16

Education for Peace

Concepts and Institutions

What is distinctive about education for peace? It subsumes much else that precedes it in this book, drawing especially on the basic concepts and educational processes for conflict resolution. But it goes beyond education for conflict resolution in that it addresses the crossing of adversarial *large-scale intergroup boundaries*. This includes hostility across national boundaries and hostility across ethnic, religious, or political boundaries within a nation. The first condition is conducive to international war; the second condition is conducive to civil war. The large-scale hostilities have not been so much the focus of attention in recent education as interpersonal and community education for conflict resolution. Education for peace is more complex and daunting than education for conflict resolution. But the stakes are so high, and likely to get so exceedingly dangerous in the twenty-first century, that education for peace must be addressed in serious and sustained ways—the sooner the better.

In this and the next two chapters, we try to clarify the following:

1. The essential content of education for peace, or at least the critical issues that need to be addressed
2. How to upgrade such information and concepts on a continuing, long-term basis so that education for peace can grow in strength over the decades ahead
3. How to make such content personally meaningful and widely available throughout the world

Learning to Live Together: Preventing Hatred and Violence in Child and Adolescent Development. David A. Hamburg and Beatrix A. Hamburg, Oxford University Press (2004).
DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780195157796.003.0021

What evocative and thoughtful efforts have addressed the preceding three points? Peace education works toward giving children, adolescents, and young adults clear ideas about how to contribute to the creation of peaceful communities on both local and global scales. Starting from a low baseline, this century has seen an increased interest in peace education, but still it has not entered mainstream education. Although many schools have adopted conflict-resolution programs, they usually stop short of addressing the larger issues of war and peace. Yet there is a connection between the two. The challenge is to move beyond a narrow arena (for example, the school) to a broader view—indeed a worldwide outlook. The worldwide predilection to violence is both a serious constraint and profound challenge to peace education. So, too, is the paucity of research in this field.

Peace education gives a long-term strategy for dealing with problems of violence. The aim is for children to grow up to be citizens committed to finding alternatives to violent conflict. Such a preventive strategy offers little immediate reassurance to those concerned with local violence, including violence in and around schools. Yet, the ability to build peaceful societies is one of the world's most pressing problems. This fact constitutes a powerful stimulus to the education community to formulate curricula, materials, and school environments conducive to peaceful living. Likewise, it challenges religious institutions and community organizations as well as the media.

Essentially, we need to understand ourselves better. Human beings need not be destructive; we can learn to work cooperatively. Modern technology has made warlike behavior suicidal. In our actual struggle for survival, we must maximize the likelihood that all of humanity can legitimately be treated as potential allies. Because cooperation needs mutual confidence, major educational efforts should be made to augment prosocial behavior and to generate a sound basis for trust across cultural and national boundaries—not trust based on wishful thinking.

PEACE EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1820–1990

Peace education in the United States has a long history.[1] In the early nineteenth century, the peace society journals in various parts of the country began to mark violence as a social ill and peace as a symbol of a civilized society. As the century wore on, there was an increasing belief (linked to ideas inspired by Darwin on evolution and progress) that, with intelligence and reason, human action could bring about a peaceful and just world. A number of prominent social thinkers and educators—the ranks of which included such luminaries as John Dewey, Horace Mann, and Jane Addams—felt that ethical principles were essential factors for a healthy citizenry and should be included in children's education. This ethical education was predicated on the belief that beneficial changes could come about by peaceful, gradual, and nonviolent means.

These hopes were severely jeopardized in the course of the twentieth century. World War I dashed many of the concepts of peace that appeared in the nineteenth century, but despite this, pacifist movements along with educational efforts gained considerable status in the wake of the war. However, they were often tarred as socialistic or

communistic by critics and could be billed as un-American. This generally kept peace education from firmly establishing itself in the mainstream. So, too, did the illusion that such efforts could lead to a pacifist utopia.

After the horrendous second world war, with the superpower tensions of the cold war that held the potential for catastrophic nuclear conflict, there were redoubled efforts to reinforce peaceful behavior on the part of the United States and the Soviet Union. For example, the Nobel Prize–winning Pugwash organization, in addition to its analysis of ways to reduce the nuclear danger through arms control and efforts to influence policy, established the international Student Pugwash organization in the 1970s. To this day, Student Pugwash supports programs that encourage young people to examine the ethical impacts of technology from a global perspective and to foster peaceful international relations.

The Vietnam War was a significant moment in peace education. The anguish of the conflict led to an expanded view of the responsibilities of citizenship. Greater emphasis was placed on illuminating differing viewpoints on issues rather than simply obeying authority. The general concept of what constituted peace education itself was also broadened. Rather than just focusing on physical security, it came to include underlying problems that stimulate or exacerbate human conflict. Broader questions of inequity entered too, such as serious environmental damage and opportunities for often-oppressed women in societies across the world.

Peace education is gradually achieving a broader acceptance in the educational system. Within the universities and schools, it is not uncommon to find conflict prevention and peace education courses. Nevertheless, it can hardly be characterized as a widely established, mainstream part of education—an odd circumstance in view of the higher-than-ever and rapidly growing stakes at issue, even before the terrorist destruction of September 11, 2001.

Types of Peace Education

Since the middle of the nineteenth century, teachers have tried to educate children on the atrocities of war so that it might be avoided.[2] The horrors of modern warfare dominated peace education at the end of the nineteenth century and at the turn of the century, Maria Montessori taught young children to think for themselves to counteract the effects of fascism.[3] The 1970s peace education was a response to the Vietnam War. Nuclear threat and global devastation were themes of the 1980s. At the end of the twentieth century, peace education was, more than ever, seeking to give children positive alternatives to violence in building their own lives and contributing to their society's paths to peaceful problem solving—thinking of peace as something more than the (often transient) absence of war.

Although there is a lack of longitudinal studies about the effects of peace education in classroom settings, short-term observations are encouraging. There is an inherent plausibility in teaching pupils peaceful ways to respond to conflict—and giving them experience in practicing those skills—in order to prepare them to become peaceful adults.[4] Some research has shown cognitive changes in response to peace education.[5]

College students have exhibited a serious interest in changing their own behavior as a result of peace education.[6] Peer mediation programs have shown that students are able to learn peacekeeping skills in school and then apply their knowledge to daily living.[7] We have noted a successful program in the New York City public schools, the Resolving Conflict Creatively Program. Though it is not international, it does involve a variety of ethnic and religious groups, largely strangers to each other. This program focuses on cooperation, communications skills, responsible decision making, conflict resolution, and cultural competence. Research has shown a remarkably positive change in student behavior as a result: Teachers (71 percent) report a moderate or great decrease in physical violence in the classroom, and 66 percent noted less hostile name calling and verbal putdowns. In addition, teachers reported that they also changed—over 84 percent reported that their own listening skills improved and enhanced their understanding of conflict resolution—and that they used this increased knowledge in their personal lives.[8] Teachers in many countries are showing growing interest in peace education as a result of such positive findings and the compelling nature of the subject matter.

Different Emphases of Peace Education

A subject so complex as this, often involving highly charged emotions, naturally calls for different approaches. Many disciplines are involved, and the problems are looked at from different angles.

