be useful to explore how 'conflict' is perceived and construed in practice. Another direction, which I favor, is to carry on to do a PhD which looks at further exploration of the DFCV (domination-fear-conflict-violence) cycle, whereby 'fear' is given a focus, as 'conflict' was in this study. I would like to look at how 'fear' (and fearlessness) are conceptualized in CME discourses, and how hegemonic discourses are biased ideologically and otherwise. This doctoral work, as an extension of this masters thesis, would continue the conceptual critique and development of key aspects of the DFCV cycle and how a 'conflict' pedagogy may employ these conceptual critiques into a CCE.

***************

1 It was seductive throughout this study to come up with a "list" of distinguishing premises, characteristics, or "rules" for what constitutes CCE and a 'conflict' pedagogy, in comparison with CME. I have attempted to focus on a critical analysis of the current state of CME (and conflict knowledge), rather, than attempt to define CCE or a 'conflict' pedagogy prescriptively. I feel this latter activity requires much further research into the dynamics of the concepts involved in the DFCV cycle, before prescribing any curriculum or pedagogy to undermine that cycle. A potentially useful PhD study would be to examine 'fear' as a major concept and 'reality' in the DFCV cycle.

2 My current hypothesis of this complex relationship suggests that domination is similar to hegemony (in a Gramscian sense), in that it is not necessarily violent or hurtful as a social process-- rather, it is part of differentiation and difference (healthy), where some parts have priority and abilities and skills that dominate in various environments/contexts. This domination creates social conflict as a process to work through the differentiation, differences and the rank and privilege that is sometimes obtained from them. Conflict is the mediator (like a healing process, or discharging of distress), where domination doesn't necessarily have to become pathological (i.e., turn to violence) as long as conflict processes are happening to deal with domination processes. When the conflict process is repressed (as violence), then domination becomes violence and 'fear' is produced. 'Fear' creates more violence-- all this toxic part of social life taking place because the healthy conflict processes are unable to operate freely and are overwhelmed with the rapid rates of domination turning to violence (or ideology in the non-Gramscian sense). This is a very basic outline and open for critique and change.

3 Granted, his book (1992) is a foundational source to his pedagogy which centers around conflict and how we deal with it in higher education settings (cf. Figure 12).

4 "True" or "authentic" are problematic terms. Describing them in words, is not the experience of what these
community ever, (according to these models mentioned) is statically "true" or "authentic," and likely, it is not even possible in this world.

In the 1980s revisions to the conceptualization of 'peace' were common in peace studies and peace education. Krauss and Krauss (1989) wrote, "Conceptualizations of peace as quiet and harmony between individuals have changed to conceptualizations of peace as conflict management." (p. 1)

This term is created here to describe the whole of the personal/collective imagination (free flowing creative ideas and synthesis of ideas) at any time-- in this case, particularly in regard to conflict. For critical pedagogues, the term conscientization (a la Freire) may be more familiar and very similar to conflict imaginary-- although, Freire's concept is more limited. Heaney and Horton (1990) wrote of conscientization: "... is the mind's bending back to reflect upon experienced, collective resistance, to theorize and create a rationale for acting against existing oppression while simultaneously imagining alternatives." (p. 93).

Unfortunately, I would guess most of "social activism" is aroused in anxiety, turned to 'fear' and terror-- and these well-meaning intentions are so often perpetuating the same terrorism they attempt to overthrow or stop.

These are publications in Portuguese, and have not yet been translated into English. Freire's more well known publications in English have been focused on a "pedagogy of the oppressed" (1970/75) and "pedagogy of hope" (1994).

For a review of the critics see for example, Ohliger (1995).

Several adult educators well-acquainted with Freire's writing and work have agreed with my claim that there is virtually nothing in Freire's writing on conflict itself as a concept (Denis Collins, personal communication, April 1, 1999; Paz Buttedahl, personal communications, March 17, 1999; Tom Heaney, personal communications, March 17, 1999; John Ohliger, personal communications, March 11, 1999). Tom Heaney wrote to me, "I think you are right in saying that Paulo Freire did not critically analyze the notion of conflict which permeates his writings.

This was written for adult educators/facilitators teaching both youth and adults. This was in the time of the Cold War. Kathy Bickmore, an American educator, was writing for "Friends" (which is the Quakers group). Note: This manual could be classified as a CME manual. It was not included in the survey of 22 CME manuals merely because it was not discovered in time to get into the sample. It was found on microfiche and in an obscure reference only.

Upon further reflection, while writing this, a case could be made Bickmore's manual is much further up the spectrum in Figure 12. Although, her manual would not be classified as a 'conflict' pedagogy because it has no critical analysis of the problematics of defining conflict itself.

The argument here could be directed to the political dimension (power/knowledge) of how "applied research" is being funded and published more than "pure research" in the subject of violence.

Albeit, I am equally critical of the critical pedagogies that have also not taken an interest in the conflict knowledge of CME, and likewise, would come under a similar criticism as launched at CME in this thesis.

From the booklet on the website http://www.abwam.com/nalybi/consciousliving/Conflict.html

This is written, in part, by the Director, who is a female. Discourses have no gender boundaries. You can imagine, without much difficulty, that the conflict education in an institute like this is not teaching about "justice," (as conflict practices) through strikes, demonstrations, or civil disobedience.

Discipline is used loosely here, referring to CME within the entire area of conflict resolution (which many would argue is not yet a discipline-- cf. for example, Delattre (1991)). However, Redekop (1999) makes a case for conflict resolution studies as a distinct but emerging discipline.


Lederach, would likely argue, his work is more "conflict transformation" than "conflict resolution."

Critical adult educators (e.g., Wilson and Cervero, 1997) have long disputed the dominating ways in which training, and technical rational biases have shaped planning and education for adults. Lederach (1995) offers a useful distinction between "prescriptive" (training) and "elicitive" educational approaches to CME.

Dialogue, is probably the foremost educational way to work with difference and conflict. This has a long tradition in philosophy as well. My use is within a critical (conflict) tradition. Gadotti (1994) notes: "... [The] central idea of this book is that the pedagogy of dialogue does not exclude the notion of conflict. On the contrary, the philosophy of dialogue values conflict and works to overcome it. It considers conflict legitimate and relies on it as a means of fully realizing authentic dialogue.... Dialogue, not consensus, is imperative in dealing with conflict. Dialogue within conflict works toward overcoming and integrating without eliminating the opposition. Pedagogy of conflict is essentially dialectical." (p. 143). This is a Freirean conception
but with all that ability to be critical— I wonder how well we do "conflict" as part of it? (in relation to power)

in a postmodernist framework be carried out in sociology (in particular). I recommend that an integration of modernist (conflict tradition) and postmodernist analysis is possible as both these have a great interest in 'conflict'

a useful framework to build a 'conflict' pedagogy.

with Giroux, Apple, McLaren, Lather, hooks, etc. (see References).

starting with Giroux, Apple, McLaren, Lather, hooks, etc. (see References).

Although neo- is troublesome, for now, it suggests that a thorough review of conflict theory, and an update within a postmodernist framework be carried out in sociology (in particular). I recommend that an integration of modernist (conflict tradition) and postmodernist analysis is possible as both these have a great interest in 'conflict' and its role in social and cultural life. These two traditions have a battle to pursue, but I would argue that a conceptual study of 'conflict' can act as a catalyst and centre to pull these areas of thinking together in a very powerful synthesis— a synthesis, that will likely involve a better analysis of Foucault's concepts (especially power) in relation to conflict.

I have long been concerned that there is critical theory (traditions) and a "culture of argument" (Tannen, 1998) but with all that ability to be critical-- I wonder how well we do "conflict" as part of it?  
Students are already being exposed to the violent ideological conflicts of the university everyday.... When there is little open debate [conflict], teachers readily project paranoid myths about one another, deepening the campus's atmosphere of suspicion and hostility. (Graff, 1992, p. 169).

Beneath the scholarly presentation of this research thesis is a wounded raised-poor working class person, working class-identified intellectual-- and wounded artist embedded in an existence interested in 'soul-making,' as James Hillman or Carl Jung have written about in the depth archetypal and transpersonal psychological/spiritual traditions E. and W. The pain of changing my subaltern cultural language to an academic middleclass language for this thesis and scholarly assessment, in the name of social science rigor (and respect, and cultural capital), has not been an easy sacrifice. I feel stretched completely, often dislocated, and drawn out to a thin-line across the borders between classes, as I complete this initiation of a Master's degree. I am not a Master at anything yet. And I truly wish the Educational Studies Department would honor the "Arts" in the Master of Arts degree. I take space now to honor the art aspect of this thesis and my work in this preface.

