CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.0.0.0 Introduction

The present study titled “A Study on the Effect of Specially Designed Instructional Material in Developing Peace Awareness Among the Pupils of Standard VII in Uttara Kannada District” was an experimental study whereby the Investigator first assessed the Peace Awareness of the pupils of standard VII, studying in English medium schools through a Pre Test tool prepared by himself. After assessing the existing Peace Awareness, the Investigator treated the pupils with a self designed Instructional material to develop Peace Awareness in them. The effect of the self designed Instructional material was studied through applying the same Pre Test Post Test tool.

As the investigator thought about this particular problem the following questions pervaded his mind

a) Is it possible for schools to contribute to “Peace Education”?

b) What measures should be taken in this regard by the schools?

c) What is the existing level of Peace awareness among the standard VII students of English medium schools?

d) Is it possible to develop peace awareness among the standard VII students of English medium schools?

e) What are the ways through which Peace awareness could be developed among the standard VII students of English medium schools?

f) What material could be made use of to develop Peace awareness among the standard VII students of English medium schools?
g) Does the use of special instructional material bring about peace awareness among the students?

This chapter explains and discusses afore mentioned issues. Besides containing the theoretical background on Peace Issues, the chapter also states the problem, defines the variables under study and throws light on the objectives, hypotheses, limitations and organization of the entire research report.

Part I

Theoretical Perspectives

1.1.0.0 Conceptual Framework on “Peace”

Peace is usually understood as an absence of war (Peter Gonsalves 2003). But what about in countries where there is no war at all? Isn’t peace prevailing there? Hence peace has other connotations than mere absence of war. The UN defines the word ‘peace’ in terms of a type of a culture that exists when peace prevails. In spelling out what this culture is, it identifies the ideals of peace that have become standard principles of peace that are accepted universally. It calls the embodiment of these ideals the culture of peace. “A culture of peace is based on respect for human rights, democracy, and tolerance, the promotion of development, education for peace, the free flow of information and the wider participation of women as an integral approach to preventing violence and conflicts, and efforts aimed at the creation of conditions for peace and its consolidation “ (UN Resolution 52\13, 1998)

Peace is an idealistic term and rarely there will be stable peace, which means that peace can be achieved but maintaining it is very difficult. Peace also doesn’t mean that total absence of any conflict. It means the absence of violence in any form and resolving the conflict in a constructive way. There is a distinction sometimes made between ‘negative peace’ and ‘positive peace’. Negative peace refers to the absence of violence. It is negative in nature because something undesirable stopped happening, e.g. violence stopped, the oppression ended. Positive peace is often called as ‘warm’ Peace too, which is filled with positive content and encompasses all the
aspects of good society such as restoration of social relationships, economic well being, economical balance and other values required for the constructive resolution of conflict. Therefore peace exists where people are interacting non-violently and are managing their conflict in a positive way keeping in mind the concerns and interests of others. (Singh Vandana 2007)

Peace is an energy, a qualitative energy which emanates constantly from the One imperishable source. It is a pure force that penetrates the shell of chaos, and by its very nature automatically puts things and people into balanced order. The self is a reservoir of vital resources, one of which is peace. To recognize the original quality of the human soul as peace is to stop searching outside for peace. Through connection with the One eternal and unlimited source of peace, our own reservoirs overflow with silent strength. In its purest form, peace is inner silence filled with the power of truth. Peace consists of pure thoughts, pure feelings, and pure wishes. When the energy of thought, word, and action is balanced, stable, and non-violent, the individual is at peace with the self; in relationships, and with the world. The power of peace embraces the fundamental principle of spirituality: look inward in order to look outward with courage, purpose, and meaning. The first step in that process takes careful examination of one’s thoughts, feelings, and motives. By opening the window of the inner self, individuals are able to clarify and pinpoint attitudes and behaviour patterns which are destructive causing chaos and carelessness. (www.livingvalues.net/values/peace.htm)

1.2.0.0  The Integrative Theory of Peace

The Integrative Theory of Peace (ITP, Danesh, 1997; Huit, 1999 a, b) is based on the concept that peace is, at once, a psychological, social, political, ethical and spiritual state with expressions at intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup and international areas of human life. The theory holds that all human states of being, including peace, are the outcome of the main human cognitive (knowing), emotive (loving) and conative (choosing) capacities which, together, determine the nature of
our worldview. Within the framework of a peace-based worldview, the fundamental elements of a culture of peace, such as respect for human rights and freedom, assume a unique character. ITP draws from the existing body of research on issues of psychosocial development and peace education, as well as a developmental approach to conflicts.

1.2.1.0 Sub theories of the Integrative theory of peace

**Sub theory 1:** Peace is a psychosocial and political as well as a moral and spiritual condition.

**Sub theory 2:** Peace is the main expression of a unity-based worldview.

**Sub theory 3:** The unity-based worldview is the prerequisite for creating both a culture of peace and a culture of healing.

