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CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Nature And Concept Of Peace Education:

In the contemporary world, understanding of peace varies from country to country and within different cultural context. Many people think of peace as a tranquility or the absence of war and conflict. But peace is a positive concept that implies much more than the absence of war and conflicts. Peace comes not only from the absence of conflict of life but the ability to cope with life. Peace involves standard of justice, living in balance with nature and providing meaningful participation of citizens in their government. “Peace a concept” has been defined by Toel Kovel as a state of existence where: Neither the overt violence of war, nor the covert violence of unjust systems are used as an instrument for extending the interests of a particular nation or group. It is a world where basic human needs are met and in which justice can be obtained, conflicts resolve through non-violence means and human and material resources are shared for the benefit of all people. Thus, ‘Peace’ is a concept that motivates the imagination, connotes, more than ‘non-violence’. It implies human beings working together to resolve conflicts, respect standards of justice, satisfy basic needs and honour human rights. Peace involves a respect for life and for the dignity of each human being without discrimination or pre-judice. Peace is not a new concept. It is something which is prevalent right from the beginning of human history. People always strived for peace from time
immemorial. The idea of war may not have been in the minds of man but the idea of peace has always been there in the minds of man.

There are two core concepts of Peace Education, namely, “Negative Peace” and “Positive Peace”. Negative Peace is easy to exemplify and define. In simple words, Negative Peace can be defined as the absence of direct, organised + physical violence. Woolvan (1985) refers negative peace as mere absence of war. This definition is based on Johan Galtung’s ideas of peace. For Galtung, Negative Peace is defined as a requiring set of social structures that provide security and protection from acts of direct physical violence committed by individuals, groups or nations. The emphasise is on control of violence. The main strategy is dissociation, whereby conflicting parties are separated. In general, policies based on the idea of negative peace donot deal with the causes of violence, only it’s manifestations. Therefore, these policies are thought to be insufficient to assure lasting conditions of peace. Indeed, by suppressing the release of tensions resulting from social conflict negative peace efforts may actually lead to future violence of greater magnitude.

Positive Peace on the other hand can be defined as the absence of structural violence and emphasises promotion of human rights to ensure a comprehensive motion of social justice. It is a pattern of co-operation and integration between major human groups. It is about people interacting in co-operative ways, it is about social organisations of diverse people who willingly chose to co-operate for the benifit of all human kind. Positive Peace calls for a system in which there are no winners and losers; it is a state so highly valued that institutions are built around it to protect and promote it. It also involves for search for positive conditions which can resolve the underlying causes of conflicts that cause violence. The strategies used for this
purpose are called ‘associative’ and they are characterised by a high level of social interaction which enables more rapid resolutions of conflicts by providing maximum contacts through which solutions may arise.

Apart from this, there can be “Cold Peace”, “Hot Peace”, “Inner Peace” and “Outer Peace”. In cold peace, there is almost a neutral view of a previous enemy. There is little mutual hostility, but, there is also a lack of mutually beneficial interactions aimed at developing trust, independence and collaboration.

By contrast, Hot Peace involves active collaborative effort designed to “build bridges” between and among past and present adversaries. This involves searching for common ground and the development of new non-human enemies --- threats to the health and well being of human-kind and the planet. These new enemies could include human rights abuses, air and water pollution, dwindling energy resoures, the destruction of the ozone layers, famine, poverty and ignorance. Hot peace promotes, and indeed defined by --- global independence, human rights, democratization, an effective united nations, and a diminution of national sovereignty. The object is the proliferation of co-operative relations and mutually beneficial outcomes. Hot peace thinking imagines peace and the abolition of war.

Inner Peace is the peace that take place within the individual. Some people believe that this inner peace can be strengthened through our relationship with the Divine. Inner peace involves peace of mind and absence of fear.

Outer Peace is peace in the society. In India, there is, in general, a greater stress on inner peace. But in the West, there is more emphasise on outer peace. But there is a need of both innerpeace and outer peace. This need has given rise to a new
concept of a culture of peace, which is known as Holistic Inner and Outer Peace. It has both Spiritual and material Dimension.

The concept of peace encompassed existence preservation by providing external security, but also the requirement for human existence to be able to develop in the form of health, satiety and well-being. The nature of peace education is shown in the form of a diagram in fig. 1.

![Peace Education Diagram](image)

**Fig.1-Nature of peace education**

Peace Education is flexible in a violent world. The societal necessity of peace education focusses on the need of insight to be given to global issues and to bring changes accordingly and the people in general need to be educated in order to be aware of the fact that the global society should be made more peaceful. Hence, concept of peace education is understood as creating a culture of peace, building a
non-violent and just society which is essential for the survival of human beings on this Earth. It also provides knowledge to be applicable to the problems of re-forming and re-structuring the present conflicting and violent human society to make it peaceful, unified and violence-free.

2.2 Aims Of Peace Education:

Peace education is the knowledge and skill of attaining peace. As such the overall aim of Peace Education is to help build a peaceful world. But in order to build a peaceful world peace education should be imparted with some specific aim. Therefore the main aims of peace education should be to:

- Prepare the world for children and youth making it better, healthy, safe peaceful and united; and to prepare the children for such a world.

- Contribute and help creating an united world order which will ensure and safeguard the ‘Right to a Safe Future’ for world’s children and generation yet unborn.

- Assist the participating populations in establishing an all-inclusive civilization of peace.

- Create in children’s minds desire to learn how nonviolence can provide the basis for a just and sustainable future.

- Create a better learning environment where conflict and relationships may be explored.
• Sharpen awareness about the existence of hostile relationships between people and within and between nations.

• Create a more peaceful world where all of us may become agents for change. Thus, Peace Education gives us the skills that will assist in achieving peaceful societies.

• Understand the nature and origins of violence and its effect on both victim and perpetrator.

• Investigate the cause of conflicts and violence embedded within perceptions, values and attitudes of individuals as well as within social and political structures of society.

• Equip children and adults with personal conflict resolution skills, so that when they are faced with conflict, they will choose to be peaceful.

• Show people that violence and war are learned and not an intrinsic part of human nature and that it is possible to resolve conflict peacefully.

• Encourage the search for alternatives and possible nonviolent skills.

• Correct the limited understanding of peace held by many people that it is the absence, however contrived, of direct violence, of wounding and killing.

• Seeks to build on the philosophy and the processes of nonviolence to help us understand the role that conflict and violence have played in our own lives, seeking ways to transform them.
• Educate every new generation of students to become peacemakers and to devote their talents, capacities, and energies towards the creation of a civilization of peace based on the twin pillars of a culture of peace and a culture of healing.

2.3 Objectives of Peace Education:

Peace Education is actually a call for an inclusive approach to mutual coexistence and to a holistic way of living. A holistic way of living implies to live in peace with others and with the environment in all perspective. Peace Education is also a gateway that takes people to various avenues of learning to appreciate our differences, but honestly and sincerely addressing the imbalances.

Peace Education can be taught in formal and informal school setting with following objectives:

• To foster changes in order to make the World a better and more humane place.

One way of making the world a better and more humane place is to create the culture of peace in the mind of our learners. It can be done by thinking of the primary goals of reducing and eliminating violence, and enhancing and universalizing human dignity and equality. Nowadays the normative, behavioral, institutional, existential obstacles and the global problems together are equally contributed towards the worldwide manifestations of the culture of war. So, it is crucial to instill the theoretical construct and applied aspects of the concept of peace in the minds of students and teachers in order to build a safe and habitable world.
through Peace Education. So keeping the objectives in the mind, it is important to guide our learners towards a clear comprehension of the major obstacles to a culture of peace.

Peace Education will also enable to understand that war and other forms of physical, economic, political, ecological and gender violence are not of the same order as natural disasters, and these are not inevitable eventualities to be prepared for; just these are the consequences of human will and intent, and can be avoided, even eliminated entirely, if human will and intent so desire. So, the students can be prepared for peace as intentionally and systematically with the effective implementation of Peace Educations in formal and informal school setting to make the world a better and more humane place.

- To develop values and skills to assist the students in striving for the fullness of life.