This soul-making, contrary to individualism and psychologism, is not one dissociated from the historical, sociocultural and political world, but is driven and articulated by it and through it-- and visa versa. Arnold Mindell's work on what he calls "deep democracy" and large group conflict transformation is inspired by the transpersonal 'field' and lingers always in my experience with his work and my own teaching when in the face-of-conflict and violence. This study of 'conflict' is led by a soul conviction that the problem of violence is primarily led by ideas and thus, is inherently a problem of the imagination (a depleted conflict imaginary throughout the world). The pursuit of conflict knowledge in this thesis is a pursuit of creativity of ideas as critical inquiry, on the way toward, what I have labeled an improved conflict imaginary. This research began on the assumption that Jung, speaking about 'evil'
(could have been speaking of 'violence'), was on the 'jugular' of the soul problem I sought to engage in this thesis. He wrote (paraphrasing), *The greatest problem of evil is that we have lost our imagination for evil, and now it has us in its grip.*

As Graff (in the quote above) pointed out, the university is not the best place for such imagination and creativity for graduate students, or many others who are deeply in-touch with the *artist.* On this fourth draft of this thesis, I have felt sometimes dismayed at the attempts of current scholarship among my research committee (and others) to over simplify, decontextualize, and technicize what my original spontaneous drafts spoke soulfully about 'conflict' and 'violence.' In the name of conformity to traditions, styles, laser-efficiency and reader-friendliness, they brought out their swords and cut. If such a result is an improvement to them, it is a dubious one to me as author— and I honor my resistances. This does not mean this exercise of graduate initiation, defense and editing, power/knowledge dynamics of the institution, and critical engagement with my thoughts has not been useful. It has been more than useful too.

My concern is the way *soul* is killed in universities and their knowledge-making today. Like Mindell (1995), my concern is how the rebel spirit is squelched by authoritarian privilege and rank in organizational culture. Like Graff, my concern is that ideological violence is perpetrated continually among researchers in academic communities. Education, so called "higher," has proven in two years to continue to manifest the same pathology that led me to leave school teaching as a profession nearly 20 years ago. Little has changed in the educational imaginary, and as Graff's writing so clearly indicates, until conflicts are dealt with upfront and center as part of learning communities, there will continue to be violence perpetrated in every academics' fear, if not terrorism. In this context, I wrote to my research committee an "MA Thesis: Submission Letter" (the double-meaning of "submission" intended). On Dr. Petrina's encouragement, I've included it here in this Epilogue:
Dear Research Committee Members (Nov. 15, 1999); After finishing this 2nd draft, which feels like a big improvement, I felt something was incomplete. This letter to you is what I felt I needed to do for myself to complete this process of handing over my writing to you. I have a deep sense of sadness and some joy in finishing this passionately-driven work. I wish for readers to find something worth taking with them in the sacred battles to undermining the violence that continues in our lives. I want to acknowledge my sadness and hurt that comes from the past two years in graduate school. My thesis is on violence and conflict and their relationship. I have to 'walk-my-talk.' There is so much violence that occurs for students and staff, as I have witnessed. I see my thesis as a record of a search for conflict knowledge--motivated because of my disappointment in education and its institutions. My disappointment is underlayed with how systemic 'terror' is constructed and invades--preventing what could be a great place to learn and grow together as colleagues. I hate it when we settle for less than 'greatness' in our work and lives. Pain stings and fear numbs. My thesis begins ... with a definition of violence that is complex and subtle and incorporates the symbolic violence which I have seen mostly in graduate school. Conflict processes constantly ignored, denied, suppressed etc. The hurt--then the phoniness. The stabbing behind backs. The power/knowledge/conflict dynamics are both fascinating to study and yet they take a toxic toll on us all. I have paid dearly for my time here. No doubt each of you has as well. I have been hurt and hurt others as part of this poisonous pedagogy that exists in large bureaucratic institutions. None of us goes clean or stays pure. I chose to be here and walk through this path, this rite of passage and initiation, which I have so often wanted to reject and attack--this academic community. But I cannot stand apart from it now. This thesis and my passion to continue research joins me in this community. I honor and respect you, my mentors/research committee at UBC (albeit, a daily challenge for me), and, I also want to speak the truth. The quality of education is rapidly declining in this institution. I don't pretend there are easy answers or solutions. I don't pretend I have attempted to help out either. I don't pretend people
will all be excited and enthused to engage with me on the implications of a 'conflict' pedagogy and my critical analysis in this thesis. I don't pretend this has not been a 'terror-filled' path (and it does continue). I also have been very excited by the possibilities of what this thesis research has opened up. I leave it with you now to pass judgment. I encourage you to be ruthless. I also respond well to encouragement. May 'conflict' be a critical site of teaching and learning for all. 

- Michael
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APPENDIX I  Schematic Of The Conflict Imaginary

CONFLICT THEORY

Historical, Political, Sociocultural Context

Domination 'Fear'

CONFLICT KNOWLEDGES

SOCIAL CONFLICT PRACTICES

CONFLICT IMAGINARY

POST-MODERN EPISTEME

CLASSICAL EPISTEME

Crisis
Complexity
Change
Contradiction

The conflict imaginary is a conception that was created for this study to begin an analysis of how imaginative, creative, flexible, and healthy a person, group, or culture's view of 'conflict' is. My current definition for conflict imaginary--this term is created to embrace the entire complex of ability to imagine, create, transform, learn and practice conflictwork, outside and beyond (transcendent to) the habitual notions and reactions that commonly are associated with conflict and violence within one's own culture (i.e., one's own cultural conflict habitus, using habitus in a Bourdieuan sense, cf. Bellamy, 1994; Grenfell and James, 1998). However, the conflict imaginary goes beyond merely a "view" of 'conflict.' It encompass the combination (see diagram) of two main spheres. First, the inner gray sphere which includes the social conflict practices and conflict knowledges that are being utilized at any particular time or circumstance. These influence both how violence and conflict are seen to be related to each other conceptually, and how violence and conflict are interrelated in actual manifestations of social life. Note: the crisis-complexity-change-contradictions concepts are linked to conflict in this diagram. And domination-fear are linked to violence. These are indictors that have led me to believe that neither 'violence' nor 'conflict' will ever be well understood if their relationship to these extending concepts are ignored in the very conceptualizing process of conflict and violence (and their intimate link with each other). There is no longer, indicates this conflict imaginary model, justification to isolate the defining and conceptualizing of the concepts (and social phenomena) of conflict and violence. Second, the gray sphere is located within a larger contextual sphere (white) called "Historical, political, sociocultural context." This context ensures that a conflict imaginary is conceptualized analytically, and studied descriptively, within this larger context, in order to improve the meaning of conflict imaginary. The entire diagram is structured between a continuum of consensus theory and conflict theory. These represent long-term historical ideological positions about the nature and order of society and social life (cf. Bernard, 1983). The particular theory and/or conflict imaginary influencing greatly how conflict or conflicts are dealt with (via management and resolution methods). The consensus theory, tending to emphasize a benign structuring of social life/order as the norm. The conflict theory, tending to emphasize an oppressive and conflictual structuring of social life/order as the norm, where consensus and cooperation are often ensured via power and domination (i.e., coercion). The classical episteme (see Lyotard, 1984 on "modernity") and the post-modern episteme, roughly fit this consensus-conflict continuum but should not be taken literally or rigidly. The diagram generally shows there is a bias of the gray sphere, impacting the current North Western world conflict imaginary, toward the consensus, modernist and classical episteme. Conflictwork practices, as proposed in this thesis, as well as the 'conflict' pedagogy and critical conflict education are to be designed on shifting this paradigmatic bias of the conflict imaginary hegemony.

*****
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Economics/Politics</th>
<th>Theorists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800-1840</td>
<td>classical economics:</td>
<td>Hegel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ricardo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-1870</td>
<td>German historical economics</td>
<td>Marx and Engels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Realpolitik</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-1900</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nietzsche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engel's dialectical materialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1920</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marxist theories of imperialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simmel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1940</td>
<td>Mannheim; Lukacs; Gramsci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frankfurt School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marxist sociologists of science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1960</td>
<td>Gerth; C.W. Mills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organization theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stratification theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>political sociology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1990</td>
<td>conflict theory: Dahrendorf; Lenski; Collins</td>
<td>neo-Marxism and neo-Weberianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>world systems theory;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>historical sociology of revolutions,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>social movements, and the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sex stratification theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX III

### COOPERATION AND CONFLICT PERSPECTIVES ("Theory")

**Guiding Assumptions, World Views & Practices**

(Data collected primarily from sociology of education/adult education, and organizational development. Author's cited may or may not hold to the particular perspective being described.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COOPERATION THEORY</th>
<th>CONFLICT THEORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### ESSENTIAL PREMISES -
- Individual wills and volitions are seen as being subordinated in the interest of the general good...
  - (McGahan, 1981:236). "The system serves the needs of individuals and society. From this perspective social inequalities are tolerated because the majority of the people share a consensus view about the core values of society." (Eisey, 1986:53).

### FUNDAMENTAL ASSUMPTIONS -
- Societies cannot survive unless their members share at least some perceptions, attitudes, and values in common...
  - (Lenski, 1966). Emphasize common beliefs and values; conflict is secondary...
  - (Rubenson, 1989:54). "By necessity man [sic] is constantly seeking ways of ensuring predictability and continuity in his social relations. Norms and values are the key..." (Eisey, 1986:84).

### METHOD OF ANALYSIS -
- ... see the analysis of social phenomenon in terms of "structure and function"... (society) can be understood through the analysis of its various organs and the ways in which they are related. (Hassard, 1993:17).
  - (The) social system is ontologically and methodologically prior to its participants...
  - (Dawe, 1970 cited in McGahan, 1981:219). "Much of early sociology was concerned with grand theories of society which could explain social relations as a whole. This holistic approach, as it is called, is the basis for social systems perspectives. These holistic perspectives start from the notion that social behaviour is largely shaped and determined by forces outside the control of individuals..." (Eisey, 1986:62).