GLOBAL PEACE EDUCATION This system is closely linked to international studies. It gives students an awareness and understanding of other cultures and helps young people to see themselves as compassionate global citizens by identifying with their basic humanity. Students also learn about security systems, which could eventually lead them to create new laws and institutions designed to avoid the horrors of violent conflict. Current and salient examples of such institutions are the United Nations and regional organizations such as the European Union. Global peace education would engage, for example, in teaching fundamental international law embedded in the United Nations charter as well as the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

CONFLICT-RESOLUTION PROGRAMS This training helps children to deal with interpersonal conflicts constructively by utilizing skills of empathy, mediation, and alternative dispute resolution methods. To qualify as peace education, it must go beyond in-group boundaries.

Studies have shown that students who learn negotiation procedures in school are able to apply these skills at home and with friends. They also are more apt to seek peaceful solutions to their conflicts.[9] A study by Metis Associates of conflict-resolution programs in New York City schools showed that as a result of this training, students spoke in a more supportive manner, behaved more cooperatively, and showed more caring behavior and increased understanding of another's point of view.[10] The challenge is to extend such work to the wider sphere of international relations.

VIOLENCE-PREVENTION PROGRAMS The goal of these programs is to create a safe school environment and reduce the violent behaviors that some children exhibit in and around school. Concern often revolves around street crime, fights, and unruly student behavior in school. Prejudice and stereotypes are examined in the context of enemy image formation. Anger management techniques are taught as a way of helping students to avoid fights. In school and community, the immediate and vivid aim is to provide these young people with alternatives to fighting.[11]

Evaluations of these programs show that they help to reduce physical acts of violence, and increase prosocial behavior.[12] By clarifying risk factors for violent behavior—family patterns, violent social settings, substance abuse, weapon availability—such education can give students insights into sources of violence as well as constructive alternatives. Here again, we have a platform for *peace* education on which future efforts can build—beyond the community to large heavily armed adversarial groups.

EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRATIC SOCIOECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT This approach focuses on oppressive social institutions and ways of transcending the violent habits they condone. It examines hierarchies and their propensity for heavy-handed dominance. Human rights and environmental studies are included in development education. It seeks to promote the development of and participation in democratic communities.

NONVIOLENCE EDUCATION This type of education calls on the work of great nonviolent thinkers such as Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Jiddu Krishnamurti, as well as religious leaders such as Desmond Tutu. It strives to conceive of a world where human beings work cooperatively toward sustaining a peaceful future. It offers solutions to problems in which both sides can win. We sketch a few examples here from recent history.

The value of nonviolent social action has been seen in several situations internationally in recent decades. One of the most powerful came in the epoch making year of 1989. That year, in East Germany, there were growing tensions as the country's citizens sought to leave the country and other Eastern Bloc nations opened their borders. The situation was dangerous since the East German government had a history of violent repression against internal dissent. Its leader, Erich Honecker, kept to this tradition and generally resisted Mikhail Gorbachev's examples of liberalization. Street protests became commonplace as Germans sought not only the right to move freely but also began to agitate for democratic reform. Leading the way in organizing these protests were a number of protestant pastors who used their churches as sanctuaries for this purpose and also used their high standing to maintain the peaceful nature of the protests even when faced with repressive government measures.

Organizers made sure that crowds maintained their composure while exerting strong social pressure, and thankfully, the security forces backed down from confrontation. People from all walks of life joined in such demonstrations.[13] The streets of various cities were soon swollen with their citizens. They remained peaceful, which not

only gave the regime no legitimate cause to crush dissent but also gave the protesters and their message considerable moral authority. In the face of this swelling evidence of people power, the fierce East German regime tottered and then fell in November of 1989.

Protests of this sort hark back to the nonviolent movements of Mahatma Gandhi against colonial rule and of Martin Luther King, Jr., against racial discrimination. They show that these movements can be educative forces for social change and also for the prevention of deadly conflict.[14] Here, as in the East German and South African situations, adolescents and young adults played a vital role in the dynamic, nonviolent uprising for peace and democracy.

This approach does not always work. The violence used to sustain repressive systems can be terribly harsh. Yet in the Philippines, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Mongolia, and most recently in Serbia, leaders and activists—and the people themselves, young and old—understood the true power of principled mass nonviolent protest. They made sure that their demonstrations remained peaceful in the face of provocation. In this way they minimized the risk of violent conflict and moved toward a better life.

A PERSPECTIVE FROM COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Professor Betty A. Reardon of Columbia University, whose career has been thoughtfully devoted to peace education, provides an informative review of the history and various approaches to this field.[15] Though peace education has been characterized, historically, by a trend toward multiple approaches to accomplishing common causes, Professor Reardon recognizes that it must come to be understood and accepted by mainstream society. Her assessment of the field is heavily influenced by her experience internationally; yet she naturally approaches her work from a Western orientation. She describes the history and practice of peace education, identifies common purposes and goals among its practitioners, and highlights important aspects of the field.

Defining Peace Education and Recognizing Common Purposes among Practitioners

Whereas other fields are structured by the professional organizations and academic departments of their practitioners, peace education has very few such places devoted entirely to its development. Citizens' organizations may support its practice and professional organizations contain subgroups dedicated to networking with their colleagues; however, peace itself has only recently gained the time and resources of far-reaching organizations such as UNESCO. The birth and growth of peace education initiatives globally have often taken place independent from other programs and in a variety of disciplines. There has, therefore, been virtually no unified approach to the practice of peace education thus far, though there have been common purposes.

Most practitioners cite the construction of a humane society, on a local, national, or international scale, as their primary purpose. Their means toward attaining that goal:

"positive, mutually beneficial relationships among the members of the society."[16] Practitioners around the world recognize that public policy must result in positive environments that provide all citizens opportunity. Such is the consensus born of a universal respect for human rights that permeates nonviolent solutions to controversies.

Broad-gauged education is steadily gaining acceptance as an effective way to achieve this end, as evidenced in UNESCO's focus in the field, its Declaration and Integrated Framework of Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights, and Democracy.[17] Although comprehensive philosophically and pedagogically, this approach includes incorporation of peace education at all of the students' developmental stages. With good intentions, UNESCO's efforts in this field are so far quite limited. Education for peace may also be substantively based in various disciplines, such as international relations, political science, international law, human biology, and developmental or social psychology. The linkage of peace with human rights and democracy strikes us as important.

One approach emphasizes human rights education, an aspect of peace education originally inspired by the basic concept of human dignity. Human rights education developed standards based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was drafted and adopted under the leadership of Eleanor Roosevelt in 1948. It had a worldwide influence on human aspirations for just, humane, and equal treatment of all people. Human rights education is an important component of peace education, as it teaches respect for the common humanity of people from different cultures. The ultimate goal of alleviating prejudice supports indelibly two important principles: fair treatment for all and the ideology that people from different cultural, religious, or ethnic groups need not be feared by one's own group. Such education has been implemented in areas of the world experiencing demographic change, change that has frequently taken place as a result of conflict.

The History and Growth of Peace Education in Schools

The establishment of the International Peace Research Association in 1964 had a stimulating influence on the field as a whole. It was here that the term peace research was first coined and entered universities. Universities have been research-oriented, in that they either conduct research or offer coursework focused on peace research methodology. This research informs university peace studies curricula, though the coursework is mostly in the social sciences. Professor Reardon focuses on the ways in which peace education can be incorporated into the methodological approach to creating instructional techniques for general education—both in the middle grades and at other levels, including colleges and universities. There are potentially valuable linkages across levels. For example, universities can go beyond concerns about instructional approaches and focus on curriculum development for the middle grades. As detailed in Chapter 18, they can create curricula that engage students' attention, incorporate social and ethical questions, and are of relevance to everyday life.

