**What comes after post/modern peace education?**

The predomiantly modernist field of peace education is just beginning to respond to postmodern critiques (Gur Ze;ev, 2011). Reports of its death are therefore rather a shame. In this short contribution, I will argue that modernity and postmodernity continue to hold sway in peace education work and research, and that they exist in a creative and dynamic balance with each other, and with other traditions of peace.

Overall, modernity is lost without its nemesis, modernity, and vice versa. For as long as (high / late / liquid....) modernity continues, so will postmodernity. Like fractious twins, modernity and postmodernity were born together and exist to be in conflict with each other. Bauman (2007) describes modernity as a snake eating its own tail – it carries its ‘post-‘ with it, and has done since its inception. This is all the more so in the field of peace education. In my own peace education work (e.g. Cremin & Bevington, 2017), I draw on the work of Wolfgang Dietrich, an anthropologist in peace studies who sees both modern and postmodern ‘peaces’ as part of an on-going plurarilty of peaces.

Efforts towards world peace cannot ignore this plurality – global harmony can never be achieved, for example, by the imposition of a modern liberal peace agenda. A modern view of peace brings a necessary element of security, but this is not sufficient. Likewise, postmodern peaces ground themselves in competing notions of truth, representation and reality, but stand in relationship with modern peaces. Altogether, Dietrich identifies five families of ‘peaces’ that co-exist in time and space (2012): energetic peaces (I prefer the term dynamic peaces) bound up with harmony and balance; moral peaces bound up with justice and monotheism; modern peaces bound up with rationality and reason; postmodern peaces bound up with notions of truth; and transrational peaces which integrate all of the other four.

It is this last family that is the most intreguing. Firstly, the prefix ‘trans’ expresses the cross-cutting, transcendent and eco-systemic nature of peace in a way that the linear prefix ‘post-‘ misses; and secondly transrational peaces are grounded in rationality, but also contain the embodied, the sacred, the affective, the discordant, the aesthetic, and so on. As Dietrich (2012: 266) puts it, transrationality, “does not deny rationality. It also does not overcome it, but crosses through it and adds the aesthetic component that is always inherent in interpersonal relations but that has not been observed that attentively by modernity”. It can be seen, not as a denial of enlightenment ideals, nor as a rejection of postmodern critique, but as a completion of all of them in a mature global ethics free from universalised norms. The transrational task of peace education, then, is to aspire towards the reduction of violence and injustice, whilst recognising that conflict is a continuous part of nature and human relations, and that traditions such as Daoism and Shamanism from the Global East and South have their part to play in responding to some of the transgressions of modernity.
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