### ESSENTIAL PREMISES -
- [This] sociology of action (Dawe, 1970)... the key notion is that of autonomous man [sic], able to realize his full potential and to create a truly human social order only when freed from external constraint..." (McGahan, 1981:219). "Disruption [socially via conflict] therefore, is accepted as a necessary and common attribute of society where relationships are built on power, exploitation, and social contradictions." (La Bels, 1986). One doesn't have to..." accept simplistic structuralist [conflict] theories that do not take human agency into account." (Adams, 1986:411). "Material conditions determine human consciousness, and social classes see the world differently depending on their economic interests and the social conditions to which they are exposed... the dominant ideas in any society are those of the ruling class." (Rubenson, 1989:54).

### FUNDAMENTAL ASSUMPTIONS -
- Man is driven by self-interests, and groups will form certain associations of like-minded (and like-interests) which provide collective benefit... but they... do not always co-exist harmoniously because separate groups will, necessarily, pursue interests defined according to their unique perceptions of the world and according to those needs... but individuals in those groups will have to sometimes put their own needs second to the group. Where these groups do not compete a peaceful pluralism can be accomplished; however, where there is competition, some management of conflict becomes necessary..." (Meighan, 1981:237). "People as basically self-interested and self-centered, accepting social pressures to conform or cooperate only insofar as these behaviors serve to satisfy or maximize their own desires and interests. While it may be possible to enhance or change a person's basic egoistic predisposition through education, such egotism establishes the dominance of vested interests in society. Out of such interests comes the pragmatic need to organize collectively and to take action." (La Bels, 1986:42). This view sees "status differentiation" and hierarchies... as a way for superordinates to impose their will on those in subordinate positions...[La Bels, 1986:45]. "...argue that members of a society enjoy a measure of independence and autonomy and are not necessarily subordinate to the whole... place emphasis on structures, especially those associated with the production and distribution process, as important components in society as they heavily influence, if not determine, the nature of social interaction... place emphasis on the dialectic or the need to juxtapose opposing principles or tendencies." (La Bels, 1986:45). See POWER & AUTHORITY (Eisey, 1986:84-5). "...both versions of the conflict perspective... embody ideal visions of society, irrespective of their grasp...
is achieved and maintained... gives rise to different interpretations of how it is achieved...". (Eisey, 1996:82). Good approach for macro-analysis (Meighan, 1981:26). "... explains social phenomenon by describing their systemic relations to other phenomena without seeking original causes." (Adams, 1988:408). Based in "... Western social science... positivist epistemology and the quest for objective science... Parsons and Smelser and Merton... functionalism became the mainstream orientation of American social scientists in most of the 20th century." (Adams, 1988:408). "... describe the social system in a state of inertia, they tend to seek the cause of change among factors external to the system. They hypothesize that exogenous forces generate internal stresses thereby motivating adaptive responses which lead to social change..." (Eisey, 1996:44). Has been linked epistemologically with globalization and global competitiveness strategies, performativity, pragmatism, instrumentalism ("what works" is best) ("what is, must be") and "positivist" thinking... "... characterized by a concern for social order, consensus and social integration.... they struggle to derive 'facts' and 'theory' immune to local disruption or refutation.... Generalization across contexts is desirable.... A good theory is testable, parsimonious and significant. Hopefully it will explain and predict phenomena everywhere." (Bosshier, 1998:9). More interest in "how things work" than "why" or "whose interests are being served?" (Bosshier, 1998:10). "... a realist view of reality,... acceptance of objective structures and conditions and a belief in universals and foundational knowledge, or truth.... quest for nonmetiotic (awful) knowledge and believe in the possibility of progress.... positivist philosophy and empirical scientific methods... explaining causes by effects." (Paulston, n.d.: 179). "... provides an essentially rational explanation for social affairs... want practical solutions to practical problems and are usually committed to social engineering...". (Bosshier, 1996:64).

NATURAL WORLD - Parsons, Comte, Mills, Spencer and Durkheim "... stress on a unitary, natural world- system, a totality in which all the parts [are] related to the whole...". (Gassard, 1992:16).

FUNDAMENTAL ETHICS- is based on "... the standpoint of what is desirable for society as a whole." (Eisey, 1996:88). Evolved central values of society as primary (see INDIVIDUAL Eisey, 1996:88).

INDIVIDUAL - Durkheimian view... man [sic] as a being restrained from unfettered pursuit of his [sic] own self-interest by his association with, and by the restrictions which arise from, the collective value system of society. "..." (Meighan, 1981:23). "... what is desired is compatibility between the needs of the individual and society as a whole, for they are seen as necessarily integral. This encourages the belief that the central values of society, have been evolved and tested by custom and practice, are the mainstays of integration and stability." (Eisey, 1996:88). on observable truth. The conflict perspective puts forward the idea that the elimination of inequality, in the possession of resources, status, wider life chances and political power, leads to social stability. Thus equality is a utopian vision of society where social conflict has been drastically reduced through man's [sic] collective humanity and sense of justice." (Eisey, 1996:87). "... views structural characteristics of society as the consequence of struggles for power and dominance between competing groups. Tensions [conflict] and contradictions between elements of a society are assumed to be ever present and, when sufficiently intense they set the stage for radical change." (Adams, 1988:408).

METHOD OF ANALYSIS- "... have as their point of departure for sociological analysis, the concern... the Hobbesian question of how societies hold together." (Meighan, 1981:23). Focus is on "conflict and power" in social organizations. (A Marxist approach). "... the attraction of conflict theory... is that it allows us to generate explanations of social behaviour at both the micro- and the macro-analysis levels." (Meighan, 1981:23). "... place emphasis on the dialectic or the need to juxtapose opposing principles or tendencies..." (La Belle, 1986:45). See INDIVIDUALS (La Belle, 1986:44). "The conflict analysts reject the equilibrium paradigms image of the benign system that is self-regulating, harmonious, and tending toward homeostasis." (La Belle, 1986:46). "... emphasize competing interests, elements of domination, exploitation and coercion." (Rubenson, 1985:4-5). "The world [sic] conflict somewhat erroneously gives the impression that the theory focuses only on dramatic events such as revolution, war, and other forms of open (direct) conflict. Its main argument, however, is not simply that society consists of conflict but that open conflict is only the tip of the iceberg (Collins, 1985)." "The intellectual contribution of the work of Marx and Engels lies at the core of the conflict paradigm. In classical Marxism, the so-called forces and relations of production are central to class conflict...". (Rubenson, 1985:54-5). "... the historical materialist focused on structural transformation for 'social evolution'...". (Paulston, n.d.: 199). "... radical [conflict] functionalist texts research most often seeks to derive social facts from various a priori theories...". (La Belle, 1986:181). "... focus... on the forces and relations constraining and directing collective behavior..." (Paulston, n.d.:190). "... the problem-solving adequacy of the Marxist and neo-Marxist theories has created a dilemma for some of the non-Marxist scholars who subscribe to a pluralistic democratic society with constitutionally guaranteed freedoms. Thus, to make use of the rich resources available to us in the Marxist tradition, certain attitudes have to be overcome." (Kuhn's communist ideology and economic determinism) (Rubenson, 1985:54). Collins (1985) points out that just because classical Marx [overly deterministic] theory of economic production hasn't been sufficient, we don't have to abandon it completely (Rubenson, 1985:54). Rooted in a materialist view of the natural and social world.". According to Burrell and Morgan (1979:327), "it is based upon an ontology which
SOCIAL ORDER - Spencer: "... a self-regulating system which can be understood through the analysis of its various organs [parts]..." (Hassard, 1993:17). The anthropologist Malinowski argued "function" explains why a primitive society is the way it is (Hassard, 1993:17). "... society as a system whose interrelated and interdependent components interact within some circular boundary line. Systems are understood to exhibit a natural tendency to maintain themselves by moving toward a state of equilibrium and/or integration among the forces acting within and upon them." (La Bele, 1966:42). Society is a whole - "Much of the early sociology was concerned with grand theories of society which would explain social relations as a whole." (Eisey, 1986:62).

SOCIAL SYSTEM - "[this view] ... asserts the paramount necessity, for societal and individual well-being, of external constraint; hence the notion of a social system ontologically and methodologically prior to its participants." (Dawes, 1970 cited in Meighan, 1981:219). "The existing social system, that is, its institutional structure and values, is regarded as the basis of order and stability. This framework is not regarded as challenging in any major respect." (Eisey, 1986:58). "It is assumed that social system refers to organised patterns and processes of social behaviour." (Eisey, 1986:62). "... the social system as in a state of inertia..." (La Bele, 1986:44).

SOCIAL STRUCTURES - "Social change takes place largely through structural differentiation and specialization, and all modern societies are assumed to have similar social structures...". (Adams, 1986:400).

SOCIAL NEEDS - are equivalent to "system needs" (Meighan, 1981:216). See INEQUALITY (Rubenson, 1989:54).

SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR - The holistic (social systems) perspective "... starts from the notion that social behaviour is largely shaped and determined by forces outside the control of individuals." (Eisey, 1986:62).

SOCIAL ORDER - "... social order results from a general agreement of values, a consensus omnium ... which out weighs all possible or actual differences of opinion and interest." (Dahrendorf, 1959 cited in Meighan, 1981:236). "... gives rise [through scientific investigations] to different interpretations of how it [social order] is achieved, ranging from the idea of collective consensus based on common values to the ideas that repression, fear, manipulation and the exercise of power by some over others is the basis of social order [a la Hobbes]." (Eisey, 1986:63). "The consensus model starts from the idea that social order is brought about by people's commitments to norms and values of behaviour. These prescribed forms of social relations determine social cohesion and stability, making society a naturally integrating system... Norms and values are the key elements providing the means of social cooperation emphasizes the hard and concrete nature of reality which exists outside the minds of men... focuses upon the essentially conflictual nature of social affairs and the fundamental process of change which this generates." (cited in Adams, 1986:40).

NATURAL WORLD - seen from a materialist view (Adams, 1986:40).

INDIVIDUAL - "... routine deviations... are explicable in terms of individuals seeking to further their own particular causes and interests..." (Meighan, 1981:236). See CONFLICT (Meighan, 1981:237) and the importance of individuals having power to shape and determine goals in the "management of conflict." "... view individuals as being in embattled positions, fighting for identity, prestige, and basic freedoms in the face of constraints that threaten survival and life chances." (La Bele, 1985:54).

SOCIAL IS - "... in this perspective of society stability is uncertain and fluctuating...". See POWER AND AUTHORITY (Eisey, 1986:84-5). From the utopian ideal vision of this perspective see FUNDAMENTAL ASSUMPTIONS (Eisey, 1986:85). Re: change in the nature of society - see SOCIAL BEHAVIOR (Eisey, 1986:83).

SOCIAL STRATIFICATION - "This perspective implies that social life, particularly in the political and economic spheres, generates all kinds of sectional interests and groups with differing amounts of power. This explains the existence of social stratification... This hierarchical arrangement is often the basis of conflict between groups in society for interests are neither identical or equally shared." See POWER & AUTHORITY (Eisey, 1986:84). See INEQUALITY (Eisey, 1986:84).

SOCIAL BEHAVIOR - See METHODS OF ANALYSIS (Meighan, 1981:29). "... man's [sic] ideas and actions can change social relations, and ultimately the nature of society, through the redistribution of power. Social behaviour would still be subject to external forces but on the basis of a new political and economic dispensation." (Eisey, 1986:63).

SOCIAL ORDER - "... view social order as being achieved through a continual process of disputed interaction between men, of sectional struggles and of the imposition of order by those who win power." (Meighan, 1981:236). "... holds that coherence and order in society are founded on force and constraint, on the domination of some and the subjugation of others." (Dahrendorf, 1959 cited in Meighan, 1981:236). "... principles legitimize the preparation of an intelligent and loyal revolutionary vanguard, the mobilization of the masses for participation in the change process, and the implementation of a new social order." (La Bele, 1985:40).

"... in this perspective of society stability is uncertain and fluctuating." (Eisey, 1986:84). "... soc-
and consensus over most areas of life. The divisions that arise between people and groups are countered by a fundamental unity of purpose." (Eisey, 1986:84).

SOCIAL CONTROL - "Sociology's long-standing support of the systems notion is revealed by those who emphasize system maintenance with equilibrium and/or integration tendencies. These individuals consider functional those elements of the system that contribute to its stability. Such elements include both normative consensus and social control." (La Belle, 1986:44). "... coercion [to maintain social order and consensus] is seen either as temporary or as benefiting society as a whole." (Rubenson, 1989:54). See REGULATION (Boshier, 1996:64).

CHANGE - "... view change as a consequence of how well the parts of the system fit together or how well the system fits with other surrounding or interacting systems. The process of change is understood as a process of tension reduction. The source of change lies primarily in the internal stresses and strains created by exogenous intrusions or endogenous inequalities.... if some element or condition contributes to the stability of the system, the absence of that element or condition contributes to the instability and/or change.... change and stability are not mutually exclusive states. The system retains stability only by adapting in response to changing conditions." (La Belle, 1986:43). "Change occurs, therefore, from the centre of the value structure of society, usually as an adaptive process in response to revised ideas derived from new insights and knowledge." (Eisey, 1986:86). "... with its modernization theory approach to change as structural innovation for social efficiency and 'progress'..." (Paulston, n.d.:199).

SOCIAL PHENOMENA - "... explains social phenomenon by describing their systemic relations to other phenomena without seeking original causes." (Adams, 1980:408).


SOCIAL CHANGE - "... a process of gradual adaptation." (Meighan, 1981:226). See POLITICAL AGENDA (La Belle, 1986:50-1). "... adaptation is the only kind of change that is acceptable as it is viewed as the single means of adjusting the system to dysfunctional conditions. Boskoff (1964) defines dysfunctional conditions as those including: (1) interpersonal and intergroup conflict..." (La Belle, 1986:44-5). "Adult education may facilitate such change [in value structure of society] through the dissemination of knowledge by a two-way communication of ideas.... adult education communicates outwards and downwards from the core culture of society. This means that maintenance and conservation of society takes precedence over more urgent ideas of social change [emanating from the margins of society]."

SOCIAL CONTROL - Vertical hierarchies, roles and status (i.e., differentiation) are the means of maintaining the system (La Belle, 1986:42). See POWER & AUTHORITY (Eisey, 1986:64). "[paraphrasing Morales-Gomez, 1979] conflict is inherent in Latin America and Caribbean societies where political power is based on a show of force and repression is used to maintain the status quo favoring the existing dominant elite." (La Belle, 1986:46).


SOCIAL MOVEMENTS - are seen as important and integral parts of a "broader struggle for change..." (Rubenson, 1989). For Gramsci [and popular education] "... change is not simply a technical question of seizing power; it is a movement of the masses culturally and politically through worker's councils..." (La Belle, 1986:46). See EDUCATION PROGRAMS and EDUCATIONAL REVOLUTION (Rubenson, 1989; Boshier, 1998).

SOCIAL RELATIONS - "... emphasis is typically on opposing needs and power in accounting for social relations (Schermorhon, 1970). "... man's [sic] ideas and actions can change social relations, and ultimately the nature of society, through the redistribution of power." (Eisey, 1986:83).

SOCIAL POLICY - See EDUCATION PROGRAMS (Rubenson, 1982:5).

SOCIAL PLANNING- [structural-functionalism] has been "...social change takes place largely through structural differentiation and specialization, and all modern societies are assumed to have similar social structures...". (Adams, 1986:413). "...they hypothesize that exogenous forces generate internal stresses thereby motivating adaptive responses which lead to social change...". (La Belle, 1986:44). "...a preference for incremental social change...". (Rubenson, n.d.: 4). "...usually committed to social engineering as a basis for change with an emphasis on gradualism, order, and the maintenance of equilibrium...". (Adams, 1988:413). "...some authorities believe that social change is best accomplished by embodying in that person increased skills and knowledge." (Rubenson, 1982:4). "...the problems within the individual and that an investment in education increases the person's productivity by embodying in that person increased skills and knowledge." (Rubenson, 1982:4). "...believe social problems are caused by breakdowns in the communication of core values and norms (such as achievement and ambition, tenacity, thrift, hard work, self-help, and other long term goals of life). The problem of communicating values lies in the socialisation process which is ineffectively transmitted in the family, neighborhoods, schools...". These explanations are embodied in the culture of poverty and cycle of deprivation perspectives on social problems. These place emphasis on various forms of psychological (individual) deviance, evidenced by the social behaviour of the disadvantaged (placing fault in delivery of services) rather than political-economic solutions." (Eisey, 1986:413).

SOCIAL PROBLEMS- "With regard to social problems the task of the social welfare, of which adult education and community development are constituent elements, is to strive towards the social integration of the disadvantaged into the mainstream values and behavioural norms of the majority of members of society. This supports cultural and psychological deficit explanations of social problems and residual welfare policies." (Eisey, 1986:46). "...the problems rest within the individual and that an investment in education increases the person's productivity by embodying in that person increased skills and knowledge." (Rubenson, 1982:4). "...believes social problems are caused by breakdowns in the communication of core values and norms (such as achievement and ambition, tenacity, thrift, hard work, self-help, and other long term goals of life). The problem of communicating values lies in the socialisation process which is ineffectively transmitted in the family, neighborhoods, schools...". These explanations are embodied in the culture of poverty and cycle of deprivation perspectives on social problems. These place emphasis on various forms of psychological (individual) deviance, evidenced by the social behaviour of the disadvantaged (placing fault in delivery of services) rather than political-economic solutions." (Eisey, 1986:46).

SOCIAL PLANNING- [structural-functionalism] has been "...traditionally popular in international planning circles...". (Adams, 1986:413).

