

**Presentation of Anuradha Chenoy at the 56th Annual DPI/NGO Conference,
Human Security and Dignity: Fulfilling the Promise of the United Nations
Tuesday, 9 September 2003, United Nations Headquarters, New York**

Panel II

Peace and Security (and Gender) and Role of Governments and NGO's in achieving Millennium Development Goals in Education

Learning, Living and Practicing Peace, Rights and Gender Equity

- Anuradha M. Chenoy^{*†}

The task before us as educators/activists is to evolve a programme of peace, human rights and gender equity in order to change the discourse in a world that remains plagued by conflict and inequity. The task is multi-pronged beginning with bringing basic education to millions who remain out of school, outside literacy and who go to schools that remain insufficiently equipped. Millions of children are learning and living as refugees and in conflict situations witness to extreme violence. Our task further extends to questioning paradigms where gender biases, ethnic/racial stereotyping, militarist values distort the learning process and transform it into a discourse that inculcates peace, human rights and gender equity.

The Coalition for Learning

Given the magnitude of this task, there is no option but to have a people's, national and international coalition for learning and education. Bringing children to schools and bringing schools to every community has to be an effort that has to be promoted from the local to the international level. The thirst for education and peace from people who remain deprived of it needs to be channeled by educators/activists to urge states to turn more resources to education because it is a critical aspect of rights, development and security.

The barriers that stop children from going to school vary in each social context, but poverty, unavailability of schools, gender bias and conflict situations remains the most frequently cited reasons. States, NGO's and individuals have used innovative programmes for getting children into schools and methods have already been tried and worked. The wisdom generated from these programmes emphasizes that it needs political will to achieve this. For instance, making primary and secondary school compulsory for all children as part of human rights and constitutionally safeguarding this right. Popular movements and mass contact programmes should legitimize this demand. Programmes

* Dr. Anuradha M. Chenoy, Professor School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, 110027. Email: chenoy@vsnl.com

† I am grateful to Prof. Kamal Mitra Chenoy for his suggestions and comments.

for adult literacy like the Open Schools system, non formal education, ‘teach ins’ by using information and communication technologies, mass contact programmes like “each one teach one” have been tried in specific regions, have had a measure of success and problems and need to be expanded and improved. The pressure for this must come from a combination of peoples movements linked with other transformative movements.¹

To encourage schooling, schemes like the mid-day meal schemes, where the poorest countries, from South Asia to Sub Saharan Africa must provide mid-day meals can be initiated with minimum costs. Where millions of women lack literacy, schemes like adult literacy through ‘education tents’ where women can meet and learn should be part of every local community. Radio programmes that women listen to while working in the home, give them much knowledge and learning. Special schemes for the girl child have to be launched as priority in all states. All this can come with a combination of local and international pressure.

What we learn and how we educate continues to remain an important issue. The quality of education matters, because the values of society are embedded in it. The texts, ideas and concepts form people’s intellectual and cultural perspective and the basis of their worldview.² Education is an instrument of ruling paradigms. It works with and ascertains where power lies. It involves decisions like which/whose history must be remembered, which peoples are included and excluded, which morality do we follow, where will our gender lead us, and many more issues. The schooling system does not work in isolation of society, nor does it change society on its own, but can become a partner for transformative activities.³ Education and educators play a dialogic role in the process, to contest sectarian ideas especially if they link up with wider social movements and discourses.

The Dominant Paradigm

The basis, the context and the concept of education are as unevenly developed as our nation states and as diverse as our social systems. They are inter-linked with development models and inequities. They are depended on strategic or situational context. Within countries, schools their availability, their syllabus vary vastly. Just like the status of peace, rights and gender equity (PRGE) education will vary if you live in situations of conflict; on the nature of the political system; the state of civil society and the social system, because education remains the instrument to serve our purpose. Security interests, the virtues that we identify with in contrast to the ‘Other’ are reflected in this everyday learning.