Peace Education can reach out of the poor and non-poor, advantaged and disadvantaged governing and non-governing and elite and non-elite sectors of society by developing values and skills for potential influence. Peace Education emphasizes the crucial role of values formation through its pedagogical processes. In this line Peace Education needs to be very explicit about its preferred values, such as compassion, justice, equity, gender fairness, caring for life, sharing, reconciliation, integrity, hope and active nonviolence. Those values and skills may be conducive to peace, nonviolence and an active commitment to build a cooperative and caring democratic society. So it is believed that Peace Education will definitely cultivate such values and skills to think constructively about both physical and social issues.
and to develop constructive values and skills towards striving for the fullness of life and solving problems that arise in their communities through peaceful means.

- To help students develop a rich vision of peace to work for a viable global society.

Peace Education is a process that prepares students for global responsibility which enables them to understand the nature and implications of global interdependent; and helps them to accept responsibility by eradicating human ills ranging from injustice, inequality, prejudice, intolerance, abuse of human rights, environmental destruction, violent conflict and so forth in order to create a world of justice and peace. Peace Education if generalized and systematic can enhance the capacity of schools and universities to increase the pool of future social leaders committed towards working for a viable global society. Peace Education is constantly encouraging learners towards outside and innermost values that shape their understanding of realities and their actions in the world through the strong indicator of peaceful pedagogy. The constructive Peace Education curriculum will blend hopefulness and faith of all students to exercise patience, commitment, courage, interdependence, compassion and sensitivity for the needs of others in transforming their realities to create a rich vision for peace.

- To create constructive behaviours for dealing with problems so as to minimize and eliminate conflict.

Conflicts are a phenomena associated within inevitable outcome of co-existence in all societies. They are an expression of tensions and incompatibilities between different, mutually independent groups with regard to their respective
needs, interest and values. These conflicts are liable to lead to crises and destructive escalations affecting global society. But the problem is not the conflicts by itself, but the way in which they are managed and resolved. Hence Peace Education will help develop peace building capacity by offering students the necessary knowledge with which to analyze and think about the causes, management, resolution and transformation of violent conflict in a depoliticized, safe and educationally rewarding context.

A culture of peace can be achieve when citizens of the world understand global problems; have the skills to resolve conflict constructively; know and live by international standards of human rights, gender and equality; appreciate cultural diversity; and respect the integrity of the Earth. Such learning cannot be achieved without intentional, sustained and systematic education for peace. In this sense Peace Education aims to make students become concerned about the damage that is being caused by conflict, to become motivated to try out these skills in a real situation; to try out new behaviours such as negotiating in a cooperative manner in a conflict situation and to make a commitment to continuing to use and learn about non-violent methods of handling conflict. Thus conflict can be understood as the central goal and core of Peace Education. The main objective of Peace Education is to create construct behaviours which are essential to deal with problems, so as to minimize and eliminate conflict.

- To explore peace both as a state of being and as an active process for the promotion of positive human relations
The Study of Peace Education would enable students to appreciate differences, to discover similarities, and to develop empathy for others and all other necessary skills for the promotion of positive human relations. By the process of exploring peace through peace instruction students can enjoy the environment, value the relationship of man and environment and then they will start working individually and collectively for the betterment of the world. Acceptance of culture is another way in which this world would be so much better, so much richer realizing that race, gender, ethnicities are things to be celebrated not hated. The vast variations in our skin colour are fascinating and beautiful. Males and females each have equally important contributions to make our world and our ethnicities help us to have different perspectives and experiences that we can all learn from. We could just accept each other. Acceptance of each other is very necessary. If man can embrace the idea that inspite of the differences and uniqueness all are same, then the world will be a much better place to live in. In this sense Peace Education help us to explore peace both as a state of being and as an active process for the promotion of positive human relations.

2.4 Rationale For Peace Education:

The futility of violent solutions to international conflicts (as in Iraq, Afghanistan, Bosnia, the great lakes region) and the growing concerns over the continual prevalence of multiple forms of violence, coupled with visions of a peaceful world have resulted in suggestions for, and implementation of, multiple strategies for building peace through education (Carter, 2008; Brenes-Castro, 2004). Moreover, the significance of peace education has also been affirmed in official documents of UNESCO (1996, 1995a, 1994) and the Hague Appeal for Peace
All these stress considerable international institutional commitment to the implementation of peace education. According to Fountain (1999), peace education is firmly grounded in the vision of education set forth in the 1990 Jomtien Declaration. It is also based on the articles of the convention on the rights of the child, which aim to eliminate all forms of violence against children, both overt and structural, and to promote an environment of rights in which peace can flourish. Peace education is a right of all children, not only those living in situations of armed conflict, but also a long-term process that can take place in any learning environment. The relevance of peace education was clearly stressed by Fredrick Mayor- Secretary General of UNESCO, (UNESCO, 2005), when he asserts that; “If education is the only defence against human catastrophe, peace education is the soul of education that can create the shield for human survival on the planet earth. It is only through peace education that peace can be installed in human mind as an antidote to war is in the minds of men”. Peace education is based on the assumptions that young people can develop peace-promoting knowledge through learning about causes of violence and processes for ending it (Lantieri and Patti, 1996; Johnson and Johnson, 1995). Moreover, all individuals have the capacity or potential for individual peacefulness and this capacity can be developed as a consequence of social learning processes (Sommerfelt et al., 2008). This assumption is only valid in situations where the means to learning are by peaceful means. However, in situations in which learning processes are authoritarian and monological, competitive, violent and exclusionary, such learning may not lead to individual peacefulness.
2.5 Philosophy Of Peace Education:


However one intriguing and lingering lacuna within the critical literature has been the failure to develop and expound systematic philosophical foundations for peace education. This lacuna is also evident in the considerable international documentation dealing with the importance of peace education. The Preamble to the Charter of the United Nations (1945), the Constitution of UNESCO (1945) and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1949) all contain statements undergirding the importance of peace education. Since then the enunciation of the importance of peace education has become more explicit within international pronouncements and
declarations. Peace education has been affirmed within official documents of UNESCO (1974, 1980, 1994/5, 1996), UNICEF (1996, 1999), the UN General Assembly (1978, 1995, 1996, 1999, 2002), and the Hague Appeal for Peace (1999). Moreover, there is considerable institutional commitment to peace education. At last count, UNESCO (2000) listed 580 peace research and training institutes around the world. One could argue that such an international commitment presents or represents legitimacy for peace education, as the importance of a commitment to peace education has been repeatedly endorsed by the United Nations and by the action of societies and governments in establishing peace research and training. Nevertheless it remains that case that within such a commitment there is no well developed philosophical rational for peace education, other than perhaps a general deontological notion that peace education is something humanity ought to be committed to. The current philosophical approach to peace education within the critical literature and by international organizations might be described as being almost a fideistic one. Actually, it can be said that the importance of believing in peace and peace education has been taken for granted. Such an approach may be understandable, although it nevertheless does not serve to provide or advance any fundamental educational rationale for peace education. Ilan Gur-Ze'ev rightly suggests (2001) that this lack of theoretical coherence or philosophical elaboration for peace education is not always viewed as a bad thing, as “at times philosophical work is understood as unnecessary, artificial, or even dangerous for this educational cause”. Gur-Ze'ev develops a critique of peace education as justification or rationalization of what is often a violent status quo, what Gur-'ev calls hegemonic violence. The very fact that Gur-Ze'ev makes such a critique underscores the
importance of exploring the potential foundations for peace education. What follows is an outline of five possible areas of philosophical foundation for peace education, namely, virtue ethics, consequentialist ethics, aesthetic ethics, conservative political ethics, and the ethics of care.

