Encountering Others through Compassion: Tough Values, Moral Challenges, and Religious Education

Abstract

This paper proposes a pedagogy of compassion based on the reinterpretation of Christian compassion and critical dialogue between three religious educators. Historically, scholarly literature on compassion tends to compartmentalize compassion as one of the following concepts—a virtue, passion, emotion, or duty/obligation. However, no individual concept adequately addresses the issues that emerge in encounters with others, such as those that occur through migration. Therefore, I redefine compassion as a holistic way of being in the world and participating in others’ suffering through an ongoing process of openness and mindfulness towards the other—socially, psychologically, spiritually, and ethically. Based on this revised definition of compassion, I engage in a critical dialogue among three educators and conclude that a pedagogy of compassion is about cultivating a way of being in the world, rather than teaching knowledge about compassion. I argue that the process of cultivating compassion can be compared to the process through which students grow in socio-political, ethical, psychological, spiritual, and relational awareness.

Through the cultivation of compassion, religious education can contribute to resolving conflicts caused by differences. Historically, the scholarly literature on compassion tends to take a compartmentalized approach by characterizing compassion as either a virtue, an emotion, or a duty/obligation (Cassell 2009, 394). Although each concept is grounded in historical, philosophical, and theological metaphors, no individual concept adequately addresses the issues that emerge in intercultural encounters with others, such as those that occur through migration. A compartmentalized approach limits the embodiment of compassion in the classroom. Contemporary studies on compassion tend to resist monolithic descriptions and instead view compassion as a holistic process that encompasses emotional, behavioral, psychological, social, ethical, physical, and religious components. In this paper, I redefine compassion as a holistic way of being in the world and participating in others’ suffering through an ongoing process of openness and mindfulness towards the other—socially, psychologically, spiritually, and ethically. Based on this revised definition of compassion, I propose two key issues in the

1 Various religious educators have discussed the interconnection between religious education and compassion: see Rogers (2014), Goto (2016), and Parachin (2000). This paper expands upon the existing research on compassion in religious education.

2 Despite some variations in language, researchers agree that compassion involves at least the following five aspects: cognitive (recognizing suffering), affective (a sense of concern), aspirational or motivational (a wish to relieve the suffering), attentional (focus and attention), and behavioral (an action that stems from compassion) (Ekman 2008; Gilbert 2005; Neff 2011; Batson, Ahmad, and Lishner 2009).
pedagogy of compassion: (i) how we expand the circle of compassion and (ii) how we embody compassion by integrating its psychological and behavioral aspects.

The purpose of this paper is to propose a pedagogy of compassion based on a reinterpretation of historical and contemporary understandings of compassion and on critical dialogues among three educators: John Dewey, Paulo Freire, and Mary Elizabeth Moore. This paper is composed of four sections. The first part builds upon the critical dialogue between historical works of compassion (Augustine, Aristotle, and the Stoics) and contemporary perspectives on the ethics of compassion (global liberation theologians) and presents four ways of defining compassion: as resistance, as forgiveness, as reconciliation, and as peaceful coexistence. The second part provides a pedagogy of compassion in order to connect the four definitions of compassion to the broader social issues that emerge in intercultural encounters. I draw on three concepts developed by educators whose works incorporate compassion: John Dewey’s intersubjective transformation in learning, Paulo Freire’s understanding of Conscientization, and Mary Elizabeth Moore’s process-relational pedagogies. Based on the critical dialogue among these three educators, I conclude that a pedagogy of compassion is about cultivating a way of being in the world, rather than teaching knowledge about compassion. I argue that the process of cultivating compassion can be compared to the process through which students grow in socio-political, ethical, psychological, spiritual, and relational awareness.