Though peace education entered schools as a result of individual citizens, teachers, and community organizations, these local movements have received material and guid-

ance from organizations such as Educators for Social Responsibility. This organization, founded by U.S. teachers, provided school- and community-based education programs to teachers. Those involved in the peace movement and associations often supported such programs. It was not until 1963 that a sharp focus on critical issues emerged following Pope John XXIII's encyclical, *Pacem in Terris* and President John F. Kennedy's great speech at American University, "Toward a Strategy of Peace," which also announced the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Though it is difficult to define peace education precisely, Reardon delineates a unity of purpose among its practitioners and a growing awareness of the necessity for peace education initiatives. Citizens, organizations dedicated to peace, and some political and religious and academic leaders have increasingly advocated the protection of human rights by democratic institutions as crucial pathway to peace. This approach is stimulating peace education in the schools. The dialogue is now open not only to instructional approaches, but also to curriculum development.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS FOR PEACE EDUCATION

Robert A. Hinde and Patrick Bateson, biologists of great distinction at the University of Cambridge, explore the goals of peace education and define it as embracing all the conditions conducive to individual fulfillment and the continued progress of the whole human species.[18] The content they propose for peace education builds on concepts in our earlier chapters dealing with education for conflict resolution within a single nation. Now we extend these ideas to international conflicts. Peace is more positive and complex than the mere absence of war, or of simply keeping the peace—which implies a situation of tension and mistrust. This comprehensive view covers many situations and many factors that influence human aggression, from two schoolboys fighting over possession of an object, to village warfare involving relatively small groups of people, to modern warfare viewed as a set of human institutions in which individuals have specific roles with attendant rights and duties. The institutions of war shape the inclinations of leaders to impose war on the country and exploit the propensities of soldiers and other citizens to cooperate and obey their superiors. We fight for those to whom we are closely attached and are obedient to aggressive leaders. Propaganda is used as a tool by leaders to foster the institutions of war, often playing on the solidarity of in-group attachments. This viewpoint suggests that two goals of peace education might be described as clarifying those individual propensities that are conducive to the institutions of war and learning how to counteract the consequences of those institutions on the behavior of individuals.

Individual Propensities

In this view, education for peace must address several objectives: (a) to raise children to be disciplined in restraint toward violence, (b) to arrange society so that human assertiveness can benefit humanity without damaging individuals, (c) guide human po-

tentials for cooperation and prosocial behavior so that they are employed to the benefit of mankind and not set one group against another, and (d) to be concerned with humane values as well as aggressive motivations.

Hinde and Bateson also seek to inform people about how the institutions of war can have a powerful effect on their individual behavior. They emphasize stereotypes of potential enemies, along the lines of our earlier discussion of invidious distinctions between in-groups and out-groups. They pay special attention to fear of the strange or the unknown and the need for identifying with valued groups—all too often identifying with one group exclusively and devaluing others. It is important to understand how political, religious or ethnic leaders can manipulate these tendencies to promote and justify war. This occurs in many cultures and is so ubiquitous throughout history that it deserves close scrutiny. They explicitly advocate promoting knowledge of other peoples—friends and adversaries alike, on the basis of the most solid information available. Here, the basic requirements and opportunities of international education (see Chapter 15) mesh with those of peace education.

The world is composed of a multitude of cultures with their own unique value systems and special merits. At the same time, there is a *shared humanity*. For example, teaching about the global problems of air pollution and depletion of the world's resources is not only intrinsically important but also illuminates crucial *universal values* in the service of *survival*. Moreover, fundamental human biology, key attributes of human societies, and basic human needs are central to our shared humanity. Diversity must be understood and respected in this framework of shared humanity. This does not mean that all cultures must be equally valued. Although all seek ways to solve basic problems of human adaptation, some are more humane and compassionate than others; some are more democratic and protective of human rights than others.

Because the institutions of war were created over a long period of time, we need to examine ways in which our current behavior is influenced by past events, even obsolete attitudes and customs. Education for peace must show that some societies are not inclined to war and have built structures for maintaining peace based on widespread physical security, emotional well-being, and social justice. Indeed, we have learned from some nations (for example, Sweden) that a previously war-prone nation can change its orientation in fundamental ways.

History often gives war a glorified status. Another goal of education for peace is to present a multifaceted picture of war, bleeding warts and all. Also, history must not be seen as an inevitable unfolding of events. The interplay of leaders and those being led is a fundamental topic for understanding war and peace. A careful assessment of conditions that justify war is essential.

Finally, Hinde and Bateson offer a basis for hope in building and sustaining a peaceful world:

1. We now have the means to limit population at sustainable levels.
2. We understand the urgency to conserve the world's resources for future generations.

3. We see how extreme human self-absorption can contaminate the planet but also human ingenuity can find ways to reduce the dangers.
4. The threat of nuclear war has provided a historically new, essentially unprecedented, incentive to reach an understanding of worldwide problems, and the will to do so is increasing.
5. There has been a real expansion of social conscience in the democracies. For example, now governments' commonly dispatch aid to those suffering from disaster or famine half a world away. Many concrete steps that can be taken by governments, intergovernmental organizations, and nongovernmental institutions—especially the pillars of civil society—have been clarified in recent years.[19]

Human Aggressiveness and War

In a notable gathering of scientists from many fields and many countries marking the 50th anniversary of the creation of Pugwash, Robert Hinde and Lea Pulkkinen examine the issue of human aggressiveness. They ask the fundamental question: Why do humans participate in war?[20] Conflict is a natural part of human interaction—between individuals, groups within states, and in relations between states. They are concerned with factors that move conflict into violence. We summarize here their focus on socialization and education in relation to human aggressiveness and war.

AGGRESSION BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS In studies of human twins, research shows that genetic factors affect differences in antisocial behavior, which includes aggression. This is especially true when aggressive behavior appears early in life in combination with persistent hyperactivity. However, there is no direct effect of genetic differences on overt aggression or violence. Genes determine the protein structure in our cells. Then there is a long series of developmental processes affected by factors in the environment. So, it is difficult to generalize about the relative importance of genetic and environmental factors. Gene differences could also affect some other inclination that influences the frequency of experience that could be associated with aggressiveness.[21] For example, in the case of an irritable infant, parents may treat the child in a manner conducive to the development of an aggressive temperament. Childhood aggressiveness does not necessarily lead to adult antisocial behavior, except when it is intense and linked with other symptoms such as hyperactivity and rejection by peers.[22]

In most cultures, males are more aggressive physically than females, and the incidence of violence increases with age. The peak is reached in the late teens or early 20s and then declines.[23] The extent to which hormonal factors, especially testosterone, affect these processes is under investigation.

