

This book chapter has been published in **Decolonizing Education for Sustainable Futures** which is available here: <https://bristoluniversitypress.co.uk/decolonizing-education-for-sustainable-futures>

Reparative pedagogies

Author: Julia Paulson

This chapter explores reparative possibilities in and through education, with a specific focus on reparative pedagogy. It does so by sharing examples I've encountered and by documenting many ongoing conversations around the possibilities and challenges of describing, designing and imagining pedagogy as reparative. These include conversations with friends, researchers, educators and activists, many (but not all) of which take place within the Education, Justice and Memory Network (EdJAM). EdJAM exists to support and learn more about creative approaches to teaching and learning about past violence and injustice and currently works in 18 countries. Some of the people with whom I've been in conversation describe their work using the term reparative pedagogy and others do not. However, as this chapter argues, there are features of their pedagogical approaches that align with and enable repair and reparation and therefore allow for the possibility of describing them as reparative.

As discussed in more detail later in the chapter, reparation generally, and in its application to education specifically, is often described as encompassing material, symbolic, epistemic, and affective measures to right wrongs of the past. There is growing attention to what Arathi Sriprakash and colleagues (2023, in this volume; 2022) call 'reparative futures in education' and to education's roles in enabling reparative measures across the domains listed above (see for example Ramírez-Barat and Duthie, 2016; Bellino et al., 2017). The material, symbolic, epistemic and affective are all present within pedagogy and pedagogy could therefore contribute towards these types of reparative measures. But, this chapter explores the possibilities for understanding reparative pedagogies in their own right, as another form of reparation. One motivation for doing this is to recognize the ongoing work by educators, artists, activists and students in this area. Reparative pedagogies can and do proceed without waiting for formalized programmes of reparation, transitional justice or systemic reforms to the structural injustices that permeate the education systems that they might complement. In not recognizing, describing and seeking to support reparative pedagogies we risk missing spaces where futures of education are reimagined through pedagogical approaches to acknowledge and reckon with past injustices and their afterlives in the present.

For the purposes of this chapter, I adopt a broad understanding of pedagogy. In the vast literature on pedagogy multiple meanings and debates circulate, with definitions ranging from "the act of teaching together with its attendant discourse of educational theories, values, evidence and justifications" (Alexander, 2009, 928) to "a practice for freedom" (Freire as cited in Giroux, 2010, p. 715; hooks, 1994). Rather than reviewing in depth these and other definitions and the differences between them, I think it suffices to say that the idea of reparative pedagogies can speak to and be pursued within several understandings of and ways of practicing the pedagogical, including those that focus on teaching and learning relationships in schools and other formal education spaces and those that define pedagogical sites much more widely (Paulson et al., 2021; Gomez-Suarez, 2017; Burnyeat, 2022; Sriprakash et al., 2022). Schools and classroom practices are of course important sites for transmitting knowledge of the past and making sense of the present, but they are far from the only (or even the most important) spaces where young people learn about and the approach the past (Sriprakash et al., 2022; Sanchez Meertens, 2018; Bekerman and Zemblyas, 2011). Though this chapter works with an expansive understanding of pedagogy, it is important to note that pedagogy is often understood very narrowly and instrumentally, with its focus purely on the delivery of information in the service of the

acquisition of a narrow range of learning outcomes. This view of pedagogy, though widely critiqued, is predominant in global policy discourses around education, particularly within the framing of the 'global learning crisis' (Tikly, 2020). Within these narrow understandings of pedagogical processes and functions, I think the opportunities for reparative approaches are limited.

From the outset, it is important to acknowledge a few things. The first is authorship, positionality, the style of this piece, and its many debts. I am a white woman, born in Canada, fortunate to spend a lot of time in Latin America, and now having lived more than 15 years in the UK, ten of those in Bristol. I grew up and went to school in a suburb just outside of Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. A prairie province, a small city with a river winding through it. Treaty 6 land. Amiskwacîwâskahikan. Meeting place of Cree, Saulteaux, Sioux, Blackfoot and Métis peoples. St. Albert (Payhonin), the suburb where I grew up, was the site of two residential schools, which removed Indigenous children from their families to 'educate' them. Bishop Vital Grandin, after whom the neighbourhood that I grew up in was named and a key architect of Canada's system of residential schooling, described their purpose: "we instil in them a pronounced distaste for native life so that they will be humiliated when reminded of their origins. When they graduate from our institutions the children will have lost everything Native except their blood" (as cited in Thomas, 2020). The residential schools in St. Albert closed before I was born (though others elsewhere remained open into the late 1990s), but their names (Poundmaker and D'Youville) are still firmly part of the city; I played sports on Poundmaker field and friends attended Marguerite D'Youville secondary school.

Not that I knew the history behind the names that marked my daily comings and goings or ever heard the word Payhonin. My family of settlers with roots in Iceland, Ireland, France and England didn't talk about residential schooling or settler colonialism. And, I didn't learn about it at school. I do remember learning about 'aboriginal Canadians' in the language of my 1980s and 1990s textbooks, in social studies lessons and at visits to heritage sites around Alberta. But the textbooks and the sites treated Indigenous people as history, worthy of noting, but from the past. I absorbed that their customs were interesting to explore and their art worth preserving through what Papaschase Cree scholar Dwayne Trevor Donald (2009) calls the 'tipis and costumes' approach. But, at school, I never grasped a sense of Indigenous cultures, languages and peoples as present, living next to me, resisting this totalising absence and the settler colonialism that has sought to erase them physically, materially, linguistically, culturally and symbolically for over a century. I wasn't taught to recognise or reckon with what Alexis Shotwell (2016) calls 'the ghosts in my bones' or to see my own implication in the histories of dispossession that were silenced as I paged through textbooks of teepees and furs. I wasn't part of an education system or classroom where repair was an intention.

