



5-2018

Colonialism and Peace and Conflict Studies

Sean Byrne

University of Manitoba, Sean.Byrne@umanitoba.ca

Mary Anne Clarke

University of Manitoba, maryanneclarke@live.ca

Aziz Rahman

University of Manitoba, rahman17@myumanitoba.ca

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/pcs>



Part of the [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Byrne, Sean; Clarke, Mary Anne; and Rahman, Aziz (2018) "Colonialism and Peace and Conflict Studies," *Peace and Conflict Studies*: Vol. 25 : No. 1 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/pcs/vol25/iss1/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the CAHSS Journals at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Peace and Conflict Studies by an authorized editor of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.

Colonialism and Peace and Conflict Studies

Abstract

The nature of colonialism is examined in this comparison of British colonial policy in Ireland and Canada toward Indigenous people. The histories and realities of Indigenous peoples' experiences of colonizing violence are not adequately addressed by the dominant approaches of the democratic peace theory's universalist neoliberal technocratic values, expectations, and assumptions (see Mac Ginty, 2013). PACS scholars and practitioners need new interpretive frames to make sense of the impact and consequences of colonialism and the intent of genocidal destruction across different colonial contexts in order to understand the deep roots of conflict (economic exploitation, internalization of oppression, racist ideology), and how we should go about critical and emancipatory peace building, theory building, and practice. The study of colonialism is required to understand conflict milieus characterized by structural violence in order to create a *justpeace* (see Lederach, 1997) that includes restorative and reconciliatory processes, and recognition of local people's resilience and resistance to structural violence and social injustice (see Chandler, 2017).

Keywords: *Peace and Conflict Studies; Indigenous Studies; Colonialism;*

Author Bio(s)

Dr. Sean Byrne is cofounding Director of the Arthur V. Mauro Centre for Peace and Justice at St. Paul's College, University of Manitoba, and cofounder of the Peace and Conflict Studies Ph.D. and Joint M.A. programs. He has won awards for his extensive writing, outreach, and teaching including the 2017 University of Manitoba's Excellence in Graduate Student Mentorship Award. He is interested in critical and emancipatory peacebuilding and social justice.

Mary Anne Clarke is a PhD Candidate in the PACS Ph.D. Program at the University of Manitoba. She is grounded in First Nations epistemologies due to her life experiences and studies. Her primary area of research and interest is children and families in Manitoba Northern First Nations. Her goal is to assist in developing alternatives to the current colonial and genocidal practices in children's services.

Aziz Rahman is a PhD Candidate in the PACS Ph.D. Program at the University of Manitoba. He is the recipient of a number of scholarships including the Joseph Bombardier Canada Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) Doctoral Scholarship. He was a lecturer at the Department of Criminology and Police Science, Mawlana Bhashani Science and Technology University (MBSTU) in Bangladesh. He is the author of three books and thirty-two peer reviewed articles and book chapters.

Colonialism and Peace and Conflict Studies

Sean Byrne, Mary Anne Clarke, and Aziz Rahman

One of the classes taught by Dr. Sean Byrne in the Peace and Conflict Studies (PACS) doctoral program at the University of Manitoba, titled *International Peace and Conflict Resolution*, began a conversation in October 2011 about the role of British colonialism in the conflict on the island of Ireland, and how the legacy of that violence is impacting relationships to this very day. Dr. Byrne suggested that the British colonial model developed in Ireland was then taken and transplanted to new colonies. In May 2016, two former students who were part of the discussion in class on that day had lunch together with Dr. Byrne. They came around again to discussing this very issue. Aboriginal scholar Dr. Paul Cormier suggested that they should focus their work on British colonialism and its legacy, as it is a central issue within social justice, and it has received scant attention in PACS. Dr. Peter Karari agreed and indicated his desire to explore the British colonial model within his homeland of Kenya. Thus began a project that has included rich discussion among participants resulting in an issue of papers that begins a much-needed conversation within PACS of the connections of colonialism to present day conflicts in the Global North and in the Global South. This special issue explores the role of British colonialism in Australia, Canada, Cyprus, India, Ireland, Kenya, Nigeria, and British Mandate Palestine.

Exploring the roots of British colonialism in Ireland is not new (Byrne, 1997; Coogan, 1995; White, 2010). However, comparing British colonial policy in Ireland and Canada toward Indigenous people is original. This paper begins by discussing the nature of colonialism. Next, we highlight the significance of the study of colonialism for understanding conflict milieus characterized by structural violence—then creating a *justpeace* that includes restorative and reconciliatory processes and recognition of people’s resilience and resistance to structural violence and social injustice (Lederach, 1997). Finally, the nature of the British colonial model as it emerged in Ireland and Canada is outlined. What follows in the rest of this Special Edition is a series of articles exploring the impact of British colonialism on other individual case studies.

Colonialism

The practice and consequences of imperialism are central to understanding the need for reconciliation in conflict settings presented with structural violence, as well as in post peace-accord milieus. Johan Galtung (1980a) identifies three phases of imperialism in history. In the

historical phase, colonialism was a practice in which a state occupied and controlled another state or region, while imperialism—the idea behind colonialism—created an Empire through direct and concrete cultural, economic, and political dominance and power relations, with a disharmony of relationships between the centre and the periphery (p. 437). Eurocentric imperialist forces had the necessary military science and technology to successfully wage war in the colonies and to destroy future generations of Indigenous people biologically and psychologically as they internalized the oppression. As Galtung (1976) stated, “The war in vacuum, the war across a zero relationship. The first colonial wars were like that, before dominance was firmly established” (p. 297). In the present third phase, Galtung contended that international organizations are part of neocolonialism, and in the future phase, international communication comprises neo-neo-colonialism (Galtung, 1980a).

The structure of imperialism “simply goes on by itself, creates wealth for some nations, poverty for others, wealth for some classes, poverty for others and does not ask for much in terms of motivation” (Galtung, 1988, p. 298). The motivation of imperialism is to control and exploit the periphery economically to protect privileges through communicative, cultural, political, military, and social means (p. 299). The creation of exploitative relations makes it easy “to locate the exploiter and the exploited, and identify them as actors; we would then immediately have the basic element of a centre-periphery theory” (Galtung, 1978, p. 31).