Many studies show that life experience strongly affects the development of individual aggressiveness.[24] In cases of nuclear families in Western society, a disruption in parenting is associated strongly with subsequent aggressiveness in the child. Parenting that is disorganized or insecure, very cold, or highly permissive, or where punishment is highly inconsistent also relates to subsequent aggression in the child.[25] In 1971, Baum-

rind found that children whose parents are highly controlling and lacking in affection and highly permissive parents were more aggressive than those children of parents who are authoritative in a constructive way.[26] Punishing a child for behaving aggressively has complex outcomes. On one hand, the child learns that the aggressive behavior results in a negative response. On the other hand, the pain involved with punishment induces aggression in the child and shows the parent behaving aggressively, thus providing a model for future aggression. In general, the interaction of family members has an important impact on the development of aggressive behavior, so too do influences of the peer group (especially peer rejection).

The values and norms of society are significant in bringing about aggressiveness. Some cultures promote harmony within the group while encouraging aggressive behavior toward other groups. A tough image may be created in the search for self-esteem or as part of coping with harsh conditions, as was the case in frontier areas of the United States in the nineteenth century and in many modern cities.[27] Poverty is a strong force related to aggressiveness within and across societies.

Mass media reflects as well as creates social norms. Although there are consistent links between television violence and aggressive tendencies, these are not strong in a randomly selected population. However, violence in the media clearly increases aggressive tendencies in an individual who is at risk for aggressiveness for other reasons (such as inadequate parenting and violence in the family).[28] Being exposed to violence in the community can enhance aggressiveness.[29] Video games that involve active participation in simulated violence are especially strong influences on aggressive behavior. In recent years, their popularity and the intensity of their interactive violence have come to constitute a serious social problem.

Situational factors such as crowded inner cities raise emotional levels of individuals and are associated with aggressive behavior. Architectural design can perpetuate feelings of alienation. For instance, high-rise buildings, with their impersonal nature, tend to reduce feelings of community, which predispose to violence.[30]

Individual factors make aggression more likely, but it is important also to examine triggers that lead to aggressive behavior. Aggression is usually stimulated by a desire to attain or maintain a highly desired goal—especially by blockage of such desires. Frustration is an important cause of aggression, but the concept of frustration is sometimes used so broadly that its value is diminished. Other factors leading to aggression are (1) the desire for power, especially if an aggressive act will improve the status of the actor in the eyes of peers or a wider population; (2) pain and fear; and (3) the presence of weapons. There is no question that availability of weapons is an important factor in the high levels of homicide in the United States; however, of greater importance is the abundance of light weapons in many poor countries that are in fact highly destructive.

INTERGROUP AGGRESSION Intergroup aggression spans a large, multidimensional middle ground ranging from individual aggression to interstate wars. These include gang wars, terrorism, and civil wars (sometimes based on religious or ethnic differences) common since the mid-1900s. Also, violence between groups can include violence perpetrated by an individual who identifies himself or herself as part of a group

(as in many acts of terrorism), or a group act of violence toward an individual viewed as representing a group (such as in apartheid).

The nature of antagonistic groups is critical to understanding the nature of aggression between groups. It is necessary to understand the way group members see themselves and how they respond to given circumstances that lead to violence. It is important to understand human groups, as we tried to do in Chapter 2 ("Child Development, the Human Group, and Survival"). In the course of human evolution, it was important to survival and reproduction for individuals to be associated with a particular group or community. It has been argued that the advantages to be gained by dealing with a complex society are largely what drove the development of the primate brain.[31] Individuals identify themselves in two ways: first as unique individuals and second as members of a group. So, individual and social identities can be linked to group survival.[32] Reasons for defending land or resources, for example, can be seen as necessary to the survival of everyone in the group—thus providing a legitimate reason to go to war.

Members of one group tend to view members of another group as being different, and these differences are readily amplified in times of stress especially when emphasized by an antagonistic leader. By belonging to a group, one defines one's position in society. When a member of one's group achieves something highly positive, this reflects positively on all members of the group, even if other group members did nothing to contribute to the achievement. Members of a group who believe in the group's unique values and reject outside values are poised on the threshold of conflict with other groups.

In group situations, several factors contribute to violence: (1) Near anonymity defines the individual; (2) intense arousal occurs; (3) psychological support of individuals with similar perceptions may reduce the inhibitions against violence; and (4) individuals may conform to aggressive group norms and pressures. The act of sharing values gives added potency to each of these factors.

Group solidarity is encouraged by promoting the evils of the out-group and the superiority of the in-group. Perception of reality changes readily and is easily manipulated by leaders. Propaganda is especially useful when designed to encourage the belief in the superiority of the in-group.

Often perceived deprivation or suffering is linked to aggression, but this does not mean that violence is simply a reaction to relative deprivation. It is a predisposing factor that is often politically exacerbated. Escalation to violence is likely to occur when group members are highly frustrated; there are repeated failed negotiations and poor intergroup communication; the out-group is perceived as using power illegitimately, and the in-group sees itself as able to control its own destiny.[33]

Internally peaceful societies are rare, but some research is available on the Zuni of the southwestern United States, the !Kung bushmen of the Kalahari, the Arapesh of New Guinea, the Xingo of Brazik, the Semai of Malaysia, and the Buid of Mindoro. These relatively peaceful societies share several characteristics. Their value systems look unfavorably on anger, boasting, quarreling, and violence. Such characteristics as generosity, gentleness, and avoidance of conflict are embraced, as are institutions that promote conflict resolution. According to spiritual beliefs, helpful spirits defy malevolent spirits that prey on human beings. These societies are generally egalitarian and mutually

supportive.[34] Lessons can be learned not only from the structure and values of such simple societies, but also from more complex ones that have undergone a transition from war-proneness to peaceful living. A remarkable example is provided by today's Scandinavian countries, among the world leaders in fostering peaceful conditions far and wide. They were among the most violent only three centuries ago—a short time in the sweep of human evolution.

National characteristics, religions, and propaganda play large roles in perpetuating the institutions of war. Traditions vary from country to country. If attacking orientations are generally given high status in the society, war obtains legitimacy for solving conflicts. Religions generally teach about peace, yet too often wars have been defined as holy wars. In these instances, religion plays a major part in perpetuating the institution of war.[35]

Official propaganda is used to enhance the belief that war is a compelling necessity to preserve national integrity or international order. It is used to convince the population that war is justified. Often prejudice is used to justify war. The motivation stems from hatreds passed down from one generation to the next and frequently leaves participants of the war with no knowledge of its original cause.[36] If war is seen as justified, then it follows that citizens must contribute to the effort so that victory may be won.

Hinde and Pulkkinen have examined how violence comes to occur at individual, group, and international levels. To find long-term solutions, they conclude that it is necessary to improve the education of future generations in all of these areas. Education should be strengthened to enhance international understanding and cooperation; establish social justice; and move towards eradicating prejudices against other groups and nations. Educational objectives should be critically reviewed in each country in relation to the fostering of positive human relations and mutual accommodation, not the fostering of hatred and violence. Education should encompass upbringing in the home, day care and school, and adult education.

Education for peace involves *a culture of peace that clearly identifies the ideals of peace and cultivates a will for peace*, which includes habits of mind that allow one to think critically about propaganda, favor tolerance and sympathy toward others, and behave with high ethical standards based on awareness of shared humanity. It is important to put old and obsolete rivalries into a new perspective and to teach tolerance explicitly. Beyond teaching, education must encompass the notion that at every level—individual, group, and international—violence is not a satisfactory solution to ubiquitous human conflicts. Individuals need to understand that violence breeds more violence; that with today's weapons, violence may readily become mutually suicidal; and that win-win solutions must be sought. It is vital that conflicting parties feel a sense of success by learning nonviolent ways of solving real problems and meeting basic human needs.