2.5.1 Virtue Ethics And Peace Education:

Virtue ethics has been undergoing something of a renaissance in recent decades, and there has been particular interest in the relationship between virtue ethics and education. There are many ethicists who have been prominent in this revival, although two of the most influential have been Alasdair McIntyre (1985) and Rosalind Hursthouse (1999). There is much support for a virtue ethics in world religions, and throughout much of human history ethics has been virtue ethics. Two of the standard historical sources for virtue ethics remain the work of Aristotle (1984) and Thomas Aquinas (1963-1975). It is noteworthy also that there is much popular writing that implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) works upon a virtue ethics basis. There is much to be said for the suggestion that the revival of virtue ethics reflects an ethical response that empowers the individual or that seeks to empower the individual, at a time when social systems tend to dictate that the individual is of no significance. It is probably fair to say that the revival of educational interest in virtue ethics relates to concerns over a perceived loss of a public sense of social civility, perceived increases in levels of personal aggression and violence, and a perceived diminution of an overall commitment to ethical conduct. The arguable virtue ethics basis for peace education is related to the emphasis within virtue ethics on the importance of the development of character or virtue. If we agree that education is concerned with the development of character, then an important
element of character development is to develop and encourage harmonious and co-operative relations between individuals. Similarly, a fundamental aim of education should be to develop the character and personality that will value harmonious and co-operative relations between individuals. In a sense, if we say that respect for others and active non-violence are virtues, then it follows, from a virtues ethics approach to education, that education should aim to encourage and develop those virtues. The interesting point about a virtue ethics approach to peace education is that this approach has much in common with the theory of intrapersonal peace, and especially as developed within the theory of nonviolent action. Within his life and writings, Gandhiji continually emphasized the importance of nonviolent action based upon the inner commitment of the actor to truth. Indeed within Gandhian thought nonviolence is thought of as truth-force or satyagraha. Peace was not a set of actions or even a state of affairs. Peace is a character orientation on the part of the individual. Similarly virtue ethics emphasizes not action as such but rather the state of the actor. It is significant that virtue ethics is sometimes referred to as agent-based ethics: within both virtue ethics and within much peace theory it is who you are which is of prime importance. What we do derives its significance from who we are.

2.5.2 Consequentialist Ethics And Peace Education:

Consequentialist ethics is another emergent area of ethical theory that may serve as an area of foundation for peace education. Consequentialism is the ethical doctrine that the morality of any action is to be assessed by the consequences of that action. There are variations of consequentialism such as act and rule consequentialism, although undeniably the most identifiable form of consequentialism is utilitarian philosophy, in which the consequences (and worth) of
actions are determined by the degree of overall well-being or happiness resulting from those actions. The utilitarian tradition is perhaps best represented through the writing of Jeremy Bentham (1970) and John Stuart Mill (1877). Consequentialist/utilitarian ethics have been emerging for some time, although it is still arguable that such ethics are implicitly the ethics of a modern mass society, in that it is only with the rise of democratic theory that the well-being of the greatest number of people would be considered relevant to ethics and it is only a modern scientific society which can measure that well-being. It is interesting that so few contemporary philosophers claim the title of consequentialism, possibly due in part to the situation so much of the operation of modern societies and political structures are already undergirded (at least in theory) by such an ethical philosophy.

It is arguable that consequentialist ethics basis for peace education is the most obvious, and most writing on the importance of peace education or education for peace implicitly works on a consequentialist basis. The basis for a consequentialist ethics approach to peace education goes something like this: what we teach and how we teach has an effect in forming the sort of society we live in. This proposition is not always articulated, although in some ways is quite self-evident. If there were not some implied hope of betterment through education and teaching, then we would not be expending the effort in education and teaching. Conversely, what we fail to teach and our failure in how we teach also has an impact in the type of world we will live in. From a perspective of peace education, therefore, it is important to teach, both through content and example, that there are alternatives to conflict and injustice. In particular, from a perspective of peace education, it is important to teach of the unnecessary suffering resulting from war.
and resulting from social injustice. If what we teach and how one teaches has consequences, it follows that one of the aims of education therefore should be to encourage students to think about the type of world we would want to have, and to empower them to create such a world. Thus when we say that there is a danger of nuclear war and that we need to teach about this danger, the assumption within such a proposition is a consequentialist one, namely, that by teaching young people about nuclear war they might in the future make political decisions to move away from reliance on nuclear weapons and perhaps also to become committed to nuclear disarmament. The interesting point about a consequentialist ethics approach to peace education is that this does find links in other forms of approaches to curriculum and education. What is sometimes known as Social Reconstructionism works on the basis that we can and should aim to reform society through the educational process. The more recent emphasis on critical literacy is undergirded by an assumption that individuals with critical insight are more able to challenge and ultimately change the (unjust) social structures of society. Critics might suggest that all such approaches are highly political. Advocates of such approach would say that there are not so much political as moral. If there is social danger we have a responsibility to educate about this danger so that future generations might do something to avert the danger.

2.5.3 Aesthetic Ethics And Peace Education:

A third possible philosophical basis for peace education is within the area of aesthetics, and in particular within aesthetic ethics. Traditionally, aesthetic ethics is most often contrasted with moral ethics, substantially due to the influential Kantian insistence that moral action must be counter-inclinal – the moral act is only that act which is performed with regard to duty alone, and not out of sympathy.
However, in recent years the separation between the moral and the aesthetic has been challenged, and many writers have argued for a rehabilitation of the unity of aesthetics and ethics. The proponents of such a rehabilitation include Heesoon Bai, Marcia Eaton, Josef Früchtl, André Leverkühn, Martin Seel, and Jean-Pierre Wils, although arguably there are precursor elements to an aesthetic ethics in the writing of those such as John Dewey (1960), Friedrich Schiller (2000), Albert Schweitzer (1923a, 1923b, 1931) and Ludwig Wittgenstein (2001). Aesthetic ethics in a modern sense refers to actions based upon judgments about what is beautiful or desirable, or in a more general sense, about what is considered to be of value. The line between discourse on aesthetic judgments and value judgments is a blurred one: in some ways when we talk about aesthetics we are also talking about values and what we consider valuable and worthwhile. One can maintain that all of education is undergirded by aesthetic judgments or judgments as to what is beautiful and desirable. If we believe that peace, that is, harmonious and cooperative relations between individuals and societies, is a beautiful thing, a valuable thing in itself, then we should not be ashamed in having this as a stated objective within the curriculum. We should not reticent or ashamed at articulating the importance of peace education.

Interestingly, the application of aesthetic ethics to education finds resonance in the influential writing of Richard Stanley Peters. Peters would be not normally considered as a proponent of aesthetic ethics. Nevertheless, the importance of the aesthetic dimension of education is a recurrent theme in the writing of Peters (1964, 1966). Moreover, the idea of education as an initiation into worthwhile activities, prominent within the work of Peters, assumes that there are specific activities that
are intrinsically valuable or worthwhile, and that the act of valuing something intrinsically is important.

2.5.4 Conservative Political Ethics And Peace Education:

The fourth potential basis for peace education is within emergent conservative political theory and ethics, and in particular aspects of conservative political thought, such as an aversion to violent social change, an aversion to a priori reasoning, and an emphasis on the importance of a strong and stable nation-state. The notion of conservative political theory is at surface a contradictory one, as writers within what might be called a conservative intellectual tradition tend to be antagonistic to political ideology as such. The most influential thinker within the conservative political tradition has been Edmund Burke (1969), although more recently the writing of Michael Oakeshott (1962) and Anthony Quinton (1978) has also been highly influential. It is significant that within the work of all three of the above there is not an absolute opposition to social change as such, but rather a commitment to gradual and orderly (we might say peaceful) change. Such a vision is entirely consistent with the vision of peaceful social transformation through peace education. If we examine the three emphases within conservative thought, that is, aversion to violent social change, aversion to a priori reasoning and emphasis on a strong and stable nation state, we can believe that there are strong linkages to the notion of peace and the project of peace education within each of these. The conservative aversion to violent social change finds an obvious resonance in peace theory and education. Indeed one can say that both peace advocates and conservatives share a common interest in peaceful social change. Peaceful social change generally (although not always) means orderly social change. This is why
conservative political theory generally emphasizes continuity with the past and with past experience, as without such continuity social change cannot be orderly. Similarly, without order and structures, such as the nation-state, there is all the more potential for violence. Individuals and societies need not be violent. Nevertheless, humankind will remain ultimately always imperfect, and structures need to be in place to cover that contingency. Each of the above three aspects of conservative political ethics can be argued to be highly problematic. The aversion to violent social change can be argued to reflect an opposition to all social change, and a commitment to the status quo. Certainly that is the popular understanding of conservatism. The aversion to a priori reasoning and the notion of the human imperfectability can be taken as an aversion to all ideology and vision, which again is not necessarily the case within conservative political theory. One can argue that within conservative political theory one can have even a utopian vision of a peaceful society, although within conservative political theory there is an emphasis that the implementation of this vision should be an orderly one. It can also be argued that a commitment to the nation-state within conservative political theory is not consistent with the aims of peace education, given that war is a phenomenon linked with the nation-state, and one of the emphases within peace education is to pose alternatives to nationalism and the nation-state. However the above is not necessarily a contrast. The statist emphasis within conservative political ethics is on a stable rather than a totalitarian nation-state. Such an emphasis does not preclude change (through such measures as education) towards acceptance of larger collectivities, be this in terms of international co-operation or even international government. Properly understood,
political conservatism is not necessarily opposed to change. The emphasis is merely that the change should be a peaceful one.