POLITICAL AGENDA - "...relatively little concern for radical change in such a maintenance-oriented culture as consensus regarding the correctness of existing economic and political structures makes the drive for change a question of enhancing individual welfare within the larger society." (La Belle, 1986:50-1). "...the widespread adoption of the new-Rightist political ideology has created a situation where adult education is widely thought to be for remedial purposes, for skills training and reskilling for economic development...". (Boshier, 1996:61).


SOCIAL PROBLEMS- See INTEGRATION (Eisey, 1986:47). "[The] view of social problems places greater weight on inequality in the economic and political spheres of society, where resources are allocated and life chances determined, as the main causes of social problems. Hence the emphasis upon the redistribution of economic resources, social opportunities and policies of positive discrimination as the basis of welfare provision. These also serve as lubricants of social change...". There are two versions of conflict theory as it relates to dealing with social problems. The pluralist approach seeks a gradual transformation of social problems through progressive welfare measures, such as positive discrimination programmes. Pluralism in this context means political power. This provides the basis for egalitarian welfare policies aimed at bringing about far reaching social change. Essentially the pluralist approach starts from the idea of solving social problems and resolving conflicts within the framework of a parliamentary democracy. Such a democracy could include room for the expression of the wants and needs of all kinds of community groups. This is a participatory democracy a more developed forum for consulting the people than the existing representative system. These ideas are particularly attractive to radically inclined adult education and community development workers...". The [radical approach] more extreme conflict perspective whereby social problems are regarded as only resolved by operating outside the existing social order. This is seen as too vested with entrenched interest groups to desire much social equality and change. Ultimately, this conflict perspective regards violent revolution aimed at fundamentally changing the prevailing system of economic and political relations in society as the only realistic solution. This is implicit in the radical version of social welfare...". Both [conflict perspectives] embody ideal visions of society irrespective of their grasp on observable truth." (Eisey, 1986:47).


POLITICAL AGENDA- this view seriously questions the "...dominant liberal views on [society and] adult education." (Rubenson, 1989:66). "...focus on material and psychic deprivation, are often visionary and utopian and concerned with possibilities rather than acceptance of what is." (Boshier, 1996.}
POWER & AUTHORITY - "... view inequality [or power etc.] as natural and inevitable. ... What is important is the pervasive power of elite groups to uphold and transmit those values that are associated with the successful functioning of society." (Eisey, 1986:87). "Social purpose [unity] is the basis of legitimate authority and power, exercised by some on behalf of all society's members through a wide range of institutions. ... The educational system performs important tasks in communicating and transmitting social norms and values and represents a collectively agreed means of legitimate authority, backed by legal force and the prescribed duties of the teacher's role to uphold social values. ... [this view] argues that the unequal distribution of power reflects natural differences in abilities and efforts. Elite rule not only provides a means of advancing the development of society it also ensures its stability. This is achieved through the influence of good examples of cultural standards, economic success and leadership qualities, which in turn act as incentives for others to emulate elite groups in society. ..." (Eisey, 1986:84). "Power is derived from the norms and values shared by the majority in society. Power is regarded as a resource for the coordination of social relations in economic, political and cultural activities. Whereas it is possible that some people misuse their power, nonetheless the overall purpose of power is a functional one in society." (Eisey, 1986:85).

CONFLICT RESOLUTION - "The [conflict] divisions that arise between people and groups are countered by a fundamental unity of purpose." (Eisey, 1986:84).

CONFLICT (TENSIONS & STRAINS) - "Despite this inclination toward stability and balance, however, systems are subject to internal stresses and strains [conflict] caused by either differences in internal components or by disturbances from external forces. The system attempts to minimize these tensions and conflicts and to preserve or retain equilibrium through internal mechanisms of adaptation and adjustment." (La Belle, 1986:42). See CHANGE as a process of "tension [conflict] reduction" (La Belle, 1986:43). "Consensus theories emphasize common beliefs and values; conflict is secondary..." (Rubenson, 1989:54). "... regards conflict as a deviation from central values...". (Eisey, 1986:86).

OPPOSITION (CONFlict) - "... even fairly routine deviations from the 'normal' ... opposition-- become problematic... [explanations of authorities based on the assumption] the individuals involved being victims of poor socialization, of their being ignorant of the 'common good', or their not understanding the welfare depends upon the successful development of the collective interest...". (Meighan, 1981:236).

DISORGANIZATION (CONFlict) - "Problems of disorganization or conflict are thus largely attributed to poor organizational factors, the lack of fit between role and personality, inadequate adaptation to emerging.

POWER & AUTHORITY - See CONFLICT (Meighan, 1981:237). "... conflictual interactions between groups of unequal power also engender interdependence and elements that have system or equilibrium characteristics." (La Belle, 1986:54). See SOCIAL RELATIONS (La Belle, 1986:46). "... goal attainment by one group as inversely related to goal attainment by another group. Such forces in opposition--structural incomparabilities, power differentials, and the pursuit of incompatible goals- inevitably generate conflict as groups vie in attempt to improve their status and promote their own interests." (La Belle, 1986:46). "... relationships are built on power, exploitation, and social contradictions." (La Belle, 1986:46). For Gramsci [and popular education movements] ... change is not simply a technical question of seizing power; it is a movement of the masses culturally and politically through worker's councils...". (La Belle, 1986:47). See INEQUALITY (Rubenson, 1989:54-5). "The conflict model places emphasis on the power of certain economic, political and cultural groups to determine the norms and values of society in their own interests. This implies that social relations at the workplace and in many other areas of interaction between interest groups, are based on inducement and coercion. Thus social relations are often characterised by divisiveness, leading to opposition and conflict under certain conditions (such as anger at discrimination and awareness of exploitation). This perspective implies that social life, particularly in the political and economic spheres, generates all kinds of sectional interests and groups differing amounts of power. This explains the existence of social stratification... This hierarchical arrangement is often the basis of conflict between groups in society for interests are neither identical or equally shared. Those holding power and having privileged positions to maintain the means at their disposal to resist other interest groups. This provokes a pressure to change and in this perspective of society stability is uncertain and fluctuating." (Eisey, 1986:64). "... power... that its possession is derived from the productive system, with those having greater access to economic resources gaining control of many other commanding heights of society; in politics, education, religion, .... Power is the currency for determining social norms and values which are then broadcast by elite groups to the rest through the institutions of society. ... Power defends the interests of privileged groups and is therefore the base root of social inequality. ... Conflicts of interest centre around vested economic and class
INEQUALITY - "The continual attempt to adapt to the system makes for greater integration of the whole, which in turn makes the structure more able to survive by reducing internal disharmony...". (Hassan, 1993:17)

DYSFUNCTIONAL [CONFLICT]- "Boskoff (1954) defines dysfunctional conditions [in society] as those including: (1) interpersonal and intergroup conflict (2) intergroup competition... rather than being accepted as naturally occurring phenomena, are viewed as indicators of system breakdown...". (La Belle, 1986:44-5). "Where malfunctions emerge in society the theory holds that self-correcting mechanisms come into play to re-integrate and stabilize social relations." (Eisey, 1986:50).

DEVIANE [CONFLICT] - see DISORGANIZATION (Meighan, 1981:210). "... regards conflict as a deviation from central values...". (Eisey, 1986:50). "In this view social values are re-emphasized to correct any behavioral deviations." (Eisey, 1986:50). "... poverty and disadvantage are seen primarily as the result of deviance and social disorganization." (Eisey, 1986:50). Social problems are generally placed upon the "... various forms of psychological deviance...". (La Belle, 1986:46).

INEQUALITY - "... various forms of psychological deviance...". (La Belle, 1986:46). "...as individuals or groupings feel threatened and are capable of defending themselves, conflict becomes an expression of the value system of that society...". (La Belle, 1986:46). "... view individuals as capable of protecting their interests...". (La Belle, 1986:46). "... view individuals as being in embattled positions...". (La Belle, 1986:46). "... as individuals or groups come into contact with one another they establish regularized relations which may be seen as indicators of system breakdown...". (La Belle, 1986:46). See OPPOSITION [CONFLICT] (La Belle, 1986:46). "... management of conflict becomes necessary...". (La Belle, 1986:46). "... view individuals as being in embattled positions, fighting for identity, prestige, and basic freedoms in the face of constraints that threaten survival and life chances...". (La Belle, 1986:46).


PROFESSIONALISM - "... professions can be seen as interest groups [of privilege] protecting their members' privileges rather than as groups operating a service-to others ethic." (Meighan, 1981:50).

prepared to work hard and use their brains. This incentive system is an unconsciously evolved means of making society operate effectively. "parts...are interlocked into a functional whole." (Eisey, 1986:85). "Rather than social inequalities being seen as 'system disturbing' they are regarded as natural elements of social integration and stability." (Eisey, 1986:69).


**REGULATION** - "Burrell and Morgan [1979] spoke of a sociology of regulation... emphasizing an underlying unity and cohesiveness... on how societies maintain themselves as an entity, how they hold together rather than fall apart." (Boshier, 1996:64). See DYSFUNCTION [CONFlict] (Eisey, 1986:80). "In this view social values are re-emphasized to correct any behavioural deviations. Social values lie at the heart of social policy." (Eisey, 1986:86).