INSTITUTIONS THAT CAN PROMOTE EDUCATION FOR PEACE

In *No More Killing Fields*, we considered a variety of institutions and organizations that can be conducive to just peace in many ways.[37] Here we summarize a few that are of

great long- term importance. This is only a sampling of relevant, constructive influences. But they provide a framework within which effective education for peace becomes possible.

Democratic Institutions

Education for peace must include substantial content and strong emphasis on education for democracy, because this is by far the best long-term path to peaceful living. The basic orientation of democracies encourages people to attempt to see the perspectives of others and to learn mutual accommodation from early life into adulthood.[38] Pluralism is the heart of democracy. Here the attitudes of tolerance, mutual respect, and sensitivity to and protection of human rights are valued and perpetuated. The culture itself must be supportive in order for democracy to exist. Leaders of all sectors need to accept the principles of free speech, freedom of worship, the rule of law, human rights, and other fundamental ideals such as free education for all citizens. Minorities must *not* be marginalized; their rights must be respected and maintained by the majority.

Democracy is an evolving process whereby democratic values are built by civil society through nonviolent means of conflict. What are some of the positive conditions created by democracy that can help it take hold as countries emerge from hostile, repressive regimes? First, more prosperity generally exists in democratic countries than in countries with nondemocratic governments. Second, a democratic government can provide the maximum prospect for persons to exercise the opportunity to live under laws of their own choosing. Third, there is a greater chance of exercising moral responsibility within a democracy. Fourth, human development is fostered more fully than in other feasible alternatives. Fifth, the practical and fundamental notion of human equality (albeit taking into account biological and cultural variability of human experience and attributes), which gives people equality before the law, is an effective means of resolving grievances in the absence of violent conflict. Moreover, legislative and judicial processes help to diminish patterns of discrimination and provide mechanisms for dealing with grievances. This is closely linked to the ideal of equal opportunity. The main paths for implementation are through *free public education over many years* and legal protection for civil rights. It is fundamentally important to *educate specifically for democracy*—ranging from the most fundamental principles to operational details: How do democracies actually work, and especially how do they resolve conflict without violence?

The international community can and should play a strong role in fostering democracy worldwide so that as many countries as possible can share at least a minimum standard of democratic values—especially those countries that are developing socioeconomically from poor, repressive, and belligerent conditions. There is emerging a global movement of mutually supportive democratic organizations—both governmental and nongovernmental. Ever-growing communication technologies are extending the potential for international cooperation on building democracies. *Democracy in its essence is a way of resolving ubiquitous human conflicts with a minimum of violence.*

At the earliest stages of democracy building, children and youth must understand

the possibilities for nonviolent conflict resolution and the practical value that mutual accommodation holds among the different sectors of society—across all sorts of group barriers.

Human rights have been placed front and center in recent years, the significance of which is measured by the fact that nations and interest groups increasingly seek to justify their actions in human rights terms. There is extensive independent monitoring of human rights protections. Democratic institutions are the most secure protectors of human rights. These rights are increasingly recognized as having universal value in the fundamental quest for human dignity.[39] This is one of the main factors that has stimulated worldwide, visible cooperation among democratic governments.

We have shown in previous chapters how democratic principles form the necessary underpinnings for effective peace education and education for conflict resolution. In recent years, a growing worldwide interest in promoting democratic governments and institutions has begun to emerge. But what is democracy? Robert R. LaGamma, Executive Director of the Council for a Community of Democracies defines it meaningfully as "a process to allow ordinary people to act to advance their own best interests through laws and institutions. And it is a faith that ordinary people know their own best interests and do not need to be told what those interests are by leaders who interpret a reigning dogma."[40] He makes a point of distinguishing democracy as a process as opposed to a doctrine. A process allows for flexibility and interpretation. Therefore institutions and laws under a democracy can reflect the country's unique traditional practices, cultural heritage, and historical background.

Educating for peace has the best chance for success under democratic conditions, and it is heartening to see the development and acceptance of these ideals. In recent years, the full range of world democracies has joined efforts in two meetings so far to pursue a common goal of encouraging the spread of democracy, which includes civic education. The Warsaw meeting in 2000 set the stage for global democratic solidarity, followed by a similar meeting in Seoul Korea two years later, and a third meeting will be held in Chile in 2004.[41]

THE WARSAW MEETING 2000 In June 2000 Warsaw, Poland was host to a meeting of representatives from 107 countries who met to discuss international democracy issues. U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, in the Clinton Administration's final year, began this initiative with collaborators who were heads of states from several democracies. The central goal of this initiative was to encourage a cooperative spirit among democracies around the world with a joint focus on finding solutions to a range of shared problems.[42] A movement known as the Community of Democracies grew from this meeting.

Representatives from eight nations organized the Warsaw meeting: the United States, Poland, Korea, India, the Czech Republic, Chile, Mali, and Portugal. At the Warsaw meeting, high officials of foreign ministries from 107 countries deliberated on issues of international democracy. In the end, a final declaration was signed by 106 countries that pledged to do the following: Give aid to democracies that are vulnerable or in danger; form a united presence in the face of regimes under dictatorial or authori-

tarian rule; usefully coordinate assistance to democracy; and make effective, organized use of regional and international organizations that support democracies.

The committee hoped their declaration would be as significant as the Helsinki declaration of human rights of 1975 during the cold war. In fact, the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and UN membership were major benchmarks in the writing of the Warsaw Declaration. Each provided the foundation for developing a consensus on democracy and provided examples of developing norms and practices.

The Warsaw meeting highlights the importance of UN presence in such discussions.[43] Present at this historic Warsaw meeting was UN Secretary General Kofi Annan. In associating himself with the new coalition of democracies, Kofi Annan stated that the coalition is "dedicated to expanding the frontiers of freedom and to ensuring that, wherever democracy has taken root, it will not be reversed." Annan said also that "when the United Nations can truly call itself a community of democracies, the Charter's noble ideals . . . will have been much closer to fulfillment."[44]

SEOUL, KOREA 2002 In an International Herald Tribune article, John Richardson and Richard C. Rowson reported on the Community of Democracies ministerial conference meeting in Seoul, Korea, on November 9, 2002.[45] Linked to this conference was another meeting held concurrently—a forum comprised of representatives from more than 100 international nongovernmental organizations that proposed an initiative for "global civic education for democracy."[46] This was a unique proposition that reflects an urgency for such education, especially in the dim light of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

Teaching the fundamentals of democratic governance is not a new idea; it was a major highlight and requirement of U.S. policy during and after occupation of Germany and Japan. Now with threats to democracy by global terrorist activities, it is more important than ever to teach education for democracy, or civic education, in primary and secondary schools throughout the world. Nongovernmental organizations such as the National Endowment for Democracy, the Open Society Institute, Freedom House, the American Forum for Global Education, and the Council for a Community of Democracies all recognize the urgency of creating an initiative for global civic education; in fact, they helped to influence the Seoul conference planners to include this on their ministerial conference agenda.

Terrorism is bred in countries where governments fail to provide hope and opportunity for their people. Al Qaeda and others prey on a flawed educational system for their own dangerous and hateful purposes. Students emerging from such education cannot possibly be prepared in terms of values or basic tools to be effective citizens who would support human rights, rule of law, free and fair markets, and legitimate elections.