2.5.5 The Ethics Of Care And Peace Education:

The final philosophical basis for peace education is within the emergent ethics of care. The ethics of care is usually associated with the writing of Carol Gilligan (1982, 1995), Nel Noddings (1984, 1992, 1995) and Sara Ruddick (1989), who have emphasized the importance of the discovery or re-discovery of a feminine or caring perspective in ethics. But here it is important not to limit the ethics of care as a specifically feminine ethics, but rather to articulate a universal ethics of care. It is not merely women who are naturally caring, but, properly understood, both women and men. The work of Sara Ruddick is especially relevant for peace education, in that Ruddick attempts to develop a philosophical basis for a politics of peace through the notion and practice of maternal thinking. While talking about the importance of parenting, one should emphasize the importance of both fathering and mothering in the nurturing process. Nonetheless, however we frame it, the important point of the ethics of care is that nurturing (caring) ought to be the dominant guiding principle in how we act towards others.

One of the specific emphases within an ethics of care is that actions should be relationship based rather than based upon principles and perceptions of what is just. Thus in what we do we should concentrate on value such as nurturing and kindness rather than on rights and duties. The discourse of rights and duties invites the question of how those rights and duties ought to be enforced. The notions of rights and duties are subtly linked to power and domination, and to enforcement and
coercion. In some ways the ethics of care is very reminiscent of situationalist ethics. Within situationalist ethics the emphasis is that in deciding how to act in any situation one should act out of an agapeistic or altruistic concern for the other. In Gandhian thought this concern for the other is expressed through the notion of *ahisma*, or love-force. This concern for the other therefore should be the guiding principle and should override all over principles of what is moral or right. It is not too difficult to see the potential connection between the ethics of care and education for peace. Peace is ultimately about relationships. This includes relationships between individuals and relationships between collectivities such as nation-states. On a deeper level, peace also concerns the relationship of a person with one’s own self and the relationship of humanity with the environment. However the connection does not end there. An important dimension of the causation of war and conflict is an insistence and concentration upon national rights and national justice. An ethics of care does not suggest that national rights and national justice are not important, but rather caring for individuals is more important. Peace education itself is also about relationships. Put quite simply, we learn within the context of and from relationships, and peace education is concerned with establishing a nurturing and supportive relationships. Curriculum content is important. However what is far more important is the relationship between the teacher and the student, and the institution and the student, within all levels of education. Ultimately it is only the nurturing and supportive relationship through which an individual can learn peace education.

2.6 Historical Development Of Education For Peace:

Madam Montessori said, “All education is for peace.” Even then we find history of education entrusted with the responsibility of making secure ‘peace’ in the
world. In 1910, an eminent American philosopher William James wrote an essay, "The Moral Equivalent of War", stating that educators and teachers should wage a campaign against militaristic thinking that was perverting civilization.

Formally, historical development of Education for peace began since around the First World War in 1918. The Document "Education and the People's Peace, (1943) states: "The World Was ended with the belief that a war was fought to end the war and to make the world safe for democracy." The peoples all over the world started struggling to attain to decent and peaceful world by means, other than was because they have experienced the catastrophe of war. The people began to believe that, a world is possible where men can learn to walk together in dignity and peace. After Armistice, education became the chief concern of the statesmen of the world.

In July, 1919, a Peace Convention of Nations Education Association, U.S.A. met in Milwaukes, United States. The convention passed strong resolutions and urged, "the creation of an International Commission of Education ........ to provide for a world education in the elements of democratic citizenship and the extension of the privilege of education to all people and to all classes.

Further all successive conventions favoured the establishment of the 'League of Nations" but it was intensively believed that "the only league of Nations that gives any assurance of a permanent peace is the league which teachers of the earth shall write in the minds and hearts of the children. All conventions faithfully reflected the optimism of the moment. The educators raised their voices and warned that, "it will be futile to ........ establishment of a League of Nations unless there is back of peace terms and of the League of Nations, a world-citizenry. A peace
founded on coercion can never survive: only a peace founded upon ... a mutuality of purpose secured through definitely planned system of education stands a chance of surviving.

The League of Nations was founded in 1920 with the hope of preserving peace in the world. But The ‘League’ had limited scope in resolving conflicts between nations because it was not able to successfully mediate. However the ‘League of Nations Union’ promoted ‘Education for International Understanding’ and ‘Education for world Citizenship’ in England. Despite, the earnest efforts of League of Nations to maintain peace in the world, the Second World War (1939-45) was fought. The whole world experienced the pain of the catastrophe of the wars again. It was believed at international level that, the Great War cunningly contrived conspiracy carried to its tragic climax through an educational system. Further, it was declared that “Unless ............... the children of all freedom are trained effectively in all of those habits and arts that make the national solidarity and strength and for international sympathy and understanding, the safety of civilization cannot be guaranteed, even by the League of Nations. A world half educated will be only half free.” Though emphasis was placed on the economic cause of war but it was also thought that, all mankind’s hope will come crashing down again, if people fail once more to add certain educational factors to the support of peaceful organization of the world. I was believed that knowledge and attitude that are conducive to peace can be developed only by education, so are the knowledge and attitude that contain the seeds of war. It was felt that, “by appropriate educational measures and intelligent desire for peace, with an understanding of the conditions necessary for maintaining it, must be fostered among all the people in every part of the world.” But it was also
believed that no nation can wisely and safely conduct such education unless all nations do so.

With aforestated conditions as a general frame work, the Document proposed the conscious and systematic use of organized education to help establish and maintain the people’s peace after the people’s war. The Document emphatically declared,” this powerful force of education must be fully and wisely used in mankind’s next and perhaps last chance to built a peaceful world.” During the period of World War II people of world community, with growing clarity of vision, started thinking in the direction of achieving a growing measure of freedom and fair play of all men. The whole purpose of struggle changed from a defensive to a creative basis. They strived to seek long term measures to stop the war and terminate the fear of catastrophe and violence in the world. Consequently amidst ideological commotions, United Nations Organization (UNO) was founded in January, 1942. It was a coalition to resist the aggression of the axis of powers in World War II formed of 26 nations initially. In 1945, original membership was formed of 51 states. Today, there are 192 member states.

The Charter of UN enumerated measures for the prevention of war and removal of threats to peace in the World. The founding of the United Nations provided an impetus for an international effort to teach about the problems associated with war, violence, injustice, illiteracy, poverty and other sources of human conflicts. In keeping with the principles of the UN Charter, that promoted international co-operation and peace, the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) was founded in November 1945 as a specialized UN agency and set in motion with the objectives: to contribute to peace and security
by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of the law and for the human rights and fundamental freedom which are affirmed for the peoples of the world without distinction of race, sex, language or religion by the Charter of the United Nations (UNESCO, 2004).

