Education and Extremisms

Rethinking Liberal Pedagogies in the Contemporary World

Edited by
Farid Panjwani, Lynn Revell,
Reza Gholami and Mike Diboll

Education and Extremisms

'This book provides a most comprehensive and detailed account of the growing prevalence of extremism across the world and of the educational response which needs to be made. In so doing, it challenges the superficial responses of the political controllers of education as well as prevailing views of liberal education.'

—*Richard Pring, Formerly Professor of Educational Studies,*
University of Oxford, UK

Education and Extremisms addresses one of the most pressing questions facing societies today: how is education to respond to the challenge of extremism? It argues that the implementation of new teaching techniques, curricular reforms or top-down changes to education policy alone cannot solve the problem of extremism in educational establishments across the world. Instead, the authors of this thought-provoking volume argue that there is a need for those concerned with radicalisation to reconsider the relationship between instrumentalist ideologies shaping education and the multiple forms of extremism that exist.

Beginning with a detailed discussion of the complicated and contested nature of different forms of extremism, including extremism of both a religious and secular nature, the authors show that common assumptions in contemporary discourses on education and extremism are problematic. Chapters in the book provide a careful selection of pertinent and topical case studies, policy analysis and insightful critique of extremist discourses. Taken together, the chapters in the book make a powerful case for re-engaging with liberal education in order to foster values of individual and social enrichment, intellectual freedom, criticality, open-mindedness, flexibility and reflection as antidotes to extremist ideologies. Recognising recent criticisms of liberalism and liberal education, the authors argue for a new understanding of liberal education that is suitable for multicultural societies in a rapidly globalising world.

This book is essential reading for academics, researchers and postgraduate students with an interest in religion, citizenship education, liberalism, secularism, counter-terrorism, social policy, Muslim education, youth studies and extremism. It is also relevant to teacher educators, teachers and policymakers.

Farid Panjwani is Senior Lecturer and founding Director at the Centre for Research and Evaluation in Muslim Education (CREME) at the UCL Institute of Education, University College London, UK.

Lynn Revell is Reader in Religion and Education at Canterbury Christ Church University, UK.

Reza Gholami is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Education and Social Justice at the University of Birmingham, UK.

Mike Diboll is Honorary Research Associate at UCL Institute of Education, University College London, UK.

Education and Extremisms

Rethinking Liberal Pedagogies
in the Contemporary World

**Edited by Farid Panjwani,
Lynn Revell, Reza Gholami
and Mike Diboll**

Contents

Foreword

How we educate the present younger generation in a rapidly changing context will have a crucial impact on every aspect of society and will inevitably shape our future. 'Extremism', whether religious or secular, presents a pressing current concern. An especially urgent issue under discussion is the production of 'extremism' within educational environments and the consequent need to address this trend. The arguments presented in this collection of papers – intersecting education, extremism and criticality – are thus very timely. Their thematic juxtaposition raises important questions not just for educationalists but for all of those interested in, and connected with, education in Britain today. The questions they pose are both large and complex, and their multi-dimensional significance is reflected in the scope of this volume, at the heart of which lies a critique of the approach that has been adopted by the state of late to deal with extremism and radicalisation in educational institutions.

Collectively the papers included here engage with discourses that suggest that the state seems to be fundamentally most concerned with the maintenance of the *status quo*, achieved through moral and social regulation and control. The so-called 'normalisation' of the individual through disciplinary power and conditioning, in turn, relies on controlling the kind of knowledge that fosters a sense of a unitary national identity – Britishness. Arguably, this approach crowds us all into a herd within which no one is permitted to think critically, where differing from each another effectively becomes a twenty-first century version of Orwell's 'Thought-crime'. Statutes mandate British values. Citizenship becomes confused with obedience.

This volume instead contends that definitions fashioned by the state-run counter to what we might view as education's liberal ideals and purposes. Indeed, it argues that what constitutes extremism is always a subjective and political matter, and, therefore, open to contestation. And such contestation would in turn be possible if in educational environments free enquiry was stressed and uninhibited, and the unequivocal challenging of all ideals and values encouraged.

The concern of contributors to this collection, therefore, is precisely the sharp eclipse of the liberal vision – 'a deficit of criticality' produced by a neoliberalised, utilitarian and instrumental model of education that can be critiqued for contributing to 'weakening education's capacity to develop the kinds of critical

intellectual skills' that might robustly challenge hegemonic political discourses and nurture alternative ways of thinking. Through the tools furnished by liberal education, the book's chapters argue, it could be possible to resist the notion of homogeneous extremism and equip students to develop more effective critiques of different kinds of extremism, including what these contributions collectively describe as the 'extremism of the mainstream'.

This volume is to be welcomed precisely for offering a radical critique of modern education and making a ringing call to stem the corrosion of the liberal vision in education. As it seeks to persuade us, by revitalising and reformulating this vision so that it again acquires the centrality in educational thinking, more rational and reasoned responses on issues of extremism stand more chance of being mounted.