**Sub theory 4:** A comprehensive, integrated and lifelong education within the framework of peace is the most effective approach for a transformation from the conflict-based meta categories of survival-based and identity-based worldviews to the meta category of unity-based worldview. ITP posits that peace has its roots at once in the satisfaction of human need for survival, safety and security; in the human quest for freedom, justice and interconnectedness; and in the human search for meaning, purpose and righteousness. Thus, peace is the ultimate outcome of our transition from self-centred and anxiety-ridden insecurities of survival instincts and the quarrelsome, dichotomous tensions of the identity-formation processes to a universal and all-inclusive state of awareness of our fundamental oneness and connectedness with all humanity and, in fact, with all life.

1.2.1.1 Worldview and power

A significant and closely related element in the development of worldview is power. Central to the development of a worldview, in addition to the inevitable development and expansion of human consciousness, is the role of power in the formation of worldview, which is due to (1) the ubiquitous attraction to power in all
human relationships in the earlier stages of development of both the individual and the society, and (2) power’s intimate relationship to issues of survival, security and identity formation. All these issues—survival, security, identity—have direct relationship with subjects of conflict, war and peace. Power gives the illusion of security and supremacy and consequently is both the most sought after and the most abused element in human interactions. Power is sought to ensure safety and peace for oneself and one’s group. However, because power at best provides limited peace based on the dichotomous concepts of otherness and contention, it is usually open to abuse and gives rise to new conflicts and wars. Thus, every occasion of limited peace—for oneself and one’s group—is punctuated by periods of conflict and war with others, and a durable peace is a relatively rare occurrence in human history. Power is also sought as the main vehicle for establishing one’s individual and group identity, particularly in the earlier stages of the development of human individuals and societies. Under these conditions, the main expression of identity formation is in the form of power struggle in all departments of human life—physical, economical, social, political, intellectual, artistic and religious—which in turn gives birth to conflicted rivalries and highly competitive and aggressive practices.

1.2.1.2 Three meta categories of worldview

The concept of worldview, as formulated in ITP, encompasses our view of (1) reality, (2) human nature, (3) the purpose of life, and (4) approach to all human relationships. Worldviews evolve in direct response to the development of human consciousness which, in turn, is shaped by the aggregate of life experiences. As such, our worldviews are shaped by our individual life stories in the context of our collective cultural histories. Because all individuals and societies are subject to the universal laws of life—unity, development, creativity—we are able to find fundamental similarities and patterns in worldviews that cut across cultural, linguistic, religious and ideological boundaries. By taking into consideration the dynamics of development of individual and collective consciousness, we can identify three distinct meta categories of worldview that are, to varying degrees, present in all human individuals and societies. These worldviews reflect the particular characteristics of
three distinct aspects and phases in the development of every individual and society, respectively designated as survival based, identity-based and unity-based worldviews. (Danesh, 2002).

1.2.1.3 Survival-based worldview

The survival-based worldview is normal during infancy and childhood and corresponds to the agrarian and pre-industrial periods of societal development. This worldview can also develop under conditions of poverty, injustice, anarchy, physical threat and war at any time and in any cultural setting or age group. These circumstances can jeopardize the very survival of both individuals and groups and predispose them to seek power in their quest for security. However, the distribution of power and the nature of relationships during this phase are unequal and proclivity to use force and/or conformity to achieve one’s objectives is strong. Under these conditions usually one person or a small number of individuals hold the reins of power and assume a position of authority. The remaining members of the group become appeasing conformists, withdrawn pessimists, or subversive activists. These dynamics apply to both small groups such as the family, school and the workplace and to large groups such as nations and religions. The use of power in the survival phase is in the form of ‘hierarchical power structure’ with a considerable proclivity to conflict and violence because within this mindset the world is viewed as a dangerous place, operating on the principles of force and control, with the twin ultimate aims of survival and security for oneself and one’s group. In the survival-based worldview authoritarian and dictatorial practices are common and deemed justified. This worldview is not conducive to the creation of lasting peace in the context of ‘unity in diversity’. It demands conformity, blind obedience and passive resignation. It systematically puts women, children, minorities, foreigners and others devoid of power and wealth in a condition of disadvantage, neglect or abuse. Thus the peace and order created by an authoritarian system are illusory, lasting only as long as the balance of power favours rulers and the ruling class, enabling imposition of an arbitrary peace on their subjects. One recent example is the former USSR’s state of
enforced peace that has been replaced by sporadic devastating periods of conflict since the regime collapsed.