A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF HISTORICAL VIEWS ON COMPASSION

Although compassion is at the heart of the Christian tradition, the ways Christians have articulated compassion throughout history differ and contain some ambiguity (Wessel 2016, 2). *The Oxford English Dictionary* defines compassion as “suffering together with another, participation in suffering.” The linguistic root of compassion is *cum-passio*. *Passio* means “to suffer” and *cum* means “with.” Put together, compassion means “to suffer with.” The early Christians viewed compassion as morally ambiguous because many of them believed that relating compassionately to the suffering of others required feeling emotion *passionately* (Wessel 2016, 2). This emotional aspect of compassion was considered a serious threat to the ascetic ideal exemplified by the “monks, nuns, and spiritual elite” who dedicated themselves to the pursuit of “emotional tranquility,” whether in isolation or in religious communities (ibid.). The idealization of their emotional tranquility therefore produced a tension between the virtue of compassion and Christian life. Among those influenced by this view of the passions was Augustine (d. 430) (Brown 2013, 9-10). Ambivalence between asceticism and compassion, passion and Christian life, and emotion and action is reflected in his early writings in the *Confessions* (Wessel 2016, 121). After 40 years of grappling with the tension, however, he came to believe that because Christians feel the passions in the context of God, they are not distracted by the passions as pagans are (Augustine, 2009, 9.5). In fact, the passions in Christian contexts lead to the practice of virtue and should be cherished for their ethical purpose (Augustine, 2009, 9.4). Augustine writes: “Because such a Christian morality was inherently different from that of the Stoics; the emotions the Christian experienced served a specific ethical purpose” (Augustine, 2009, 9.5). These emotions allow us to be responsible to Christian life as long as they arise in the context of Christian love (Canning 1993, 42-43). How, then, did Augustine turn from avoiding emotions to acknowledging the key role emotions play in compassion and Christian life?

---

Scholars believe that this shift occurred after he made peace with his grief over the deaths of his friend and his mother. This grief, he concluded, had shaped him in an essential way. In contrast to the ideal of the passionless wise man who was unaffected by grief, Augustine had learned to embrace emotion (Wetzel 1992, 110). Augustine’s turn from emotionless tranquility to affective compassion can be viewed as an “affective transformation” (ibid., 115). The definition of compassion we see in the *City of God*—”a kind of sympathy in our heart for the suffering of another that surely compels us to help as much as we can”—was the next development of compassion after Augustine’s “affective transformation” (Augustine, 2009, 9.5). The Stoic ideal of the impassive wise man no longer seemed desirable or even possible to attain. Specifically, the idea of the impassive wise man failed because “[h]is refusal to engage emotionally signaled his unwillingness to offer aid to the afflicted” (Wessel 2016, 114). Feelings in the Christian life should be “the virtuous motivation for ethical deeds” (ibid., 118). Therefore, in the *City of God*, Augustine suggests that “[t]he sympathy (‘compassio’) we feel for another human being motivates us to act compassionately to alleviate suffering” (ibid.).

Augustine’s affective turn, as I have described above, parallels a contemporary movement toward holistic approaches to compassion. Augustine’s effort to consolidate feelings and actions (i.e., to produce compassionate behavior) have moral implications for education today because the kind of compassion we need does not involve a separation between how we feel and how we act, but is an *embodied* compassion, or a *praxis* that connects the emotional aspect of compassion (i.e., feeling other people’s suffering) and the behavioral component (the action that follows the feeling). This “affective turn” is also expanded by contemporary scholars who strive to find ways to enlarge the scope of compassion to include cultural, geographic, and religious others. In the following section, I discuss how contemporary scholars express this continuing effort to (i) embody compassion and (ii) expand compassion.

**FOUR CONTEMPORARY THEMES OF COMPASSION**

Despite differences in nuance, the Christian theological vocabulary of compassion has five recurring themes: compassion as suffering with, compassion as resistance, compassion as reconciliation, compassion as forgiveness, and compassion as peaceful co-existence. First, many contemporary theologians, including feminist, process, and Latin American liberation theologians, describe compassion as *suffering with* (Heyward 1984, Johnson 1993, Swinton 2007, Whitehead 2010). In this understanding, God is portrayed as a loving God who suffers with humans and is moved by their suffering, as opposed to what Aristotle calls an “unmoved mover.” For example, Johnson (1993, 59) depicts the Creator Spirit as participating in the creation’s suffering:

> Love who is the Creator Spirit participates in the world’s destiny. She can be grieved (Eph 4:30); she can even be quenched (1 Thes 5:19). When creation groans in labor pains and we do too (Rom 8:22-23), the Spirit is in the groaning and in the midwifing that breathes rhythmically along and cooperates in the birth. In other words, in the midst of the agony and delight of the world the Creator Spirit has the character of compassion.