Schools have been a site where nationalism has been constructed and they remain capable of conveying images, messages and representations that reflect the dominant ‘nationalistic’ culture of the society wherever they are located. This dominance has been critiqued because this system has created a small elite, excluded large numbers of others and has been male dominated, but little has been done to change it. For instance, it has been repeatedly shown that in most cultures history is equated with the glory of power, conquest and expansionism. The heroes of history are linked with military victories. The

attempt to correct this is to add the heroines of history who broke the 'normal' nurture and mothering roles with military victories for national glory. Concepts of 'Our heritage', 'National History' 'World Literature', etc, often exclude or minimize the history of marginalized communities and women's voices and construct the past in a way to suit the present. This gives the message of power as equated with force, dominance and masculinity, to the young mind. The tendency then, is to use this aspect of power to negotiate relations and strategize life along this goal. This dominant paradigm comes with subtle messages and representations, or more directly depending on the location of the schools.

Children relate to peace, rights and gender equity (PRGE) not just from texts but also through lived experiences. The families, schools, peer group, media (TV) community, are contributory factors.⁴ PRGE are located within social contexts and teaching and learning has different contexts and meanings for a child/person in Sweden/Canada/New Zealand as opposed to those in Palestine/Liberia/ Sri Lanka because reality is the basis for learning. PRGE can be practiced and taught best in a situation of security and educators/ activists must know the nature of conflicts and be able to contest the greater phenomenon or ideology behind them. Analysis of recent conflicts reveal that they have multiple causes though a large number are due to oppression, deprivation, denial of rights, sectarian hegemony, territorial claims, lack of dialogue and conflict resolution.

Conflicts and learning patterns are structurally inter-linked. Conflicts impact on education, human rights and gender as learning methodologies and experiences feed into conflicts. Analysis of conflicts establish that the largest number of victims are civilians, largely women and children, there is gross human right violations by both state and the non-state actors. In all conflict regions the funds allocated to education and social sectors were lower than those to defence were; illiteracy rates especially amongst women remain high; women structurally and socially discriminated against. Domestic violence against women appears to be greater in conflict-ridden societies. Most conflicts had regional and international linkages, either through state or non-state actors.

Teaching in schools located in regions of conflict where there is an identifiable 'other', or schools with specific ideologies/religious views tend to inculcate gender biases and sectarian views.⁵ For example in both India and Pakistan, the debate on inclusions and exclusions in history has been the battleground between right wing parties and the liberal education setup.⁶ This is not unusual. Textbooks are the obvious examples of how history is manipulated because they "are conceived, designed and authored by real people with real interests."⁷ The seminaries in Pakistan are known to have contributed large numbers of young boys to the Taliban and Jihadi outfits. In 2003, the most high profile sectarian and terrorist groups like Lashkar-e-Toiba and Jaish-e-Mohammad, admitted that they enrolled thousands of young boys, ages 18-25 years as 'jihadis' (holy warriors). These largely school dropouts are given shelter and ideological training and recruited as irregular fighters. In 2002, hundreds of these young boys were killed in conflicts.⁸ In response, in India right-wing Hindu groups are training young boys and girls in special camps for Hindu ideology and martial arts to "protect" Hindu identity.⁹ Social Studies texts for grades 1-5 in Pakistan's public schools instruct students in the concept and

importance of Jihad, curriculum stresses on male superiority and women are subtly shown in traditional roles.¹⁰ Children are molded to absorb militancy and jihad. Thus education is not outside conflict but part of it. It is a dimension of our prevailing cultures and learning itself remains a contested site.

The problem of biases is not restricted to the Third World. Internationally, political leadership is culturally presented as 'tough' and willing to use force. When liberal democratic states have policies of hegemony and unilateralism their leaders start using a 'muscular discourse'. This discourse stereotypes and homogenizes people into binaries like 'us' or 'them', good or evil; warriors or wimps; civilized and barbarians and makes neat binaries and categories. Such characterization is repeated in thousands of languages by a globalized media and leaders world over use similar muscular language to mobilize their own communities against the local other.

This muscular discourse that each of us find in our cultures especially in matters of national security has wide ramification in each society. It re-enforces values of force as justified method of conflict resolution.¹¹ The 'tough' are associated with power and privilege and the public viewed with contempt since it excludes people (especially women) who do not have the physical capacity for dominance, whether at the international, national, civil society or family level. This discourse creeps into the public psyche, is echoed in the media, in films and becomes part of popular culture and ultimately finds its way into classrooms and the learning mind.