1.2.1.4 Identity-based worldview

The identity-based worldview corresponds to the gradual coming of age of both the individual and the society. Development of new ideas and practices, intensity of passions and attitudes and extremes of competition and rivalry characterize this phase. Identity development, though a lifelong process, attains its highest level of expression in adolescence and early adulthood in the individual and, correspondingly, for societies at the time of their emergence from authoritarian environments and attempts to create democracy. It is a phase in which physical, emotional and mental powers begin to blossom, bringing a new level of dynamism and extremism to the life of the individual and society alike (see Erikson, 1968; Hogg et al., 1995; Rothman, 1997). This phase typically corresponds with the period of scientific/technological advancement and democratization of the society, usually within the framework of adversarial power structure. Extreme competition and power struggle are the main operating principles at this stage of development, and the political, economic and social processes are shaped by the concept of the survival of the fittest. The ultimate objective of individuals and groups operating within the framework of the identity based worldview is to prevail and win—an objective that often adversely affects the manner in which such important issues as the rule of law, regard for human rights, and respect for democratic practices are approached. It is important to note that all aspects of human culture such as science, religion, governance, technology, marriage, family and business practices are subject to abuse and misuse within both the survival-based and identity-based worldviews. A cursory review of contemporary approaches to human and social relationships demonstrates the prevalence of these two worldviews, which are also reflected in the two main approaches to governance (authoritarian and adversarial democracy) and the two dominant economic philosophies (Marxist socialism and individualistic capitalism) that have dominated the world political and socio-economic landscape for the past one and a half centuries. We are still using scientific knowledge, technological expertise, religious affiliation and ethical concepts
in the limited, conflict-ridden and conflict-prone survival-based and identity-based worldviews. Consequently, both science and technology, and religion and morality, have been used for the good of humanity and also abused in the name of humanity. However, a new level of consciousness, characterized by a new worldview, is gradually emerging, pointing to the fact that humanity is entering a new phase in its progress toward the creation of a civilization of peace. Humanity is now becoming aware of its fundamental oneness.

1.2.1.5 Unity-based worldview

The unity-based worldview characterizes the age of maturity of humanity and is based on the fundamental issue of the consciousness of the oneness of humanity. Within the parameters of this worldview, society operates according to the principle of unity in diversity and holds as its ultimate objective the creation of a civilization of peace—equal, just, progressive, moral, diverse and united. The unity-based worldview entails the equal participation of women and men in the administration of human society. It rejects all forms of prejudice and segregation. It requires the application of universal ethical principles at all levels of government and leadership. It ensures that the basic human needs and rights—survival and security; justice, equality and freedom in all human associations; and the opportunity for a meaningful, generative life—are met within the framework of the rule of law and moral/ethical principles. A consultative, cooperative power structure characterizes the unity-based worldview and creates conditions in which the legitimate exercise of power and facilitation of empowerment—both necessary for survival and identity formation—take place within the framework of unified, caring interpersonal and group relationships. The unity-based worldview is at the core of the EFP curriculum and is based on the all-important yet little-understood concept of unity.

1.2.2.0 The unity paradigm
Certain basic assumptions form the foundation of most existing theories with regard to the phenomenon of human conflict in its varied expressions—intrapersonal, interpersonal and intergroup. These assumptions basically focus on issues of survival, security, pleasure and individual and/or group identity. They consider interpersonal and intergroup power struggle and intense competition as necessary, inevitable processes of life, and deem conflict the unavoidable outcome of this struggle. Dahrendorf (1958, cited in Wehr, 2001) states that ‘[conflict is] the great creative force of human history’, and Coser, in his analysis of the results of social conflict, concludes ‘that conflict often leads to change. It can stimulate innovation, for example, or, especially in war, increase centralization’ (cited in Wehr, 2001). According to these theories, the best we could accomplish is to decrease the destructiveness of human conflict and to develop tools to resolve conflicts before they turn into aggression and violence. In this respect it is important to note that several concepts and approaches to conflict resolution such as ‘super-ordinate goals’ (Deutsch, 1973; Worchel, 1986; Galtung & Jacobsen, 2000), cooperative conflict resolution (Deutsch, 1994; Johnson et al., 2000), principled negotiation (Fisher et al., 1991) and conflict transformation (Bush & Folger, 1995; Lederach, 1995), are in fact seeking to bring more cooperative, positive and caring dimensions to the current understanding of conflict and its resolution. Similar attempts at finding a new approach to the issue of conflict and unity are also being made within the education community. An excellent example is the range of articles in the recent issue of the Journal of School Health on the theme of ‘school connectedness— strengthening health and education outcomes for teenagers (issue 74(7), 2004). However, many of these concepts and strategies are still formulated according to the notion that conflict is an intrinsic and inevitable aspect of human reality and life. The concept of unity, however, proposes that unity—not conflict—has an independent reality and that once unity is established, conflicts are often prevented or easily resolved (Danesh & Danesh, 2002a, b, 2004). This is similar to the process of creating a state of health, rather than trying to deal with the symptoms of disease. The unity paradigm provides a developmental framework within which various theories of conflict—biological, psychosocial, economic and political—can be accounted for and the diverse
expressions of our humanness can be understood. Certain essential laws govern life and their violation makes the continuation of life problematic or even impossible. Among the most crucial laws of life is the law of unity, which refers to the fact of the oneness of humanity in its diverse expressions. Peace is achieved when both the oneness and the diversity of humanity are safeguarded and celebrated. As we begin the twenty-first century, it is clear that the process of unity is accelerating in all departments of human life.

1.3.0.0. THESES ON PEACE

Francis D’ Sa in his article “Glory to God in the Heavens and on Earth-Peace to all humans” discusses on the following theses on Peace

1.3.1.0 Thesis One: *Peace is not a product of human effort.*

Peace is not something that humans can produce. This realisation is the first step that moves away from the myths of “no war is peace” and of hybris. There are two aspects here which are intimately connected: one, peace cannot be produced by humans and two, moving away from false understanding of peace. Being caught up in the illusion that peace can be produced through intense pressure and meaningful negotiations, it is not at all an easy thing to free oneself from this illusion. Freedom from this illusion means changing one’s direction by 180 degrees – it means weakening one’s bonds with the myths of “no war is peace” and of hybris. Whereas both these myths (in reality they are merely two aspects of the same myth) rely on human determination and will power to produce peace, the realisation that peace cannot be produced sets one in the diametrically opposite direction of realm that cannot be manipulated by human will.