The theme of *compassion as suffering with* is explored in the description of the divine-human relationship. Investigating the Hebrew words and etymologies related to compassion in the Old

---

4 On the discussion of Augustine’s “affective turn,” see Wessel (2016, 115-120).
Testament, Davies (2003, 108) argues that “compassion as a unified concept, unequivocally implying ‘suffering with,’ is more modern in kind.” Building upon Davies’ analysis, Yang (2014, 113) explains that “the meaning of compassion in the OT is also associated with the present meaning of the word ‘compassion,’ meaning ‘to suffer with.’” Yang expands the analysis to show that references to God in the Old Testament reveal the compassionate and merciful attributes of God, whose compassion resembles that of “a father or mother for his or her children” (113).

Second, contemporary theologians understand compassion as resistance (Fabella and Oduyoye 2006; Farley 1990). Farley (1990), for example, argues that God is present and active through divine compassion that empowers human beings to resist radical suffering. Participating in the compassion of God, humans experience God’s love as a power or a force that empowers people to resist injustice. Compassion is manifested as an active resistance to evil and suffering that strives for healing and God’s communion with the world. Attesting to the power of compassion in history, Farley points out the moments of effective compassion in history—occasions of redemption, healing, and empowerment: “Compassion is love as it encounters suffering” (79). Divine compassion is to be found wherever compassion resists radical suffering. In this sense, interhuman compassion is intimately related to divine compassion because it is the source of interhuman compassion.

Third, the theme of compassion as reconciliation for communal healing is promoted by many contemporary theologians, including Latin American liberation theologians. Arguing that God is a compassionate liberator of the oppressed, Gutiérrez (1988, 4) perceives Christ as the one who brings liberation from the sin of all kinds of injustice and oppression. The Asian feminist theologian Kwok Pui-lan (2000, 66) argues that in Asia, “where many people are struggling to acquire basic necessities and human dignity, God is often seen as the compassionate one, listening to the people’s cries and empowering them to face life’s adversities.” God’s love is shown in the embrace of human beings for whom they are regardless of their location, class, gender, sexuality, nationality, or originality.

Fourth, contemporary theologians understand compassion as forgiveness. Suchocki (1994, 144) maintains that forgiveness is “willing the well-being of victim(s) and violator(s) in the context of the fullest possible knowledge of the nature of the violation.” Forgiveness is an essential form of compassion because “forgiveness holds the possibility of breaking the chain of violence” (ibid.). Defining compassion as a wish for the well-being of the other, Suchocki connects it to the Christian interpretation of passion:

This is compassion, a “feeling with” that at the same time longs and works for the well-being of the other and therefore the self. Such a dynamic may well underlie the Christian interpretation of Christ on the cross identifying with all sin and sinners, and therefore able to redeem all sinners from sin. Conformity with the sin is an essential step in transformation. (111)

For Suchoki, the notion of forgiveness as compassion corresponds to the Christian understanding of sin.

Lastly, Christian theologians understand compassion as a peaceful co-existence that incorporates a radical inclusion of the marginalized, including the natural world. Citing Albert Einstein, Dowd (1991, 81, my emphasis) emphasizes the task of widening the circle of
compassion to all living beings: “Our task must be to free ourselves from this prison by widening our circle of compassion to embrace all living creatures and the whole of nature in its beauty.” Johnson (1993) also argues that the Creator Spirit encourages humans to be “co-creators” of compassion. “Moved by this Spirit [of compassion],” Johnson writes, “human beings are similarly configured to compassion, taught to be co-creators who enter the lists on behalf of those who suffer, to resist and creatively transform the powers that destroy” (59). Expanding the circle of compassion would “rejoin us to the cosmic covenant made after the biblical flood ‘between God and every living creature of all flesh that is on the earth,’ and whose sign is the rainbow (Gen 9:8-17)” (ibid., 49). Widening the circle of compassion to all creatures is one of our responsibilities as co-partners with the Creator Spirit. Likewise, Heyward (1984, 87) connects the themes of sexuality, love, and justice: “Our passion as lovers is what fuels both our rage at injustice—including that which is done to us—and our compassion, or our passion, which is on behalf of empathy with those who violate us and hurt us and would even destroy us.”

What these five themes of compassion point toward is the commitment to tikkun olam, a Hebrew phrase meaning “repair of the world” (Moore 2004, xii). In the following section, I invite three educators to explore practical ways to embody these five themes of compassion and thereby enlarge the circle of compassion.