My education was steeped in what Charles W. Mills (2007) called 'white ignorance', an active form of learned ignorance, which enables blindness to and denial of "the long history of structural discrimination that has left whites with the differential resources they have today, and all of its consequent advantages in negotiating opportunity structures" (p. 20). These consequent advantages have no doubt helped with my education and career since my childhood in Payhonin. The consequent disadvantages maintained by white ignorance are clear in their material and epistemic consequences for those whose histories are denied and excluded in the maintenance of structural discrimination. However, not learning the histories of the Indigenous peoples on whose meeting place I grew up is also a disservice to settler Canadians like me and my predominantly white classmates – it has led to gaps in my knowledge and in my ways of knowing, including in my understandings of pedagogy. Understanding the reasons for these gaps in my own knowledge and the ways in which violence and injustice are learned and elided in other contexts has been a motivation for my research.

Esther Priyadharshini's (2023, in this volume) questions around citation and quotation in the previous chapter are relevant here as I draw up on and learn from and in dialogue with the practice of others, whose labor I've tried to name, cite and describe in elaborating the concept of reparative pedagogies. In this piece, outlining the pedagogical innovation, resistance and beauty created in many of the examples shared here by colleagues materially and epistemically disadvantaged by the ignorance, exclusions and inequalities of the education systems they passed through, I hope to write in a spirit of accompaniment, with the intention - that also underpins the work of EdJAM- to connect ongoing work to teach and learn about violence and injustice in ways that enable repair and to play a part in amplifying this work and enabling conversation around it.

Reparative pedagogies are necessarily not one thing. Repair is in part about imagining and glimpsing more just futures, working towards them without certainty in their shape while attending to past and present injustice such that they are not (and no longer) inevitabilities in these futures (Sriprakash et al., 2022). This imagining, working and creating, therefore, of course, happens in multiple ways. Describing even the characteristics, much less the definitive features of reparative pedagogies, might be a fool's errand. Yet, as so much pedagogy continues to do harm, it seems vital to describe the alternatives that educators, activists and artists are developing. A key part of much of the scholarship on reparative approaches is the idea that they enable something new or at least enable the imagining, the glimpsing of something new. Ali Aslam (2022) argues that repair can be seen as glimmers of more just futures thanks to the mending work that is done in the present to redress the harms of the past. This means that a discussion of reparative pedagogies must be descriptive (rather than prescriptive), open (rather than bounded) and messy and unfinished (rather than tidy and complete). The image I've held in my head to aid this description is of a flower - each petal, an entity on its own, complete and beautiful, but also creating something more when viewed next to its companion petals. In the chapter, I describe and offer examples of some petals that on their own might be described as reparative pedagogical approaches and that, when and if combined, might create something more. The petals (or characteristics of) reparative pedagogical approaches, that I describe here are: dignity, truth-telling, multiplicity, responsibility and creativity. Though, of course, these aren't the only or the exclusive characteristics of reparative pedagogy.

Describing the reparative

This section briefly explores literature around reparations and the reparative turn, advancing a theoretical case for the idea of reparative pedagogies. The idea and practice of reparation has been developed in different ways, including through international human rights and humanitarian law, philosophically and theoretically, as a goal and demand of activist movements for liberation. In reviewing these different ways of defining and working towards reparation, this section seeks to connect the existing literature with each of the petals of reparative pedagogy described in the next section.

Legally victims of gross violations of international human rights law and serious violations of international humanitarian law have the right to reparations, which should be "adequate, effective, prompt, and should be proportional to the gravity of the violations and the harm suffered" (OHCHR, 2022). The United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR, 2022) defines reparations measures as including restitution (which should restore the victim to their original situation prior to the violation), compensation (which should be provided for economic and moral damages), rehabilitation (which includes care and services), and satisfaction (which includes the cessation of continuing violations, truthseeking and symbolic actions). While financial compensation may be the first form of reparation to spring to mind, as these definitions make clear, reparations can take the form of material, restitutive, symbolic, epistemic and collective measures, and indeed these

measures can be combined and mutually reinforce one another (ICTJ, 2022; de Grieff, 2006). Reparations are part of the United Nations definition of and approach to transitional justice, which the UN defines as “the full range of mechanisms and processes associated with a society’s attempt to come to terms with a legacy of large-scale past abuses, in order to ensure accountability, serve justice and achieve reconciliation” (United Nations, 2010). International human rights law establishes the obligation of states to victims of human rights violations and these responsibilities can extend to others (e.g. armed groups (Zegveld, 2002)) responsible for violating human rights. These legal definitions establish the foundations for discussion around two of our petals; first, responsibility, since legal definitions are clear that reparations are something for which certain actors have responsibility due to their involvement in committing, or their failure to prevent, human rights violations; and second, truth-telling, since acknowledgement of harm, which requires unearthing silenced or denied histories and events, is a fundamental first step in opening the possibilities for repair.

The implementation of transitional justice processes broadly, and reparations programmes specifically, have been part of post-conflict and post-authoritarian transitions, often with a focus on economic compensation when pursued programmatically (de Grieff, 2006; Barkan, 2001). As the focus of transitional justice expands beyond its traditional attention to civil and political rights to encompass and respond to violations of economic, social and cultural rights, so too does the call for and practice of reparations under transitional justice (Roth-Arriaza, 2014). This expansion includes three elements important for the purposes of this chapter. First, the increasing possibility and practices of educational reparations as part of transitional justice (Roth-Arriaza, 2014; Bellino et al., 2017), through which scholarships or bursaries are provided as reparations to victims and family members or collective and/or symbolic reparations are offered via, for example, renaming schools to honour victims. And, second, the broadening of the conceptualisation of cases in need of transitional justice to include calls for transitional justice to address crimes of colonialism (Löytömäki, 2013; Yusuf, 2018; Beckles, 2013), enslavement (Táiwò, 2022; Coates, 2015), genocide against Indigenous peoples (CARICOM, 2013; Cunneen, 2005) and ongoing settler colonialism (Park, 2020; Balint et al., 2014). And finally, these developments widen the idea of responsibility for reparations. These arguments to expand the remit of transitional justice also, arguably, extend discussions of responsibility to encompass structural injustices and intergenerational harm (Miller, 2021; Balint et al., 2014). These are questions that are being explored in the context of reparative pedagogy, as developed below, in the discussion of the responsibility petal.