1.3.1.1 Thesis Two: *Peace belongs to the realm of the non-manipulability.*

Convictions are part of the universe of meaning which is not manipulability; that is why they make sense. To state this is to recognise that the human condition is subject to dimensions over which human have no control. Convictions cannot be produced at will. They are brought forth by a combination of social conditions,
societal attitudes and prejudices as well as by personal history. A certain amount of manipulation is done by the media, but even they do not always or fully succeed. There is no foolproof way to ensure that the voters will choose the candidate on whose behalf one has been campaigning. There are things that simply escape human manipulation.

To produce changes in societal attitudes one has to work at various levels, while fully recognising that in spite of all this work there is neither a recipe for nor a guarantee of success. Such recognition is the beginning of a new way of being.

1.3.1.2 Thesis Three: *Peace is a process.*

The new way of being is based on the insight that peace belongs to an altogether different dimensions of being, a dimension over which human have no direct control. However, this does not mean that the quest for peace exempts humans from working for peace! Paradoxically the contribution of humans is the most important factor in working for or against peace. It is humans who are connected with the peace process in a way that can promote or prevent its progress. Whatever they do accelerates, slows down or prevents the peace progress.

Humans have a response-ability that needs to be cultivated in an integral manner. Humans are not just humans; they share in the cosmotheandric nature of reality. The process of peace is in fact a cosmotheandric process.

1.3.1.3 Thesis Four: *The process of peace requires a holistic approach to reality.*

Reality is pluralistic and manifests unity in diversity. The three constituents of reality, the cosmic, the human and the divine are its three irreducible centres. Our approach to reality discloses these three centres. The dynamics of these centres are unique but interdependent. One cannot be without the other two, but in such manner that none can be reduced in any way to the others.

The world surrounding us (in which we live, move and have our being) comes to meet us; it reveals itself to us. In this it takes the initiative. Its dynamics are
centripetal. The dynamics of the human, however, are centrifugal, that is, they move towards the world, they are not inward looking. And the dynamics of the divine are orbital, circular and all-pervading. The threefold dynamics (namely, the centripetal, the centrifugal and the orbital) are complementary, all unique yet mutually dependent. Only when these threefold dynamics are respected is the process of peace on the right track.

However our approach to reality is now fragmented and subjectivist. It needs integration, which is not the same as uniformity. Integration refers to the wholeness that emerges from the dovetailing of their respective dynamics into what has been called *perichoresis* or *circumincessio*. The dynamics of the three dimensions have to be experienced and expressed harmoniously. Needless to repeat that such integration, such harmony is not a one time goal but an on-going process.

In what does such harmony consist? How is such an integration possible? We are speaking of the integration of the three dimensions of reality. Humans in our times do not to a great extent respect the threefold dynamics of reality. As we saw earlier, the cosmic dimension is being objectified, that is, it is being reduced to an object; humans have become blind and are unable to perceive the wholeness of reality; the consequence is that life is becoming increasingly meaningless. The search for meaning in life has become a major problem.

We have to discover that the world is not a mere collection of objects but a living reality. It is not a mere ‘It’ but also a ‘Thou’. The sacramentality of the universe refers to this fact. The sacra-mentality of humans is a response to the claim that the sacramentality of the universe makes on us, namely to discover and respect its ‘Thou-aspect’. Only when the two eyes of sacramentality and sacra-mentality synchronise, will the birth of harmony and integration be possible.

1.3.1.4 Thesis Five: *The sacramentality of the universe expresses the Dharma of the universe.*

The discovery of the sacramentality of the universe is in effect an insight into the relational nature of the universe, a discovery of the way every thing is related to
every thing, that for anything to be it has to be connected with its surroundings and related to history, time and space. The sacramentality of the universe expresses the fact that the whole network of reality’s relationships is more than the sum of its parts. The whole is made present through its parts. To shake a person’s hand is to welcome the [whole] person, not just the hand. The networking of the Dharma of all things is like that of a complex organism wherein every thing exists because of every thing. But now access to the whole is always through its parts. The sacramental nature of the universe is such that the whole exists in the parts and the parts in the whole. The Dharma of the universe is upheld only through the Dharma of its parts. The integral Dharma of the parts, however, always leads to the Dharma of the whole. In this scenario the work of humans brings to expression their experience of wholeness and integration.

1.3.1.5 Thesis Six: *The sacra-mentality of humans is an expression of their religiosity.*

The integral Dharma of the parts is discovered by the sacra-mentality of humans, that is, by mentality whose perspective is holistic. If sacramentality is a characteristic of the cosmic dimension, sacra-mentality is the characteristic of the human dimension. Far from objectifying the cosmic dimension sacra-mentality focuses on the wholeness of reality, that is, it does not get stuck to the externals of things as it were. Sacra-mentality then reveals a world of symbols, not of objects. The difference between the two is this: Whereas an object has no depth-dimension a symbol makes present the human person without being identical with it. The function of the symbol, like that of the body, is to make present the symbolised reality. Sacra-mentality discovers that reality is symbolic and that the really real is most adequately experienced as symbol and best expressed in symbolic language.