In all conflicts militarization is a structural part of society in times of both conflict and peace and deeply impacts children. For example: a boy forced into an illegal army, a child that plays war games, a girl forced to stay away from school in a conflict situation to the girl who wants to join the army so she is acceptable are all absorbing militarism in different ways.¹² Anything can get militarized - from an economy with a five per cent war surcharge, or one that makes conscription essential. It is just a question of degree, cultural variation and specificity. Militarization intertwines with cultural practices, is inextricably linked with patriarchy as it defines and stereotypes masculinity and femininity. The role of educators/activists is to let students recognize the tensions and conflicts, to understand their nature and then to deal with them

The domination of male actors in history and contemporary politics and the few women in national security apparatuses who make militarist choices signal a message that promises empowerment for the select few women who are capable of making a 'bargain' and accepting the terms of patriarchy.¹³ This kind of empowerment takes away from the struggles for equity and gender equality that the women's movement has been arguing for. Right wing and militant women's organizations based on sectarian identity politics are springing up in conflict prone areas that propagate weapon training and martial arts for women, inculcate hatred toward the 'other' community, and teach them to 'donate' their children for the causes of their community/nation.¹⁴ This patriarchal bargain is at many times an easy option for women because patriarchy is constructed as a universal and pervasive ideology and remains unchallenged in many societies.

This dominant paradigm needs to be altered but should this contest of ideas be located in education and pedagogy? As argued above, biases, conflicts and ideology already exist through images, messages and texts in schools and in society, where children are continuously absorbing them. There is thus urgent need for alternate paradigms.

The Need for Gender Equity

Gender equity, development, rights and security are inter-linked and as educators/activists we need to recognize the special needs for women. Girls are seen as a burden on parents and still do not have the same value as compared to boys in many societies. In other societies their value is gendered. This leads to practices like female feticide, trafficking and sale of women. A situation of security does not necessarily bring in rights or security for women. Insecurity keeps girls and women out of public spaces not only during conflicts but long after. As the post war situation in both Afghanistan and Iraq show, young girls have not been sent to school or work for fear of insecurity and violation of their honour.¹⁵ Rape and abduction of girls is widespread yet remains unreported.¹⁶ Traditions such as the veil are re-enforced and women remain in the private domain, where family values and not public laws operate. Even if gender is not women's history it is her insecurity.

Violence against women is persistent and is tolerated because gender relations remain unequal. Force and masculinity are aspects of power that legitimize unequal gender relations. Violating women is symbolic of violating, humiliating and terrorizing an entire community and its culture since women are symbols of their culture and homeland and represent the 'honour' of their community. Sexual abuse linked to such symbolism has happened in recent conflicts like Bosnia ethnic war; the civil wars in Liberia, Congo. In honour killings in Pakistan and sectarian violence in India, Nepal and elsewhere where women's bodies have been part of the 'privilege of the conqueror'.¹⁷ The insecurity of women, casting them in a mothering role deprives them of equal citizenship rights and is synonymous with their powerlessness. Women are thus kept out of politics and even peace negotiations (though they are linked to peace roles). Note for instance women's absence and marginal roles from recent conflict resolution dialogues, from Afghanistan, Iraq, Sri Lanka, where peace itself become militarized. This attitude places women's rights on the back burner.

There are structural linkages between practices in the family, society, state and international system. For example if violence is a legitimate method of resolving international disputes, states will increase their force levels and the use of legitimate force to organize their political systems / regimes. Methods of force are replicated in society and family. The use and legitimacy of force varies in each system, but violence against women remains almost a constant factor in almost all societies at times of conflict and peace.

Since gender biases and inequities begin at birth, it is from birth onwards that equity has to be ensured. Since biases arise from the minds of people, it is their worldviews that we have to address, education and learning is key to this process.