COMPASSION AS A WAY OF BEING: THREE EDUCATORS IN CONVERSATION

John Dewey

Despite some controversies of Dewey’s philosophies of education, scholars uphold Dewey’s educational theory and find it relevant to today’s educational context (Hildebrand 2003; Alexander, 2006; Weber 2008; Seigfried 2010; Cunningham and Heilbronn 2016). Among Dewey’s contributions, this paper will point out three aspects relevant to our discussion of pedagogy of compassion.

First, Dewey’s concept of educational experience contributes to what Javier Sáenz Obregón calls “inter-subjective transformation” for teachers, which invites both teachers and students to the educational experience. Arguing that the goal of education is realizing individuals’ “utmost potentialities,” Dewey implies that this goal could be applied to teachers as well as students. Teachers, like students, are the “subjects of educational experience,” and that we must learn to apply to teachers the same aspirations we have for students (Obregón, 2016, 96). In particular, pedagogical practices should promote “inter-subjective transformation” for teachers and students alike (Obregón, 2016, 96). Dewey’s emphases on “self-reflection and self-creation” (Garrison, Neubert, and Reich, 2012, 173-174) could be applied to teachers who are also participants of the learning processes.

Second, Dewey gives special attention to the importance of cultivating virtues, calling it “the social aim of education” (Dewey 2010). Dewey writes:

The school must make ceaseless and intelligently organized effort to develop above all else the will for cooperation and the spirit which sees in every other individual an equal right to share in the cultural and material fruits of collective human invention, industry, skill and knowledge (Dewey 2010).

For Dewey, democratic virtues such as “intelligent sympathy” play essential roles in an individual’s life. He writes: “Sympathy as a desirable quality is something more than feeling. It
is a cultivated imagination for what men [sic] have in common and a rebellion at whatever unnecessarily divided them” (Dewey 2004, 116). Democratic virtues such as intelligent sympathy and compassion prepare individuals to respond to the social responsibility by preparing them with inner potential. Although Dewey did not suggest that compassion, by itself, is sufficient in promoting the social aim of education, he saw the potential that compassion contributes to moral responsibility and benevolence (Rockefeller, 1991).

Third, as a pragmatist, Dewey was keen in reading the reality that influences educational processes. In his 1934 article, he writes:

The world is being rapidly industrialized. Individual groups, tribes and races, once living completely untouched by the economic regime of modern capitalistic industry, now find almost every phase of their lives affected by its expansion . . . The other especially urgent need is connected with the present unprecedented wave of nationalistic sentiment, of racial and national prejudice, of readiness to resort to force of arms (Dewey, 1934, 244).

Dewey answers to the educational need in his time which reads: “to rebuild the spirit of common understanding, of mutual sympathy and goodwill among all peoples and races, to exorcise the demon of prejudice, isolation and hatred” (Dewey, 1934, 245). Overall, Dewey’s goal to develop a peaceful and democratic culture is still an enduring task in our present time. As Andres English argues, Dewey’s concept of “struggle in learning” has influenced definitions of learning and of learning’s beginning point in contemporary education. The condition of “in-between of learning” (English, 129)—being beyond ignorance but not yet in possession of full knowledge—is uncomfortable and difficult, but it offers rich possibilities for reflective thinking for learners and teachers who are willing to undertake the daunting task of pedagogical reconstruction in the face of changing realities.

Paulo Freire

Freire’s movement toward the process of Conscientization—a process in which learners become aware of socio-political and economic oppressions and act to transform it—provides profound insights to the pedagogy of compassion in five aspects. First, Freire emphasizes the importance of co-learning and co-creating of knowledge. The traditional “banking” education—where learners are regarded as passive recipients of knowledge—inhibits the “emergence of consciousness and critical intervention in reality” which is required for cultivating compassion (Freire, 2014, 81). In “banking education,” learners are “docile listeners” who mechanically memorize and reproduce information. (Freire, 2014, 81). Therefore, Freire promotes the co-creation of knowledge where learners are “critical co-investigators in dialogue with the teacher” (Freire, 2014, 81). In this Conscientization process, “the teacher presents the material to the students for their consideration, and re-considers her earlier considerations as the students express their own.” (Freire, 2014, 81) Students begin to recognize social, political, or economic oppression and act to eliminate it. In this sense, both teachers and learners are active co-participants of the learning process.