Galtung (1980b) contends that a structure of dominance includes four components: (1) exploration – “an asymmetric pattern of division of labor,” (2) penetration – “a pattern whereby the dominant party controls the centre of the dominated,” (3) fragmentation – “a pattern whereby the dominated are split and kept apart from each other,” and (4) marginalization – “a pattern whereby the dominant establish their own organizations, keeping the dominated outside” (p. 406). Much “international economic dominance can be seen in these terms, as can the political pattern known as (internal or external) colonialism” (p. 406).

Colonialism is direct, cultural, and structural violence (Galtung, 1988). Hence, *justpeace* is equally important in conflict environments infused with structural violence and in post peace-accord milieus. The legacy of colonialism in societies coming out of violent wars and for settler-Indigenous societies is critical for PACS scholars and practitioners to understand. It is important to also comprehend the similarities and difference of other colonial Empires and their impact on Indigenous peoples, for example the Dutch, Portuguese, and Spanish exploitation of Central and

Latin America and Southeast Asia during the sixteenth century, and the Italian, French, German, and Belgium scramble for Africa during the nineteenth century. More recently, the colonial proxy wars carried out by the Soviet Empire and the U.S. during the Cold War can shed some historical light on contemporary conflicts within and between states.

The Significance of the Study of Colonialism for PACS

“To fight for peace is to fight against direct and structural violence” (Galtung, 1975, p. 364). This necessitates creating a sustainable justpeace that is inclusive, empowering, and deconstructs unjust cultural, economic, political, and social structures as well as facilitating reconciliation processes so that people can heal from the traumatic consequences of colonialism. Such a sustainable process should recognize local people’s resilience and resistance to social injustices, and the invisible work of everyday peacemakers (Chandler, 2017; Mac Ginty, 2008; Richmond, 2016). The “infra politics” of local resistance and resilience can be found in people’s local stories as well as the socially embedded networks, practices, relations, and spaces of everyday life (Scott, 1992).

In the peacebuilding phase of social justice, unjust institutions that emerged out of colonial practices must be transformed, as well as relationships between Indigenous peoples and settler societies (Lederach, 1997). The creation of inclusive and just cultural, economic, and political structures, processes, and practices can address many of these past injustices. The challenge is in dealing with the psychological and biological harm caused by the direct and indirect violence of colonialism. At the cellular and biological level, the trauma from colonization can also impact a whole generation of Indigenous people’s DNA (Bombay, Matheson, & Anisman, 2009, 2010, 2014)

The creation of macro level truth and reconciliation processes can assist in the societal healing that needs to take place, and they can be combined with local story and arts-based peacebuilding approaches, growing areas of PACS reflexive praxis, that address everyday suffering in local communities (Senehi, 2009; Erenrich & Weregina, 2017), to prevent the “transgenerational transmission of trauma” (Volkan, 1997, p. 7). In addition, an accurate rewriting of history must be included in the education curriculum in schools that is inclusive of Indigenous epistemology, cultures, and languages (Bekerman & Zembylas, 2014; TRC, 2015). A peace pedagogy that is intrinsically part of an inclusive socialization process will lead to the positive political development of all citizens.

**Some Common Intentional Tactics and Their Consequences:
The Nature of British Colonialism in Ireland and Canada**

It is important to note that intergroup and inter-clan conflict and violence existed in both Ireland and Canada before the arrival of the British and the French (de Paor, 1995; Dickason & Newbigging, 2015). While the British Crown has been a primary colonizer globally and within both Ireland and Canada, both locations had previously experienced external contact with others. This included the Norse Vikings who made their way to both locations and settled in with the Celts in 787, leaving their imprint entwined with Celtic communities and cultures (de Paor, 1995). In Canada, Norse external contact appears to have had minimal lasting influence (Dickason & Newbigging, 2015), as was the impact from the Portuguese fishers and whalers off the Atlantic coast (Da Rosa & Teixeira, 2009).

The Norman and French impacts on both Ireland and North America were also distinct from British colonization: in both locations, the French intermarried and became integrated into the Indigenous peoples. In the twelfth century, Leinster king Dermot MacMurrough attempted to supplement his waning power with external assistance from England's French-born-and-based King Henry, inviting "his subjects... to rally to Dermot's assistance" (Martin, 1995, p. 127). Given initial battles and conflict with the Celts, the Anglo Normans set themselves up within their fortified towns and introduced their legal system and legislature (Moody, 1995). However, they came to "adapt themselves to the country as they did in England and Sicily," seeing the Gaelic Chiefs as their social equals (Martin, 1995, p. 139). "The Gaelic Chieftains as a whole were never conquered or forced to come to terms" (Lydon, 1995, p. 152). Most notably, the Norman families were mixed in blood and culture, speaking and dressing Gaelic (Moody, 1995), and becoming "more Irish than the Irish" (Cahill, 1995, p. 213). The Indigenous Gaels remained in their pastoral settings (Martin, 1995) and, in fact, had a Gaelic revival in the fourteenth century that led to the Anglo Normans working mostly in alliance with the Gaels (Cosgrove, 1995; Rolston, 1993). This is very distinct from the Gael's later experiences with the British Crown.

Canada as a nation-state was created from vast lands and waterways, and the French were the first non-Indigenous to leave a lasting impact. In 1534, Jacques Cartier met St. Lawrence Iroquois at Stadacona, the present site of Quebec City (Dickason & Newbigging, 2015). Cartier, along with Champlain and other French people, attempted to start French settlements in the sites

of Iroquois, Huron, Innu, Mi'kmaq, and other Indigenous nations. The French intermarriage with Indigenous women in Canada indicates varying degrees of absorption into the local culture and society (Belanger, 2014).