Regarding civic education, we can hope the result of the Seoul meeting will promote the following: (1) expanded commitment of governments to education for democracy, (2) expanded cooperation between governments for this purpose, (3) commitment of experienced countries to help others who have little experience in this field, and (4) appeal to international institutions to provide resources for education for democracy.

Schools and educational media must, whenever possible, promote civic education for democracy. The meeting at Seoul is potentially a turning point in the growth of a global movement on behalf of education for democracy.[47] Yet this is not the only path to education for democracy. Many organizations in many countries can, in their own distinctive ways, contribute to this great effort. It is time to move beyond lip service to stimulate the creativity of free peoples to educate their children and youth about the essence of democracy and how they can and indeed must actively participate to bring their own lives to fulfillment.

The established democracies have much work to do to strengthen education for democracy to fulfill its promise, to make adaptations in keeping with global interdependence, and to overcome inherent dangers such as the tendency to plutocracy—the corrosive effect of big money in politics. But the hardest problems involve the dictatorships and autocracies whose leaders tend to suppress such education. In this context, it is heartening to see an unprecedented UN-sponsored report prepared by Arab scholars for Arab readers that makes the case for the necessity and feasibility of democratic development in Arab countries. This remarkable report includes a significant section on education reform.

EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN DEVELOPMENT OF ARAB STATES The UN sponsored a report compiled by a team of Arab scholars for the United Nations Development Programme. The most striking weakness identified in the report, underlying all the other problems, is a lack of democracy that leads to poor governance.

The report points out that political participation in the Arab region is still very limited compared to other regions—and this region is rated lower than any other for freedom of expression and accountability of government. The Arab media was described as seriously lacking in freedom. Even when civil rights are written into constitutions and laws, they are often ignored in practice. Above all, the Arab people have been hobbled by poverty of capabilities and poverty of opportunities. In addition to a lack of freedom, failures in the areas of women's opportunities must to be remedied to help the region break out of its current inertia.

Education, too, has been moving in the wrong direction. Spending levels have fallen since the mid-1990s, and school enrolment levels are not keeping up with rapid population growth. The report strongly advocates drastic upgrading of educational opportunities and quality.

"Education is a key factor in today's knowledge-intensive world. As education stimulates a critical outlook and creative skills, it simultaneously accelerates the pace of change, development and progress. Education and progress should therefore be mutually reinforcing. To help to achieve this goal, this section proposes a radical revision of education systems in Arab countries as they move into the twenty-first century."[48]

The report covers important educational topics. The areas for educational expansion and improvement include

1. Adult education
2. Preschool education

3. Education for children with special needs
4. Technical and vocational education
5. Higher education

"A powerful shake-up to improve quality is needed in the existing institutions of higher education. . . . Higher education should encompass the concept of lifelong education through various modes of continuing learning."[49]

Although these prescriptions for fundamental reform of education in Arab countries are generally constructive and forward-looking, they have essentially nothing explicit to say about education for conflict resolution and for peace—indeed, even little about mutual accommodation among various Arab peoples. Nevertheless, there is a progressive, humane tone in the report that at least implies openings for such education in the future. These are perhaps the hardest cases in the world today, and this report offers encouraging ideas that may in several decades provide valuable results.

Development Institutions

Much of the world has been poor, uneducated, and repressed for so long that the inherent dangers of these conditions have been overlooked in the more affluent parts of the world until recently. But now serious efforts to foster socioeconomic development are growing.[50] For example, the Carnegie Corporation of New York built a program on African development in the 1980s and 1990s with a three-part focus, paying special attention to South Africa during apartheid. The first was to *build democratic institutions*. The second was to *strengthen the role of women*, with special attention to *health and education*. And the third was to promote *science and technology* that would support development. All of these measures *enhance economic opportunity* and *competent governance*. They provide a basis for hope and a sense of emerging fairness. On the other hand, failures of development are conducive to mass violence, for example, civil wars.

During the 1990s, a reexamination of the world's development experience from 1950 to 2000 took place to better understand its successes and failures. A feature of this effort was to view more broadly the development process and recognize the importance of *human* development. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) was a leader in this effort in the 1990s and provides a valuable source of analysis. The Nobel Prize winner in economic science of 1998, Amartya Sen, made a major contribution to this work. His analysis of the relevant research points to development essentially as a process of *enlarging the actual freedoms that people can utilize for meeting basic human needs* and fulfilling their potentials. Although there is worldwide economic growth and much opulence, a great number of people are still without elementary freedoms, opportunities, or minimally-adequate incomes—not to speak of the ravages of disease such as AIDS. Human development requires basic education, health care, and the ability to live in the context of *human rights*, with widespread equal opportunity and broad *political participation* in a democratic framework.

In a series of analytic papers by Joseph Stiglitz, another Nobel economist and former senior vice president of development economics and chief economist at the World

Bank, he shows that the past quarter century has experienced dramatic advances in many areas of the developing world. By investing in the health and *education* of people, economic growth is stimulated. In turn, this provides resources that can be further invested in people so they may achieve higher levels of development.

Increasing evidence points to the fact that educating girls and women is an invaluable investment in developing countries. Vast potential rests in women's contribution in the economic, intellectual, political, and social spheres. The education of women has several effects: marriage tends to be delayed past the very early teen years, and contraception is likely to be more widely used, thus easing the burden of nonsustainable population growth. Family well-being is enhanced. Borrowing and investment opportunities are improved through education, which contributes significantly to economic growth. Children raised by more informed women benefit in many ways, not least in their intellectual and problem-solving capabilities.

In our view, *knowledge, skill,* and *freedom* are the three pillars of development. And education is crucial in constructing these pillars. Altogether, democratic development is in the long run the best hope for a peaceful world. Therefore, the *processes of achieving democratic socioeconomic development through international cooperation are an essential component of peace education*.

If development is badly neglected, states fail, suffering is severe, and a human morass occurs. This is a breeding ground for pandemic diseases, disruptive and painful mass migrations, serious environmental damage, and above all, hatred, violence, and terrorism. So, major international efforts to foster constructive development are not an altruistic luxury, but rather an essential component of the quest for a just, peaceful world. *Clarification of the paths to development*, in the educational work of both rich and poor countries, *is a vital component of education for peace*.

Scientific Institutions

In virtually every corner of the world, we are faced with ubiquitous hatreds, prejudice, and threats of violent conflict. Because of its danger, complexity, and pervasiveness, this problem must become a serious issue for the global scientific community.[51] This deeply destructive tendency of humanity requires an increasingly unified and in-depth examination by researchers in the physical, biological, behavioral, and social sciences. This community of scientists can provide a crucial public service by sharing insight and new perspectives on the age-old problem of deadly conflict.

Historically, scientific inquiry in this area of aggression and conflict has been marginalized, even in many of the world's foremost educational and scientific institutions. Some useful approaches have nevertheless emerged.[52] Among these is the neurobiology of aggressive behavior, which has been explored through research into cells, circuits, and biochemistry mediating such behavior. Relative to this line of inquiry has been the role of drugs in precipitation, exacerbation, and therapy of hyperaggressive behavior. Research done on child abuse has led to increased understanding of aggression in children and youth and to influences on prosocial and antisocial development.