Second, Freire emphasizes the “situationality” of learners and teachers where they are placed in a particular situation: “Human beings are because they are in a situation. And they will be more [who they are], the more they not only critically reflect upon their existence but critically act upon it” (Freire, 2014, author’s emphasis, 109). The fact that teachers and learners
are located in a particular situation does not mean that it is stagnant. This is why Freire believes both teachers and learners should constantly analyze their realities. “In order for the oppressed to be able to wage the struggle for their liberation,” Freire writes, “they must perceive the reality of oppression not as a closed world from which there is no exit, but as a limiting situation which they can transform” (Freire, 2014, 49). The critical analyses of realities should motivate individuals to resist oppression and create an avenue to participate in social transformation.

Third, Freire maintains that action and reflection should occur at the same time. For him, critical reflection is also action, and vice versa. This is because Conscientization is a continuous process that begins with the recognition of oppressive situation which is followed by an action to transform the oppressive situation. Conscientization can be compared to the process of cultivating compassion which requires facing one’s deep-seated prejudice, stereotype, and traumatic memories that hinders one from practicing compassion.

Fourth, Freire introduces three elements of critical pedagogies: critical reflection, dialogue and action. Freire believes that the goal of critical pedagogy is to encourage learners to challenge social inequalities and ultimately transform the oppression. In order to achieve these goals, Freire believes that dialogue and subsequent action should be rooted in critical reflection, which involves active participation, ethical passion toward common human flourishing, critical insight that penetrates surface meanings, and compassion towards humanity. “Dialogue with the people is radically necessary to every authentic revolution. This is what makes it a revolution, as distinguished from a military coup” (Freire, 2014, author’s emphasis, 128). Ira Shor aptly summarizes critical pedagogy as “Habits of thought, reading, writing, and speaking which go beneath surface meaning, first impressions, dominant myths, official pronouncements, traditional clichés, received wisdom, and mere opinions, to understand the deep meaning, root causes, social context, ideology, and personal consequences of any action, event, object, process, organization, experience, text, subject matter, policy, mass media, or discourse” (Shor, 2012).

Lastly, Freire recognizes the value of creative energy to name the wrong and change the world. Freire believe that inculcation of knowledge “anesthetizes and inhibits creative power” whereas “problem-posing education involves a constant unveiling of reality” (Freire, 2014, 81). This “creative power” enables learners to critically intervene in reality. This is why Freire believes “to the oppressor consciousness, the humanization of the ‘others,’ of the people, appears not as the pursuit of full humanity, but as subversion” (Freire, 2014, 59). For Freire, the essential part of the Conscientization process is learners equipping the ability to decode their situations and see themselves as the subject of the learning process.

Essentially, Freire’s contribution to the contemporary education, in general, and the development of the pedagogy of compassion, in particular, can be summarized in the following concepts: praxis and radical love. According to Freire, praxis is a “reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it” (Freire, 2014, 51) and radical love is a “commitment to others” (Freire, 2014, 89). In order to resist oppression, the “act of love” is essential because it is a “commitment to their cause— the cause of liberation” (Freire, 2014, 89). Through this process of intervention and re-intervention, human beings can participate in the betterment of the world through education.

Mary Elizabeth Moore

Throughout her scholarship, Moore shows practical and concrete ways to embody the praxis of compassion based on the process-relational assumption that people are always in
proces). Moore places imagination at the center of her educational theory (Moore 2005, 2006). Although Moore does not use the term “compassion” in the essays discussed here, what she proposes as ways to cultivate imagination are also essential ways to cultivate compassion. In her essay “Imagination at the Center,” Moore (2005) provides five ways to cultivate imagination: Seeking Goodness, Seeking Transcendence—Seeking Goodness, Touching the Unknown, Intimate Knowing, Knowing the Stranger and the Unfamiliar, and Imagining and Responding to the Possible. With “seeking goodness,” Moore (2005, 201) refers to the teleological direction of educational practices that “enable people to discover and analyze forces of goodness and evil, and those practices that stir vision and equip people with skills to enhance the common good.” Moore’s search for goodness in education resonates with the work of Paulo Freire, which I explore in more detail later. By “seeking transcendence—touching the unknown,” Moore refers to “transcending limits of an evil social system, transcending narrow understandings of humanity (and ‘we-ness’), and transcending one way of living in order to dwell in transition and emerge in a new way” (204). Practices of “intimate knowing” refers to practices that lead people to “engage deeply with the fullness of other individuals and communities, other parts of the cosmos, empirical data, and complex ideas” (204). “Knowing the stranger and the unfamiliar” refers to “encouraging people to know the stranger and the unfamiliar” (205). Finally, “imagining and responding to the possible,” refers to the educators’ duty to “engage students in envisioning alternate futures” (207). For the purposes of this paper, I discuss the practices of “intimate knowing” and “knowing the stranger and the unfamiliar” in detail. These two ways to cultivate imagination will ground our discussion of Moore’s process-relational theology of compassion.