        The UNESCO was assigned the tasks of advancing through the educational, scientific and cultural relations of the people of the world, the objectives of international peace and of the common welfare of mankind for which United Nations Organization was established and which its Charter proclaimed. Hence the preamble of the constitution of the UNESCO reflected It’s motto as : Since war begins in the minds of man, it is in the minds of men that the defense of peace must be constructed.1

Since its inception, UNESCO is carrying out its mission according to the terms of its Constitution which was created to build a world from which the specter of war has to be banished. The last six decades have witnessed several significant advocacies by UNESCO for Education for Peace. UNESCO has taken problem focused actions to reinforce peace from three stand points, which are mutually complementary: peace research, study of the international system and lastly education for peace, which concerns both the development of international understanding be means of education and the most diversified forms of action to promote an awareness among all sectors of society, such as encourage the radical changes of attitude and practice which the institution of a peaceful world calls for.
To promote peace and international understanding, UNESCO launched ASPnet in 1953, which in 2003 included 7500 institutions ranging from nursery schools to teacher training institutions in 170 countries. The network is dedicated to the pursuit of peace, liberty justice and human development. The other major actions of UNESCO which are two of the landmarks are recommendations on education for international understanding, peace, human rights and fundamental freedom (1974) and action plan (1994) for education for peace, human rights and democracy endorsed by 144 countries.

An innovative pilot project on “Peace and Disarmament Education” is being implemented in four countries Albania, Nigeria, Peru and Cambodia by UN Department of Disarmament Affairs (UNDDA) and Hague Appeal of Peace (HAP). The Centre for Research on Education for peace (CERPE) at the University of Haifa, Israel, which has been functionary since 1998 serves as an interdisciplinary and international forum for the scholarly studies of education for peace. The centre has undertaken a number of research projects on Education for peace. The Earth and Peace Education Associates International (EPE) New York, is yet another organization which promotes basic values related to peace, viz., sustainability, non-violence, social justice, intergeneration equity and participatory decision making. Besides these, a number of other organizations, national and international, governmental and non-governmental around the world are working for peace.

Much of the peace research that has been carried out in recent years is the work of NGOs established either as national or international centers. Many of them are federated in the International Peace-Research Association (IPRA), which has consultative status with UNESCO and was affiliated to the International Social
Science Council, in 1999, United Nations General Assembly approved that, we are at present half way through the decade for the promotion of culture of peace. On the eve of the new millennium (21st Century) the General Assembly of the United Nations proclaimed the year 2000 as International Year for the Culture of Peace and the decade 2001-2010 as the International Decade for Culture of Peace and Non-violence for the Children of the World.

The notion of a “Culture of Peace” was first elaborated for UNESCO at the ‘International Congress on Peace in the Minds of Men’ held at Yamoussoukro, cote d'Ivories in 1989. The Yamoussoukro Declaration called on UNESCO to “construct a new vision of peace by developing a peace culture based on the universal values of respect for life, liberty, justice, solidarity, tolerance, human rights and equality between women and men and to promote education and research for this vision.

Subsequently, UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education was organized at Paris, October, 1998, to build a landmark in the development of education for peace. The suit was followed by ‘A Conference on Higher Education for Peace’ held in Tromso, Norway, May 2000. The Tromso Conference focused on certain issues, as supremacy of races and war and further endeavored to seek solutions to issues of how the peace aspect might be focused on in higher education. The Conference tried to settle down the questions regarding concept of peace education, the content and methods of peace education focusing in particular on higher education and its impact on the whole field of education, formal and informal from universities to day care centers and communities. The Conference suggested for such methods of education, which enable and motivate the students to take part in practical peace efforts.
According to the Declaration and Programme of Action for a Culture of peace, adopted by United Nations General Assembly (1999), NGOs and other civil society organizations were urged to contribute to a global movement for a culture of peace. In response, at the midnight of the decade, i.e. 2005, 700 civil society organizations reported to the General Assembly that the global movement is advancing despite lack of attention from the mass media.

Since 2001 various national NGOs coalitions in several countries have been established to promote the culture of peace and non-violence.

2.6.1 Education For Peace In India:

History on Indian Education reveals that education in India has been always for peace. In ancient India, when teachers in gurukuls used to invoke for blessings before discourses this invocation was a peace Chant (Santipatha). The peace Invocation was found common in Upanishadic education. It is as follows :-

ॐ सह नाववतु।

सह नौ भुनवतु।

सह वीर्य करववहें।

तैजस्विन नावधीतमस्तु मा विद्विषववहें।

ॐ शान्ति: शान्ति: शान्ति: ।।
Om, may God protect us (teacher and students) both! May God nourish us both! May we both acquire energy (as a result of this study)! May we both become illumined (by this study)! May we not hate each other! Om Peace! Peace! Peace!

“The peace invocation contains many beautiful sentiments, the sentiments which have inspired Indian education- secular and religious for a few thousand years. Teachers and students engaged in the pursuit of knowledge and excellence of character in the context of a harmonious relationship between the teacher and student. The giving and receiving of knowledge leading to the remaking of man depends on the stimulus of such teacher students relationship. The teacher gives and students receive not only ideas and information but inspiration as well.” Hence, the education in Upanishadic style begins with a prayer or peace within and without. This invocation is called Santipath or Peace Chant, because it is meant to induce a state of creative tranquility in the mind by making it receptive, knowledge oriented and bereft of hatred and other evil passions.

In ancient India, the theme of education was the real nature of man and his true destiny; and education was meant to investigate the inner world of experience. Through education man reached the stage of maturity of outlook and he was prepared to discipline his emotions and to deal with the pressures of the external world.

The ancient Indian education primarily struck the idea of keeping a human body, an excellence venue for spiritual enlightenment, thus is prescribed the techniques of Yoga as an integral part of education. Julian Huxley called it the science of human possibilities.16 It was believed that the practice of Yoga
harmonizes body, mind and soul. It transforms the personality of a man and provides him far sight and foresight to life and strength and steadiness to character. When a man realizes his real nature, all fears of set-backs are completely removed and burnt in the fire of spiritual knowledge and he attains a stable moral life. Apart from aforesaid expositions, there are thousands of examples in Indian history which reveal how ancient education was intertwined with peace values.

Not only spiritual life, but also religion was the centre of all educational discourses. It was the mundane concern of education which emphasized on the relationship between man and man, man and the nature, man and the society, man and the universe.

‘Sarve Bhavantu Suhkinah’ and ‘Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam’ have been the basic themes of our educational system. But with the passage of time, as history descended, the values inherent in Indian education began to decline towards the mundane surface and slowly occupied more and more materialistic ground. British period of education created a big gap between ancient and modern; the values interwined in educational system were deliberately made to fade out. The British period marked a hiatus in the history of Indian education. In 1984, the government dismissed the inclusion of moral education in the curriculum. The attitude of the British Raj was negative even antagonistic to religious and moral education.

After a long interval of time, the Report of the Central Advisory Board (1944-46) however marked a departure in the thinking on the subject. It recognized that “religion in the widest sense inspires all education and that a curriculum devoid of ethical basis will prove barren in the end. Further a special Committee under the
chairmanship of Bishop G.D. Barne was appointed to study the feasibility of implementing the recommendation of the Central Advisory Board. The committee came to the conclusion that religious education should be “the responsibility of the home and community to which pupils belongs.”

After independence, the Report of Secondary Education Commission (1952-53) was a significant landmark in the direction of moral and religious education. The Commission identified character building as the defining goal of education. The Report prescribed ‘moral instruction’ as the means to achieve this goal. It recommended integrative approach to moral instruction rather than treating it as a separate subject. The Report stipulated that, religious instructions may be given in schools only on a voluntary basis and outside the regular school hours, such instruction being confined to the children of the particular faith concerned and given with the consent of the parents and the managements. Reviews of the Report reveal that, it had lack of confidence in implementing its recommendation on moral religious instruction. Later on, the report of the University Education Commission (1962) put forward the issue more confidently. “If we exclude spiritual training in our institutions... we would be untrue to our whole historical development. The Report recommended not for moral or religious education, rather it marked for evolving “a national faith, a national way of life based on the Indian outlook on religion, free from dogmas, rituals and assertions.

The Education Commission (1964-66) emphasized on education and national development and pointed out the defects of the curriculum as the “absence of provision for education in social, moral and spiritual values. It recommended that,
“these values should be taught with help, wherever possible, of the ethical teaching of great religions.

The National Policy on Education (1986) expressed concern over the erosion of essential values and increasing cynicism in the society and it recommended for making education, “a forceful tool for the cultivation of social and moral values ……. Education should foster universal and eternal values, oriented towards the unity and integration of our people.

The Programme of Action (1992) attempted to integrate the different components of value education into the curriculum of education at all of school education.