**SCHOOLS** - "Parsons [1959], the leading consensus theorist, sees schools as instruments of selection... function as agencies of socialization whose role is the allocation of manpower to the appropriate positions...", which take the form of commitment to broad values of society and a performance role in the society (Rubenson, 1989:55). "Regarding crisis of schooling, it is "... seen as a technical, organizational, and administrative problem caused by improper planning by governments and a lack of resources. Outcomes like high dropout and socially biased selection to secondary education are regarded as nonfunctional outcomes." (Rubenson, 1990:2).

**EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT** - "According to Parsons, the main process of differentiation and selection [i.e., stratification] through education takes place along the axis of achievement. Achievement is different for different people, and it is differently valued by different people. So, from the society's point of view... allocation of resources through differentiation and selection, based on widely shared values, is considered fair." (Rubenson, 1989:55). "Parsons [1959] (p. 30) states, "Probably the most fundamental condition underlying this process is the sharing of common values by the two adult agencies involved, the family and the school... that it is fair to give differential rewards for different levels of achievement, so long as there has been fair access to opportunity, and fair chance that these rewards lead to higher-order opportunities for the successful." (Rubenson, 1989:55).

collective humanity and sense of justice." (Eisey, 1986:87). "One trend [in educational research] is a revival of Marxist theory coupled with a focus on conflict, power, control..." (Rubenson, 1986:69). "Tensions [conflict] and contradictions between elements of a society are assumed to be ever present..." (Adams, 1986:49). "From a structural Marxist perspective, for example, Morales-Gomez (1979) maintains that conflict is inherent in Latin America and Caribbean societies where political power is based on a show of force and repression is used to maintain the status quo favoring an existing dominant elite." (La Belle, 1986:40). "society is characterized by inherent conflicts and, within these, lie the basis of change." (Boshier, 1996:69).

**STRUCTURAL CONFLICT** - re: "structural conflict" [this view] ..."disputes that all groups are relatively well served by the structural arrangements, and the idea a conflict of interests is stressed. Some groups are seen as having advantageous positions over others and they will strive to keep this situation as it is..." (South, 1981:26). Burrell and Morgan (1979) spoke of a sociology of "radical change", "... whose explanation for change resides in deep-seated structural conflict, modes of domination and structural contradiction." (Boshier, 1996:54). See POWER & AUTHORITY (Eisey, 1986:84-5).

**CLASS CONFLICT** - "its main argument, however, is not simply that society consists of conflict but that open conflict is only the tip of the iceberg (Collins, 1985).... The intellectual contribution of the work of Marx and Engels lies at the core of the conflict paradigm. In classical Marxism, the so-called forces and relations of production are central to class conflict..." (Rubenson, 1989:54-5). "Conflicts of interest centre around vested economic and class positions held by powerful elites in society and the forms of opposition that arise periodically from discontented groups." "... the ultimate cause of all class conflict and social modifications rests with the production process and how the resulting product is distributed..." (La Belle, 1986:46).

**OPPOSITION [CONFlict]** - "... emphasis is typically on opposing needs and power in accounting for social relations (Schermerhorn, 1970). These principles establish a conflict relationship between or among social units, which are construed as oriented toward the attainment of incompatible or mutually exclusive goals..." (La Belle, 1986:46). See POWER & AUTHORITY (Eisey, 1986:84). See CLASS CONFLICT (Eisey, 1986:69).

**DISRUPTION [CONFlict]**: "Disruption, therefore, is accepted as a necessary and common attribute of society where relationships are built on power, exploitation, and social contradictions." (La Belle, 1990:46).

**INEQUALITY** - "... equal opportunity [in the rhetoric of the status quo, particularly in regard to education]... is questioned [critically] by the conflict pers-
EDUCATION PROGRAMS - Those associated with human capital nonformal education programs - programs intended to prepare individuals to take their place as economically productive citizens in the existing socioeconomic (order) structure - it emphasizes the contribution of education to stability and adaptation - (characteristic of) long-standing capitalist societies and some aspects of recent victorious revolutionary movements in socialist societies..." (La Belle, 1986:42). Maintenance-oriented non-formal education may be present in a recently victorious revolutionary process or it may be a part of a politically stable society's development agenda..." (La Belle, 1986:50). Adult education, values and change - see SOCIAL CHANGE (Eisey, 1986:60).

See AUTHORITY & POWER (Eisey, 1986:84). "Type 1 and 2 [conventional - adult education programs] are essentially regulatory and seek incremental individual change within the status quo." (Paulston and Altenbaugh, 1988:118). Such conventional adult education programs are "... low in change goals... formal systems... business, military... training seeking to enhance individual and socio-economic efficiency and productivity..." (Paulston and Altenbaugh, 1988:118). "... is based upon the implicit assumption that the pedagogic actions of families from different social classes, as well as the action of the schools, work together in a harmonious way to transmit a cultural heritage which is considered the property of the whole society. The assumption is that the educational system promotes mobility in a fair and equal way (Bourdieu, 1977)." (Rubenson, 1989:81). "From a functionalist perspective it is obvious that adult education does not play the same role in socialization that preadult education does." - however, adult education is still involved in shaping values and attitudes - and this is particularly strict in new revolutionary regimes where adult education is key in transforming values and motivations for political ends (Rubenson, 1989:51-2). "Accountability", "measurement", evaluation via "competency-based instruction" and "behavioral objectives" are common (Bushe, 1990:121). "Functionalist-oriented education systems are concerned with consolidating extant power relations." (Bushe, 1990:63). Most manpower, government training, reskilling programs, up-grading, continuing professional development, technical training, adult basic education and school-like institutions are based on functionalist assumptions. (Bushe, 1990:64). Massive health campaigns as "education" are out to change individual behavior "... a focus on individuals makes it easy to blame the victim and successful education (and control) greatly depends on the leadership and cooperation of people at risk [as in the case of AIDS]." (Bushe, 1990:122).

EDUCATIONAL REFORM- uses a "rationalist model" of "instrumental action", "... governed by technical roles based on empirical knowledge." (Adams, 1988:41). "The conceptual basis for N.A. education policies and practice previously emanated from structural-functional framework emphasizing consensus, which supported the notion that educational reform had little to do with political... factual opportunities to participate are far from equal." (Rubenson, 1989:54-5). See CONFLICT (La Belle, 1986:54). "... [this]... approach questions social change, inequality, mobility, and stratification..." (Rubenson, 1989:54-5). "Social inequality is seen as an expression of the struggle for power, privileges, and goods and services that are in short supply." (Rubenson, 1989:54-5). "Power defends the interests of privileged groups and is therefore the base root of social inequality." (Eisey, 1986:84) also See POWER & AUTHORITY (Eisey, 1986:84-9). See INTEGRATION (Eisey, 1986:87). "The conflict perspective puts forward the idea that the elimination of inequality, in the possession of resources, status, wider life chances and political power, leads to social stability. Thus equality is a utopian vision of society where social conflict has been drastically reduced through man's [sic] collective humanity and sense of justice." (Eisey, 1986:87). "Far reaching social change is the end result of attacking the root causes of inequality and disadvantaged in society, by changing the distribution of economic rewards and political power. In short, the class society has to be dismantled for social justice and stability to prevail social relations." (Eisey, 1986:88).

VIOLENCE- See EDUCATIONAL REVOLUTION (La Belle, 1986:42). "Ultimately this [more radical] conflict perspective [of the low conflict approaches] regards violent revolution aimed at fundamentally changing the prevailing system of economic and political relations in society as the only realistic solution. This is implicit in the radical version of social welfare..." See SOCIAL PROBLEMS (Eisey, 1986:87).

INTEGRATION- "... there is no natural tendency towards social integration and stability for unequal and disadvantaged groups. It is only by ensuring greater equality and social justice that the social problems that divide society can wither away, to be replaced by integration and stability between equal members of society..." (Eisey, 1986:87).

SCHOOLS- "Studies using a conflict perspective may often use the concept of alienation in schooling." (Meghan, 1981:26). "The conflict theorists maintain that the symbols and of the knowledge in educational institutions is that of the dominant culture and is therefore intimately related to the principles and practices of cultural and social control (Apple, 1982)... schools reproduce and legitimate the ubiquitous power structures of today's society." (Rubenson, 1989:54-5). According to Althusser (1971), schools are the most important source in the reproduction of capitalist society, and schools only look separate and autonomous from the economic system (Rubenson, 1989:58).

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH- there has been a slow revival of alternate research traditions in adult education with the decline of positivist tradition in social sciences generally... "One trend is revival of
EDUCATORS - "The task of adult educators and others is to socialize people into an awareness and response to these values [central to society as a whole]. This places the communicators of knowledge and skills, such as adult educators, in the position of representing the mainstream values and goals of established leading groups in society." (Eisey, 1996:38). See AUTHORITY & POWER (Eisey, 1996:54). "AIDS educators often use the 'campaign' as the primary method. Techniques are usually integrated so as to present a unified and inescapable body of 'facts' to the populace... informed by functionalist assumptions run by public health authorities... assume there are objective 'facts'... to be 'communicated'." (Boshier, 1995:5).

EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT - "Paulston [1977] identified evolutionary, neoevolutionary, systems and structure-functionalist approaches [all closely related] to education and development." (Boshier, 1995:3). "With regard to the Third World, the development thesis is often accompanied by the notion that progress is achieved by spreading [trickle-down-theory] the 'benefits' of modern society to backward areas through the application of technology and capital (La Belle, 1976)." (Rubenson, 1982:3).