Possibilities

To achieve universal education directed towards rights, equity and peace the Coalition for Learning has to work in every community, state and internationally. Governments have to put education first, at level with security needs. They have to safeguard, equip and privilege education systems. They have to give them a level of trust and autonomy. Autonomous educational bodies have to build curriculum through wide ranging consultation that ensures values of a rights and gender equity education and assist in upgrading teacher skills towards this direction. They have to encourage parent –teacher-social movements-community interaction. Schools have to be receptive to new ideas and discourses. They have to let parent-teacher association’s function. NGO’s have a special role to play by making education a civil society initiative. They have to link between the school and education system and civil society. They have to initiate mass contact and popular movements, link social movements to schools, prepare surveys and status reports of schools in their areas for public awareness, intervene on behalf of rights and gender equity at the grass roots level.

Table I

Some Roles of Coalition for Learning

Government	Autonomous Educational Bodies	Schools	NGO’s/Activists/intellectuals/parents	International Institutions
Provide adequate funding and support for schools. Encourage public education TV channels and information technology.	Create curriculum that has democratic, gender equity and human rights values.	Use curriculum to create rights and gender equity understanding in relation to local and familiar situations.	Make education a civil society initiative. Initiate popular and mass movements for bringing schools to communities where they do not exist.	Disseminate information on successful schemes and reforms across countries; Give guidelines of curricula and how it should be made relevant to local situations.
Ensure autonomy and non-intervention by government in day to day functioning of school system	Have regular curriculum consultations with schools, activists, NGO’s.	Encourage questioning and analytical minds and methods and a situation of gender equity within schools.	Initiate discussions to make curriculum gender sensitive and open to human rights, peace, the	Provide and share information on successful programmes and movements for education and rights.

			marginalized and to the 'other' of the community	Initiate seminars on comparative education patterns and give governments guidelines how innovative methods have worked.
Provide credibility and legitimacy to educational programmes. In poor areas, have mid-day meals as incentives; raise standards and flexibility of the Open School system.	Ensure schools, teachers upgrade their skills with current trends on gender and human rights discourse; provide refresher courses for teachers on these issues.	Encourage interaction with popular and social movements related to right, gender equity, environment, etc.	Conduct surveys of their own, separate from those of the state to ascertain the impact and functioning of government programmes; on status of education; on gender/human rights programmes, etc.	Popularize the gender equity, human rights and human security discourses through audio and video tapes
Listen and respect feedback from grass roots schools and NGO's. Adhere to guidelines from international bodies like the UNESCO.	Interact with schools, teachers, NGO's, activists and organize feedback from these groups and from the community	Schools should facilitate that teachers should upgrade their skills and knowledge of new theories and discourses	Organize interaction between leaders/activists of popular and social movements, like environment, peace, women's movements with schools	Have a more detailed status of education report as part of the Human Development Index.
Conduct surveys to view outcome of programmes.	Make sure that schools are multicultural, inclusive and representatives of all the communities of	Interact and include all communities around the school. Work with the parent-teacher	Play watchdog role for schools. Make sure parent-teacher associations work.	Propose greater accountability from governments, and NGO's on issues of education.

	their location.	associations.		
Make provisions for infrastructure of schools and good conditions for teachers. Ensure gender equity at all levels of education programmes.	Make facilities for career counseling for all, with special needs for girls.	Have career counseling with special care for girls. Ensure teacher attendance, and student and parent –teacher associations that meet regularly and give feed back.	Do field survey and bring to public notice the status of schools, and government programmes on education through reports, press conferences, etc.	Have teams do field surveys of education programmes.

One example of effective intervention by NGOs is that of advocating the mid-day meal scheme in India. A public interest litigation filed by the People’s Union for Civil Liberties led to an order from the Supreme Court 1991, ordering the Union and State governments implement the mid-day meals scheme and provide children enrolled in government schools mid-day meals. The Government of India in 1995, launched a new “centrally-sponsored scheme” where cooked mid-day meals were to be introduced in all government and government-aided primary schools. Six years later, activists and independent research teams carried out a survey on the status of this scheme and found that in states that had implemented the scheme, there was a significant increase of primary school enrollment.¹⁸ There was a dramatic surge in female school participation after mid-day meals were introduced. Mid-day meals ended ‘class room hunger’ that had earlier distracted young children. The scheme led to increase in female employment in village schools and contributed to liberating working women by freeing them from the burden of having to cook mid day meals. These meals also helped reduce class and caste inequalities as children from different social groups sat and ate together.