If one way of looking at religiosity is the search of the human for the divine in the cosmic, then sacra-mentality is an expression of the authentically religious nature of the humans. In this case religiosity can be paraphrased as the quest for wholeness, fullness, plenitude. Such a religiosity brings forth a cosmic liturgy in which human work is understood as being not only for their survival and for the enjoyment of the
good life, but also and much more for giving expression to the experience of wholeness and integration.

1.3.1.6 Thesis Seven: \textit{The quest for wholeness is the synchronization of the two eyes of the sacramentality of the universe and the sacramentality of humans.}

Clearly the sacramental nature of the universe and the sacramental attitude of humans are complementary, one without the other is not possible and not genuine. The quest for wholeness ensures that the two work in tandem. The attitude of humans to humans, though different from their attitude to the universe, is not one of superiority but of complimentarity: humans are part of the universe and the universe is part of humans. When this happened, that is, when the two eyes (the sacramentality of the universe and the sacramentality of humans) synchronize, the depth-dimension become manifest. ‘Synchronize’ means that the sacramentality of the universe promotes work for the welfare of humans and vice-versa, the sacramentality of humans promotes the welfare of the universe.

The welfare of the universe demands respect for the Dharma of each and every person and thing. It demands justice and a just order at every level. A just order requires a right understanding of things and their interrelationships. A just order requires that the world be treated not as a mere object but as the dwelling place of the divine. The world matters because it is more than matter.

The welfare of humans is best promoted by freedom that helps them to be free internally and externally. Internal freedom refers to freedom from fears, anxieties, compulsions, obsessions, prejudices, etc., a freedom that allows one to function without internal compulsions. External freedom refers to freedom from the rigid and narrow borders of ethnicity, nationality, religion, culture, etc., a freedom that allows and promotes respect for the freedom of others. The rights of one group have to be such that they articulate and point to their duties in such a way that they promote the rights and point to the duties of other groups.

1.3.1.7 Thesis Eight: \textit{The ingredients of peace are justice, freedom and}
Because both justice and freedom belong to the order of the non-manipulable and so are bound to be understood differently in different cultures and situations, a holistic spirit has to pervade them and lead them in the direction of wholeness. This is a direction which every person and every tradition has to take if it is to overcome its one-sidedness. But no tradition alone is capable of this. This is a task that all traditions have to be engaged in if indeed they are serious about moving in the direction of wholeness. Justice and freedom without the striving for wholeness will be like the two eyes, each going its own separate way. There can be no justice in the world order without freedom. A justice that is imposed from above (be it through a government or a dictatorial system) can never be justice; it has to emerge in a scheme of things where freedom is of the essence. And a freedom that does not strive for a just world order can never be holistic and so will be very one-sided indeed. Real justice has to be open to and promote freedom; and genuine freedom has to lead to a deepening sense of justice. This is ensured whenever there is the quest for wholeness.

The three dimensions of reality, the symbolic nature of the universe promoting a just order in the universe, the symbolizing nature of humans enhancing the freedom of humans and the symbolized nature of the divine expressing the wholeness of the universe and humans are the constituents of real peace. In other words, justice, freedom and wholeness are the pre-sub-positions of peace. The path that leads to the discovery of the cosmotheandric nature of reality is the way to real peace. The trinitarian character of reality poses a threefold challenge: to respect the specific dynamics of each of its dimensions. The prevalent form of globalisation is a new form of colonialism which does not respect any dynamics, either of the human or the cosmos and much less of the divine.

1.3.1.8 Thesis Nine: The dialogue of cultures constitutes the programme of peace.

Translated into more pragmatic language, the quest for wholeness implies among other things the dialogue of cultures. No culture alone is in a position to respond to the threefold dynamics of reality. All cultures will have to collaborate.
There is no choice. The alternative is chaos. Dialogue is a key ingredient in the process of peace. Though dialogue cannot directly create peace it can help prevent and foresee obstacles and hindrances to peace. Most importantly, by showing the interdependence of cultures it can lay bare the insufficiency of every single culture and the need of mutual correction and cross-fertilization of cultures.

Cultures have their blind-spots and no culture by itself can discover them. It is only in and through encounters with other cultures that a culture can discover not only its own hidden (positive and negative) aspects, but also that there are elements that it does not possess. Through encounters with other cultures a culture can become aware of what it possess but does not know well, as also what it does not possess and does not know.

The dialogue of cultures is not merely the need of the hour and our only way to survival. More than that, it is our way to peace. Only in and through dialogue can culture work for justice and peace. Just as the synchronization of the two eyes deepens the sense of depth – vision, so too, the synchronization of cultures brings out the sense of complementarity and belonging. It is the dialogue of cultures alone that can contribute to recognising and overcoming the seven deadly sins of our cultures.

- Cultures suffer from the illusion that they are self-sufficient.
- They function like ghosts.
- They are blind to their weaknesses.
- They set themselves as absolute family.
- Violence is inbuilt in the hidden nooks and corners of cultures.
- In diverse but subtle ways cultures legitimize violence.
- Cultures are intolerant of other cultures.