<div align="right">

Professor Humayun Ansari OBE,
Professor of History of Islam and Culture,
Royal Holloway University of London

</div>

Acknowledgements

Contributors

Adewole O. Adedokun is Chief Lecturer in Language Education at Jigawa State College of Education, Gumel in Nigeria, where he has taught for over 23 years. Adedokun's works include over twenty national and international conference papers and published articles on ELT and ESL. He served as Research Assistant in the British Council/MacArthur Foundation research in Nigeria. He is the author of *A Wasted Generation? You and Your Talents and Basic English for Senior Secondary Schools.*

Robert A. Bowie is Director of the National Institute of Christian Education Research and Principal Lecturer at Canterbury Christ Church University, UK, where he teaches ethics, human rights and faith and education. He is Chair of AULRE, the Association of University Lecturers in Religion and Education and is a Higher Education Academy National Teaching Fellow. For 12 years he trained teachers of RE, for seven years he taught RE in secondary school and for two years he taught English in Turkey and Japan. His 2016 book, *Dignity and Human Rights Education: Exploring Ultimate Worth in a Post-Secular World* is published by Peter Lang, and he is co-author of a 2016 A Level textbook, *Oxford A Level Religious Studies: Christianity, Philosophy and Ethics* published by OUP.

Justin Crawford graduated in 2016 with a BA (Hons.) in Middle Eastern Studies from the School of Oriental & African Studies, University of London, UK, after studying Arabic in Beirut for a year. He then worked as a Research Intern at Quilliam Foundation, August–December 2016. He is currently getting a TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) accreditation and plans to become a teacher.

Wadata Dangaladim is Principal Lecturer at Shehu Shagari College of Education, Sokoto, Nigeria. He holds degrees in Agricultural Science and Soil Science, both from Usmanu Danfodiyo University, Sokoto, and has worked on research projects with the UCL Institute of Education and the British Council, Nigeria.

Mike Diboll is an honorary research associate at the UCL Institute of Education, University College London, UK, where his research interests include the

ethnographic study of revolution, counter-revolution, resistance and resilience in the post-2011 Arab World, and the ways in which these relate to education, both in the Arab World and globally. He worked in the Comparative Humanities and Higher Education Development in the Arab World 2002–11, and was involved in the start-up of Bahrain Teachers' College, where he was Academic Head of Continuing Professional Development. He was an eye-witness to key events of the 2011 Bahrain revolution and counter-revolution, and has written extensively on Bahrain. He is a Fellow of the Higher Education Academy.

Mulika Lamido Dodo has over 30 years' teaching experience as a junior secondary school teacher, having started teaching in 1983, and is Chief Lecturer at the Federal College of Education (Technical) Bichi in Kano state, Nigeria.

Julia Ebner is a policy analyst at Quilliam, a think-tank specialising in human rights and counter-extremism. Her research focuses on reciprocal radicalisation and counter-extremism policies in the UK, France and Germany. She co-authored "The EU and Terrorism: Is Britain Safer In or Out?", the EU-funded TERRA policy advice report and various research papers for FATE (Families Against Terrorism and Extremism) and the Kofi Annan Foundation. She has given evidence to parliamentary working groups, spoken at international conferences and held workshops in schools and universities. She has written for *The Guardian, The Independent* and *Left Foot Forward* and given interviews on BBC World News, CNN International, Al Jazeera and others.

Chidi Ezegwu is an independent social research specialist with interests in political economy, gender, education, young people, social justice, conflict and public policy. He holds masters degrees from the University of Ibadan, Nigeria, and the UCL Institute of Education, University College London, UK, and has worked on numerous donor research projects, including for the British Council, DFID, MacArthur Foundation, UNICEF and USAID. He is also an active Wikistrat Analyst, contributing to its global strategic analysis and forecasting on conflict, political economy and development.

Chioma Ezegwu is a postgraduate student of Digital Education at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland. She worked with the coordinating team in a two-year MacArthur-funded research on Gender and Teacher Education in Nigeria, which was implemented by the British Council and UCL Institute of Education. Her publications and international conference presentations centre on education, climate change and conflict.

Reza Gholami is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Education and Social Justice at the University of Birmingham, UK. He earned his PhD in the Department of Anthropology and Sociology at SOAS, University of London, where he also conducted postdoctoral research funded by the UK's Arts and Humanities Research Council. He is the author of *Secularism and Identity: Non-Islamiosity in the Iranian Diaspora* (Routledge, 2015) and also publishes on citizenship and citizenship education, migration, cosmopolitanism and social policy.

Usama Hasan is Head of Islamic Studies at Quilliam, a think-tank specialising in human rights and counter-extremism. He is a trained imam, having memorised the Qur'an at age 11 and led mosque prayers for over 30 years, as well as being a physicist with a PhD, MA and MSc from the Universities of Cambridge and London, a Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society and a Member of the International Society of Science and Religion. He has translated Islamic texts from Arabic and Urdu into English. His latest academic papers address Islamic thought, law, human rights, religious freedom, gender equality and scientific ethics.

Zulfiqar Khimani is a PhD student in sociology of religion at Cambridge University, UK. He earned his MPhil from the University of Cambridge in Modern Society and Global Transformations with a focus on critical social theory and media studies. His PhD thesis is interdisciplinary and investigates translocal flows and networks within the context of religious communities. His academic interests include critical social theory, contemporary Muslim communities, media studies and philosophy.

Sarah V. Marsden is Lecturer in Radicalisation and Protest in a Digital Age at Lancaster University, UK, prior to which she was a Lecturer in Terrorism Studies at the University of St Andrews. She has a PhD in International Relations from the University of St Andrews, a masters in Forensic Psychology, and holds a BA (Hons) in Philosophy and Literature from the University of Liverpool. Her research takes an interdisciplinary approach to questions of terrorism, radicalisation and contentious politics. She has published widely on global jihadism, religious nationalism and radical social movements, including the book *Reintegrating Extremists: 'Deradicalisation' and Desistance* (Palgrave, 2017).