Theoretically, scholars in law, philosophy and other disciplines have long accompanied and challenged the development of international human rights and humanitarian law around reparations and the programmatic development of reparations programmes (e.g. de Grieff, 2006; Torpey, 2006). This work establishes both the moral case for reparations and the political challenges to their implementation, and also critically documents the implementation of reparations programmes around the world (de Grieff, 2006). More recently, what might be called a ‘reparative turn’ is visible in the social sciences and humanities. Here the lens expands to examine silences and epistemic injustices in the development of academic disciplines and knowledge production more broadly, for example, in Gurminder K. Bhambra’s powerful critique of how theorization of the nation state and the global elides “the colonial histories that were constitutive of their formation” (2022, 11) and in Kevin Myers et al.’s (2021) attention to the racialized and racist discourses that underpinned UNESCO’s early work. The implications of the failure to understand empires as historically constitutive of contemporary nation states, Bhambra argues, “mitigates against us being able to understand the past in connected terms” (2022, 12). Connected understandings in the social sciences, she argues, would acknowledge that the inequalities (globally and in specific constituencies) that are the subject of much academic enquiry are connected to the generation of wealth and poverty through colonialism. This would also expand

understandings of citizenship, belonging and entitlements beyond the confines of the nation state. This work is concerned with the opening of creative possibilities for generating knowledges otherwise, recovering silenced histories and learning and unlearning the past and present in new ways. For reparative pedagogies, this work highlights the importance of multiplicity (another of our petals) in the narration of the past, as Arathi Sriprakash and colleagues (in this volume) described in their account of radical humanist historical thinking in education, which creates “spaces for listening to multiple, often competing, knowledge traditions so that all have opportunities to be recognized, explored, debated and critiqued,” enabling what they call ‘reparative remembering’.

Olúfẹ̀mi O. Táíwò (2022) outlines a proposal for reparation that is both backward looking, in terms of the necessity to identify those to whom reparation is owed, and forward looking, in its ultimate goal and ability, which Táíwò argues is to enable present and future self-determination for those who have been denied it due to past and ongoing systems of oppression. Keston K. Perry’s (2021) work also contributes towards proposals for future-oriented, freedom generating reparations and repair. Both Perry and Táíwò connect their proposals for reparations for past injustices with the contemporary realities of climate change and climate emergency, with Perry calling for climate reparations that challenge the ‘colonial-climate ontology’ whereby current global configurations remain silent on historical responsibility for uneven and extreme climate-induced consequences. Perry calls instead for a programme of reparations for historical and ongoing loss and damage related to the uneven effects of climate change, and sees these proposals as created “anew based on political acknowledgement of and mobilizing around differentiated responsibilities and impacts.” These reparative proposals share as fundamental the idea that reparation is a path towards freedom, self-determination and human dignity – goals shared by reparative pedagogical approaches as developed below.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, reparation is and has been a key idea for many activist movements for liberation and in challenge to present day systems of oppression. Reparation is learned through praxis (Aslam, 2022), connecting with theoretical traditions in critical pedagogies (Giroux, 2010; Freire, 2005; hooks, 1994) and pointing to the importance of the creative in bringing it to life. Much of the literature summarized here and more appears in the publications of social movements demanding reparations (see for example Movement for Black Lives’ (M4BL) Reparations Now Toolkit (2019); Reparations Bristol, 2022). However, they tend to add in their work towards and understandings of reparation, a deeper attention to healing, care and protection from the daily lived experience of harm as both an outcome of and crucial part of the processes of repair and, therefore, a greater appreciation of the labour, creativity and improvisation involved in bringing reparative relationships and glimpses of more just futures into being. Ali Aslam (2022), writing on social movements for police and prison abolition in the United States, identifies what he calls ‘repair praxis’ which ‘makes ready’ people, norms and institutions in need of transformation. Aslam describes this praxis as made up of creative and interconnected approaches that are improvisational, multi-faceted, flexible and expansive – these ideas are explored in greater depth within the creativity petal. Importantly, Aslam argues, repair praxis is also able, after careful investigation, to declare something ‘beyond repair’ (p. 2-3). This is a question that many of the colleagues whose approaches are highlighted below hold open in their engagements, or lack thereof, with formal education.

Describing reparative pedagogies

Reparative pedagogies can and do represent various ways of defining, imagining and working towards repair and reparations. Below I describe dignity, truth-telling, multiplicity, responsibility and creativity as some petals of a reparative approach. While we might imagine these as petals of a flower together producing something beautiful, educators, artists, activists and students may develop approaches that centre one, or some combination of several but not all of these ideas given the priorities and needs of

the groups and communities with whom they are working. To illustrate each of these petals below, I offer descriptive examples drawing on the practices of colleagues in and beyond the EdJAM network.

- **Dignifying**

At an online presentation in 2020, I asked Lawrence Hoo, Bristol poet and founder of CARGO Movement, whether he thought the CARGO Classroom Resources were reparative. CARGO Classroom is a beautifully designed and powerful collection of educational materials that centre African and African descent historical figures and their stories of leadership, resistance and resilience. They begin with Imothep and move through history, including materials on Queen Nzinga, Mary Seacole, Marcus Garvey and many others. Hoo responded that “This is about *self* reparation first – we need to put ourselves together first. We need to see and teach our value to our communities and then we won’t ask permission from others for reparations, once we are strong enough we can make demands from others. Yes, reparations is a part of it, but first comes our own self repair” (Hoo, 2020).

Here Hoo’s arguments echo with writing on “taking up space” (Dunn and Love, 2020, 190) being developed by scholars arguing for Black Joy and pro Black pedagogies in education (Parks et al., 2022; Dunn and Love, 2020). The CARGO resources celebrate historical figures of African descent who are, as Hoo describes in his poetry remembering his own education (Hoo, 2019), otherwise largely absent from UK classrooms (for which the resources were designed, though they are being used more widely). Hoo argues that in pulling these resources into a discussion of reparations, the necessary space for celebration and self-repair and healing may be prematurely closed down. When Arathi Sriprakash and I reflected on Hoo’s responses later, Sriprakash was interested in how connecting this work with the idea of reparation returns the celebratory resources, and power they may have for Black students encountering them, to a conversation that includes or even centres (white) institutions and analyses of the reasons for these historic exclusions from curricula.