The behavioral sciences have recently studied many conflicts, which include stud-

ies of real-life and simulated negotiations. Inquiry has been made into ways in which past conflicts began and their subsequent resolution, and into how these relate to contemporary situations. Studies have also been made on various intergroup and international institutions and processes as they relate to large-scale conflict. Excellent historical research has emerged. This is all connected to research specifically focused on war and peace—including lessening chances of nuclear war by arms control, crisis prevention, and reducing risk of accidental or inadvertent nuclear confrontation. Improvement in relations among nuclear nations has also been studied. Many levels of conflict have been examined—from family to nations. The search for commonality of factors and basic principles in one area helps to illuminate understanding in other areas. Prejudice and ethnocentrism have been clarified by studies of intergroup relations in social psychology, anthropology, sociology, as well as evolution and history of human violence.[53] Although much more must be done, these powerful and converging lines of inquiry provide valuable insights into ways of modulating human aggressiveness and violent behavior. This can be facilitated by systematic, substantive cooperation of leading scientific institutions all over the world. A fine example is provided by the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, which (under the leadership of Bruce Alberts, its president) is linking closely with other science academies throughout the world to pursue the kinds of purposes considered here. The newly formed Inter-Academy Council is beginning to provide science-based, objective analysis of development problems such as ways of providing adequate food for Africa.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS IN EDUCATION FOR PEACE: COOPERATION AND TRUST

Writing in the late 1980s, the distinguished ethologist Robert Hinde identified several ways that education for peace can facilitate cooperative international relations involving trust.[54] This is a long and tortuous but essential process that has changed in some respects since the end of the cold war.

According to Hinde, education for peace can

- promote common appreciation of the terrible risks of weapons of mass destruction. The avoidance of arms races can be viewed as a *common goal* of mutual benefit.
- promote the general appreciation that alternative styles of international relations are possible, facilitated by changes in attitudes toward other groups—especially by moving away from dehumanizing adversaries.
- promote the idea in individuals that a new ethic in international relations is possible—one in which flaunting military or economic power to achieve national advantage is not condoned, nor is the passive acceptance of dictatorial, repressive regimes, nor the permission of massive inequities.
- increase familiarity with other nations, so that they are seen as *related human beings*, not as aliens or subhuman creatures.

- promote personal familiarity across national boundaries and the assumption that they too probably wish to live their lives peacefully unless there is clear evidence to the contrary.
- Promote trust in many ways. Personal relationships can help, not only among leaders but also among people at large—hence the value of people-to-people exchanges.
- Expand social conscience to reach the entire world population, thinking of all humans as significantly related to each other and in need of each other's help to solve global problems.

Cooperation, trust, and mutual commitment in interpersonal relationships and between groups are core concerns when educating children to be caring, thoughtful, and peaceful individuals. To build a learning environment that can promote such attributes, Hinde suggests several actions:

- Provide incentives so that the benefits of cooperating outweigh the disadvantages.
- Create short-term goals that can best be achieved by cooperation.
- Foster the establishment of mutually beneficial, long-term relationships, thereby creating a sense of familiarity and kinship.

Trust can be enhanced in environments that

- foster good communication (teacher/student and student/student as well as between groups).
- create long-term interests that are shared across boundaries and that are mutually beneficial.
- explore common values—including the fundamental shared humanity in a world of diversity.
- increase likelihood of mutual benefits from respectful communication and joint efforts.

When dealing specifically with groups as opposed to individuals, it is important to minimize the in-group–out-group effect. The challenge is to nurture understanding of other groups and strive toward appreciation without attempting to make "them" be like "us." Finally, improving a group's social conscience can be enhanced in many ways—for example, through study, games, art, movement/dance, and role-playing that explores ethical themes of decent human relationships.

The Case of Finland: An International View of Education for Peace

The distinguished psychologist Lea Pulkkinen has reviewed progress in education for peace in Finland.[55] She asserts, "Peace in one country is not enough for the protection of its citizens. Responsibility must be broadened across national borders."[56] She pro-

vides an overview of education for peace in Finland, covering the background of education for peace in Finland, peace education as compared to related terms, the attitudinal foundation in Finland, the legislative situation in Finland, and education for peace in practice. This provides a constructive illustration of one country's efforts to take this subject seriously. Other countries are proceeding in a variety of ways, and they can learn from each other.

Peace education since its inception in Finland has included the long-term goal of active peace between nations, groups, and individuals. The emphasis is on developing a framework for education, not on defining what traits a child should have. The aim is to foster growth toward shared responsibility, cooperative nonviolence, and international understanding through social and ethical education.

The Ministry of Welfare and Health in Finland in 1985 followed UNESCO's recommendation and defined education for peace as education "to help the individual grow into a critically thinking, empathetic person aware of his/her responsibilities, who in cooperation with other peers is capable of acting towards the creation of the conditions for peace of all nations. Education for peace means the gathering of information on the larger problems of humankind, the formation of attitudes favoring nonviolence and preparation for practical improvement of conditions for peace."[57]

Pulkkinen views the objectives of education for peace as twofold: the creation of a culture of peace and the cultivation of persons with a will for peace. First, creating a culture of peace means actively eliminating structural violence, decreasing the idealization of physical violence, fulfilling human rights, avoiding the glorification of weaponry, objectively analyzing the image of an enemy, and clarifying of ideals of peace. Second, cultivating a person with a will for peace involves several aspects of personal development: awareness of the goals of peace; an emotional life, which includes empathy for other people and nations; the will to assume an ethically high level of responsibility for one's own actions; and skills for resolving conflict. There are several settings in which education for peace is applicable in Finland: day care, home upbringing, schools, and adult education.

DAY CARE The psychological point of departure for peace education is the recognition of the child's age and level of development. Developmentally appropriate education for peace includes the development of empathy, role-playing capability (to help in understanding other people), and cooperative skills. Materials for social education to this end have been developed. Information is provided about the children and customs of other nations. At an early stage, there must be room in a child's thoughts for children of other nations. This room is needed since emotional responses to other nations begin to develop early and adoption of this basic attitude facilitates the acquisition of later information. Parents must help by understanding the goals of education for peace. The education of day care personnel is essential; there have been obstacles such as lack of information, and negative attitudes. In the town of Espoo, near Helsinki, it was decided to educate the whole town for peace. A daylong course in peace education was given to key personnel in early education as a launching process. Espoo was subsequently divided into 10 districts; in each one, existing day care centers were helped

to provide education for peace for both staff and parents. A variety of innovative efforts have been made in Finland to promote norms of peace early in life.

HOME UPBRINGING Literature was supplied on education for peace in the home. The material emphasized, among other issues, ensuring basic security, analyzing the effects of violent entertainment, and refraining from purchasing war toys.