Joyce Miller is Associate Fellow in the Religions and Education Research Unit at the University of Warwick, UK. In 2007 she retired as Head of Diversity and Cohesion at Education Bradford, before which she was a senior lecturer in religious studies at the University of Wolverhampton. She is a former Chair of the RE Council and of the Schools Linking Network. She was a member of the REDCo Warwick community of practice and of the qualitative research team investigating resources in religious education. She recently co-edited *Religion in Education: Innovation in International Research* and has written widely on cohesion and extremism.

Farid Panjwani is Senior Lecturer and founding Director at the Centre for Research and Evaluation in Muslim Education (CREME) at the UCL Institute of Education, University College London, UK. With a background in the philosophy of education, international development and Islamic studies, Dr Panjwani is particularly interested in education about inter- and intra-religious diversity, interface between religious and citizenship education and the philosophical questions posed by the need for social cohesion in contemporary multicultural societies. He has published widely on the aims, curriculum

and pedagogy of religious education. His DPhil from Oxford was on the role of faith schools in liberal societies. He has worked on several curriculum and teacher education projects in religious and inter-cultural education and has acted as consultant to many organisations both nationally and internationally. Dr Panjwani has a wide range of experience in teaching religious education in formal and non-formal settings. In addition to the UK, he has taught courses in universities in Italy, Canada, Tunisia and Pakistan. His current research is on critical pedagogy, education and poverty, teaching of philosophy in Muslim faith schools and the pedagogical approaches to religious diversity.

Daryoush Mohammad Poor is a research associate in the Department of Academic Research and Publications at the Institute of Ismaili Studies, London, UK. He is also a lecturer for the Department of Graduate Studies and his teaching areas include Ismaili intellectual history and philosophy, intellectual traditions and contemporary Muslim thought. He completed his PhD in 2012 at the University of Westminster in Political and Social Studies. His latest book, *Authority without Territory: The Aga Khan Development Network and the Ismaili Imamate* (Palgrave, 2014), is a fresh theoretical engagement with contemporary institutions of the Ismaili imamate.

Angela Quartermaine is Senior Executive Officer for Public Education at the Woolf Institute, University of Cambridge, UK. Before coming to Cambridge, she completed her PhD research into pupils' perceptions of terrorism at the Warwick Religions and Education Research Unit (WRERU), Faculty of Education, University of Warwick. She gained her first class undergraduate MA (Hons.) in Religious Studies from the University of Edinburgh; a postgraduate MSt in the Study of Religions from the University of Oxford; an MPGCE in Religious Education (secondary teaching) at the University of Warwick; and has taught RE and Sociology in UK Secondary Schools. She recently finished an ESRC-funded PhD project, which she passed without corrections. Her current work involves developing and delivering the public education projects conducted on behalf of the Woolf Institute.

Lynn Revell is a reader in religion and education at Canterbury Christ Church University, UK, where she has worked on the PGCE for Religious Education and Citizenship, and now leads the Doctorate in Education. She has worked in secondary schools as a teacher of Religious Education and for the Commission for Racial Equality. She is currently involved in research looking at the significance of extremism in education and free speech in schools and FE. She has published work on the representation of Islam in RE, and the impact of the requirement to promote 'Fundamental British Values' in schools and colleges.

Tania Saeed is Assistant Professor at the Lahore University of Management Sciences (LUMS), Pakistan. She is the author of *Islamophobia and Securitization: Religion, Ethnicity and the Female Voice* (2016, Palgrave Macmillan). Saeed obtained her doctorate in Education from the University of Oxford. Her area

of expertise is education, social exclusion and securitization within the context of the UK and Pakistan.

Angus M. Slater currently works at Keele University, UK, and has previously worked at both Lancaster University and the University of Cumbria. His interests include work on inter-religious dialogue, particularly in the area between Christianity and Islam, but also extend to aspects of identity formation, narrative theology and Islamic Law. Recent applications of this have included work on Islamic identity in the West, queer accounts of identity formation and a re-reading of Radical Orthodoxy's approach to dialogue.

Elaine Unterhalter is Professor of Education and International Development at University College London, UK, Institute of Education. She has written widely on gender, education and development, and was the principal investigator for the study on gender and teacher education in Nigeria, reported in this volume.

John A. White, CVO, was born in 1942 and educated at The Grammar School, Batley, Leeds College of Commerce, The University of Hull and The College of the Resurrection, Mirfield. He was ordained priest in 1966 and was Assistant Chaplain, University of Leeds, UK, until 1972. He was the first full-time staff member of an experimental clergy training course (NOC). Between 1982 and 2012 he was Canon of Windsor; Canon Librarian; successively, Precentor and Treasurer; also Vice Dean as well as Staff Member and Warden of St George's House (conference and in-service education centre). He has been a consultant to the Anglican Diocese of Mexico for 22 years and a Canon of Monterrey. In 2012 he was appointed Canon Emeritus of St George's Chapel by HM The Queen and also awarded CVO. He is also a published poet.

Philip Wood is Associate Professor at the Institute for the Study of Muslim Civilisations, part of Aga Khan University International. He teaches history and the study of religion. He completed a DPhil at Oxford with Professor Dame Averil Cameron in 2007 and held a British Academy Post-doctoral Fellowship at Corpus Christi College Oxford 2007–10. Subsequently he was Director of Studies in History at Sidney Sussex College Cambridge. He has written two monographs on Iraq and Syria in late antiquity (AD c. 400–800) and is also interested in the contemporary reception of early Islamic history.