Trade relationships developed, and when the British arrived a competition ensued, with both France and Britain attempting to gain military, political, economic, and social support from the various Indigenous nations. During alternating relationships of conflict and peace, France signed a peace treaty with the Indigenous League of Five Nations in 1665 (Rice, 2013). The treaty processes between Indigenous nations had always been an acknowledgement of accepting deep kinship relationships, and the Mohawk and Onondaga extended this with the French, developing the French relationship from that of being their Brothers, to Fathers of the Indigenous nations, as exemplified in the Great Peace of 1701 (Cook, 2015). The French attitude towards Indigenous people in North America was complex: they consistently attempted to “treat them with every consideration, avoid violence (this was not always successful), and transform them into Frenchmen” (Dickason & Newbigging, 2015, p. 56). They never succeeded however in having Indigenous nations adhere to French law and their monarchy. An eighteenth century Spanish visitor to Louisbourg on Ile Royale stated that Indigenous peoples “acknowledged the [King of France] lord of the country, but without any alteration in their way of living; or submitting themselves to his laws” (Dickason & Newbigging, 2015, p. 63).

France's greatest threat was the British, both in North America and Europe, and thus both the French and the English sought staunch support from Indigenous nations in Canada, and in Ireland French General Hoche's expeditionary force landed in Co. Cork in 1796 to support the United Irishmen. In Canada, Indigenous leaders saw the Europeans' disputes as not involving them, and only participated when it aided their own trading relationships, as they never considered themselves “conquered” under the French (Dickason & Newbigging, 2015, p. 98).

Regarding Ireland and Canada, the impacts of British colonization, compared to the French, were clearly different. Britain had strategic concerns about the French influence in both Ireland and Canada. The relative cohesion between the Gaels and the Normans was of increasing concern to England, who feared that Ireland would not only completely ignore England but could have the potential to overtake England (Cosgrove, 1995). When King Henry VIII came to power, differences in religion added fuel to the fire (Cosgrove, 1995). However, King Henry's principle motive for overtaking Ireland was self-protection (Hayes-McCoy, 1995, p. 174). Thus, Henry

VIII took an aggressive approach, and the Irish Parliament declared him King of Ireland (Hayes-McCoy, 1995, p. 176). While the Anglo-Normans of the twelfth century conquered the locals militarily and brought about tremendous change with the introduction of the feudal system (White, 2010) beginning in 1169, English and Scottish plantations followed in the seventeenth century (Kallen, 1994, p. 148)—leaving a permanent British colonial imprint.

After shared whaling in the Arctic area of Canada, Britain expanded its colonization to Canada as early as 1576-1578, when Frobisher met the Inuit, followed by Henry Hudson meeting the Cree in 1611, followed by further British influx in the Eastern coast and into the St. Lawrence Seaway (Dickason & Newbigging, 2015). The *Treaty of Paris* in 1763, in response to the European conflict and the Seven Years War, effectively ended French dominance in Canada leading to British expansion and control. Britain issued the *Royal Proclamation* declaring ownership over North America to King George (Dickason & Newbigging, 2015; Hansen, 2016). While it was a unilateral proclamation, the *Royal Proclamation* at least recognized that Aboriginal title had and still exists and that,

...all land would be considered Aboriginal land until ceded by treaty. The Proclamation forbade settlers from claiming land from the Aboriginal occupants, unless it has been first bought by the Crown and then sold to the settlers. The Royal Proclamation further sets out that only the Crown can buy land from First Nations. (Hansen, 2016, p. 1)

The *Royal Proclamation* in 1763 secured most of North America for the time being, until the American Revolution.

Much of Ireland's history from the twelfth to the twentieth century is illustrated by English rule and the Irish people's armed insurrection (White, 2010). Direct British colonialism formally ended with the partition of the island through the Irish Republican Army's (IRA) truce with Britain that ended the War of Independence with the 1920 *Government of Ireland Act* (Byrne, Fissuh, Thiessen, Irvin, & Tennent, 2010). A new constitution, *Bunreacht na hEireann*, was created in 1937 by the Eamon de Valera-led *Fianna Fail* government, and Ireland became a republic in 1948 under *Taoiseach* John A. Costello's *Fine Gael* government (White, 2010). Twenty-six of the 32 counties on the island of Ireland were given independence under the 1920 *Anglo-Irish Treaty*, yet Northern Ireland's remaining six counties have remained under British control to this very day (Byrne et al., 2010). According to Hechter (1975), since 1921 the six counties within Northern Ireland have remained in an "internal colonial" situation

through the Ulster Protestants' loyalty to Britain dominating this economic heartland (cited in Lange, Mahoney, & vom Hau, 2006, p. 1415).

The site of one of Britain's earliest overseas settler colonies became the nation-state known as the Dominion of Canada, under the Crown of England, through the *British North America Act* (BNA Act) (1867). One distinct difference between Canada and Ireland is that when Canada was formed through the BNA Act, the nation was under the control of the colonizers, and the Indigenous peoples had no recognized status or power. In fact, eleven years later, the Indigenous peoples were relegated to being wards of Canada through the *Indian Act*, with no citizenship, no rights, and no voice (Burnett & Read, 2016; Kulchyski, 2007). In contrast, when Ireland became its own nation-state in the twentieth century it had twenty-six of its thirty-two counties under an Irish-led government. In Canada, the territory of Nunavut has some degree of recognized Indigenous (Inuit) governance; however, it is still within the state of Canada (Dickason and Newbigging, 2015).

For both Ireland and Canada, English and British colonization has had the most impact, and both locations—and their respective Indigenous peoples—are still deeply impacted by the British influence as evidenced by the continuing direct and structural violence (Alfred, 2009; Belanger, 2014; Dickason & Newbigging, 2015; Kinealy, 1995; Moody & Martin, 1994; Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of Canada, 2015). Even with increasing political freedom, Ireland and Canada have inherited colonial legacies from Britain over many centuries, and they continue to suffer the consequences of British genocidal colonialism in all spheres of life (Beiner, 2007; Blackstock, 2008; TRC, 2015; White, 2010).