The importance of self-healing is also addressed by Tarcila Rivera Zea (2023, in this volume), Quechua Indigenous leader, founder of CHIRAPAQ, Rivera Zea centres dignity in her discussion of reparative pedagogy, as do EdJAM projects working from and celebrating Indigenous knowledges and lifeways, like ‘U kúuchil kaambal kuxtal: school for life,’ which is a developing an alternative curricula for Maya young people in Yucatan, Mexico. Drawing from social justice theories prominent in educational research, we can describe these examples as enabling representation and as working towards recognition (e.g. Fraser, 2005; Novelli et al., 2017). But it is important to note that these are not the terms with which Hoo, Rivera Zea, and Chan (who leads Ukúuchil kaambal kuxtal) use to describe their work. They use words like dignity, freedom, celebration, pride, healing, recovery, self-repair, resonating with Sietta Parks and colleagues’ (2022) descriptions of pro-Black pedagogy as co-constructed, intentional, caring and loving. A claiming of healing and celebratory space on its own terms and without any necessary obligation to engage with institutions and groups who have upheld exclusions and injustice (Parks et al., 2022; Paris and Alim, 2017). In many cases, this engagement does follow – CARGO have been holding teacher trainings and are developing an online course to support teachers to use their resources and Rivera Zea outlines the state responsibilities to respond to the educational proposals of CHIRAPAQ – but the reparative work starts with healing and celebration, dignifying pasts and presents that have been disrespected and denied.

- **Truthtelling**

One part (or petal) of reparative pedagogies is to work against the denial of truth about oppression and its consequences; to clarify the ways in which histories of violence, dispossession and exploitation have produced structural injustices that endure in the present; to acknowledge, understand and work

against the powerful ways in which ignorance and silence shape the history that is passed on in school and beyond it. The right to truth about gross violations of human rights and serious violations of international humanitarian law is enshrined in international human rights law alongside the protocols that establish basic principles for a right to remedy and reparations (OHCHR, 2022; UN General Assembly, 2013). Truth and truth telling are key principles of repair.

Research exploring education and transitional justice has tended to focus on this element of reparative pedagogy (though not always using this language), examining for example the ways that truth commission reports enter into curricula, textbooks and classrooms (Paulson and Bellino, 2017) and the broader implications of societal truth telling process on education (Keynes et al., 2021). This work highlights the complexities in truth-telling in education given education's longtime complicity in the silencing of some historical truths and the privileging of others. It also points to the limits imposed by the reliance on a collective memory approach to teach historical narratives in schools which, in transmitting a single narrative of the past that is necessarily partial and exclusionary, erases and excludes a multitude of historical experiences and truths (Paulson, 2015; Keynes et al. 2021, Psaltis et al., 2017). Finally, history teaching can naturalise violence, relying as it does on a linear movement often marked by and moving between one violent episode and the next, with truths about the alternatives to and resistances of violence that coexist alongside violent events usually remaining untold (Bermudez, 2021).

In this section, I explore examples of truth telling that do otherwise. The section is inspired by this definition of truth authored by Juana Yunis in reference to the Colombian context as part of the Educapaz project discussed belowⁱ:

“When we speak about truth in this methodological guide, we are **not** referring to a philosophical position in which there is one unique and absolute truth, nor to a political intention to impose one totalizing account of history and to repress alternatives. On the contrary, from a human rights perspective, we refer to the idea that... it is necessary to guarantee the right to truth of victims and of society more generally as one of the preconditions to build a stable and sustainable peace... We adopt the ethical position that, the testimonies of victims, perpetrators and other actors, combined with verification through reliable sources, establish facts that cannot be denied or relativized; in other words irrefutable facts” (Educapaz, 2020, p. 18, emphasis in original).

This definition is important in capturing the necessity of truth for the repair of injustices, but also appreciates the ways in which a singular or absolute truth is also violent. The manual that it is drawn from goes on to develop a mosaic of methodologies for truth-telling in education based on this definition.

In 2018, I visited a courtyard of the Universidad del Norte's campus in Baranquilla, Colombia, where the results of years of work with this mosaic of methodologies were on display. The students and teachers present were from regions severely affected by Colombia's many decades of armed conflict. For several years they had been working with *Escuelas de Palabra*, a programme designed by the civil society organization Educapaz, to support the Colombian truth commission's call to make 'truth a public good' (Educapaz, 2020). The truth commission saw schools and the education sector more widely as key allies in their mandate for clarification of the truth, coexistence and non-repetition. Educapaz's project aimed to materialize this commitment and working relationship. The methodological mosaic that underpins the project offers five routes to support schools to work as sites of truth-telling. These range from a pathway that explores truth as a value and possibility to orient daily life and policies at school, through to active memory work that explores the ways in which the school

is and was an active subject in armed conflict and in the construction of peace. In the courtyard, there was dancing, photo exhibits, research projects, collectively designed school value statements and behaviour policies, plays, documentaries, small curated museums and art exhibits.

On each pathway schools undertake their own truth-telling exercise around a conflict affecting their school but they are not confined to “cataloguing wrongs” (Táiwò, 2022), engaging with pasts that are actively traumatising or potential retraumatising (Godobo-Madikizela and Van Der Merwe, 2019), or opening discussions that can make learners or teachers unsafe (Horner et al., 2015). Some schools did choose approaches inspired by what Javier Corredor and colleagues (2018) call ‘historical memory education,’ combining personal and intergenerational memories of conflict, localised histories and the ‘irrefutable facts’ that transitional justice processes seek to establish beyond the possibility of denial (Educapaz, 2020). In one case, a school in a community with a strong paramilitary presence explored the ways in which this affected the school in a careful process that included children and families involved in paramilitarism and those who were directly and indirectly victimised by its presence. Another dug more deeply into the causes behind the forced displacement that had created the locality in which the school now operates. Others chose to explore everyday conflicts that they identified within their schools, for example, why there were problems listening meaningfully to one another within the school community, or which factors explained the rising levels of drug consumption in their community.