Introduction

Farid Panjwani, Lynn Revell, Reza Gholami
and Mike Diboll

This volume seeks to address in new ways educators' and decision-makers' concerns about extremism and extremist sympathies among a significant number of relatively well-educated young people in the United Kingdom and elsewhere. The contributors hail from a wide array of academic backgrounds: religious and moral education, anthropology, development studies, sociology, political science and philosophy, as well as practitioners in education, religion and the third sector. In their different ways, the contributors seek to advocate a renewed emphasis on liberal education for our times, to foster students' powers of questioning, criticality and imagining egalitarian futures as the way forward in contesting all forms of extremisms in education and in the wider society.

The familiar-elusive idea of extremism frames much of current educational practice, policy and discourse. Its familiarity is due to its widespread deployment to categorise certain stances (words, acts or intentions), as being far removed from the ordinary, and thereby being irrational and threatening. It is elusive because it is not easy to define what ordinary is, which is always perspectival, involving a degree of subjectivity, of political outlook and of moral economy of power.

The word extremism did not always have the wholly negative connotation it has recently acquired, particularly since 11th September 2001. For instance, the Rev. Dr Martin Luther King, in his Letter from Birmingham (Alabama) Jail in 1963 wrote:

> the question is not whether we will be extremist, but what kind of extremists we will be. Will we be extremists for hate, or will we be extremists for love? Will we be extremists for the preservation of injustice, or will we be extremists for the cause of justice?
>
> (King, 1963)

Just before penning these lines, Dr King invokes the Old Testament prophet Amos, St Paul, Abraham Lincoln, Protestant reformer Martin Luther and some others as 'extremists' for love, freedom and justice. However, in recent times use of the term extremism by governments and the media has rendered it synonymous with violence, threat and irrationality. This transformation is underpinned by a securitisation paradigm which has increasingly shaped policy making and, as

we will see below, affects the educational practice as well. The contributors to this book argue that a better educational response is through a renewed engagement liberal education and critical thought.

It is, therefore, unsurprising that there is not one agreed definition of extremism, nor is there a definite answer to the question why individuals or groups come under the thrall of extremist narratives. Perhaps, therefore, the first step in tackling extremism is to differentiate between extremism in ideas and extremism in acts, including violence. The latter is a criminal act and needs to be addressed as such. For example, UNESCO (2016) defines violent extremism as 'violence to achieve radical ideological, religious or political views.' However, even here, things may not be always clear. As Coleman and Bartoli note:

> the same extremist act will be viewed by some as just and moral (such as pro-social 'freedom fighting'), and by others as unjust and immoral (antisocial 'terrorism') depending on the observer's values, politics, moral scope, and the nature of their relationship with the actor . . . power differences also matter when defining extremism. When in conflict, the activities of members of low power groups tend to be viewed as more extreme than similar activities committed by members of groups advocating the status quo.
>
> (Coleman and Bartoli, n.d)

The former, extremism in ideas, brings up a range of philosophical and social issues to do with freedom of speech, the securitisation of communities and the labelling of young people. For example, current UK government policy defines extremism as 'vocal or active opposition to Fundamental British Values' (DfE, 2011: 15). By including vocal opposition, the definition creates the suspicion that the aim here is not only to curb extremism, but also to muffle legitimate discussion and critique of the set of values the government wants to promote. These issues receive attention in the chapters in this book by Angela Quartermaine, Tania Saeed and Lynn Revell. In this regard, Saeed's chapter draws upon a narrative study of Muslim students in universities in England exploring their perception of extremisms and goes on to argue for a move away from the surveillance agenda to one that promotes critical and engaged pedagogy.

Ultimately, the central problem relating to extremism may not be the beliefs held, but rather the ways in which they are held: intolerant, closed to scrutiny and fixed. This intolerance, combined with other factors, can develop into violence. The will to impose and not the will to believe seem perhaps to be the underlying problem in extremism. Given that many well-educated people seem to accept the will to impose by joining extremist organisations, the question of extremism becomes an educational and a pedagogical concern. There is a long list of well-educated terrorists in recent years, from the World Trade Centre attackers in 1993 and 2001 to many among the 'foreign fighters' who have joined ISIS. That well-educated young people can be attracted to extremist ideology and can carry out violent acts has been noted in scholarship since 1980s. More recently, in their book *Engineers of Jihad: The Curious Connection between Extremism and*

Education (2016), Diego Gambetta and Steffen Hertog have noted that graduates from applied sciences backgrounds such as engineering are disproportionately represented among Islamist and right-wing extremist movements. Farid Panjwani and Zulfiqar Khimani in their chapter take up this finding and argue for a renewed emphasis on the humanities in education.

The ubiquitous use of the word extremism in media, political and policy discourse today appears to date from the 1980s, and has increasingly been applied to Muslim contexts, particularly after the events of 11th September 2001. Even though the perils of other forms of extremism, especially right-wing extremism, have been noted for some time, it is only recently that it has started once more to attract significant scholarly attention (Anthony, 2016; RUSI, 2016). As Ramalingam (2014) notes in her report on far-right extremism:

> The dichotomy between national security and community safety means that, as a result, far-right extremism tends to be relegated to a second-tier security threat, even though its impact is felt on a daily basis by individuals and communities across Europe.