Some common elements exist in the British colonial model as it is applied to native Irish people in Ireland and Indigenous people in Canada. These include control over the land, British divide and rule policy, use of apartheid laws such as the Penal Laws and the Indian Act, economic exploitation and loss of livelihood, as well as religious, linguistic, and cultural subjugation and suppression. Thus “infrastructural war” (Sjoberg, 2006, p. 191) deprived people of access to their basic human needs, while depoliticization excluded local people from governance. Trauma and inward violence are a decolonization consequence of British colonialism in settler societies. They are perpetuated by deprivation and self-destructive behavior evidenced today through internal colonization including intrapersonal and intragroup violence resulting from colonial manipulations (Freire, 1970).

Divide and Rule

One of the most common elements of the British colonial model was the manipulative policy of “divide and rule”—first used in Ireland during the twelfth century and then again in Canada (Byrne, 1997; TRC, 2015). According to Freire (1970), divide and rule is a fundamental dimension of oppression, and “is as old as oppression itself” (p. 122). The majority must divide the subordinates and “keep it [them] divided in order to remain in power” (p. 122). Not only must the oppressors keep the dominated/colonized away from themselves, they must also further divide the oppressed into various groups, with deep rifts between them.

Britain applied different forms but used the same strategies of divide and rule around the world, including Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and the Caribbean (Horowitz, 1985). The British colonizers used divisive factors such as religion, ethnicity, territory, and cultures to expand their imperialism through colonial policies, institutions, and practices that did not treat ethnic groups equally nor neutrally. For example, the colonial power employed certain chosen buffer groups for colonial administrative purposes (Horne, 2018). The colonizers manipulated immigration and labor policies to favor some groups, to get Indigenous labor at the lowest possible wage, to increase productivity, or to have native Indigenous labor do continuous work (Horowitz, 1985, p. 157). The divide and conquer approach has also been used in both Ireland and Canada through infiltration of resistance groups (Manuel & Derrickson, 2015, p. 220; National Archives of Ireland, 2015).

The British colonizers often resorted to the partition principle (Byrne, 2006) that has continued as a conflict management strategy in protracted ethnopolitical conflicts throughout the world to weaken Indigenous peoples, and to manage these uprisings against its tyrannical rule when they faced violent and nonviolent resistance and rebellion in Ireland and its other colonies, such as India and Cyprus (White, 2010). Partition is self-evident in Ireland through “the 1920 *Government of Ireland Act* [that] brought the Anglo-Irish war in Ireland to an end” (Byrne, 2006, p. 150). Partition led to “competing visions of justice” that continue to this day in Northern Ireland (McMaster & Hetherington, 2017, p. 24). In Canada, partition is self-evident with the relocations of First Nations peoples onto reserves, Metis settlements, and multiple relocations of Inuit and other Indigenous peoples, so as to quell uprisings through separations and gain colonizer access to Indigenous resources (Belanger, 2014; Dickason & Newbigging, 2015).

Control of Land

Another key element of the British colonial model was the control over land and territory. Colonialism entailed a “struggle over geography,” and the making, imagining, and remaking of the land (Said, 1994, p. 7, as cited in Egan, 2013, p. 37). In Ireland, the 1690 Penal Laws did not allow native Irish to own land while the plantation scheme was used as a means of establishing order, progress, and improvement (Byrne, 1997; Montano, 2011). In Canada, many Indigenous people were forced to dislocate from their ancestral lands and so lost their connections with land, ceremonies, and spirituality that are connected to land, nature, and geography from which they were displaced (Dickason & Newbigging, 2015; Ross, 2014). This loss of traditional lands and the rights and opportunities to use land in their traditional ways led to mass hunger and resulting deadly epidemics in both Canada and Ireland (Daschuk, 2013; Kinealy, 1995).

Ethnocentrism

Cultural imperialism was a common feature of British colonization (Ross, 2014; TRC, 2015; White, 2010). One of the characteristics of British colonialism was to install divisive Christian religious beliefs in the colony and have natives identify with those beliefs even through force and torture. British cultural imperialism marginalized and attempted to eliminate the culture of natives (TRC, 2015; White, 2010). In Ireland, the Penal Laws prevented the native Irish from practicing their Roman Catholic religion and cultural traditions such as speaking their native Gaelic tongue (Byrne, 1997). In Canada, Indigenous people were not allowed under the *Indian Act* (1876) to observe or take part in their Indigenous ceremonies, women were removed from community leadership, and Aboriginal children were forced to abandon Indigenous teachings, speak English, and practice Christianity under the residential school system (TRC, 2015).

Religious Suppression

The British Empire used religion as a tool for its benefit in the oppression of the Indigenous communities (McDowell, 1995; TRC, 2015). Before the Norman invasion of Ireland in the late twelfth century, Catholicism was incorporated into Celtic culture and traditions on the island (Carter & Byrne, 2000). The British imperial policy overthrew Catholic values and practices through religious discrimination by forbidding Catholic ceremonies, spiritual practices, and religious traditions, thereby oppressing natives so that colonial subjugation altered Indigenous people’s religious beliefs and practices (White, 2010). In Ireland, the British

colonizers attempted to impose Protestantism through the British Crown, the head of the Anglican Church, enforcing the London-based Church of Ireland as the dominant church on the island (McDowell, 1995; White, 2010). Catholicism went covert using penal rosary rings, whereby one could secretly pray his or her rosary on a ring around the finger, hidden within the pocket, rather than the more noticeable long rosary chains that had been used.

In Canada, the British colonizers imposed Christianity through the *Indian Act's* outlawing of traditional practices such as the prairie Sundance and the West Coast Potlach ceremonies, with penalty of imprisonment. They also used culturally genocidal means within residential schools. Children were forced to attend the schools, were treated as prisoners and inhumanely assimilated to English language, education, and Christianity through physical, emotional, and spiritual torture (Alfred, 2009; Ross, 2014; TRC, 2015). One difference in Canada is that additional Christian denominations were encouraged by the Crown in Right of Canada to contribute to the Christianization of Indigenous peoples, with a competition between them about who had missionary control over the people and who could run which residential schools (TRC, 2015).