In response to this, the dialogue of cultures brings to our notice what we may call its seven cardinal virtues.
a. The dialogue of cultures promotes awareness of the interdependence of cultures.

b. It leads them to function like parts of an organism.

c. It makes them (1) recognise their own strengths and weaknesses and (2) the strengths and weaknesses of other cultures.

d. It highlights the specific contribution of each culture without absolutizing it.

e. It exposes the provocations to and the causes of violence at work in cultures.

f. It encourages reconciliation as a new way of being culture.

g. It makes a culture reach out to other cultures.

**Part II**

1.4.0.0 Conceptual Framework on Peace Education

Peace Education means to learn about and to learn for peace. Peace Education is an education with a focus on peace. In the first place it should be an education which imparts or provides knowledge and understanding of PEACE and its constituent elements. It should tell about what contributes to real peace, what damages it, and how to achieve the real peace. Secondly the goal or ideal of the Peace Education should be PEACE itself. There is no single methodology or consensus on the content of peace education. The variety of approaches may be reflected in the variety of terminology such as peace education, peace studies, peace research, disarmament education, defence education, world order studies, global education, conflict resolution studies, international studies or even multicultural education. What is important here is that it should equip the learner with the skills, attitudes and values that one should possess in one’s quiver, in order to establish or maintain or contribute to peace. Peace Education should prepare the field from where peace should sprout as the natural growth from the individuals. It should conscientize, mature and educate the individual towards attaining a perfect human social condition for co-existence. It should enable people to live together in a peaceful way, to resolve
conflicts in a non-violent manner. (Mishra Loknath, 2009) Peace education is a process whereby the people learn about the dangers of violence, develop their capacities to counter violence and build sustainable peace in their communities.

Peace Education differs according to the context, geographical structure, social conditions, political structure, and international situation. E.g. Peace Education in Sri Lanka can be different from the Peace Education in India. Because the political situation in Sri Lanka is different than that of India. After the fall of LTTE – the peace that is required in Sri Lanka is different than that is required in India. Another example of Israel and Palestine could be quoted here. The peace that is required in Israel is rather “negative peace” and in India it is the “Positive Peace”. All Peace Education is based on Human Values but enriched by a particular society’s cultural and spiritual values. Hence it is needless to say that the Peace Education curriculum developed in India will be based on universal human values such as love, reciprocity, empathy and concern for others. Because it reflects the Indian social problems where there is no threat of internal war. In India we require the positive peace condition and not mere absence of war as in negative peace. Behind this present concept of peace education there lies the past concept of Peace Education which was purely a “war prevention education”. It was about analysing the causes of war, its effect and ways and means to prevent the war. Today Peace Education has entered a wider scope. Besides issues related to war, the Peace Education includes issues related to social violence, conflict resolution, issues relating to life, abortion, ethnic hatred, racism, genocide and poverty, etc. This does not mean that peace education would provide answers to all the problems, but definitely it is a most apt approach to the present gloom; because such type of education works towards the behavioural and attitudinal change.

In general Peace Education could be understood from a negative or a positive perspective. Negatively Peace Education is learning how to react in situations of conflict and war or how to avoid them. Positively Peace Education is a long term proactive strategy. It aims to promote peaceful persons who are equipped with appropriate knowledge, skills and attitudes to encounter the many conflicts.
1.4.1.0 Definitions on Peace Education:

Peace Education is in the process of evolution. Hence a perfect definition is not possible, however there have been efforts to define it in the following manner.

1. “Peace Education is an attempt to respond to problems of conflict and violence on scales ranging from the global and national to the local and personal. It is about exploring ways of creating more just and sustainable futures” – R.D.Liang (1978)

2. “Peace Education is holistic. It embraces the physical, emotional, intellectual and social growth of children within a framework deeply rooted in traditional human values. It is based on a philosophy that teaches love, compassion, trust, fairness, co-operation and reverence for the human family and all life on our beautiful planet” – Franschmidt and Alice Friedman (1988)

3. “Peace Education is skill building. It empowers children to find creative and non-destructive ways to settle conflict and to live in harmony with themselves, others and their world……..peace building is the task of every human being and the challenge of the human family. (Franschmidt and Alice Friedman) (1988)

4. Hicks is of the opinion that the “Peace Education refers to the activities that develop the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to explore concepts of peace, enquire into the obstacle to peace to resolve conflicts in a just and non-violent way and to study ways of constructing just a sustainable alternative future”.

5. Galtang is of the opinion that the “Peace Studies evolve from a focus on research and building knowledge to an emphasis on skills building insight into the rots of violence must be balanced with work on devising ways to overcome, reduce and prevent violence”.

6. Gandhiji opines that “there is no way to peace, but Peace is the way. Peace Education refers to the pedagogical efforts to create a better world. It teaches love, non-violence, compassion and reverence for all life”.

7. Dale Hudson says that “Peace Education can be defined as education that actualises children’s potentialities in helping them learn how to make peace with themselves and with others to live in harmony and unity with self humankind and with nature”.

Thus the basic concept embedded in the above definition is that Peace Education is a remedial measure to protect children from falling into the ways of violence in the society. It aims at the total development of the child. It tries to inculcate higher human and social values in the mind of the child. In other words, it tries to develop a set of behavioural skills necessary to powerful living and peace building from which the whole humanity would benefit.