The National Curriculum Framework for School Education (NCERT, 1975-2000) adopted value-oriented approach to integrate peace concern in education specially, the National Curriculum Frame Work (2000) pleaded for integrating value education into the curriculum, and stated that, what is required however “is not religious education but education about religions, their basics, the values inherent in them and also a comparative study of the philosophy of all religions. The framework prescribed that value education and education about religions should be judiciously integrated with all subjects of study. In India, struggle for value oriented education through a decade has shifted its focus from moral and religious education to ‘Education for Peace’ in larger context. Recently The NCF (2005) made a major change in approach and considered the ‘Education for Peace, the ideal strategy for contextualizing and operationalising values in education.
NCERT took the reference of the UNESCO World Conference of Higher Education, Paris, (1998) when a country paper entitled, 'Higher Education in India, Vision and Action' was presented by Indian National Commission in co-operation with UNESCO, New Delhi, and envisaged the status of teacher as it is increasingly recognized that if defense of peace are to be built in the minds of men and women and if qualities of co-operation, mutuality and harmony are to be fostered in humanity, the role of teachers will include the task of changing the tendencies of egoism, domination and war. It is particularly for this reason that a new programme of teachers training has to be envisaged and this programme will not only cater to the continuous development of professional skills but also continuous development of teachers' ethical and spiritual abilities.

Keeping in view, the context of The UNESCO World Conference (1998) and Education for peace, the Curriculum Framework (2005) recognized the role of teachers as very important and found its specific relevant as they are the role models for students and they not only impart knowledge but can also influence the psychological, emotional and spiritual growth for their students. A teacher is the only person who can create an environment for the induction and transaction of peace to the students through education. Hence, NCERT has organized various orientation and training programme for teacher educators, on various issues and concerns related to the education for peace. NCERT is aiming to help teacher educators understand their roles as peace educators and enable them to learn the ways of integrating peace in teaching learning activities in and out of classrooms in teachers training institutions. It is hoped that the future teacher prepared under the
training of such teacher educators will be able to deliver education for peace in the reality of classrooms in the schools.

Other than government efforts, many non-governmental institutions are working for the promotion of peace. Some of the prominent institutions are, The Gandhi Peace Foundation, The Gandhi Smriti Darshan Samiti, Gandhian Institute of Studies, Jaipur Peace Foundation, Krishnamurti Fundation, Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University and Adhyatmika Ishwariya and Research Foundation, Brahmakumaris Academy, women Shanti Sena (a peace organization) New Delhi, International Network of Museum for Peace, Gandhi Memorial Museum, Indian Institute for Peace, National Gandhi Museum, National Museum of peace, Gandhi Memorial Museum, Indian Institute for peace, National Gandhi Museum, National Museum if Indian Freedom Movement, Global Peace Works. New Delhi. The UNESCO Chair in Peace, Human Rights and Democracy at Maharasta Academy of Engineering and Education and so many other peace organizations, national and international are voluntarily working for the promotion of the culture of peace. Although NGOs have been contributing to different aspects of peace studies viz. human rights, gender discrimination, environment, individual and social peace and so forth, they do not impart education adequately at various stages due to lack of coordination. Hence, there is need for coordination among NGOs and educational system in India, in order to enhance the effectiveness of their proposed measures for the cause of peace and for the development for peace.
2.7 The NCF View Of Peace Education:

Moral education has always been viewed as an important subject to be included in the curriculum, to help children make the right choices. The NCF takes this a step further; the goal is now to consciously give the child an environment that builds sensitivity to others’ cultures, perspectives and rights. The NCF speaks of the compelling need for peace education, clearly stating that education must be oriented towards values associated with “peaceful and harmonious coexistence.” (NCF 2005).

According to the NCF, only education has the capacity for building long-term peace through inter-cultural conversations. School-aged children are endowed with a special sensitivity to constructing their moral character. The NCF echoes this thought and describes the various stages of ethical development and how they occur. According to the NCF, at the primary stage, children become conscious of both themselves and their immediate environment and begin to form notions of right and wrong. At the next stage, they develop reasoning abilities and learn to question, discuss and reflect upon ethical dilemmas. The result, an independent individual who can make well-reasoned judgments. It is through this complex process, dialogue, sensitization to issues, learning skills for resolution and imitating good role models that children will learn to construct their value systems, and proactively choose peace over violence. Peace education is, thus, a teaching of skills and values that supports respect for all humans and calls for a change in attitudes.
2.8 Peace Education in UNICEF:

Peace Education in UNICEF refers to the process of promoting the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values needed to bring about behavioral changes that will enable children, youth and adults to prevent conflict and violence, both overt and structural; to resolve the conflict peacefully; and to create the conditions conducive to peace, whether at an intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup, national or international level.

2.8.1 A Rationale For Peace Education In UNICEF:

Article 29 of the convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) states: “The education of the child shall be directed to the preparation of the child for responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples.”

The 1990 World Declaration on Education for All says that: “Every person – child, youth and adult – shall be able to benefit from the educational opportunities designed to meet their basic learning needs. These needs comprise both essential learning tools (such as literacy, oral expression, numeracy and problem solving) and the basic learning content (such as knowledge, skills, values and attitudes) required by human beings to be able to survive, to develop their full capacities, to live and work in dignity, to participate fully in development, to improve the quality of their lives, to make informed decisions, and to continue learning. The satisfaction of these needs empowers individuals in any society and confers upon them a responsibility to further the cause of social justice, to be tolerant towards social political and religious systems which differ from their own, ensuring that commonly accepted humanistic
values and human rights are upheld, and to work international peace and solidarity in an independent world."

The 1996 study by Graça Machel on "The Impact of Armed Confliction Children" reaffirmed the importance of education in shaping a peaceful future:

"Both the content and the process of education should promote peace, social justice, respect for human rights and the acceptance of responsibility. Children need to learn skills of negotiation, problem solving, critical thinking and communication that will enable them to resolve conflicts without resorting to violence."

The UNICEF 'Anti-War Agenda', set out in The State of World's Children 1996, declares: "Disputes may be inevitable, but violence is not. To prevent continued cycles of conflict, education must seek to promote peace and tolerance, not fuel hatred and suspicion."

The Education Section, Programme Division's paper tabled at the Executive Board, June 1999 session, also asserts that "UNICEF is committed to ensuring access to basic education of good quality - where children can acquire the essential learning tools needed to gain the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes critical to their own lives, the wellbeing of their families and their constructive participation in society". (UNICEF1999/E/ICEF/1999/14). Peace education, then, is best thought of not as a distinct subject in the curriculum, process to be mainstreamed into all quality educational experiences (although the actual approach used to introduce peace education will be determined by local circumstances).
The term 'education in this context refers to any process—whether in schools, or in informal or nonformal educational contexts—that develops in children or adults the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values leading to behavior change. The term 'peace' does not merely imply the absence of overt violence (sometimes referred to as "negative peace"). It also encompasses the presence of social, economic and political justice which are essential to the notion of 'positive peace'. 'Structural violence' is a term that is used to refer to injustices such as poverty, discrimination and unequal access to opportunities, which are at the root of much conflicts. Structural violence is perhaps the most basic obstacle to peace which by definition cannot exist in a society in which fundamental human rights are violated. The Convention of The Rights of The Child, like other, major human rights treatise call for the elimination of all forms of violence, both overt and structural, and the creation of a society based on the principles of justice and peace.

Peace education must address the prevention and revolution of all forms of conflict and violence, whether overt or structural, from the interpersonal level to the societal and global level. It is significant that the framers of the CRC viewed the promotion of understanding, peace and tolerance through education as a fundamental right of all children, not an optional extra-curricular activity.

2.9 Peace Education: An Essential Component of Quality Basic Education:

Peace Education is an integral part of the UNICEF vision of quality basic education. The 1990 World Declaration on Education for All (the Jomtien Declaration) clearly states that basic learning needs comprise not only essential tools such as literacy and numeracy, but also the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values
required to live and work in dignity and to participate in development. It further states that the satisfaction of those needs implies a responsibility to promote social justice, acceptance of differences, and peace (Inter-Agency Commission, WCEFA, 1990).