Education and Language

Education was an integral element used by the British colonial power to transform British values and norms among the local populations of the colonies. In Ireland, illegal “hedgerow schools” arose in resistance to British colonial objectives to prevent Catholics from having an education (Byrne, 1997). Educated Catholics used the oral tradition in hedgerow schools to educate young Catholic children during the Penal Law era in Ireland. The British colonizer introduced the English language and education system to subjugate native people so that the Irish could not use their Gaelic language (Carter & Byrne, 2000). Britain initiated its use of residential schools in Ireland by creating the Commissioners of Nations Education in Ireland whose goal “was to assimilate Irish people of all religions into the 1810 union of Britain and Ireland” (Coleman, 1999, p. 85).

Indian Residential Schools (IRSs) in Canada were more widespread and highly enforced upon Indigenous peoples under penalty of imprisonment and enforced hunger, and their sole *raison d'être* was assimilation (TRC, 2015). Use of native languages resulted in severe punishment and even torture, such as piercing needles through the children’s tongues, locking them up and withholding food, and using an electric chair against the children (Chrisjohn, 1997; Fournier & Crey, 1997; TRC, 2015). Most Indian children received no higher than grade eight

education, and current statistics still reflect a grossly disproportionately low high school graduation rate for First Nations (MacDonald & Wilson, 2016). Until 1961, status Indians were forbidden from attending universities or colleges unless they agreed to disenfranchise themselves and their families and descendants from their status and treaty rights. This meant, among other effects, that they could no longer live within Indian communities on the federally enforced reserves and were forced away from their extended families (Belanger, 2014).

Native Inferiority

The British colonizer used the 1695-1829 *Penal Laws* in Ireland to completely subjugate the native Irish who were perceived as abominable and barbaric (Carter & Byrne, 2000). The destruction of Gaelic culture commenced when King Henry III made land inheritable, ignoring the Irish custom of a tenable system of land. Further, Gaelic Ireland was destroyed with the O’Neil and O’Donnell’s submission in Ulster in 1603 that witnessed the flight of the Wild Geese from Ireland’s shores (Carter & Byrne, 2000).

British colonizers considered natives as savages in both Canada and Ireland, viewing them as inferior, and forcing them to use the colonizers’ education, religion, language, and political and economic system (Culhaine, 1998; Lloyd, 2000; TRC, 2015). According to Ellingson (2001), the British and French colonists profiled Indians in Canada and the U.S. as savages or inferior races, and the myth of the “noble savage” was used as a tool to deny their equality and human rights, while slavery and genocide served to eradicate the Indigenous peoples. The “inferiority” of Natives was the reason for the assimilative and culturally genocidal Indian residential schools.

Loss of Livelihoods and Sustenance

There is ample evidence of mass starvation and disease in both Ireland and Canada under British Rule. Kinealy (1995) concluded that, “the challenge posed by the Famine in Ireland could have been met successfully and many of its worst excesses avoided, had the political will to do so existed” (pp. xix–xxi). Daschuk (2013), in his deeply researched work on the health consequences of colonization in Canada, came to the same conclusion of governmental intentional neglect in the hunger and devastation on the Canadian plains.

The 1845-1852 potato famine killed over one million native Irish people through disease and mass starvation while over one million people took the coffin ships to North America and Australia (Byrne, 1997). The British government response was wholly inadequate as grain and

livestock were exported out of the country to Britain in the midst of such horror. Some have argued whether the lack of British government action to alleviate the famine was in fact a deliberate policy of genocidal violence—a traumatic experience that has impacted future generations (Coogan, 1995).

North American colonization almost annihilated the numbers of Indigenous peoples. In 1966, Henry Dobyns estimated that there were 90 million Indigenous peoples in North America at the time of European first contact in the 15th and 16th centuries (Daschuk, 2013, p. 1). In 2011 there were less than seven million Indigenous people in North America either alone or in combination with one or more other races (Government of Canada, 2011; United States Government, 2010). Entire communities were annihilated, and others were decimated so badly that the survivors were absorbed into neighboring tribes. While some are quick to add that the starvations and infestations were unintentional and were simply inevitable by-products of expansion, there is growing evidence that corroborates Indigenous oral tradition that people were infested through intentional means such as the knowing provision of small pox infested blankets and the intentional decimation of food sources, such as the bison roaming the prairies (Daschuk, 2013; Swanky 2013).

Depoliticization

An exclusionary mechanism of the British colonial model was to keep colonized people out of politics. The British settlers used political repression and discrimination against Indigenous peoples and institutionalized extreme racial inequalities through democratic and legal institutions (Lange & Dawson, 2009, p. 788). Traditional political structures were replaced by an imposed British patriarchal and exclusionary colonial structure.

The British had a background in an individual authority political system in England, and then the colonizers encountered the distinct governance structures of the Six Nations that formed the Iroquois confederacy in what is today Ontario and Quebec, and upstate New York (Rice, 2013). The colonists admired the Haudenosaunee laws and rights called the *Great Law of Peace*, and this is reflected in the incorporation of those principles into the first constitution of the American Republic of 1787 (Rice, 2013). However, it can be argued that the colonizers culturally appropriated the Haudenosaunee form of government, as it was used only within their own limited interpretation of it and only to their own advantage by ignoring the Haudenosaunee's comprehensive teachings on peaceful relationships. Canada further colonized

this nation when it refused to allow the Haudenosaunee living within Canada to use their traditional governance system. All Indigenous forms of government were outlawed through the *Indian Act*, which replaced them with a generic chief and band council system that was uniformly imposed across Canada. First Nations in Canada for millennia used traditional governance system practices that have been identified as akin to restorative peacemaking circles (Pranis, 2003; Erasmus & Dussault, 1996). Indigenous women were demoted from their traditional community leadership roles, and diseases were introduced to decimate local populations (Daschuk, 2013; Ross, 2014). The colonial power's quest for political and economic interests damaged existing power relations and structures of the chiefs and clan mothers (Belanger, 2014; Burnett & Read, 2016; Dickason & Newbigging, 2015).