USE OF EDUCATION - "Another of education's contributions to the maintenance of society come from its use as a means to inculcate a high degree of value consensus within and between various segments of society,... relatively little concern for radical change in such a maintenance-oriented society..." (La Belle, 1986:50).1 "... a pronounced social function of adult education is to maintain and upgrade the human capital necessary for the competitive and efficient economy to work for society's good." (Rubenson, 1989:59). "... it is supposed that increased amounts of schooling for individuals with little schooling will increase their wages, reduce social inequities and help develop the individual to his or her fullest potential (Simmons, 1980)." See AUTHORITY & POWER (Eisey, 1996:44). "... adult education is widely thought to be remedial purposes, for skills training and reskilling for economic development..." (Boshier, 1995:51).

EDUCATIONAL PLANNING - "Rational models of educational planning are most appropriate where there exists strong consensus on the nature of the problem or situation." (Adams, 1995:414).

APPROPRIATE KNOWLEDGE & SKILLS - "... places considerable attention on individual or group's ability to live in concert [harmony] with the biophysical marital theory coupled with a focus on conflict, power, control and the effect of structural factors on the educational process (Karabel and Halsey, 1977). The conflict school with its emphasis on societal aspects has so far had little influence on the new directions in adult education research. With few exceptions (e.g., Thomson (1980) not even those dealing with questions like societal change try to relate to this line of research...". (Rubenson, 1992a:59).

EDUCATION PROGRAMS - "... the role of adult education as integral part of social movements' broader struggle for change... From the perspective of the conflict paradigm, formal adult education is subject to the same hegemony that governs the preadult education system... There is no strong visible counterhegemonic adult education structure, this situation reflects what Marx and Engels saw as the dominant class's control over the mental production." (Rubenson, 1985:54). "The educational system is best understood not in terms of creating more equitable society but in terms of reproducing the present culture and social order... There is a belief that education policy cannot be isolated from the overall social policy and, further, that there is a correspondence between the way the educational system operates internally and the overall economic, social, cultural and political structure [operate]...". (Rubenson, 1992:5).

Adult education is examined and constructed [theoretically] from the viewpoints of various individuals and interest groups within the society (Rubenson, 1989:54-5). "Education construed from within a radical structuralist [conflict] perspective would show how accidents in boating for example might start from socioeconomic circumstances... as well gender and power relations on boats would be examined and put into the educational safety programs (Boshier, 1989:128). Referring to the work of the radical adult educator Eduard Lindeman in the early part of the 20th century in the USA, Rubenson notes that he was not a Marxist but he does apply a "... perspective that discusses both social structure and class." (Rubenson, 1989:52). In regard to commercial "fishing education" in relation to boating accidents, such a perspective would focus on corporatism, who owns what and "... mistreatment of workers, attempts at union busting..., predatory capitalism..." — Boshier, also notes generally that "... some of the most oppressive teaching techniques are deployed by those espousing emancipation." (Boshier, 1989:15). Neo-Mandist and critical theory education would mostly include marginal voices— and plans to action from learning (Boshier, 1992:15). "Type 5 [adult education programs]... hybrid... reformist adult education here collective change efforts largely outside of formal systems control...". See USE OF EDUCATION (Paulston and Arlenbaugh, 1988:118).

EDUCATIONAL REVOLUTION - "... those involved in revolutionary non-formal education efforts rely primarily on the conflict paradigm to guide their efforts as this perspective assists them in understanding radical change associated with violent guerilla
warfare." (La Bèla, 1986:42). For Gramsci and popular education movements, "... change is not simply a technical question of seizing power; it is a movement of the masses culturally and politically through worker's councils." (La Bèla, 1986:46).

Following Gramsci's ideas of the "counterhegemonic education", there is an emphasis on the potential of education (especially adult education) for social action and revolutionary change. (Rubenson, 1989:8). The approach to educational change/reform may be "rational" (like functionalist and cooperative theories) in principle, but here power differences would get the focus (Adams, 1988:411). "From a structuralist [conflict] position, it could be argued that the formal and non-formal educational systems are complementary with regard to their social function in society. The latter, redirects, and thereby effectively reduces, the demand for formal education... An alternative education which does not serve as a channel for social mobility..." (in "revolutionary education" in new revolutionary societies like China, Cuba, Tanzania) (Rubenson, 1982:5). Some conflict theorists don't agree with the strict determinism of reproduction theories of education that come can in revolutionary political agendas, rather preferring neo-Marxist versions of Giroux, Gramsci etc., who prefer to keep "human agency" and a "counterhegemonic education" within the systems of public education (Paulston and Attenbaugh, 1986:119).

EDUCATORS- re: participatory democracy "These ideas are particularly attractive to radically inclined adult education and community development workers." (Eisey, 1986:87). See SOCIAL PROBLEMS (Eisey, 1986:87). "The implicit idea of social change used by radicals and reformers in adult education is that social systems are dynamic and prone to flux and transformation, not inherently stable... Adult education and community development have the means at their disposal to organise, inform and initiate political action arising through the generation of an analytical awareness of the causes and remedies of social problems. This constitutes an important instrument of change which can challenge existing social values, ideas and practices in the political economy and welfare services." (Eisey, 1986:39).

EDUCATION & DEVELOPMENT- "... question the assumption embodied in the development framework and the consonant theory of human capital..." (Rubenson, 1982:5). "Due to the doubt about the adequacy of the individual socialization theory, the structuralists [conflict theorists] think more in terms of allocation and legitimation. The underlying assumption is that the educational system helps to define which people may legitimately play which roles in society, quite apart from whether the students are actually effectively trained or socialized." (Rubenson, 1982:5).
USE OF EDUCATION - in new revolutionary states, e.g. Singapore, "radical [conflict] functionalist" approaches turn education over to "engineers" "... who control adult education". (Bosher, 1996:64). In Type 5 adult education programs: "... use adult education in incremental change efforts [local] seeking greater equity via civil rights movements, labor movements, peace and environmental movements." (Paulston and Altenbaugh, 1988:118).
Below are some of the basic Foucauldian concepts pertinent to a critical discourse analysis of Conflict Management Education texts. All forms of power, that Foucault elaborated, are embedded in discourses. Ball (1990) defined discourses in a simple way,

[discourses are] what can be said, and thought, but also about who can speak, when, where and with what authority. Discourses embody meaning and social relationships, they constitute both subjectivity and power relations. Thus, discourses construct certain possibilities for thought. They order and combine words in particular ways and exclude or displace other combinations. (p. 17, cited in Edwards, 1997, p. 10).

Exercise of power/knowledge- involves power through knowledge and knowledge through power (where power is not necessarily oppressive but a force of energy to make things happen); Edwards (1997) refers to two analytically useful types of power: (1) disciplinary power- "signifies those processes through which knowledge about the population [or individual(s)]... is gained by the nation state [or any group, organization, system] as a condition for the effective management and governance of the people. These processes are embedded in the knowledge-able (expert) discourses of the human sciences, sciences which provide knowledge about madness, deviancy, crime, [conflict and violence], and, of course, education. These discourses constitute the objects of their disciplinary gaze [professionalist gaze], for example, 'the deviant,' 'the prisoner,' 'the student,' [the 'conflict manager' etc.] and provide the basis [rationale] for intervention, for programmatic action. Disciplinary knowledge [CME discourses] is therefore associated with certain practices or exercises of power which discipline and position people [subjection] in certain ways and 'produce' certain forms of experience and subjectivity (Edwards 1991a). To learn a discipline-- philosophy [and social technology]-- is to learn to be disciplined into a particular identity--..... Pastoral power, by contrast, is exercised through 'confession,' by which the self is constituted as an object of knowledge, self-regulation, self-improvement and self-development (Foucault, 1981). This process has become central in the governance of modern society, displacing externally imposed discipline with the self-discipline of an autonomous subjectivity. In other words, confession actively constitutes a productive and autonomous subject already governed and thereby not requiring externally imposed discipline and regulation. In order to participate 'successfully' in the process of confession, subjects need to have already accepted, or be brought to accept, the legitimacy and 'truth' of confessional practices and the particular meanings that these invoke.... Confession [any form of counselling, or group sharing, for example] enables individuals to actively participate in disciplinary regimes by investing their own identity, subjectivity and desires with those ascribed to them through certain knowledgeable discourses. Pastoral power is a central component of contemporary governmentality...". (pp. 8-9).
It is fair in general to suggest that Foucault's post-structuralist philosophical analysis is best known for its presentation of a new way to study, understand and think about the concept of power in social life. The macro-sociological study of domination/power (and "power conflict" in Weber's sociology*) is common turf to the conflict tradition social theorists and to many sociologists generally. What distinguishes Foucault's notion of power/knowledge, albeit much more complex than I present here, is his focus on the relationship of power to knowledge production— unlike, and distinct from the Marxists, for example, who tend to base discussions of power in society primarily upon materialist and economic structures (e.g., stratification, classism and class conflict). Harvey (1989) summarized this distinction and notes how "sites" of power in micro-sociological contexts is emphasized,