It is in this context that this book prefers the pluralised extremisms. We believe it is now time for educational and security efforts to counter extremism by focussing on varieties of extremisms. In this volume, Justin Crawford, Julia Ebner and Usama Hasan investigate Islamic and far-right extremisms in the context of UK education; Mike Diboll offers a 'multiple ontologies' approach to understanding extremisms, using UK ISIS support as a case study; and John White adds a historical dimension by exploring extremism in the context of Christendom. He claims that in the absence of a historical perspective, it is easy to make the perhaps mistaken assumption that extremism is merely the creation of contemporary circumstances.

Violent expressions of extremist ideologies might be viewed as strategies in a power-game. The drivers in this game of power can differ from place to place, even when we consider extremism in a specific context, such as Muslim contexts. Though loosely sharing certain ideological features, the drivers of extremism movements such as the Taliban in Pakistan, and Boko Haram in Nigeria, and right-wing extremisms in diverse contexts might be different, and can only be grasped through understanding local historical, economic and political factors, as the relevant chapters in this book seek to show. Chapters by Elaine Unterhalter et al. and by Chidi Ezegwu et al. examine these issues in the context of Nigeria. Unterhalter's focus is gender and criticality while Ezegwu explores links between violence and education in the context of the transformation of a traditional educational institution, *Almajiri*.

It is important to remember, however, that 'extremism' is not a phenomenon applicable exclusively to those whom hegemonic political-media discourse constructs as the 'Other'. One of our contentions in this book is that in many ways we are currently living in *age of extremisms*; or rather, an age in which extremisms are becoming a commonplace, and 'mainstreamed' aspect of public life. ISIS

and other jihadi organisations emerge as merely one form of extremism among a plethora. So too, for instance, are the likes of Thomas Mair, the assassin of pro-EU Labour MP Jo Cox, or Norwegian neo-Nazi mass-murderer Anders Breivik. This raises the disturbing possibility that in trying to counter extremism, hegemonic actors such as the executive state and its agencies, legislators and the mass-media have themselves sometimes articulated a kind of 'extremism of the mainstream', an idea which is explored in the chapters by Lynn Revell and Tania Saeed.

In responding to the issues raised by extremisms, education can of course only be a part of the solution. The contributors of this volume hold that educational interventions of this kind should be predicated upon a renewed commitment to liberal education, an assertion investigated from various perspectives by Robert Bowie, Sarah Marsden, Daryoush Poor, Angus Slater and Philip Wood. Bowie argues for a nuanced understanding of tolerance that distinguishes its contested moral dimension from its political dimension; Marsden calls for a greater commitment to an ethics of care rooted in a relational approach to education and social interaction; Poor observes that a more open, more humble narrative in which agencies of individual human beings and communities are taken seriously is necessary to nurture criticality and reach a more peaceful world; Wood stresses the importance of developing students' historical thinking capacities as a necessary element of education about Islam; and, Slater seeks to provide an educational response to extremism from within the religious tradition by examining the ideas of Khaled Abou El Fadl, well-known contemporary Muslim theologian.

Modern education seeks to nurture students' material, political and social aspirations. Even without aiming for it, education can give young people capacities required to become conscious and aware of the structures of society and the workings of power that will constrain their aspirations. When this happens, young people need concepts to express their critique, imagination to conceive a better world and resilience to strive for their ideals. A genuine liberal education – for there can be education that is liberal in name but utilitarian in reality – has the potential which, we argue, is being marginalised and underused. As Farid Panjwani and Zulfiqar Khimani argue in their chapter, by redeploying this potential of liberal education, students can be equipped with historical, philosophical and moral capacities to interrogate extremists' narratives. Our challenge, however, is that there seems today to be a deficit of criticality in education in the UK and in other heavily neoliberalised contexts, which promotes a utilitarian and instrumental approach promoting the prime role of education as being linked to employment, career and material advancement. Thus, because of this deficit, for many young people the language in which they articulate both their grievances and their ideals is being provided increasingly by extremist ideologies, which also are looking for opportunities to influence young minds.

Extremisms and education policies

Such a commitment to 'refurbishing' liberal education as a foil to extremisms requires a realistic assessment of the challenges that face us. This includes an

investigation of the influence of governmental counter-terrorism policies on educational thought and practice. No other threat involving political violence, including the challenges posed by Irish nationalists and Ulster loyalists 1968–98, have impacted on education in the way that threats associated with al-Qaeda, ISIS and Islamicate 'Jihadism' in general have (Sian, 2015). Such critique is shared by many contributors in the book who also offer alternatives. In this regard, Joyce Miller's chapter in this volume stresses the need to move away from a focus on 'religious ideology and identity' in religious education to develop a more balanced perspective; Angela Quartermaine uses Foucauldian ideas to bring out the difficulties facing the implementation of state policies particularly in terms of balancing freedom of speech, personal belief (or religious freedom) and challenging ideologies; Reza Gholami attempts to think beyond both secular and religious ethics towards a renewed cosmopolitanism to inform citizenship, policies and pedagogies; Mike Diboll argues for a more nuanced approach to understanding the ontologies of extremism; Justin Crawford, Julia Ebner and Usama Hasan critique the language and dichotomies of current 'counter-extremism' discourse, and call for a commitment to enabling students to discuss grievances and anxieties 'safely' as more effective means to counter extremism in education. The theme of 'safe spaces' is taken up by Sarah Marsden as well, who suggests that a 'rights and justice-based' model of countering extremism needs to be supplemented by an ethics of care to negotiate difference and 'foster critical, compassionate citizens'.