The British colonial power also oppressed radical dissidents like Sir Roger Casement in Ireland in 1916 (Gibney, Griffin, & Ó Conchubhair, 2016) and Louis Riel in Canada in 1885 (Dickason & Newbigging, 2015). The British colonizers not only attacked traditional forms of Indigenous governments in Ireland and Canada, they also prevented Indigenous peoples from participating within colonial government structures. For example, under Irish Penal Laws, the British ensured that native Irish were prevented from holding political office until their repeal in 1830 (Byrne, 1997). And while Indian people could not use their own forms of government, they also could not participate in Canadian governance until 1961 when the Indian Act was amended to “allow” status Indians to vote in federal and provincial elections, and thus of course not hold office either (Belanger, 2014; Ross, 2014). They could not even meet amongst themselves to discuss politics (Belanger, 2014; Kulchyski, 2007).

Trauma and Inward Violence Consequences

As is common within colonization, trauma and lateral violence were some of the consequences and ills faced by native people in Ireland and Canada as they tried to cope with the direct, cultural, and structural violence of the colonial system directed against them. The colonized populations' experiences of violence affected the older and new generations who suffered across generations from trauma, familial violence, suicide, and mental illness (see Volkan, 1997).

The Irish recognize that “the Irish still carry the scars of prior conflict” (Dawson, 2002, p. 183), because “the effects of the colonial past are far from over in Ireland” (Carroll & King, 2003, p. 2; Clarke & Byrne, 2017; p. 110). Peacemakers in Northern Ireland recognize how

current identities have been formed by historical trauma (McMaster & Hetherington, 2017). The colonization process in Canada has had destabilizing transgenerational effects on Canadian Indigenous peoples (Clarke, 2014; TRC, 2015). The British colonial model sought to destroy people's relationship and connectivity to the land even through the actual destruction of the land, environment, and food sources (Daschuk, 2013; Swanky 2013). All these traumas are now part of the memory of loss and mourning in Canada and Ireland (Dawson, 2002; TRC, 2015).

Conclusion

“Peace studies will not accept negative peace alone but also explore the conditions for a positive peace” (Galtung, 1988, p. 18). Inclusive and just societies must explore their past and address the legacy and consequences of colonialism in Indigenous-settler societies characterized by structural violence that continues to fuel and drive conflict. “Moral entrepreneurs” in the Global North continue to defend the position of the political powers in defining genocide as this notion of being a civilizing force. This drives their political policies and hides and erases colonial genocide in North America and around the world (Woolford, Benvenuto, & Hinton, 2014).

PACS scholars and practitioners need new interpretive frames to make sense of the impact and consequences of colonialism and the intent of genocidal destruction across different colonial contexts. With such a lens, we may understand the deep roots of conflict (economic exploitation, internalization of oppression, racist ideology), and how we should go about critical and emancipatory peacebuilding theory and practice (Cormier et al., 2011).

The international peacebuilding model is predominantly based around the democratic peace paradigm and theory's universalist liberal technocratic values, expectations, and assumptions that a capitalist free market, democracy, elections, human rights, the rule of law, and security sector reform are a panacea to transform conflict settings characterized by structural violence (Özerdem, 2014). However, the histories and realities of Indigenous peoples' experiences of colonizing violence are not addressed by these dominant approaches, which chose to ignore and erase Indigenous histories and realities, but within colonialism and in their own inherent social and political structures.

Alternatively, restorative justice processes that empower the colonized to speak about the past in a process where the colonizer and settler descendants recognize the harm done and work together for restoration with Indigenous people can go a long way in the healing, reconciliation, and transformation of relationships (Byrne, 2017). At the macro level, the

elimination of harmful laws, practices, policies, and systems—and the inclusion of Indigenous people in the co-creation of new just structures and systems—can ensure fairness and equity in a social charter that embraces diversity, justice, and social inclusion (Rahman, Clarke, & Byrne, 2017).

This special issue on the legacy of British colonialism in its colonies may begin that much needed conversation within PACS to grapple with the destructive forces of psychological group violence, arguably the most difficult form of violence with which to really come to grips. This is vitally important as the internalization of oppression continues to injure and torture between 300-400 million Indigenous peoples around the world as they struggle with the damage caused by internal and external colonization.

In this special issue Peter Genger's article illustrates how British colonial agents created and consolidated the colonization of Australia. An article on Cyprus by Kris Fics explores how the transgenerational transmission of colonial patterns assists in the continuation of the Cyprus conflict. Aziz Rahman, Mohsin Ali, and Saad Khan's article notes how British colonialism had dire socioeconomic and political consequences for India. The conflict ingredients and impact of British colonialism in Kenya as well as the development of transitional justice in post-colonial Kenya are outlined in Peter Karari's article. Benjamin Maiangwa, Muhammad Dan Suleiman, and Chigbo Arthur Anyaduba's article discusses how British colonial rule was run through its imperial Crown companies as Nigeria was administered as a business enterprise. Finally, Ran Ukashi's article focuses on the similarities and differences between Zionism and European models of settler colonialism to illustrate the incongruence between both in British Mandate Palestine. We collectively call for an urgent and accountable dialogue on what PACS must offer these conflicts and identify concepts and strategies toward that end in each of the articles that follow.

References

- Alfred, T. (2009). Colonialism and state dependency. *Journal de La Santé Autochtone*, 12(1), 42–60.
- Beiner, G. (2007). Between trauma and triumphalism: The Easter rising, the Somme, and the crux of deep memory in modern Ireland. *Journal of British Studies*, 46(2), 366–389.
- Belanger, Y. D. (2014). *Ways of knowing: An introduction to native studies in Canada*. Toronto, ON: Nelson Education.
- Bekerman, Z. & Zembylas, M. (2014). *Teaching contested narratives: Identity, memory and reconciliation in peace education and beyond*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Blackstock, C. (2008). Reconciliation means not saying sorry twice: Lessons from child welfare in Canada. In M. Brant Castellano, L. Archibald & M. DeGagné (Eds.), *From truth to reconciliation: Transforming the legacy of residential schools* (pp. 163–178). Ottawa, ON: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.
- Bombay, A., Matheson, K., & Anisman, H. (2009). Intergenerational trauma. *National Aboriginal Health Organization*, 5.6, 6–47.
- Bombay, A., Matheson, K., & Anisman, H. (2010). Decomposing identity: differential relationships between several aspects of ethnic identity and the negative effects of perceived discrimination among First Nations adults in Canada. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 16(4), 507.
- Bombay, A., Matheson, K., & Anisman, H. (2014). Appraisals of discriminatory events among adult offspring of Indian residential school survivors: The influences of identity centrality and past perceptions of discrimination. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 20(1), 75.
- Burnett, K., & Read, G. (2016). *Aboriginal history A reader*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Byrne, S. (1997). *Growing up in a divided society: The influence of conflict on Belfast schoolchildren*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses.
- Byrne, S. (2006). The roles of external ethnoguarantors and primary mediators in Cyprus and Northern Ireland. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 24(2), 149–172.
- Byrne, S., Fissuh, E., Thiessen, C., Irvin, C., & Tennent, P. (2010). The role of the International Fund for Ireland and the European Union Peace II Fund in reducing violence and sectarianism in Northern Ireland. *International Politics*, 47(2), 229–250.