Appropriate funding from states and organizations needs to be channeled for activity related to such schemes. This transformation requires an alliance of educators, activists and social movements and states, multi-lateral organizations that share the concerns for a democratic project that transforms the meaning of power and security that can ultimately achieve the aims of fulfilling the goals of human security and dignity for all.

The need for gender equity in schools has to be addressed within social contexts. The school curriculum that implicitly produces gender differences should be changed and guided to remove gender stereotypes. Young women be encouraged to consider careers and vocational guidance should provides information on non-traditional careers. Both boys and girls should be taught how family/home responsibilities are to be shared and both need to be told how to balance careers with home. Teachers and academics need to update themselves on gender issues, human rights matters, etc. Attempts need to be made to bring in human rights, gender equity and human security discourses in order to challenge new and old hegemonic orthodoxy that excluded the rights agenda.

The knowledge of human rights and gender equity must be part of texts and daily dialogue. Rights collective, individual as well as social, cultural and civil rights, have to be introduced as basic concepts to all so it becomes part of popular sense and culture. Educators have to ensure that students get to know the ‘Other’ of their communities/states as people not as threats. There is thus need to give special focus to women’s rights and security in constructing our worldview, the learning process is a critical step for gender equity. The method of learning for dominance will have to be transformed into teaching for human rights and gender equity. (Table II)

Table II

Teaching the Dominant Paradigm	Teaching for Rights and Gender Equity
Representation and images primarily of power as conquest, nationalistic glory, past greatness, colonial expansion, for national identity, with men as dominant actors and women either absent or marginal.	Representation of peoples roles including non-militarist roles, images of popular movements, narratives of intellectual, scientific, artistic and sports figures. Questioning the past, without constructing it for contemporary politics. Explanation and questioning of gender roles.
Representation of the dominant community and thus exclusion, marginalization and sometimes demonized image of Others.	Knowing, including and understanding the Other, the marginalized.
Explanation primarily of the dominant culture and nationalistic culture.	Explanation of multiple cultures and representation of cultures as ‘salad bowl’ concept, i.e. with all colours.
Competition as the primary goal	Co-operation and team work as learning process.
Patriarchal/ authoritarian attitudes	Democratic and tolerant attitudes
Learning by rote and not enough emphasis on analysis	Learning by questioning, relating to local narratives, application to local situation and analysis.
Minimum teaching of human rights and gender equity and peace is often taught as an abstract concept.	Teaching of rights and peace in relation to specific local/national/international contexts, focus of gender equity

As activists and educators we have to make schools, workplaces and all our spaces arenas for the praxis of PRGE. Human security and rights have to connect to education. Schools are linked to communities and they have to reflect all parts of the community, not just the dominant or powerful section. The teaching of PRGE has to be related to real life conflicts and situations and texts have to reflect the experiences of the marginalized. They have to use multi-media, including the alternative media and information that is relevant to local and international experience. For this, schools must be linked with social

movements, like the environment, rights, and women’s peace movements. This brings the transformative experience to the learning mind.

To cultivate skills for conflict resolution that are based on negotiation not force, justice not management, we do not have to re-invent the wheel but build on discourses that we have which can lead us this. The two discourses that I argue for are the human security and feminist discourse, because both these are based on rights and equity. PRGE can be lived and learnt primarily in an environment of human and gender security and the discourse of militarism is an obstacle to PRGE. It is not only important for us to teach PRGE but also to practice it, i.e. the praxis of PRGE because these universal values have to be learnt through both education and from living experiences. The approach to deal with these conflicts is contested between one that supports force, more security and defence (militarization) and one that argues for more human rights, law based and gender equity approach that can be covered under the human or peoples security umbrella. It is in this contest of ideas that educators/ activists have to participate. The different approaches are told in the Table III below:

Table III

State Security Policies * [Supported by Political Parties/ Groups]	Human/Peoples Security Praxis
---	--------------------------------------