Current policies on extremism in schools have their origins in the Preventing Violent Extremism agenda (PVE) which began as a response to the 11 September 2001 attacks in the United States and the 7 July 2005 bombings in London, and was first introduced in October 2006. The initial focus was on communities (particularly Muslim) deemed to be 'at risk' (a term derived from a Social Work context) from 'radicalisation'. However, over time the net was cast wider, making all educational settings and all young people as potentially at risk from radicalisation. The result was that this has effectively placed a duty of care on all practicing educationalists in all phases of education from kindergarten to postgraduate to act as the eyes and ears of the Home Office and other governmental agencies.

Close attention to the key documents of the PVE, 'Prevent', 'Contest' and the 'School-Focused Guidelines', as carried out in the chapters by Joyce Miller and Lynn Revell, demonstrates that the underpinning conceptualisation of extremism has shifted in nuanced but significant ways in recent years. In early PVE literature 'extremism' often appears to be a fluid term. The *Learning to be Safe Together Toolkit* of 2008, one of the earliest guides written specifically for schools, provides no definition of extremism. The very first references to extremism in Prevent in 2011 define it as 'vocal or violent opposition to Fundamental British Values (FBVs)', but this definition is confined to the glossary and there are no other references to British values. It is educational policy that has consolidated the definition of extremism as a rejection of FBVs through the 2011 Teachers Standards, the Ofsted framework and the SMSC guidance. Schools have become not merely a locus for security and intelligence (Gearon, 2015)

but their intersectionality serves as a conduit through which meanings and narratives of extremism are codified and perpetuated. Thus, few areas of school life remain untouched by what has become known as the Prevent Strategy: teacher education, school curricula, teachers' code of practice (the teaching standards), teacher professional development and Ofsted – all must now demonstrate their compliance with Prevent.

It is worth recalling here that the prefix 'counter-' in 'counter-extremism' has a genealogy that takes us far away from the milieu of education. It echoes 'counter-terrorism' policies and practices as used by the security forces in Northern Ireland from 1968–98, as well as those applied in Iraq following the 2003 invasion (and in several colonial contexts during the era of decolonisation during the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s). In such contexts, 'counter-' is quite different to 'anti-', which simply means 'against' or 'opposing', as in anti-terrorism, or anti-racism or anti-sexism.

Many voices, including the teaching unions such as the National Union of Teachers (Adams, 2016) academicians and some from the Church of England (Cassidy, 2014) have objected to the extent and nature of the surveillance required to implement such policies on the duties of schools in relation to extremism. Teachers and academics have further raised concerns that the most recent policies on extremism in schools and other educational institutions will compromise freedom of speech and censor the discussion of controversial issues (ACT, 2015). Many academics and teachers fear the possibility of censorship. In December of 2015, the UK's Association for Citizenship Teaching (ACT, 2015) published a report titled: *The Prevent Duty and Controversial Issues: creating a curriculum response through citizenship* in which it argued that pupils must have the opportunity to discuss 'controversial issues' in citizenship classes. This is a useful move because it acknowledges that extremism and terrorism are, at their core, both ideological and socio-political issues that must be explored critically if they are to be dealt with meaningfully.

Citizenship, extremism and education

This codification of extremism itself takes place within a wider discourse around citizenship, which in turn has been impacted significantly by a range of trends including migration, transnationality and neoliberal governance. The concept of citizenship has become increasingly contested and controversial over the last two decades, leaving us with questions such as who or what is a citizen, and how are the boundaries and expanses of citizens' rights and duties defined? To a large degree, the contestations and controversies surrounding the notion of citizenship are themselves related to globalisation (itself a difficult to define phenomenon), which has significantly increased transnational flows, producing super-diverse societies, particularly within Western nation-states. In 2002, Beck claimed that the force of transnational flows acts to weaken boundaries between *and within* nation-states, thus gradually cosmopolitanising societies. However, in the light of recent developments it is useful to revisit Benjamin

Barber's argument that the central conflict of our times is consumerist capitalism and the emerging religious and tribal fundamentalisms (which he calls 'Jihad', but in which we can include conservative and nostalgic nationalisms). He observes that

> Our world and our lives are caught between what William Butler Yeats called the two eternities of race and soul: that of race reflecting the tribal past, that of soul anticipating the cosmopolitan future. Neither race nor soul offers us a future that is other than bleak, neither promises a polity that is remotely democratic.
>
> (Barber, 1995: 4)

The upshot of these developments is that today nation-states and their traditional logics are under constant pressure from above and below by supra- and sub-national flows. This has immense implications for questions of citizenship, as rights and duties can no longer be easily contained within national borders nor solely claimed in national contexts.

This does not mean that nation-states are to be written off (cf. Holton, 2011). If anything, we are witnessing a renaissance of both hegemonic and counter-cultural nationalisms: national and nationalistic narratives increasingly dominate global affairs. It can be argued that both developed and developing countries attempt to control globalisation by encouraging those aspects of globalisation that appear to benefit elite interests, while curtailing those aspects deemed threatening to perceived national interests. In terms of politics and policies, this has led to the emergence of somewhat contradictory nationalisms in many Western countries, nationalisms that are increasingly populist and insular – and sometimes extremist – while at the same time demanding the advantages derived from transnational flows and collaborations. The events surrounding the UK's June 2016 referendum on leaving the European Union, and the subsequent discourses and policies around so-called 'hard and soft Brexit' are a good example of this. Populist politicians continually beat the drum of 'national sovereignty' and 'taking back control' while blaming social and economic problems overwhelmingly on 'the immigrants' (so often a Trojan horse word for 'race'), and supposedly 'out-of-touch elites' and experts. In so doing, they have divisively defined the nation along ever-sharper lines of 'race', ethnicity and religion, while promoting a climate of anti-intellectualism, 'fake news' and so-called 'alternative facts': given the rise of such mainstreamed extremisms, there has never been a more pressing need to foster criticality among young people.