- Byrne, S. (2017). The legacy of colonialism among indigenous peoples: Destructive outcomes, healing and reconciliatory potentials. *Peace Research: Canadian Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies*, 49(2), 5-13.
- Cahill, T. (1995). *How the Irish saved civilization. The untold story of Ireland's heroic role from the fall of Rome to the rise of Medieval Europe*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Carter, N., & Byrne, S. (2000). The dynamics of social cubism: A view from Northern Ireland and Québec. In S. Byrne & C. Irvin (Eds.) & P. Dixon, B. Polkinghorn & J. Senehi (Assoc. Eds.), *Reconcilable differences: Turning points in ethno-political conflict* (pp. 41–62). West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Chandler, D. (2017). *Peacebuilding: The twenty-year's crisis, 1997-2017*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chrisjohn, R. D. (1997). *The circle game: Shadows and substance in the Indian residential school experience in Canada*. Vancouver, BC: Orca Book Publications.
- Clarke, M. A. (2014). *As a social worker in northern First Nations, am I also a peacebuilder?* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from http://mspace.lib.umanitoba.ca/bitstream/handle/1993/30229/Clarke_Mary%20Anne.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y_
- Clarke, M. A. & Byrne, S. (2017). The three Rs: Resistance, resilience, and reconciliation in Canada and Ireland. *The Canadian Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies*, 49(2), 105–132.
- Coogan, T. P. (1995). *The I.R.A.* New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Cook, P. (2015). Ontario gives birth: How the French in Canada became fathers to their indigenous allies, 1645–73. *The Canadian Historical Review*, 96(2), 165–193.
- Cormier, P., Karari, P., Kumar, A., Neustaeter, R., Read, J., & Senehi, J. (2011). The problem from hell: Examining the role of peace and conflict studies for genocide intervention and prevention. In T. Matyok, J. Senehi, & S. Byrne (Eds.), *Critical issues in peace and conflict studies* (pp. 271-292). Lanham, MD: Lexington.
- Cosgrove, A. (1995). The Gaelic resurgence and the Geraldine supremacy (c. 1400-1534). In T. W. Moody & F. X. Martin (Eds.), *The course of Irish history* (pp. 158–173). Boulder, CO: Roberts Rinehart Publishers in Association with Radio Telefis Eireann.
- Culhaine, D. (1998). *The pleasure of the crown: Anthropology, law and first nations*. Burnaby, BC: Talon Books.
- Da Rosa, V. M. P. & Teixeira, C. (2009). *The Portuguese in Canada*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

- Daschuk, J. W. (2013). *Clearing the plains: Disease, politics of starvation, and the loss of Aboriginal life*. Regina, SK: University of Regina Press.
- Dawson, G. (2002). Trauma, memory, politics. *Trauma and Life Stories*, 2(2), 180–207.
- de Paor, L. (1995). The age of the Viking wars (9th and 10th Centuries). In T. W. Moody & F. X. Martin (Eds.), *The course of Irish history* (pp. 91–106). Boulder, CO: Roberts Rinehart Publishers in Association with Radio Telefis Eireann.
- Dickason, O. P. & Newbigging, W. (2015). *A concise history of Canada's first nations*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Egan, B. (2013). Towards shared ownership: Property, geography, and treaty making in British Columbia. *Human Geography*, 95(1), 33–50.
- Ellingson, T. (2001). *The myth of the noble savage*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Erasmus, G. & Dussault, R. (1996). *Report of the royal commission on Aboriginal Peoples* (Vol. 5). Ottawa, ON: The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples.
- Erenrich, S. J. & Weregina, J. F. (2017) (Eds.). *Grassroots leadership and the arts for social change*. Bradford, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.
- Fournier, S. & Crey, E. (1997). *Stolen from our embrace: The abduction of first nations children and the restoration of Aboriginal communities*. Vancouver, BC: Douglas & McIntyre Ltd.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*, trans. Myra Bergman Ramos. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Galtung, J. (1975). *Peace research, education, action: Essays in peace research, volume I*. Copenhagen, Norway: Christian Ejlertsen.
- Galtung, J. (1976). *Peace, war and defense: Essays in peace research, volume III*. Copenhagen, Norway: Christian Ejlertsen.
- Galtung, J. (1978). *Peace and social structure: Essays in peace research, volume III*. Copenhagen, Norway: Christian Ejlertsen.
- Galtung, J. (1980a). *Peace and world structure: Essays in peace research, volume IV*. Copenhagen, Norway: Christian Ejlertsen.
- Galtung, J. (1980b). *Peace problems: Some case studies - essays in peace research, volume V*. Copenhagen, Norway: Christian Ejlertsen.
- Galtung, J. (1988). *Trans armament and the cold war: Essays in peace research, volume VI*. Copenhagen, Norway: Christian Ejlertsen.