This is an approach to truth that is far from totalizing but that equally does not relativise away the irrefutable facts of injustice that reparative justice processes generally and reparative pedagogies specifically must confront. *Escuelas de Palabra* accepts not just multiple truths but multiple ways of engaging with truth and varying positions of readiness to confront the harms and wrongs of the past. Perhaps multiplicity and truth-telling should be one and the same petal, given the ways in which reparative truth-telling pedagogy eschews the idea of a single truth. I have kept them separate because of the degree of opposition that often exists to the introduction of previously silenced truths into educational spaces. Examples abound: the demonisation of critical race theory in the US, UK and elsewhere and its equation with all teaching of race and racism; the resistance to teaching about Peru’s armed conflict and the political framing of any discussion of the conflict as an ‘apology for terrorism’ and therefore inappropriate for children to discuss; the growth of residential school apologetics and denialism in Canada; the list goes on. Given how active, aggressive, defensive and harmful this denial can be - as Charles W. Mills (2007) anticipated when he described white ignorance and as Sriprakash et al. (2022) discuss when theorizing the affective states of whiteness - it is important to maintain truth as a key feature of repair. Despite the harms, exclusions and silences caused by teaching a universalizing and singular truth, I think it is important to hold truth as a petal and foundation of reparative pedagogy, and to imagine how truths can be taught and learned differently, including by engaging with multiplicity.

- **Multiplicity**

Bophana Audiovisual Resource Centre in Cambodia was founded in 2006 by filmmaker Rithy Pahn with the mission of preserving and sharing film, television, photography and sound archives of Cambodia with goal of recovering memories and heritage. The Centre is at once a curator of this rich collection and a creator of new content, training young people in filmmaking and broadcasting. For the last several years they have been working with materials from Bophana’s archive and testimonies they have gathered to create a multi-media app for teaching and learning about the Khmer Rouge genocide. The app has been approved by the Ministry of Education for use in Cambodian schools and Bophana have run trainings with secondary school history teachers on its use. The first version of the

app included testimonies of victims and survivors of the Khmer Rouge regime. Bophana is currently producing a second version, which will also incorporate testimonies they have collected from former low level members of the Khmer Rouge, perpetrators of crimes and also complex victims (Bernath, 2016) whose involvement was often compelled (Cooke et al., 2022). As they begin to work with teachers to support the use of this revised version of the app, questions around working with multiple perspectives in teaching and learning about the past are raised – how are the testimonies of victims and perpetrators learned alongside one other? Ought one version be given primacy or afforded more legitimacy? Does one narrative align more smoothly with reconciliatory, peacebuilding or reparative goals? How to engage with multiple perspectives and historical narratives of the past without relativising them? Or, to re-pose Zvi Bekerman and Michaelinos Zemblyas’ (2011) question, is it possible for multiplicity in history teaching to reconceptualise different accounts and memories of the past as non-dividing constructs?

Approaching the teaching of the past via multiple narratives is probably the element of reparative pedagogies most established in the literature, with agreement among authors about the importance of this approach (Srirprakash et al., 2023, in this volume; Bermudez, 2021; Keynes et al., 2021). As Arathi Sriprakash and colleagues (in this volume) outline, reparative education must attend to “the epistemic erasures and active silences, political interests and interpretive closures, of the production and legitimisation of knowledge through educational and historical practice itself.” The acknowledgment and visibility of histories and knowledges that have been systematically excluded from dominant historical narratives and classroom spaces is an important act of representation and recognition as alluded to above. However, while Sriprakash et al.’s (2023, in this volume) call for ‘reparative remembering’ requires and includes the expansion of representations of the past and of the historical narratives being voiced, with an explicit attention to creating space for silenced and elided pasts, it also calls for more. It demands ways of working with these more representative narratives of the past that “generate a new collective recognition of the injustices of multiple pasts” (p. ?).

Clear pedagogical pathways for how to use multiplicity to generate this collective recognition are hard to come by, both in literature and practice, but both often emphasise the centrality of dialogue and relationality. “Relationality” writes Gamilaroi scholar Michelle Bishop, “is not about separation, instead the emphasis is on coming together to share knowledge from different places, communities, teachings” (Bishop, 2022, p. 140). Dwayne Trevor Donald (2009), Papaschase Cree scholar writing from my home province, is clear about the way in which the single perspective on Indigenous history taught to children of my generation delivers the “enduring message that Aboriginal peoples and Canadians occupy separate realities” (p. 4). Donald proposes Indigenous Métissage as an approach to mutually overcome what he calls colonial frontier logics transmitted through curricula. This approach “involves the purposeful juxtaposition of mythic historical perspectives (often framed as common sense) with Indigenous perspectives” with a central goal to “promote ethical relationality as a curricular and pedagogical standpoint” (p. 5-6).

Canada’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2015), which investigated the legacy of residential schooling, made a number of calls to action including towards education. These included many measures that if implemented might go some way towards material reparation of the grave inequities in education between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people Canada. The calls to action also include the recommendation of mandatory age appropriate education on residential schools and “Aboriginal peoples’ historical and contemporary contributions to Canada” developed “in consultation and collaboration with survivors, Aboriginal people and educators” (p. 7). However, a 2021 curriculum review in Alberta, my home province, proposed steps backwards in this regard – removing rather than

adding content around Indigenous peoples in a process that lacked consultation, much less collaboration (Kanygin, 2021). Voiceferous opposition to the changes mean the social studies curriculum is under further review, however, the direction of changes despite the TRC's calls for action indicate a failure, in this example on the part of non-Indigenous Canadians and educational policymakers, to recognise and take responsibility for their roles in making ready the conditions where by dialogue and ethical relationality might become possible (Beausoleil, 2021).