When Moore argues that “intimate knowing” is a requirement for cultivating imagination, she understands that intimate knowing requires “attendances to particularity, to relationships within the web of life, and to the cultivation of appreciative consciousness” (204).5 This definition of “intimate knowing” shows practical and concrete ways to embody the praxis of compassion. Moore believes that traditional educational methods tend to “neglect to strengthen habits of concrete appreciation of the individual facts in their full interplay of emergent values” as well as “engagement with particular people, beings, observations, and ideas” (2006, 213). These emphases on particularity and local contexts are discussed in her essays “Imagine Peace: Knowing the Real—Imagining the Impossible” and “Ethnic Diversity and Biodiversity: Richness at the Center of Education” (2000, 2006). In “Imagine Peace,” Moore expands Whitehead’s emphases on the balance between “intellectual analysis” and argues that “[intimate knowing] includes relating with others from the deep marrow of human experience” (2006, 213).6 Moore explains that “the creation of safe spaces” is necessary for people to experiment with new relationships and new ideas within small communities so that these new way of being can be embodied in larger communities (2005, 205; 2006, 213).

Practices of “knowing the stranger and the unfamiliar” (2005, 205-207; 2006, 213-215) help to enlarge the circle of compassion in practice. This practice presupposes “crossing cultural, geographic, religious, and age boundaries” (2006, 213). Encounters with the neighbor and stranger, the familiar and unfamiliar, according to Moore, are an essential part of education because such encounters “stir imagination by opening new windows of experience from which

---

5 This point will be further discussed in a later section.

6 Whitehead’s critique of the imbalance between intellectual analysis and individual facts in traditional education can be found in Whitehead (1925).
people can draw as they face the particularities of their own lives and their participation in the larger world day by day” (ibid.).

It is important to note here that Moore bases this practice on the notion of intersubjective relationship. Moore believes that knowing the unfamiliar requires “genuine, life-changing interactions and the deep knowing that emerges from them” (2005, 206). To elaborate this point, Moore provides three potential dangers of encountering the unknown. First, Moore warns of the danger of collecting otherness as an object to be accumulated, admired, laughed at, or pitied. Objectifying the other is dangerous because such encounters often ignore power differentials (ibid., 214). This attitude can end up externalizing others and taking agency away from them. Therefore, Moore points out the danger of “boundary-crossing education” as the second potential danger in encountering others: “If knowing has to do with relating with the world in a deep and responsive way, then our relationships need to be permeated with awareness and critical response to differentials in power, as well as differentials in language, style, arts, and rituals.” Building such relation-based knowing is possible when we ask “much of the knowers and the known, including a redress of inequalities and a movement toward equality and interdependence.” These questions include asking about “real people” who are affected by religious and cultural traditions, worldwide political and economic patterns, and multifaceted web relationships. Third, Moore warns of the danger of teaching people that encountering the stranger and the unfamiliar involves “an encounter with a radical other, which may or may not affect learners.” This disengaging way of thinking otherness, according to Moore, is based on the assumption that otherness is a “substantive, nonchanging, and external” entity. Instead, borrowing Carl Sterkens’ argument, Moore maintains that we should approach the other “recognizing that diversity exists both within and beyond individuals’ experience” (214).

For Moore, these practices of cultivating imagination can contribute to igniting an imagination of global peace and justice. To this end, Moore provides four aspects of Whiteheadian cosmology: visions of peace, inheritance and novelty, open future, and overcoming dualisms—converting opposition into contrast.