Since 1990, a number of UNICEF documents have confirmed the vision of basic education as a process that encompasses the knowledge, skills attitudes and values needed to live peacefully in an inter-dependent world. The Future Global Agenda for Children – Imperative for the Twenty-First Century (UNICEFF1990, E/ICEF/1999/10) makes a commitment to “... ensure that education and learning processes help to form both human capital for economic growth and social capital for tolerance, respect for others and the right of each individual to participate with equality within family, community and economic life; and to challenge the culture of violence that threatens to destroy family and community life in so many countries.”

2.10 The United Nations And The Culture Of Peace:

The United Nations (UN) is an important international institution. It was set up in 1945 with 51 countries as member nations and its current membership is 192. Most of the countries in the world today are members of the United Nations. The activities of the United Nations reflect the needs and hopes of not just the governments but the people of the world at large. The United Nation is, therefore, world organizations and its activities are wide ranging. The United Nations role towards world peace had many sides to it. Its organs work to prevent wars from happening. This is done by advising or encouraging countries to maintain friendliest
relations without interfering in each other’s affairs and to settle differences without using force. For this purpose, United Nations has passed several Declarations and Resolutions. They are not of course building on member countries, yet they have moral weight. However, regrettably, countries went to wars. On such occasions the United Nations worked hard to stop such wars as quickly as possible. For example, when India and Pakistan fought a war over Jammu and Kashmir in 1947, United Nations successfully persuaded both countries to stop that war. On the other hand, United Nations activities recognized need to strengthen conditions of peace through control or elimination of dangerous weapons.

**Objectives and Activities of UNO:**

The UN Charter indicates, at the very beginning, four broad objectives of the United Nations. They are;

- To maintain international peace and security through collective measures for suppression of aggression and through peaceful settlement of disputes;
- To develop friendly relations among countries based on full respect for the principle of equality and self determination;
- To achieve international co-operation in the economic, social, cultural or humanitarian fields, and
- To encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

There are four main aspects of the United Nations activities which have made our world somewhat peaceful. They are: (1) mediation activities to help countries to reach an agreement without using armed forces, (2) peacekeeping
activities to keep warring nations apart and restore peace without firing a shot, (3) permitting some member countries to forcibly intervene in a troubled area and restore peace in an area, (4) disarmament activities aimed at reducing or totally prohibiting tools of war like landmines, chemical weapons etc.

2.11 UNESCO And Peace Education:

UNESCO is a Specialized Agency of the United Nations and adopted by 20 countries at the London Conference in November 1945 and entered into effect on 4th November 1946. The organization currently has 191 member states and six associate members. The main objective of UNESCO is to contribute to peace and security in the world by promoting collaboration among nations through education, science, culture and communication in order to foster universal respect for justice, the rule of law, and human rights and fundamental freedoms that are affirmed for the people of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, by the charter of United Nations. To fulfill its mandate, UNESCO performs five principal functions:

1) prospective studies on education, science, culture and communication for tomorrows world;
2) the advancement, transfer and sharing of knowledge through research, training and teaching activities;
3) standard setting actions for the preparation and adoption of internal instruments and statutory recommendations;
4) expertise through technical co-operation to member states for their development policies and projects;
5) the exchange of specialized instruction.
2.12 World Peace And Health Organization (WPHO):

The purposes of WPHO are to devote to the development of world peace and human health, eliminating war, evil, plague, and diseases. In addition it aims to promote and publicize world peace and human health. The goal is to eliminate evils, wars, plagues and diseases that threaten the survival of human life. It is to create a new, healthy and peaceful world. Members of this organization devote themselves to this great and dignified goal of achieving health and peace.

2.13 The Elusive Nature Of Approaches To Peace Education:

Peace education approaches can be traced from its roots in international concerns about the dangers of war, which were addressed by approaches for peace education including nuclear education and disarmament education, to modern theories of education about peace based on reducing the threats of interpersonal, structural, and environmental violence including approaches such as: international education, human rights education, development education, environmental education and conflict resolution education (Harris, 2002). Peace education takes different shapes as peace educators attempt to address different forms of violence in different social contexts and particular conditions prevailing in the society (Mukarami, 1992). In justifying this, Bar-Tal (2002) suggests the different conditions in society which are reflected in the approaches to peace education that are adapted by different countries. For example, societies differ in the nature of inter-group relationships: some are at war or involved in an intractable conflict, whereas others live in relative peace with cooperative inter-group relationships; societies differ in structure: some are multicultural, others are relatively homogenous; societies differ in economic
equality; some are economically polarised, whereas others live in relative equality; societies differ in their civic culture: some are democratic, tolerant and open whereas others are relatively autocratic, intolerant and closed.

A review of the various peace education programmes reflects the varying approaches designed in relation to the social contexts of the particular societies. For example, in Australia, education for peace focuses on challenging ethnocentrism, cultural chauvinism and violence and promoting cultural diversity, nuclear disarmament, and conflict resolution (Lawson and Hutchinson, 1992; Burns, 1985). While in Japan it targets issues of nuclear disarmament, militarism and the nature of responsibility for acts of violence performed in the past (Smith and Robson, 1992). In South America, education for peace addresses structural violence, human rights and economic inequality (Garcia, 1984). In the United States and Britain, peace education had a focus on “nuclear education” in the decades of the 1980’s, as teachers and community educators tried to warn citizens, and policy makers about the dangers of nuclear holocaust. Currently, educators in North America and Europe, concerned about the increasing interpersonal violence, are promoting conflict resolution education to address prejudice, violence and environmental issues (Harris, 1996; Stomfay-Stitz, 1993). In India peace education programmes have traditionally been concerned with promoting certain core values to eliminate obscurantism, religious fanaticism, violence, superstition and fatalism, India’s common cultural heritage, egalitarianism, democracy, secularism, equality of sexes, observance of family norms and inculcation of scientific frame of mind (Pandey, 2007). In Ireland peace education is referred to as ‘education for mutual
understanding' as Catholics and Protestants use educational strategies to undo centuries of enmity (Smith and Robinson, 1992).

Likewise, in South Korea peace education is referred to as ‘reunification education’ (Harris and Morrison, 2003). Another form of peace education occurs in peace camps in the Middle East with Israel and Palestinian children as well as other places where people are attempting to transform ethnic, religious and racial hatred. In this context of intractable conflicts, peace education entails elements of antiracism, conflict resolution, multiculturalism, cross cultural training and the cultivation of a generally peaceful outlook. The different approaches to peace education are not mutually exclusive they are either promoting education ‘for’ peace or education ‘about’ peace. It is from these different approaches that a culture of peace can be promoted. Hence the conceptual framework for peace education includes, but is not limited to; nuclear education, disarmament education, international education, human rights education, development education, environmental education, conflict resolution education, life skills education and learning to live together.

2.14 Peace Education At The Elementary Stage:

Elementary stage is the beginning of formal education of a child. Children at this stage enter the concrete operational level of thinking. They start making moral judgments and take into account the interests of others. At this stage children start considering more than one aspect of a situation while drawing conclusions; it means they are now ready for logical thinking. Thus elementary stage in the life of a child is the right time for laying the foundation of peace oriented personality. Our ancient
Indian educators has also emphasized that the early years of children’s life are meant to grasp the ‘sanskars’. This is the right stage when teachers on the earth can write the message of peace in the hearts and minds of children. A great educational thinker has said, “If you don’t teach peace to a child, others can teach him violence.”

Children today are exposed to a vast amount of violence in their personal as well as social life. Right from the infancy period, a child witnesses various kinds of violent activities in the society through television. By the time a child starts going to school, he becomes quite used to various violent activities that takes place in the society. Therefore it is very necessary to impart peace education to the children right from the beginning of schooling. The learners during schooling, from the formative period through the childhood to the period of adolescence, are in the process of growing and developing. It is easier to build these young children to grownup and responsible adults during this span of school life than repairing them after becoming adulterated adults. Romani (2004) rightly said that if peace education is well begun with young children, there will be minimum need to fight the negative happenings such as terrorism, drug trafficking and environmental threats.