- **Responsibility**

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, Alexis Shotwell (2016) uses the idea of 'ghosts in our bones' to evoke questions about how we acknowledge, atone for and (though this isn't her focus) teach and learn about responsibility for past injustices. As discussed above, responsibility is a key part of transitional justice, though establishing it and agreeing appropriate sanctions or responses to it becomes more complex as crimes and harms become more historically distant, even as their afterlives persist in material, epistemic and affective ways (Sriprakash et al., 2022; Mills, 2007). Writing on reckoning with settler colonialism in Canada, Shotwell quotes Gramsci's argument that historical processes deposit "an infinity of traces, without leaving an inventory." This inventory that does not exist is a personal one, tightly tied to intergeneration biographies situated within geopolitical events and social systems. In Shotwell's (2016) words, the past "has harmed and benefited us, differentially, pervasively" (p. 24) – these harms and benefits are rarely discussed, much less accounted for. Assigning responsibility for reparations to states and other organized actors who have caused harm and violated human rights is a necessary part of reparatory justice, but these infinite traces and their pervasive but differential harms and benefits also demand other forms of reckoning and atonement.

The classroom is a place where individuals with different family histories and positions within social systems meet (though perhaps not with the frequency we might assume given the ways in which formal education remains segregated across many dividing lines in de facto if not de jure ways). Yet these meetings often remain unmediated and unexplored, 'ghosts in bones' unacknowledged and left to haunt in unchecked ways, as curricular attention is focused elsewhere.

Pedagogical approaches in peace education, critical education, and anti-racist education often call for dialogue as a way to cross divides, acknowledge others, and appreciate alternative narratives (Bekerman and Zemblyas, 2011; Bajaj and Hantzopoulos, 2016). But, ways in which responsibility, intergenerational and otherwise, figures within this dialogue is often unclear and the affective starting points of those in dialogue often also uninterrogated. Sriprakash and colleagues' (2022) exploration of the affective processes by which whiteness is learned highlights the ways in which historical benefits become largely unacknowledged yet comfortable and homely expectations for the future for those who possess and are socialized into them such that even the acknowledgement of these benefits is felt as a threat. As Emily Beausoleil (2021, p. 4) argues, "structural injustice, by its very nature, does not require villains to exist...all it requires to keep such machinations in motion is for the majority of us not to listen." These affective states can make concepts like atonement, accountability and responsibility seem unattainable even in dialogue (much less in terms of material repair). Considerable preparatory work, especially on behalf of advantaged groups, what Beausoleil (2021) calls 'gathering our people' and 'clearing the gorse', is required in order for dialogue to broach responsibility.

Scholars and educators are exploring the pedagogical possibilities of working with the idea of complicity – the knowing or unknowing contribution to wrongdoing (Leopora and Goodwin, 2013; Zemblyas, 2020),-which is social, rather than individual, and therefore is shared. Everyone is complicit in structural injustice, though not in the same manner or to the same degree (Applebaum, 2010). Michalinos Zemblyas (2020) explores the possibilities of an 'anti-complicity pedagogy' that does not

stop at making learners aware of complicity but works to enable “actions that actively resist social harm in everyday life” (p. 318). He highlights complicity as both a political and affective concern, naming guilt, shame and hope as emotions attached to the complex interrelationships between historical pasts and presents and calls for pedagogical approaches that can and do work with the “affective roots of complicity” (p. 321).

Reflecting on this reading and its connections to pedagogical practices I’ve encountered, I’m reminded of the memory-based explorations within Educapaz’s methodological mosaic for truth-telling in education discussed above. For example, in the school that has dedicated its memory work to explore the ways that paramilitarism has affected and become interwoven with the school community it is possible to identify complicities that were necessary for safety and daily survival and complicities more implicit, affective and possibly harder to acknowledge and repair (Bermeo et al., 2022). Some of this memory work is also ongoing in UK Universities, seeking to better understand their direct and indirect entanglements with colonialism and slavery. The challenges to accept ongoing complicities are clear. The University of Bristol, from where I write, has still to make public the report it commissioned Professor Olivette Otele to research into these legacies despite lipservice celebrating itself for undertaking the task. Constructive suggestions around this impasse in responsibility taking include Shotwell’s (2019) invocation to ‘claim our bad kin,’ instructing members of dominant or advantaged groups to work quietly within that group to challenge those with whom they have close relationships whose affective responses are defensive or denying; or Beausoleil’s focus on listening and becoming ‘ready to meet,’ learning to listen in order to respond more usefully and effectively to claims of structural injustice.

- **Creativity**

The memory work of the Colombian school community exploring its connections with paramilitarism involved life history interviews, intergenerational dialogues, community discussions, and the creation of art. As Rithy Pahn, founder of Bhopana Audiovisual Resource Centre explains in describing the purposes and methodologies of the centre: “The past tells us what may happen tomorrow; and images are here to make us think and feed us; it is a great strength to move forward. Education helps us analyse the images and master the techniques; creation enables us to speak up but also express what we see and how we feel” (as cited by Bophana Audiovisual Resource Centre, 2022). A final petal, or perhaps the centre of the flower, which holds all the other petals described so far and likely those that others will add, is that of creativity. Many of the approaches described above are grounded in the arts and rely on the artistry of the educators practicing them. They are relational and build relationships. They attend to emotion and affect and are active in their caring, not just for the learners with whom they work, but also for the people, including those now long gone, harmed by the histories with which they work, whose dignity they seek to recover and celebrate.

Importantly, however, adjectives like creative, relational and emotional are central to the ways that many influential theorists - from Jerome Bruner, to Lev Vygotsky, to Maria Montessori, to Paulo Freire understand their area of study: pedagogy. Pedagogy itself, it seems, is also being repaired and recovered by reparative pedagogies, which do not centre learning outcomes, value test scores or fit into neatly timetabled blocks. The degree to which many of the initiatives described here operate outside the formal education system, or seek to intervene rather than work incrementally from within it, speaks to the limits of reparative pedagogy within education systems that might yet be declared to be ‘beyond repair’ (Aslam, 2022). Reparative pedagogies go some way towards imagining and practicing something new, building it by carefully repairing the harms of the past in dignifying, truth-telling, multiple, responsible and creative ways.

Flowerings

This chapter offers the image of a flower, with its petals of dignity, truth telling, multiplicity, responsibility and creativity, suggesting some of the features of reparative pedagogy. It argues that pedagogy is another arena where reparative practices are happening and can be imagined, which can build upon, accompany and expand reparations in material, symbolic, epistemic and affective spheres. It builds on a growing body of research that shows the degree to which education itself is in need of repair. It highlights how those working with and towards reparative pedagogies are reclaiming the hopeful, creative and freeing in the pedagogical.