SCHOOLS The action taken in schools to develop peace education moved more slowly than in day care. The Department of Public Education was slow in implementing the law but in due course moved to implementing education for international understanding and for peace. Some communities have assembled peace education materials to aid teachers. In the elementary grades, recommendations cover social and ethical education without touching the questions of war and peace. In junior high school, emphasis is taken off the historical glorification of war and shifted to peaceful development. Now, education for international understanding has achieved a more stable position in school education than has education for peace. A study of teachers in the 1980s showed that only 10 percent were active in working for peace; the majority of teachers lacked interest, because they did not feel that appropriate teaching materials were available. However, over the past 20 years, teachers have generally adopted more positive attitudes toward peace education.[58] According to Helena Kekkonen, the director and a founding member (in 1981) of the Peace Education Institute at Helsinki and a central figure in developing peace education in Finland, at the onset of the twenty-first century, 30 percent of teachers were interested in peace education. In her frequent visits to schools and teacher training colleges, she has observed that teacher trainees have a strong interest in this topic, and she noted the ease of working with schools today as compared to the past. In the 1980s, some teachers believed that education for peace was a form of political propaganda. However, that is not true today. Ms. Kekkonen and Ms. Pulkkinen have concentrated their efforts along with others to promote peace education as a general concept unrelated to party politics or political ideology—that is, focusing on the well-being of humanity everywhere.

The culture of Finland has become increasingly heterogeneous since World War II, with a recent focus on tolerance to immigrants and refugees. Finnish President Tarja Halonen actually highlighted this in her televised 2001 New Year address. There are also schools that feature tolerance as a major theme within their ethical education studies. The Peace Education Institute works in *developing countries* with immigrants and schools. It has five friendship schools in developing countries. Thus, the need for curriculum materials of high quality is highlighted. So, too, is the need for preparing teachers to provide educational leadership and the readiness to reach beyond national boundaries.

ADULT EDUCATION Education for peace among adults, in university education and informal adult education, should advance along with that of youth and children. This is the goal of Finland's Peace Education Institute, which is supported by 14 organizations. It is a resource to stimulate lifelong education in concepts and techniques rel-

evant to sustaining peace. It has had relations with other countries to assist in similar efforts.

Thus, a small country with intellectual vitality and high ethical standards is trying to elicit international cooperation in education that centers on intergroup and international relations. There are indications of growing interest and concern throughout the world. But there is still a very long way to go.

Education for Peace in Developing Countries

UNICEF has earned respect throughout the world for its activities on behalf of children's health, education, and well-being. It addressed these problems in a study published in the year 2000 by the UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre in Florence, Italy, entitled *The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict: Towards a Peacebuilding Education for Children.*[59] The goal of the study was to stimulate critical thinking about the ways in which formal and informal education have an impact on ethnically based conflict-ridden areas of the world. We hope that UNICEF will continue to build on its contributions in this field in the years ahead.

This UNICEF study emphasized that fundamental changes must occur in education at every level. Simply adding extra peace-education or conflict-resolution ideas or methods to an already complicated mix will not yield the desired results for peace, especially in societies riddled by ethnic strife. It is easier to add educational initiatives than to alter old ones, principally because changing old initiatives poses a threat to regional political authority. However, without convergence between political, methodological, and educational resources, there can be little if any meaningful support from these essential players toward maintaining systemic change.

As noted in Chapter 4 ("Teaching Hatred"), education can actually be a negative force that fuels potential and actual violent conflicts around the world. Even curricula that defend ideals of tolerance and egalitarianism can be overwhelmed by an intolerant and inegalitarian social climate. In matters of identity, education, and conflict, both global hemispheres are affected. Both of them divide along lines of class and/or color and are upheld by relevant authorities in political, social, and economic spheres, thus reinforcing depreciatory and hostile attitudes.

The UNICEF study revolves around four central themes, which we summarize here: (1) education's negative face, (2) the positive side of education, (3) principles for education to build peace, and (4) goals of peacebuilding education.

EDUCATION'S NEGATIVE FACE Through education, peace can be destroyed and conflict encouraged or maintained, especially where conflicts are based on rigid identity. An unfair balance of social, economic, and political privileges can be continued by unequal distribution of education. When education is used as a weapon, a culture can be depreciated along with personal self-worth. Similarly, the discriminatory denial of education can stimulate conflict. Education can distort the meaning of historical events for political ends. Stereotypes, inequality, and inferiority are ensured by segregated education. Textbooks that do not encourage creative thinking rob children of problem-

solving capacities and keep them from constructive paths of resolving conflicts and moving toward peace.

THE POSITIVE SIDE OF EDUCATION By contrast, education can exert a powerfully decent impact. Constructive opportunities in education can reduce the risk of violent conflict. Education can promote and sustain a climate of ethnic tolerance. It can also discourage segregated patterns of intergroup thinking. It can further ideals of inclusive citizenship and avoid glorification of violence in history. Education, broadly speaking, can promote all forms of peaceful orientations and counteract oppression by the state.

PRINCIPLES FOR EDUCATION TO BUILD PEACE The *process* of building peace is highlighted, as opposed to achieving an end product. It must be understood that educating for peace is not a quick fix; rather it must be built and measured over the long term. Local resources should be accessed more than relying on contributions from external players. Education that seeks to build peace will envision the creation of opportunities for all and avoid imposing putative solutions on depreciated groups.

GOALS OF PEACEBUILDING EDUCATION Promoting peaceful, sustainable change agents rather than legitimizing the use of violence to address problems is central to any education focused on peacebuilding. Interethnic conflict is inherently complex, but two key issues must be examined to pursue reconciliation. First, assess the situation for possible shared values that might help communities find a common ground from which to build peace on the basis of mutual benefits. Second, encourage a spirit of joint participation rather than aggressive competition.

Talking Peace: The Unique Contribution of a Great Peacemaker

In a remarkable book for children, *Talking Peace*, President Jimmy Carter (winner of the 2002 Nobel Peace Prize), provides "a vision for the next generation."[60] It is a richly informed and accessible account of fundamental issues in war and peace, throughout history and in the contemporary world. He starts with his own historic achievements in making peace between Israel and Egypt, looking back at the Camp David process. He identifies food, shelter, and health care as foundations for peace. He covers protecting the environment: the earth, our home. As he did in his pioneering foreign policy, he emphasizes human rights, mediation, and elections. He closes by advising young people on what they can do to prevent war in the future. In our judgment, this book should be required reading, at a minimum, in schools of all the established democracies.

CONCLUSION

Educating for peace, even in developed and industrialized areas of the world, is very limited. The history of peace education dates back at least to the mid–nineteenth cen-

tury, and much has been learned. With recent advances in developmental psychology and social psychology, there is a solid foundation for practical application. We have seen how research has led to practice in educating for conflict resolution and peace, not only in the classroom, but also at the community level through after-school programs for children and youth, and through adult education. However, a comprehensive infusion of these promising techniques into mainstream education is still needed—and so is further research and innovation.

Typically, it has been the industrialized democracies of the North who have had the chance to put these techniques into practice. Neighbors in the South and other developing countries can benefit from the lessons learned; these concepts can be adapted to their unique cultures. But it is a daunting task by virtue of living conditions that so often prevail in these areas of the world. Poverty, illness, lack of basic education, and threats of violent outbreaks are conditions that interfere with teaching about peace. Indeed, educating for peace sometimes seems like a luxury only available to those whose basic needs have been met. But paradoxically, it is also a necessity. It will be very hard to meet basic needs without minimizing violence. So how do we begin to create conditions conducive to teaching about peace, tolerance, and conflict resolution in developing areas of the world that could ultimately benefit greatly? We try to answer this complex question by touching on the crucial elements of democracy and development, which, when taken together, compose the foundation of any society wishing to educate for peace and achieve its profound benefits. In chapter 14 we considered how advances in information technology can facilitate this process. In chapter 18 we show how universities in worldwide cooperation can strengthen the intellectual underpinnings of the whole enterprise.