Focussed on traditional and national security [Based on Realism/neo-realism and identified as militarization]	Focussed on Peoples Security [Based on Human Security and feminist concepts and identified as ethics and non-violence]
State \ regime interest	Peoples/communities/individual interest
Power of force; Power identified with state	Power of debate, justice and law; Power identified with people
Method of unilateralism	Method of multilateralism
Urge for hegemony/ hegemonic alliances	Urge for democratization and social justice
Minimum use of international law	Support and strengthening of International law
Selective use of Rights	Universal support for Rights
Militarist and Patriarchal discourse	Peaceful and feminist discourse
Threat from other states and non-state actors (terrorism) and politics of threat perceptions. Threat from the ‘Other’	Indirect threats from militarism, chauvinism, sectarianism, patriarchy, poverty, etc. Politics of truth and reconciliation. Knowing the ‘Other’
Ideology and practice of globalization	Ideology of internationalization
Focus on economic growth	Focus on economic equity
Connection of global elite	Coalition of peoples, social and peace movements
Indivisible sovereignty	Shared sovereignty

Focus on National Security Acts and draconian legislation	Focus on people centred legislation
Authoritarian / military systems *	Democratic systems
Sectarian politics*	Secular politics
Majoritarian /racist politics*	Special protection for minorities, women and excluded
Focus on increasing defence expenditure	Focus on increasing social sector spending

*Not all States practice all these policies.

Educators/activists will have to take up each principle and concept of the human security praxis, examine its values and capability, contextualize it to their local situation and let it become part of their dialogue. States and regimes do not change easily even when they are democratic. It is people who will have to make this change not a handful of specialists. People will have to identify with and legitimize this discourse as they de-legitimize force and violence in public and private domains. This would be the roadmap to re-invent the concept of power in order to re-invent society. With such a process we can learn to move away from militarization that affects our society, culture and institutions both at times of war and peace. For this it is family, school, society, media, state and the international system that have to be partners in this learning.

The concept of ‘people’ is used here in terms of a rainbow coalition of movements, civil society organizations, unions and others who can and have on occasion formed a historic bloc to promote peace and transformative activities.¹⁹ The debate and accountability on weapons of mass destruction as an alibi for war, for instance, is a consequence of such a historic bloc. Educators/activists play a crucial role in binding and dialoguing with this bloc, to change the messages, images and representations that children and the mind receives that makes us accept peace, human rights and gender equity as the discourse for a more secure world.

We conclude then as we began, education cannot go it alone. The focus of the transformative discourse based on human and gendered security must form the basis of our praxis. Activists and educators will have to bring the living experiences of the security discourse to their pupils and beyond. The contestation and alternate ideas must be examined by educators/activists and brought into pedagogy. The future of the rights discourse lies in the classrooms.

Notes

¹ In the Indian State of Kerala for instance, a people’s education movement- KSSP was instrumental in bringing awareness and pressurizing the government for compulsory primary education. The state claims almost complete literacy, including the highest literacy rates for women in India.

² Monica Ringer, "Education in the Middle East: Introduction," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, (Illinois, USA) vol., Nos. 1&2, 2001, p.3.

³ I. Shor and Paulo Freire (1987), *A Pedagogy for Liberation; dialogues for Transforming Education*, Bergin and Garvey, Massachusetts, p.37; Paulo Freire and Donald Macedo, *Literacy, Reading the Word and the World*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1987, p.55.

⁴ Researchers have established that children learn their attitudes about violence at a very young age and these attitudes tend to last. Learning violence from violent situations, family violence, TV, media, impacts children and teens in harmful ways, since they learn consider violence as a way to "handle" conflict; they learn to behave aggressively towards others and are taught the use of violence instead of self control. Document of the American Academy of Pediatrics, WWW. AAP; A.J. Schwart: *The Schools and Socialization*, Harper and Row, New York, 1975.

⁵ Studies have shown how various groups that represent political and economic diversities; racial, ethnic and religious preferences; business interests, etc attempt to control and influence public education. See for instance: A.J. Schwart, *The Schools and Socialization*, Harper and Row, New York, 1975. Women in a large number of societies continue to be banned from education. For instance, Tribal elders in northwest Pakistan have banned aide organizations from sending women to teach girls in their homes and have threatened to burn down the houses of anyone harboring the women, since it went against tradition. The Pakistan government has limited access and control in these tribal regions. (Associated Press), *Asian Age*, (New Delhi) 15 July 2003.