It is one flower, described in one way, which I hope might open conversations and further flowerings and blooms. There are certainly more reparative pedagogies to be celebrated and described and alternative ways of describing and understanding the overlapping and interrelated petals that I've described here.

References

- Alexander, R. (2009). Towards a comparative pedagogy. In R. Cowen and A. Kazamias (Eds.) *International Handbook of Comparative Education*, Dordrecht: Springer, 923-941.
- Applebaum, B. (2010). *Being White, Being Good: White Complicity, White Moral Responsibility and Social Justice Education*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Araujo, A.L. (2017). *Reparations for Slavery and the Slave Trade: A Transnational and Comparative History*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Aslam, A. (2022). The politics of repair. *Contemporary Political Theory*. Onlinefirst: DOI 10.1057.s41296-022-00547-8.
- Bajaj, M. and Hantzopoulos, M. (2016). *Peace Education: International Perspectives*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Balint, J., Evans, J. and McMilan, N. (2014). Rethinking transitional justice, redressing Indigenous harm: A new conceptual approach. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 8(2), 194-216.
- Barkan, A. (2000). *The Guilt of Nations: Restitution and Negotiating Historical Injustices*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Beausoleil, E. (2021). Calling in to cut back: Settlers learning to listen for a decolonial futures, *Ethnicities*, Online first, DOI: 10.1177/1468796821-0629-8.
- Beckles, H. (2013). *Britain's Black Debt: Reparations for Caribbean Slavery and Native Genocide*. Mona: University of the West Indies Press.
- Bekerman, Z. and Zemblyas, M. (2011). *Teaching Contested Narratives: Identity, Memory and Reconciliation in Peace Education and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bellino, M.J., Paulson, J. and Worden, E.A. (2017). Working through difficult pasts: Towards thick democracy and transitional justice in education. *Comparative Education*, 53(3), 313-332.
- Bermeo, J.D., Paulson, J. and Charria, A. (2022). Schools as Sites of Memory: The musealization of the armed conflict by students and teachers in Colombia, in C. Cross and J. Giblin (Eds.) *Critical Perspectives on Heritage for Development*, London: Routledge

- Bermudez, A. (2021). Narrative justice? Ten tools to deconstruct about violent past, in M. Keynes, Å Elmersjö, D. Lindmark and B. Norlin (Eds.) (2021). *Historical Justice and History Education*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan Cham, p. 269-289.
- Bernath, J. (2015). 'Complex political victims' in the aftermath of mass atrocity: Reflections on the Khmer Rouge Tribunal in Cambodia. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 10(1), 46-66.
- Bhambra, G.K. (2022). For a reparatory social science. *Global Social Challenges*. 1, 8-20.
- Bishop, M. (2022). Indigenous education sovereignty: Another way of 'doing' education. *Critical Studies in Education* 61(1), 131-146.
- Bophana Audiovisual Resource Centre (2022). About Bophana Centre. [About Bophana Center | Bophana](#)
- Burnyeat, G. (2022). *The Face of Peace: Government Pedagogy Among Disinformation in Colombia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- CARICOM (2013). *CARICOM Ten Point Plan for Reparatory Justice*. CARICOM. [CARICOM Ten Point Plan for Reparatory Justice - CARICOM](#)
- Coates, T-N. (2015). The case for reparations. In Holt, S. (Ed.) *The Best American Magazine Writing*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1-50.
- Cooke, P., Hodgkinson, K. and Manning, P. (2022). Changing the Story: Intergenerational dialogue, participatory video and perpetrator memories in Cambodia. *Memory Studies*. Online first, DOI 10.1177/17506980221108474.
- Corredor, J., Wills-Obregon, M.E., Asensio-Brouard, M. (2018). Historical memory education for peace and justice: Definition of a field. *Journal of Peace Education*, 15(2), 169-190.
- Cunneen, C. (2010). Colonialism and historical injustice: Reparations for indigenous peoples. *Social Semiotics*, 15(1), 59-80.
- de Grieff, P. (2006) Justice and reparations. In P. de Grieff (Ed.) *The Handbook of Reparations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dunn, D. and Love, B.L. (2020). Antiracist language arts pedagogy is incomplete without Black joy. *Research in Teaching English*, 55(2), 190-192.
- Donald, D.T. (2009). Forts, Curriculum, and Indigenous Métissage: Imagining decolonization in Indigenous-Canadian relations in education contexts. *First Nations Perspectives*, 2(1), 1-24.
- Educapaz (2020). Mosaico Metodológico. Caminos diversos para reflexionar en las escuelas sobre el valor de la verdad como bien público fundamental para la paz en Colombia. Guía para facilitadores / Escuelas de Palabra. [Camino6_Small.pdf \(educapaz.co\)](#)
- Elazar Barkan, *The Guilt of Nations. Restitution and Negotiating Historical Injustices* (New York: Norton, 2000), ix.
- Fraser, N. (2005). Reframing justice in a globalized world. *New Left Review*, 36, 79-88.
- Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed: Thirtieth Anniversary Edition*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. New York: Continuum.
- Giroux, H.A. (2010). Rethinking education as the practice of freedom: Paulo Freire and the promise of critical pedagogy. *Policy Futures in Education*, 8(6), 715-721.