1.4.2.0 Scope of Peace Education:

A few decades back “Peace Education” was unheard, especially in India, though it was very much heard in European countries. But today Peace Education has transcended all the boundaries and has become an important component of whole educational system. It has become an interdisciplinary field of study. It comprises a diversity of significant contributions from about the whole spectrum of the human sciences, because peace is a comprehensive term and it cannot be restricted. Thought the primary aim of peace education seems to be the conflict resolution, secondary aims like communication, human rights awareness, tolerance, co-operation, problem solving also come in the umbrella of peace education.

The main thrust of peace education can be exerted in the following ways:

- Through courses specifically focused on studying conflict, conflict resolution and peace
• Through peace education themes infused into a variety of courses presented in existing disciplines

• Through the influence of staff and students who are committed to solving problems, resolving conflict and restoring relationships, etc.

According to Dr. Lokanath Mishra (2009) during the developmental stage of the child the school or education has to try to develop an effective, integrated and positive personality. In other words, the peaceful co-existence requires skills like affirmation, positive thinking, empathetic listening, better communication, assertive behaviour, decision making, and critical thinking. Peace culture in the school environment is the need of time. It is in such culture of peace that our children will imbibe the values of peaceful co-existence and other human values. First of all there should be a peace culture existing in the school between students themselves and between teachers and students. The teachers should shift from teacher centred learning to child-centred learning and create a lively atmosphere in the classroom which gives way for the creative expressions of the child. It is the prime duty of the teachers to identify effective strategies and practices that could transform the school into a place of harmony and peace. Hence peace education should include a kind of citizenship training emerging out of present socio-political and economical issues.

In relation to the fundamental duties the Article 51 A of our constitution stresses the need of harmony and common brotherhood among its citizens; preservation of national heritage and diverse culture, protection and improvement of natural environment and safeguarding public property along with the doing away of violence. Undoubtedly this article speaks about the constituent elements of peace education. The UNESCO concept of Peace falls very much in live with the ideas discussed in relation to the fundamental duties.

1.4.3.0 History of Peace Education

The study of peace was initially thought to be necessary to help prevent war, as another tool in the anti-war arsenal (Reardon 2000). It was intended to contribute to the “dismantling of structures of violence and the promotion of peace” The first
practitioners of peace began by debating the causes and repercussions of war in Japan for instance, an early form of peace education was “anti atomic bomb education”.

In recent times, peace education has come to be associated more closely with the concept of positive peace, which implies the presence of justice, as opposed to negative peace or the absence of war. The goals of peace education have accordingly widened to recognise and address the many manifestations of both structural and cultural violence. In addition to the politically organized violence of war and various forms of repression, and the structural violence of neo-colonial economic institutions there is, as well, social violence such as racism, sexism and religious fundamentalism, and the cultural violence of institutions, blood sports, and the glorification of violent historical events in national holidays and the banalization of violence in the media.

In the “History of Peace Education,” Harris (2008) contends that we have practiced peace education informally for centuries through the conflict resolution strategies of indigenous peoples and peaceful communities, which have been passed on from one generation to another. He identifies religion, including the teachings of Buddha, Baha’u’llah, Jesus Christ, Mohammed, Moses, and Lao Tse as one of the earliest sources of guidelines for teaching peace to others, observing that religion has contributed to both war and peace.

Harris traces the global history of peace education from Comenius in the seventeenth century to the growth of peace movements in Europe through the nineteenth century and preceding the First World War, from the rise of the School Peace League in the early twentieth century across the United States to the contribution of Jane Adams, John Dewey and Maria Montessori to the discipline.

Other scholars like Bartlett (2008) argue that the nature and methods of peace education programmes draw on several key aspects of Paulo Friere’s philosophy of education. This includes the basic premise that education can be used to enhance an individual’s potential and liberate her; moreover, peace education clearly adopts the
problem posing approach to education, as opposed to the banking model that encourages rote learning.

Closer home, Mahatma Gandhi was one of the first to integrate ideas of social justice with a “state of peace,” by recognising the potential dangers of poverty, inequality and discrimination. Not surprisingly, peace educators from around the world have continued to draw on his philosophy of non-violence. Surya Nath Prasad (1998) draws our attention to the impact of Gandhian thought on the initial stages of the development of peace research in India, with the establishment of several organisations including Gandhi Shanti Prathishtan in 1959, the Gandhian Institute of Studies in 1961, the Centre for Gandhian Studies and Peace Research also in 1961, and the Peace Research Centre in 1971. In the decades since, several more organisations have been established, many at leading universities, all dedicated to studying and explaining the relevance of Gandhi’s ideas to generations of students.

Globally, there has been a similar (if more gradual) increase in the number of organisations committed to peace research and education. The University for Peace (UPeace), and its Graduate School of Peace and Conflict Studies, based at Costa Rica, and with a mandate from the United Nations offers several courses including Masters degrees in Environmental Security and Peace, Gender and Peace Building, Peace Education and Media, Peace and Conflict Studies, to name a few.