But, though peace education should be imparted to the students’ right from the elementary stage, it need not necessarily be taught as a separate and independent subject. Children at this stage, should not be burdened by the load of textbooks or homework, rather they should be helped to enjoy and celebrate the diversity, beauty and harmony in nature. Children should be helped to develop their aesthetic sensibility, art of listening and sense of responsibility. In-spite of text contents, more and more discussions about individual attitudes and beliefs that present different points of view should be encouraged to promote critical thinking among children. In
the middle childhood years, children may benefit from values clarification exercises that help to analyze the values that underlie beliefs and actions. Value clarification exercises can help children express their changing attitudes and establish their beliefs about peace and justice issues.

At the elementary stage, the values that form the personality are; hygiene (Both of self and surrounding), obedience to elders, respect for others and elders, dignity of labor, love, compassion, honesty, tolerance, punctuality, regularity and responsibility, etc. Later childhood stage would be an ideal time to include subjects as international institutions, world order, cultural differences, civil rights, human rights and various environmental issues befitting this age of child in the curriculum. This is the most ideal stage where children can be taught to accept diversity by learning about different cultures and understanding their own backgrounds. They should be taught about, 'why people are different'. An awareness and appreciation of the diversity of an individual and collective value may lead them to non-violent resolution of conflict. This is the stage when children are required to learn to be caring and sharing, to understand the independence of people, to value cooperation and to develop a sense of community.

2.15 Status Of Peace Education In The Curriculum:

The great teaching unanimously emphasis that all the peace, wisdom and joy in the universe are already within us; we don’t have to gain, develop, or attain them. We’re like a child standing in a beautiful park with his eyes shut tight. We don’t need to imagine trees, flowers, deer, birds, and sky; we merely need to open our
eyes and realize what is already here, who we really are – as soon as we quit pretending we’re small or unholy.

Children and the youths are the most valuable resources of any country. They are the future citizens and the development of a country depends a whole lot on them. Therefore it is very important to give quality education to this section of people and thus quality education plays a pivotal role in this regard. But our system of education still predominates the expansion of knowledge domain, which has created chaos and confusion in the mind of youth and children. This sorry state of educational system is presumably due to its rigid age old, inflexible, less qualitative curriculum that is entangled with several loopholes. So is better to evaluate the present curriculum for its standard and quality in the context of peace and value education, so as to assure the growth of functional citizens for our country. There is a positive relationship between education and peace i.e. peace is necessary for education and education is an essential element of creating and sustaining peace; however, teaching peace is not currently a core part of the curriculum in most nations. Once the drivers of peace are better understood and incorporated into the syllabus, our future leaders of society will become better equipped to create peace in their environment. Unlike other school subjects, like mathematics or science, Peace Education does not derive from any known structure of knowledge. It is an interdisciplinary subject. For its meaningful implementation, what is required is commitment from all the perceivers of education; for, Peace Education does not have a client. It is everybody’s business. Thus the curriculum development must involve every one – teachers, parents and students, in one way or the other. Hence, Peace Education is more effective when it is adapted according to the social and
cultural context and the needs of a society. It should be enriched by society’s culture and spiritual values along with universal human values. Again we have to remind the point that if education is the only defense against human disaster, Peace Education is the soul of educations that will create the shield for human survival on the earth. It is through Peace Education that peace can be instilled in human mind as an antidote to ‘war is in the minds of men’. Now it is up to the policymakers, academicians and educationists of Indian educational system and thereby give green signal to incorporate changes in the present day curriculum which is content heavy and not ‘ability enhancing’.

2.16 Peace Education And The Teacher:

A teacher is a ‘mentor’ of his students. There is a symbiotic connection between the teacher and the students. The teacher is the most fortunate person to be blessed and truly in a position to mould the lives of his people. To-day, teaching has become a huge responsibility where the teacher is not only entrusted with the responsibility of cognitive development of the students but also with the responsibility of nurturing the child holistically, building his character and preparing him to face the tough world. The teacher has to instil some values in children such as honesty, integrity, a sense of self worth, responsibility, tolerance, compassion, respect for divergent opinion, humanity and of course self discipline so that they can grow up to be peaceful and balanced human being. In doing so the teacher has to make himself a role model for the students. Therefore, it is necessary for the teacher to orient to peace. Otherwise, the teacher may play a role, unwittingly propagating violence if he is not oriented to peace, as the saying goes “What I teach is what I know and what I educate is what I am”. A teacher’s prime responsibility is to help
students become good human beings, motivate to fulfil their true potential not only for their own benefit but also for the betterment of the society as a whole. It is for this reason that a teacher is compared to a gardener who plants seeds of knowledge and good values, waters them with care and removes weeds of ignorance. Good teachers are models of peace values, such as the art of listening, the humility to acknowledge and correct one’s mistakes, assuming responsibility for one’s actions sharing concerns and helping each other to solve problems transcending differences even if they do not preach ‘Peace’.

Society expects a great deal from teachers and burden of expectation continues to pile up. Teachers are reminded more or less continuously to play their role as friends, philosophers, guides, transmitters of knowledge, human engineers, preachers of religions, moral instructors, value educators and in the present decade facilitators of learning, social healers and peace builders.

Peace Education to-day has become a necessity almost in all the societies of the world. It has become the need of the hour to include peace education directly or indirectly in school curriculum. A teacher has to play a very crucial role in imparting peace education amongst children. A teacher can directly or indirectly develop peace in the minds of students through different curricular and co-curricular activities.

2.17 Peace Education And The Role Of Parents:

Being a parent is one of the most challenging but rewarding job anyone could ever adopt. The parenting process includes protecting, nourishing and guiding the child. It involves a series of interactions between the parent and the child.
through the life span. It is not only the teacher and the peace educators who should bear the sole responsibility of imparting peace education to the children. Parents should also play an equally important role in this regard. The education for peace will be effective only if it begins in home where parents play the key role in raising peace loving children.

If children experience the possibility of peace through non-violent conflict resolutions at the family level, their faith in the possibility for peace and willingness to work for it at different level grows. Children need assurance from their parents that the world will be all right, change is possible and they can bring about change. Parents can teach their children methods of survival and strategies for change in a society filled with violence, injustice and exploitations. Parents should not exaggerate information provided by media and news channels regarding terrorism, war and violence, rather they can provide accurate information to their children about news events dealing with such matters. Parents should not force discussions of violent events upon young children rather listen carefully to children’s fear and respond in a sensitive manner to their children’s anxieties about violence in the world. Parents who want to raise peaceful children can provide peaceful models by never using personal violence, e.g. spanking, but rather by taking time to explain the natural consequences of certain actions. Since conflict is an inevitable part of life, hence children need to learn in their families to take the feelings of other people into account to deal constructively with conflict.

Co-operation is an important social quality which every child must learn in order to adjust himself in different situation in the society. Parents should, therefore, create a system of co-operation in the family because it is said “violence is nurtured
by excessive competition. Non-violence on the other hand, springs from cooperation. Children who grow up to become an agent of non-violent social change come from homes where there is an emotional closeness. A conducive home environment for the development of peaceful child consists of greater harmony, motivation, efficiency, children and parents sharing life together, happiness, communication, discovery of one’s worth and potential. Warm home relationships with intellectual stimulation and information about current events, provide experiences that enable children to face the world confidently.

Early childhood years are the most important period in the life of an individual. This is the formative period of the character and personality of a child. Children during this period should be showered with proper love and affection by the parents. It is also important for the child to develop a feeling of belongingness to the family. This period is characterised by rapid physical, mental, social and intellectual developments. But at the same time children at this stage develop peculiar types of fears, such as fears of being lost, beaten, or injured. They are exposed to various kinds of violence in television, in books or in their own day to day life. Their wild imaginations make them worried about being attacked by ferocious animals, being in dark, losing their parents, being abandoned or going up to high places. Therefore, the parents during this period should try to remove fear of children by modelling negative reaction to frightening situations. The parents should always exhibit peaceful behaviour in order to develop children into peaceful persons. Apart from this the parents should also try to foster values like truthfulness, cleanliness, tolerance, charity, respect for others, honesty, kindness, obedience etc. in order to develop their child into a good human being.
Figure 2:

Concept Mapping Of Peace Education Through School, Family And Peers:
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