- Godobo-Madikizela, P. and Van Der Merwe, C. (Eds.) (2009). *Memory, Narrative and Forgiveness: Perspectives on the Unfinished Journeys of the Past*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Gomez-Suarez, A. (2017). Peace process pedagogy: Lessons from the no-vote victory in the Colombian peace referendum. *Comparative Education*, 53(3), p. 462-482.
- Hoo, L. (2019). *CARGO*. Bristol: Inner City Tales.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Horner, L., Kadiwal, L., Sayed, Y., Barrett, A., Durrani, N. and Novelli, M. (2015). Literature review: The role of teachers in peacebuilding. Research Consortium on Education and Peacebuilding.
- ICTJ (International Centre for Transitional Justice) (2022). Reparations. [Reparations | International Center for Transitional Justice \(ictj.org\)](https://www.ictj.org/reparations)
- Kanygin, J. (2021). Alberta to rewrite controversial K-6 social studies curriculum, pause implementation of several subjects. CTV News, Calgary. [Alberta to rewrite controversial K-6 social studies curriculum, pause implementation of several subjects | CTV News](https://www.ctvnews.ca/alberta-to-rewrite-controversial-k-6-social-studies-curriculum-pause-implementation-of-several-subjects-1.5711111)
- Keynes, M., Elmersjö, Å., Lindmark, D. and Norlin, B. (Eds.) (2021). *Historical Justice and History Education*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan Cham.
- Leopora, C. and Goodwin, R. (2013). *On Complicity and Compromise*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Löytömäki, S. (2013). The law and collective memory of colonialism: France and the case of 'belated' transitional justice. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 7(2), 205-223.
- Miller, Z. (2021). Temporal governance: The times of transitional justice. *International Criminal Law Review* 21, 848-877.
- [Mills, C.W. \(2007\). White ignorance. In S. Sullivan and N. Tuana \(Eds.\). *Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance*. New York: SUNY University Press, 11-38.](#)
- [Movement for Black Lives \(M4BL\) \(2020\). *Reparations Now Toolkit*. Reparations-Now-Toolkit-FINAL.pdf \(m4bl.org\)](#)
- [Myers, K., Sriprakash, A. and Sutoris, P. \(2021\). Toward a "New Humanism?" Time and emotion in UNESCO's science of world-making, 1947-1951. *Journal of World History*, 32\(4\), 685-715.](#)
- [Novelli, M., Lopes Cardozo, M.T.A. and Smith, A. \(2017\). The 4RS framework: Analyzing education's contribution to sustainable peacebuilding with social justice in conflict-affected contexts. *Journal on Education in Emergencies*, 3\(1\), 14-43.](#)
- OHCHR (2022). About transitional justice and human rights: OHCHR and transitional justice. [OHCHR | About transitional justice and human rights](#)
- OHCHR (2014). *Transitional Justice and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*. New York and Geneva: United Nations.
- [Park, A.S.J.\(2020\). Settler colonialism, decolonization and radicalizing transitional justice. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 14\(2\), 260-279.](#)
- [Parks, S., Bell, J., Ellwood, S. and Deckman, S.L. \(2022\). Going beyond anti-racist pedagogical practices: Co-constructing a pro-Black classroom. *Journal for Multicultural Education*, 16\(3\), 259-271.](#)
- [Paris, D. and Alim, S.H. \(Eds.\) \(2017\). *Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies: Teaching and Learning for Justice in a Changing World*. New York: Teachers College Press.](#)

- [Paulson, J., Abiti, N., Bermeo Osorio, J., Charria Hernández, A.C., Manning, P., Milligan, L.O., Moles, K., Pennell, C., Salih, S. and Shanks, K. \(2021\). Education as a site of memory: Developing a research agenda. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 29\(4\), 429-451.](#)
- [Perry, K.K. \(2021\). The new 'bond-age', climate crisis and the case for climate reparations: Unpicking old/new colonialities of finance for development within the SDGs. *Geoforum*. 126, November, 361-371](#)
- Priyadharshini, E. (2023). Decolonising citational and quotational practices as a reparative politics. In Y. Hutchison, A.A. Cortez Ochoa, J. Paulson and L. Tikly (Eds.) *Decolonising Education for Sustainable Futures*. Bristol: Bristol University Press.
- Psaltis, C., Carretero, M. and Čehajić-Clancy, S. (Eds.) (2017). *History Education and Conflict Transformation: Social Psychological Theories, History Teaching and Reconciliation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ramírez-Barat, C. and Duthie, R. (Eds.) (2016). *Transitional Justice and Education: Learning Peace*. New York: Social Science Research Centre.
- Reparations Bristol (2022). Reparations Bristol Power. [Reparations Bristol](#)
- Rivera Zea, T. (2023). Indigenous education and activism: Dignity and repair for inclusive futures. In Y. Hutchison, A.A. Cortez Ochoa, J. Paulson and L. Tikly (Eds.) *Decolonising Education for Sustainable Futures*. Bristol: Bristol University Press.
- [Roth-Arriaza, N. \(2014\). Reparations for economic, social and cultural rights. In D. Sharp \(Ed.\) *Justice and Economic Violence in Transition*, New York: Springer, 109-138.](#)
- [Shotwell, A. \(2016\). *Against Purity: Living Ethically in Compromised Times*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.](#)
- [Sriprakash, A., Nally, D., Myers, K. and Ramos-Pinto, P. \(2023, in this volume\). Learning with the past: Racism, education and reparative futures. In Y. Hutchison, A.A. Cortez Ochoa, J. Paulson and L. Tikly \(Eds.\) *Decolonising Education for Sustainable Futures*. Bristol: Bristol University Press.](#)
- [Sriprakash, A., Rudolph, S., and Gerrard, J. \(2022\). *Learning Whiteness: Education and the Settler Colonial State*. London: Pluto Press.](#)
- Táíwò. O. (2022, forthcoming). *Against Decolonization: Taking African Agency Seriously*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Táíwò. O.O. (2022). *Reconsidering Reparations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, G. (2020). We need to review our commemoration programs. *Prairie History*, 1, 81-83.
- Tikly, L. (2020). *Education for Sustainable Development in the Postcolonial World: Towards a Transformative Agenda for Africa*. London: Routledge.
- Torpey, J. (2006). *Making Whole What Has Been Smashed: On Reparations Politics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action*. Ottawa: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.
- United Nations (2010). *Guidance Note of the Secretary General: United Nations Approach to Transitional Justice*. [TJ_Guidance_Note_March_2010FINAL \(un.org\)](#)
- Yusuf, H.O. (2022). Colonialism and the dilemmas of transitional justice in Nigeria. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 12(2), 257-276.

Zegveld, L. (2002). *The Accountability of Armed Organised Groups in International Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zemblyas, M. (2021). Reconceptualizing complicity in the social justice classroom: Affect, politics and anti-complicity pedagogy. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 28(2), 317-331.

ⁱ Translation from the original Spanish my own.