⁶ Romilla Thapar, "Propaganda as History won't sell", *Hindustan Times*, 9 December, 2001; Amartya Sen, Interview in *Outlook (India)* January 21, 2002; *Communalism of Education: The History Textbooks controversy Report* by the Delhi Historians Group, (new Delhi), 2001; K.K. Aziz, *The Murder of History: A critique of history textbooks used in Pakistan*, Vangaurd Books, 1993. K. Krishna Kumar, *Prejudice and Pride*, and detail how the textbooks in these two countries turn students against the Other.

⁷ Michel W Apple and Linda K. Christian-Smith, "The Politics of the Textbook" in *The Politics of the Text Book*, ed. Michel W Apple and Linda K. Christian-Smith (London: Routledge, 1991), p2-3; Betty S. Anderson, "Writing the Nation: Textbooks of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan", *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, (Illinois, USA) vol., Nos. 1&2, 2001, p5-14.

⁸ *The Friday Times (Pakistan)* reprinted in *Indian Express*, 28 June 2003.

⁹ "Training Camps Worrying India's Minorities," By Prajnan Bhattacharya , Associated Press, *Los Angeles Daily News (USA)*, July 12, 2003

¹⁰ Juliette Terzief, "Hatred Springs from Texts of Pakistani Schools", *San Francisco Chronicle*, July 30, 2003.

¹¹ Tom DeLay, the House majority leader, said in a speech in July 2003: "To gauge just how out of touch the Democrat leadership is on the war on terror, just close your eyes and try to imagine Ted Kennedy landing that Navy jet on the deck of that aircraft carrier." Quoted in Paul Krugman, "Why Bush hasn't collapsed, yet. *New York Times*, reprinted in *Asian Age*, 30 July 2003. Powerful contempt for the public. The nation cannot believe a man because he is not in a military uniform.

¹² Anuradha M. Chenoy, (2002) *Militarism and Women in south Asia*, Kali for Women, New Delhi.

¹³ Kandiyoti, D. (1998) 'Bargaining with Patriarchy', *Gender and Society*, Vol.2, No.3, pp.274 -90

¹⁴ Tanika Sarkar, (1991) 'Heroic Women, Mother Goddess: Family and Organization in Hindutava Politics', in Sarkar, T., and U. Butalia, (eds.), (1995) *Women and the Hindu Right: A Collection of Essays*, Delhi: Kali for Women.

¹⁵ Save the Children Report, from UK reports that there is a 50% drop out rate of girls from schools in Baghdad because of fear of kidnapping. Women cannot get timely help for medical problems because female staff is not present in hospitals because of fear of insecurity. Kalpana Sharma, "Another Kind of Prison", *The Hindu*, 26 July 2003.

¹⁶ Human Rights Watch, "Climate of Fear: Sexual Violence and abduction of Women and Girls in Baghdad." July 2003.

¹⁷ Susan Brownmiller (1975) *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*, New York: Simon and Schuster; and Heaven Crawley, (2000), "Engendering the State in Refugee Women's Claims for Asylum", in Susie Jacobs, Ruth Jacobson, Jennifer Marchbank Eds. *States of Conflict, Gender, Violence and Resistance*, Zed Books, London, pp87-104 (2000)

¹⁸ Jean Dreze, Aparajita Goyal et al, *The Future of Mid-day Meals, A Report*, (New Delhi) 1 August, 2003; *Public Report on Basic Education in India, A report by the Probe Team*, (1999), Oxford university Press, New Delhi.

¹⁹ Millions of people protested against the war in Iraq. This protest influenced policy as is evident from neoconservative advisor in the United States, Richard Perle's address in New York just before the war shows: Talking about German Chancellor Schroeder's refusal to endorse the Iraq war, Perle stated that the German electorate influenced his decision. "The group as I understand it, was women in the 25 to 40 age category" that had "the pacifist sentiment" that led to Germany opposing the war even if the UN mandated it: Richard Perle, *Speech on Iraq*, New York, February 24 2003, reported on the website of the Project for the New American Century, (PNAC)