Foucault's ideas— particularly as developed in his early works— deserve attention since they have been a fecund source for postmodernist argument. The relation between power and knowledge is there a central theme. But Foucault (1972, 159) breaks with the notion that power is ultimately located within the state, and abjures us to 'conduct an ascending analysis of power, starting, that is, from its infinitesimal mechanisms, which each have their own history, their own trajectory, their own techniques and tactics, and then see how the mechanisms of power have been— and continue to be— invested, colonized, utilized, involuted, transformed, displaced, extended, etc. by ever more general mechanisms and by forms of global domination.' Close scrutiny of the micro-politics of power relations in different localities, contexts, and social institutions leads him to conclude that there is an intimate relation between the systems of knowledge ('discourses') which codify techniques and practices for the exercise of social control and domination within particular localized contexts. The prison, the asylum, the hospital, the university, the school, [business office, factory etc.] the psychiatrist's office, are all examples of sites where a dispersed and piecemeal organization of power is built up independently of any systematic strategy of class domination. What happens at each site cannot be understood by appeal to some overarching general theory. Indeed the only irreducible in Foucault's scheme of things is the human body, for that is the 'site' at which all forms of repression [battles] are ultimately registered. (cont'd)

* "... Weber's theory of power conflict connects directly with the theory of organizations because it is in organizations that power is mobilized." (Collins, 1994, p. 103). See also Ratea (1999) who provides an excellent chapter (2) on power in "actor-network theory" (a la Bruno Latour et al.), applied to curriculum design. He wrote, "... power is a significant notion, and is defined in terms of the activities that actors engage in as they build networks and pursue their goals when a particular project or innovation is put forward." (pp. 51-52).
So while there are, in Foucault's celebrated dictum, 'no relations of power without resistance,' he equally insists that no utopian scheme of liberation can ever hope to escape the power-knowledge relation in non-repressive ways. He here echoes Max Weber's pessimism as to our ability to avoid the 'iron cage' of repressive bureaucratic-technical rationality. [and similar to Collin's (1994) and his conflict sociology] The only way to 'eliminate the fascism in our heads' is to explore and build upon the open qualities of human discourse, and thereby intervene in the way knowledge is produced and constituted at the particular sites where localized power-discourse prevails. Foucault evidently believed that it was only through such a multi-faceted and pluralistic attack upon localized practices of repression that any global challenge to capitalism might be mounted without replicating all the multiple repressions of capitalism in a new form. (pp. 45-46)

"... resistance for Foucault involves continual forms of transgression.... Many critics have drawn attention to 'resistance' as perhaps the most unsatisfactory element of Foucault's work. Certainly, for educators, this is a critical feature of any theorisation of education. In a sense, the problem arises because Foucault does not have an explicit theory of resistance." (Usher and Edwards, 1994, p. 98). Nor does Foucault have a theory of education, learning, or conflict.

This rich account of Foucault by Harvey, is perhaps best supplemented with a more straightforward "Readers Digest" version. Boshier (1996), an enthusiastic Foucauldian adult educator, wrote,

Whenever someone has or transmits knowledge it involves power; whenever power is exerted, knowledge is involved.... Foucault is not concerned with the so-called truths of any field or discipline. Rather, the focus is on discursive rules that permit or forbid some statements. Foucault showed how discourses were ruptured and changed by social and political events, not logic and rationality. In his later work the emphasis was on how power constructs knowledge. In particular, he showed how the so-called human sciences were rooted in nonrational and often unsavory historical events. Contrary to the liberal notion that repressive power can be used to impede learning, Foucault argues that power is an integral part of knowledge. [I'd say the same for 'conflict' (resistance)]. Hence, 'truth isn't outside power, or lacking in power... Truth is a thing of this world; it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint [and consent]. And it induces the regular effects of power' (1980, p. 131).***.... If power is always inextricably linked to knowledge there is no such thing as politically neutral or benign education.... There is no objective knowledge.... Unlike the Marxist conception where power is wielded in an objective unidimensional way by one class over another, [cont'd]

*** A key point of Foucault's work is that power (and domination) are not necessarily enforced and administrated by authorities in overt practices of "control" (power over). Rather, the postmodernist view is that "Power [most often] is exercised through seduction rather than repression." (Edwards, 1997, p. 9).
for Foucault, power exists in systems of networks [social practices]. It does not reside in one source, such as the upper class, the state or the police, and Foucault is less concerned with who holds power than with the results that stem from its application. (pp. 89-90).

**Governmentality [technologies of social control]**- "Pastoral power is a central component of contemporary governmentality, which Foucault (1979a: 20) defines as 'an ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, the calculations and tactics, that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power.' For Foucault, the notion of governmentality is a way of thinking power differently. It points to the dispersed 'capillary' nature of power and its embodiment in 'rational' forms of government, administration, management and supervision, What Miller and Rose (1993: 83) term 'government at a distance.' They characterise the modern form of governmentality as a mentality where political rationalities-- the aims and purposes of government [groups, organizations, systems] are linked with programmes of political action and particular procedures and techniques.

Governmentality is discursive, a technology of thought, which constitutes a domain for programmatic action. However, it is not confined simply to the workings or deliberate policies of governments, but exists wherever 'the political programmes and objectives of government have been aligned to the personal and collective conduct of subjects' (Gane and Johnson 1993: 9). In its most contemporary form, governmentality is characterised by 'the entry of the soul of the citizen into the sphere of government' (Rose 1991: 113). Through certain practices and techniques people's 'inner' lives are brought into the domain of power. This, then, is a governmentality where power seeks to govern not only bodies, but also subjectivity and intersubjectivity [relationships and identity through relationships], and to do so not through force and repression, but through 'educating' people to govern themselves. Governmentality works through bringing people's self-regulating capacities into line with the gaze (and regulation) of 'government,' a process where the gaze is interiorised, where 'political power has come to depend upon a web of technologies for fabricating and maintaining self-government' (Miller and Rose 1993: 102). Power is exercised through seduction rather than repression.... governmentality is never and can never be complete.... Confession is therefore a symptom of the contemporary form of governmentality rather than a cure for its ailments." (Edwards, 1997, pp. 9-10).

**Normalisation and Disciplined Society**- much has been written on Foucault's studies of punishment and the Panopticon and its effects... that is, the internalization of self-regulation and its disciplinary outcomes (i.e., governmentality). The shift from 'displays' of overt and brutal punishment of so-called "criminals" in earlier societies, to what is seen as "... a general 'humanisation' which accompanied the transition to modernity. For Foucault, however, it represents a stage in the 'normalisation' of individuals [and their practices, lifestyles, choices etc.] which is necessary for the government of life-processes. To investigate the dividing line between the 'normal' and the 'abnormal' is crucial in a
social organisation dedicated to the administration of life." (McHoul and Grace, 1998, p. 68). Diprose (1991) argues that Foucault's studies of normalising techniques suggests that bodies and minds are made to conform to certain social structures, in order to benefit from the 'normal' attributions of the disciplined (cited in McHoul and Grace, 1998, p. 73). What is important in Foucault's analysis is that privileged groups construct knowledges about the 'abnormal.' These are legitimated through power, as rationalizations to control and dominate 'other' (those deemed as 'abnormal'). The knowledges constructed by the 'normal' are at the same time creating the very problems of the 'abnormal' that the majority wishes to solve or eliminate. Thus normalization, is a process whereby the very problems thought to be solved (by humanizing discourses), are de-humanizing and violating upon those whom are to be helped. Knowledges about normalisation, in other words, are as problematic, and potentially destructive and violent, as the "crimes" they wish to distinguish and control, manage, resolve/cure. Scheid (1998) wrote of Foucault's analysis and defined "normalization" as "... a discourse of social control, a new mode of domination (see Foucault, 1975, 1977)." (p. 228). The Foucauldian analysis here reveals that dialectical and problematic side to humanisation or what could be called personality and the 'individual'. Foucault's work problematizes these notions that appear to be about human autonomy and freedom—a sense of progress—and he points out that there is a troubling side to such constructions of subjectivity and knowledges. He suggests, the very origin of "personality" is a form of normalisation and governmentality in a disciplined (and disciplinary) society. McHoul and Grace (1998) wrote, "We must not make the mistake of thinking that techniques of power have crushed those natural forces which mark us as distinct types of human beings with various 'personality' traits. Rather, differences, peculiarities, deviance and eccentricities are ever more highlighted in a system of controls concerned to seek them out. The very notion of a 'personality' derives from this process: 'as power becomes more anonymous and more functional,' Foucault writes, 'those upon whom it is exercised tend to be more strongly individualized.' In a system of discipline, the child is more individualized than the adult, the patient more than the healthy man, the madman and the delinquent more than the normal and the non-delinquent' (1977a: 193). Foucault sets up an ironic and problematic interpretation of what most liberalism sees as the positive side alone of 'individuality' and 'difference'. In the context of an ever-increasing disciplined society (albeit, more and more subtle), the individuality and difference conceptualizations are involved in power knowledge discourses and potentially play out as part of governmentality and control (i.e., regulating) devices. This Foucauldian notion is contrary to a lot of critical/radical theorist's thinking about the "system" crushing "individuality" and "difference."