- Gibney, J., Griffin, M., & Ó Conchubhair, B. (2016). Introduction: “The ghost of Roger Casement is beating on the door.” *Brea A Digital Journal of Irish Studies*. Retrieved from <https://breac.nd.edu/articles/introduction-the-ghost-of-roger-casement-is-beating-on-the-door/>
- Government of Canada. (2011). *Aboriginal peoples in Canada: First Nations people, Métis and Inuit* [National Household Survey. Statistics Canada]. Retrieved from <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/99-011-x/99-011-x2011001-eng.pdf>
- Hansen, E. (2016). *Royal Proclamation, 1763* [University of British Columbia]. Retrieved from <http://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/home/government-policy/royal-proclamation-1763.html>
- Hayes-McCoy, G. A. (1995). The Tudor conquest (1534-1603). In T. W. Moody & F. X. Martin (Eds.), *The course of Irish history* (pp. 174–188). Boulder, CO: Roberts Rinehart Publishers in Association with Radio Telefis Eireann.
- Horne, Gerald. (2018). *The apocalypse of settler colonialism*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Horowitz, D. L. (1985). *Ethnic groups in conflict*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Kallen, J. L. (1994). *English in Ireland*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kinealy, C. (1995). *This great calamity: The Irish famine 1845-52*. Boulder, CO: Roberts Rinehart Publishers.
- Kulchyski, P. K. (2007). *The red Indians: An episodic, informal collection of tales from the history of Aboriginal people's struggles in Canada*. Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Publisher.
- Lange, M., & Dawson, A. (2009). Dividing and ruling the world? A statistical test of the effects of colonialism on postcolonial civil violence. *Social Forces*, 88(2), 785-817.
- Lange, M., Mahoney, J., & vom Hau, M. (2006). Colonialism and development: A comparative analysis of Spanish and British colonies. *American Journal of Sociology*, 111(5), 1412– 1462.
- Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*. Washington, DC: USIP Press.
- Lloyd, D. (2000). Colonial trauma/postcolonial recovery? *Interventions*, 2(2), 212–228.

- Lydon, J. F. (1995). The Medieval English colony (13th and 14th centuries). In T. W. Moody & F. X. Martin (Eds.), *The course of Irish history* (pp. 144–157). Boulder, CO: Roberts Rinehart Publishers in Association with Radio Telefis Eireann.
- Macdonald, D. & Wilson, D. (2016). *Shameful neglect: Indigenous child poverty in Canada*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Mac Ginty, R. (2008). *No war, no peace: The rejuvenation of stalled peace processes and peace accords*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Manuel, A. & Derrickson, G. C. R. M. (2015). *Unsettling Canada: A national wake-up call*. Toronto, ON: Between the Lines Press.
- Martin, F. X. (1995). The Normans: Arrival and settlement (1169-c.1300). In T. W. Moody & F. X. Martin (Eds.), *The course of Irish history* (pp. 123–143). Boulder, CO: Roberts Rinehart Publishers in Association with Radio Telefis Eireann.
- McDowell, R. B. (1995). The Protestant nation (1775-1800). In T. W. Moody & F. X. Martin (Eds.), *The course of Irish history* (pp. 232–247). Boulder, CO: Roberts Rinehart Publishers in Association with Radio Telefis Eireann.
- McMaster, J. & Hetherington, M. (2017). Ethical and shared remembering. Remembering a decade of change and violence in Ireland 1912-1922. [Derry: The Junction, Community Relations and Peacebuilding]. Retrieved from <http://thejunction-ni.org.s22803.gridserver.com/uploads>.
- Montano, J. P. (2011). *The roots of English colonialism in Ireland*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Moody, T. W. (1995). Fenianism, home rule, and the land war (1850-91). In T. W. Moody & F. X. Martin (Eds.), *The course of Irish history* (pp. 275–293). Boulder, CO: Roberts Rinehart Publishers in Association with Radio Telefis Eireann.
- Moody, T. W. & Martin, F. X. (1994). (Eds.). *The course of Irish history*. Boulder, CO: Roberts Rinehart Publishers in Association with Radio Telefis Eireann.
- Özerdem, A. (2014). *Local ownership in international peacebuilding*. Routledge, UK: London.
- Pranis, K. (2003). *Peacemaking circles: From crime to community*. St. Paul, MN: Living Justice Press.
- National Archives of Ireland. (2015). *Report of June 2, 2015*. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalarchives.ie/report-of-2-june-2015/>.

- Rice, B. (2013). *The Rotinonshonni: A traditional Iroquoian history through the eyes of Teharonhia:wako and Sawiskera*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Rahman, A., Clarke, M.A., & Byrne, S. (2017). The art of breaking people down: The British colonial model in Ireland and Canada. *Peace Research: Canadian Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies*, 49(2), 15-38.
- Richmond, O. P. (2016). *Peace: A very short introduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Rolston, B. (1993). The training ground: Ireland, conquest and decolonisation. *Race and Class*, 13–24.
- Ross, R. (2014). *Indigenous healing*. Toronto, ON: Penguin Canada Books Ltd.
- Scott, J. C. (1992). *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*. Princeton, NJ: Yale University Press.
- Senehi, J. (2009). The role of constructive, transcultural storytelling in ethnopolitical conflict transformation in Northern Ireland. In J. Carter, G. Irani and V. Volkan (Eds.), *Regional and ethnic conflicts: Perspectives from the front lines* (pp. 227–238). London, UK: Taylor and Francis.
- Sjoberg, L. (2006). *Gender justice and the wars in Iraq: A feminist reformulation of just war theory*. Lanham, MD: Lexington.
- Swanky, T. (2013). *The true Story of Canada's "war" of extermination on the Pacific - Plus the Tsilhqot'in and other First Nations resistance*. Vancouver BC: Lulu Press.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC). (2015). *Final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. Volume one, summary: Honoring the truth, reconciling for the future*. Toronto, ON: James Lorimer & Company Ltd, Publishers.
- United States Government. (2010). *The American Indian and Alaska Native population: 2010*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-10.pdf>.
- Volkan, V. D. (1997). *Bloodlines: From ethnic pride to ethnic terrorism*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- White, T. J. (2010). The impact of British colonialism on Irish Catholicism and national identity: Repression, reemergence, and divergence. *Études Irlandaises*, 35(1), 21–37.
- Woolford, A., Benvenuto, J., & Hinton, A.L. (2014). (Eds.). *Colonial genocide in indigenous North America*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.