Given that the UK Brexit referendum result was more or less evenly split between 'Leavers' and 'Remainers' (with a sharp age-demographic difference and two out of the UK's four constituent nations, Scotland and Northern Ireland remaining steadfastly Remain) and the fact that similar splits exist in many other European countries, we seem to be at a juncture when a substantial segment of the population is, at least in principle, ready or willing to move towards something looking like a post-national world, while an equally significant section

advocate a reactionary and nostalgic nationalism (Gholami, 2016). These issues pose crucial questions for contemporary notions of British identity and citizenship. In this volume Robert Bowie, Mike Diboll, Reza Gholami, Joyce Miller and Lynn Revell address from different perspectives what must be the most crucial dilemma in UK education today.

Refurbishing liberal education

It is clearly well beyond the scope of a volume such as this to even begin to address the overarching political issues discussed above. However, within the field of education we advocate a renaissance of liberal education as a way forward to equip young people with the criticality necessary to interrogate and critique extremism of all kinds, be it religious of faith-based, political and economic, secular, administrative or governmental.

This will require some clarification as to what we mean by liberal education, since the term liberal is of itself contested and contestable. In the UK we speak of a liberal political tradition, which has influenced most mainstream UK political parties. This kind of liberalism developed in the late eighteenth century in opposition and as an alternative to modern Burkean conservatism. Contemporary US usage places a more generalised liberal politics in opposition to conservative politics; often, this is used by right-wing commentators as a kind of political swear-word, a usage that is becoming more prevalent in the UK, as in the supposed 'liberal elite' so despised by the right-wing parties and press. Economically, we hear much in current political-economic discourse about 'neoliberalism' as an ideology, and 'neoliberal economics'. Accordingly, the political-economic ideology that has been hegemonic in the trans-Atlantic West since the late 1970s until the present, it calls, superficially, for a return to the kind of *laissez-faire* 'free market' economics described in the eighteenth century by economists such as Adam Smith, and revived, supposedly, during the latter half of the twentieth-century by thinkers such as Friedrich Hayek (1899–1992) and Milton Friedman (1912–2006), who were in turn so influential to Ronald Reagan's and Margaret Thatcher's administrations during the 1980s (1980–88 and 1979–90, respectively).

While these political, ideological and economic senses of the term 'liberal' share something of a linguistic and philosophical genealogy with the 'liberal education' advocated in this volume, none of these usages adequately capture the intellectual underpinnings of what we mean by liberal education. Historian Sir Michael Howard comes closer to our meaning when he writes that:

> by 'liberals' I mean in general all those thinkers who believe the world to be profoundly other than it should be, and have faith in the power of human reason and human action to change it, so that the inner potential of all human beings can be realized.
>
> (2011: 3 [1978])

Historically, liberal education taught the '*artes liberale*s' that, in pre-industrial societies still predicated to a large degree on one sort of unfree labour or another, were deemed necessary to enable an individual to survive, thrive and participate in society as a 'free' (*liberalis*) man (it was usually a man) through a training in the *trivium* (logic, grammar, rhetoric), and the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, music, astrology/astronomy). Even in the Middle Ages, such an approach to 'liberal education' was something quite distinct from, but usually prerequisite to, education aimed at professional training in areas such as law, medicine or theology.

From the early nineteenth-century onwards, however, 'liberal education' has become increasingly associated with the humanities – such as the classics, languages, literature, history and philosophy – and the human and social sciences – including anthropology, psychology and sociology – along with education in areas such as the fine and applied arts, art history and generic skills such as critical thinking and research and study skills. However, in common with the 'liberal education' of the Middle Ages, the distinction between liberal education and professional or vocational education persists, so that frequently in elite higher education in the United States and the UK students undertake a 'liberal' undergraduate education (perhaps, in the United States, at a 'liberal arts college'), before undertaking a postgraduate specialisation in a profession. This modern type of liberal education began with the work of the German philosopher and educationalist Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835), who envisaged education as '*bildung*' or 'formation', a life-time process of human development merging education and philosophy to harmonise selfhood and identity with the wider social and public spheres – quite different philosophy of education to that of functionalist, vocational training. The liberal educationalist Cardinal John Henry Newman (1801–90) proposed a vision of education that sought to balance the arts and the sciences, the philosophical and the practical under a system that emphasised the cultivation of the reasoning intellect and promotion of intellectual culture. American philosopher of education John Dewey (1859–1952) took this further and envisaged an intimate and mutually reinforcing relationship between education and all manifestations of democracy, including social democracy and citizenship. Dewey's vision of 'liberal education' saw education as the key to enabling the vast masses of women and men to live freely as autonomous actors within a political and social democracy. Accordingly, this vision of 'liberal education' became linked with the concept of progressive education – education for social progress – and fed into the thought of twentieth-century educational philosophers and practitioners, including those who were neo-Marxists, and into the framing of the post-Second World War mass 'comprehensive' mixed ability education in which subjects such as art, history and English figured prominently.