[Peace] is a broadening of feeling due to the emergence of some deep metaphysical insight, unverbalized and yet momentous in its coordination of values. Its first effect is the removal of the stress of acquisitive feeling arising from the soul’s preoccupation with itself. Thus peace carries with it a surpassing of personality … It results in a wider sweep of conscious interest. It enlarges the field of attention. Thus Peace is self-control at its widest,—at the width where the “self” has been lost, and interest has been transferred to coordinations wider than personality. (2006, 204)

Although Moore does not use the term compassion, her Whiteheadian analysis of peace recalls our definition of compassion as a holistic way of being in the world and participating in others’ suffering with an ongoing process of openness and mindfulness towards the other—socially, psychologically, spiritually, and ethically. First, Moore suggests that Peace “can be actively cultivated through active engagement with the world” (2006, 204). When Moore describes teaching “active engagement with the world,” she does not simply mean teaching students about justice and peace; she demands change in “how we teach” (Bischoff and Moore 2007, 153): “Education thus needs another kind of commitment, namely to embrace chaos, to risk destabilization, and to teach skills for living with the instability that emerges in the natural flow.

---

7 See Whitehead (1933, 285-86).
of life or in the intentional disruptions aimed at reshaping a stable but destructive situation” (2005, 200)

Second, Moore believes practicing peace in education involves an enlargement of the field of attention or “a broadening of feeling” with the wider world:

Such education will involve discerning, analyzing, and even provoking destabilization, while teaching knowledge and skills that help people to engage unstable social institutions with courage and wisdom, and to imagine new futures. In most times, education needs to be involved in all of these actions, this stirring visions and teaching skills that foster some degrees of stability and some degrees of social change, with the higher goal of enhancing life that flourishes for all people and the entire earth. (ibid., 205)

Third, Moore points out the sensitivity to tragedy and the realities of tragedy in practicing Whiteheadian Peace:

[Peace] keeps vivid the sensitiveness to the tragedy; and it sees the tragedy as a living agent persuading the world to aim at fitness beyond the faded level of surrounding fact. Each tragedy is the disclosure of an ideal—What might have been, and was not: What can be. The tragedy was not in vain . . . The inner feeling belonging to this grasp of the service of tragedy is Peace—the purification of the emotions. (As cited in Moore, 2006, 205)

Lastly, Moore provides important insights for our discussion of pedagogy of compassion:

Peace is not a thing to be taught, but a gift to be expected and received. Teachers are thus challenged to cultivate expectation and wonder, rather than teaching reliance on human reason and control. (ibid., 205)

Here, Moore implies that cultivating peace is about cultivating a way of being in the world, rather than teaching knowledge about peace:

It cannot be assumed that the dissemination of information about, for example, the religious beliefs and cultural values of ethnic minorities will, in itself, counter and modify attitudes of radical prejudice or inhibit racist behavior on the part of others. (ibid., 205)

Moore’s attention to process-relational thought and imagination undergirds her commitment to pedagogies concerned with justice, peace, and compassion grounded in the particulars of practice and everyday life. To be specific, Moore fundamentally believes that the person is constantly changing. Her process view of the person does not mean, however, that the person is situated outside a particular social, cultural, economic context. Rather, the fact that a person is constantly changing requires attention to the interconnectedness of contexts. She calls for educators to build compassionate relationships with learners, embodying justice, peace, and compassion in the classroom, rather than focusing on the inculcation of knowledge. Moore (1991) calls this “teaching from the heart.”
TOWARDS A PEDAGOGY OF COMPASSION

A critical conversation among Dewey, Freire, and Moore provides us with a number of vital elements of the pedagogy of compassion. First, they all emphasize a form of praxis—a critical reflection followed by an action and an action that informs further reflection. Second, they put creation of virtues such as compassion at the center of education. Third, they all acknowledge both students and teachers as subjects of co-learning. Fourth, they address how education can expand compassion thereby potentially contributing to the global peace. Fifth, they explore how life history and social contexts influence critical learning, arguing the importance of reading the realities of a particular community in time. Sixth, they implicitly and explicitly challenge different kinds of oppressions that can occur in the encounters with others, including racism, sexism, classism, and ageism. Last, they elaborate the importance of relationship building, or what Moore calls “intimate knowing.” These pedagogical insights can not only fight the obstacles of compassion such as prejudice but also create an ethical space that promotes co-existence. In the present global context, the cultivation of compassion through the pedagogy of compassion will contribute to cultural, religious, and sociological diversity.
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