Following the election of Margaret Thatcher's Conservative government in 1979, and the subsequent drift to the right across the mainstream UK political spectrum, which intensified following the 'collapse of Communism' 1989–92, selection and elitism in schools was encouraged, and the 'comprehensive' system systematically undermined. During the 2000s and 2010s further education has

been starved of funds, higher education semi-privatised, and compulsory sector education 'freed' of local democratic control, and made subject to central control, while the 'academies' movement threatens the sector's crypto-privatisation. Concurrently to this, an increasing emphasis has been put on vocational education, while 'liberal' subject areas have become marginalised and defunded, rendering them once more the preserve of the elite. Under the imperatives of neoliberal political-economy, von Humboldt's, Newman's and Dewey's visions of education for citizenship, progress, inclusivity and social democracy are being replaced by a philosophy of education which – at least for the masses – is almost entirely vocational and instrumental in its focus, aims and purpose. For society, the purpose of education is about 'the economy' – how can education lead to increasing economic growth? For the individual, it is about that individual's marketability in an increasingly deregulated labour market – how can education get me a job?

These developments, the excessive emphasis on economic goals of education, have been challenged by a range of educationists (Bailey, 1984; Barrett, 2000; Bartlett et al., 2002; Jonathan, 1997; Brown, 2013; Ball, 2012). Many have warned of its detrimental effects on democratic citizenship. Nussbaum (1997), for instance, notes the importance of liberal education for a world being shaped by globalisation. She stresses the need for nurturing children's 'narrative imagination', an ability to read other people's life stories intelligently, as an indispensable capacity to practice democratic citizenship which requires us to make sense of very different perspectives. More recently, Lorraine Pangle (2016) has argued that liberal education must reclaim its core aim of cultivating 'the practical wisdom that is essential for living well and that comes through sustained reflection on the most important questions that we face as human beings' (208). Both, Nussbaum and Pangle see a clear danger in neglecting the liberal aims of education at a time when learning to live with difference is increasingly important.

This book falls within this movement calling for a renewed commitment to liberal education. The eclipse of the liberal vision in education and its replacement by an instrumental, economic-centred vision has contributed to weakening education's capacity to develop the kinds of critical intellectual skills students need to question, interrogate, compare, contrast, contextualise and critique extremist narratives. While not advocating a crude return to the past pedagogies, we are convinced that re-envisaging (and enacting) a liberal education for the twenty-first century is a task of the utmost urgency for all who care about education and the communities and individuals it serves.

So, what might this refurbished liberal education look like?

The twenty-first century confronts us with a unique nexus of interconnected and multi-faceted challenges. These include widening socio-economic polarisation both within and across countries, contributing to political divide, environmental challenges, crisis of democracy, the question of the place of religion in society and the relationship between technology and values. How might a refurbished liberal education equip today's young people and future generations to intervene creatively and progressively as enabled and critical cultural, economic, personal-political and social actors?

Firstly, through a renewed emphasis on the humanities. This would of course involve the older, more established humanities subject areas such as history, philosophy and literature, but it would also embrace new and emerging humanities subject areas involving the new media and a globalised perspective. More importantly, the teaching of the humanities would have to move away from its conventional Euro-centric base to become truly inter-cultural and draw upon the humanistic ideas and human experience across the world. The challenges we are facing today, from resource distribution to environment, are such that intellectual and cultural resources from across human civilisations need to be drawn upon. This does not mean that a curriculum needs to have representation from everywhere. It means that on great questions of the humanities, such as the individual and the collective or the meaning of life, students should be introduced to resources from a range of cultures, making them *culturally conversant* within and across cultural milieu, thereby opening their minds to the cosmopolitan nature of resources available to them to ponder upon. Students would be empowered to understand and appreciate difference and diversity as something to be lived with and negotiated critically and creatively. Doing so would take account of recent intellectual and practical developments in areas such as cosmopolitanism, transnationality, identity and pluralism.

Secondly, and in the same spirit, a refurbished liberal education must respond to the challenge of 'two cultures' set forth eloquently by C. P. Snow (1905–80) in 1959. Science and technology continue to shape the world we live in and are integral to everything from economics to everyday social interactions. So successful these fields have been that there are now huge asymmetries between our material capacities and our moral and political vision to guide their use in constructive ways for the common good of the humanity. There is, as Charles Taylor, the Canadian philosopher, puts it, an 'eclipse of ends, in the face of rampant instrumental reason' (1991). At the same time, many of the powerful discussions in the humanities and social sciences have become so obtuse and specialised that they are relevant only for scholars' promotion and CVs. Often the discourse about the exploited and the marginalised happens in a language that fails to speak to the very people with which it claims to be siding. Both these faults need to be addressed. To this we must add a more urgent concern, one of immediate relevance to the book, that a disproportionate number of educated extremists are coming from technical education background, with little or no study of the humanities. Against both the more general challenge of the 'two cultures' and the more immediate menace of 'engineers of jihad', a refurbished liberal education challenges the impoverished orthodoxy that privileges one form of education over another and renews conversations between all fields of human inquiry, the arts and the sciences, the humanities and technology.

Thirdly, this refurbished liberal education would not take place in isolation in a classroom, but would engage creatively and critically with *communities*. The fundamental point here is to move towards *praxis*, not only in the sense of action based on reflection but of action based on truth-seeking, human well-being and pluralistic engagement with the other. This is not about university-industry links