The United Nations Children’s Fund or UNICEF regularly offers support to peace education projects around the world and produces relevant literature and curriculum, including teaching manuals. UNICEF’S research particularly draws attention to the impact of armed conflict on young people. Their peace education programmes inevitably incorporate the framework of the Millennium Development Goals, the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Education for All Dakar Framework of Action.

Since 1981, the prestigious United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) prize for peace education has been awarded annually to recognise individuals and organisations that have made valuable contributions to
peace education. Additionally, UNESCO launched the Associated Schools Project Network (ASP net) in 1953, espousing peace education values and ideals. ASP net is currently a network of some 7,900 educational institutions in 176 countries.

The Peace Education Center, based at Teachers College in Columbia University is considered a pioneering organisation in research, teaching and training on peace education. The centre also coordinates the initiatives of the International Institute on Peace Education (IIPE) and Community-based Institutes on Peace Education (CIPE).

In 1993, a group of 46 young people, including Israelis, Palestinians, Jordanians, and Egyptians, were brought together at a camp in the United States for a cultural encounter programme. That was the genesis of the Seeds of Peace programme that has continued to work globally, encouraging young citizens to confront contentious personal and political issues. Other key players include the International Peace Research Association that brings together and facilitates a network of Peace researchers, and publishes the Journal of Peace Education through the Peace Education Commission; and the Peace Education Network which hosts the PEN Resource Catalogue, a repository of lessons, games, exercises and other curricula for peace educators.

In other words, peace education is the “process of teaching people about the threats of violence and strategies for peace”

It is evident that a peace education programme is defined and even determined by its specific contexts: geographical, political, social, psychological, economic, cultural, demographic and environmental, among others. As a result, peace education also embraces a range of meanings, within the constraints of one overarching objective: usually, to achieve and sustain peace. More simply, we can argue that the process of peace education is two-fold: teaching people (adults, men, women, children) about the potential dangers of violence (in its many manifestations), helping them develop their capacities to counter violence and thereby enabling them to build (and sustain) peaceful communities.
1.4.4.0 Growth and development of Peace Education

In tracing the recent development of peace education, we begin to see that in the past it had been an integral part of education at all times and in all cultures. Every culture regards peace as a noble ideal to attain. However with the advent of Western secularism at the beginning of the 20th century through the guise of a positivist scientific outlook to education, moral and human values including peace were slowly discouraged away from school curricula. Under the ideal of value-free positivist and reductionist knowledge the whole education was viewed narrowly tracing facts of various subjects. However, in spite of such materialistic views, the thinking of such humanists like Rousseau, Henry Thoreau, Tolstoy and Maria Montessori kept the sense of education alive. With the witness of the horrors of the First and Second World Wars there was a reawakening to the need of developing the humanistic side of education at least among a few educationists. In this context Maria Montessori’s loud and tireless reiteration on the need for educating for peace should be mentioned here with respect and appreciation. At the beginning of the 21st century today we are only rediscovering her vision of peace education which she tried to tell the world in the 1930s. For instance, she said in one of her public talks “Those who want war prepare young people for war; but those, who want peace, have neglected young children and adolescents so that they are unable to organize them for peace”

Her vision of education provides a meaningful sound basis for peace education. She looked at education as a tool for building World Peace. To her peace is the guiding principle of man and nature. Any attempt to deviate from the principle will only bring about destruction. However it has never been investigated seriously so far. Peace should be studied as a science identifying its direct and indirect complex factors. She also observed that man had neglected to realize his inner sources of energies. Mastery over the external world alone is inadequate in bringing about a peaceful world. Peace is not only cessation of war. There are many positive qualities in peace. She said that violence destroys the moral perception inherited in man. She described her time as an era of insidious madness, which demanded man to return to reason immediately. Like Rousseau, she believed that man is intrinsically pure by
nature. The child's natural innocence has to be preserved from being sidetracked or spoilt by society. To her the child is the promise of mankind. The child has real vision, a bright little flame of enlightenment that brings us a gift. Constructive education for peace must aim to reform humanity so as to permit the inner development of human personality and develop a more conscious vision of the mission of mankind and the present conditions of social life. What we need today is an education that is capable of saving mankind from the present predicament. Such an education involves the spiritual development of man and the enhancement of his value as an individual and prepares the young people to understand the time in which they live. At school we must construct an environment in which children can be actively engaged in learning.

The beginning of Peace Education can be traced in the United States. It was begun there as a way to bring about greater harmony among groups of people through schools, but the legitimacy of this fact is always questioned. The Americans involved in Peace Education have always advocated for the recognition of the worth of others who may differ in linguistic or cultured terms. The organisations like U.S. Institute of Peace, International Institute for Peace Education at Teacher’s College, Columbia University, private organisations and community based Peace Centres have been in this venture of attaining peace in the world.

**1.4.4.1 Beginning of Peace Education [1828 – 1899]:**

The ministers and lawyers were often the advocates of bringing change in the society during these years. Certain Utopian colonies like “Brook farms and fruit lands” were subjected for this kind of experiments. Hence ideas like pragmatism and idealism could be considered as the origin of Peace Education. The American Peace Society was founded in Boston in 1828 and by 1850 there were around 50 American Peace Societies (Bartlett, 1944). The first peace education could be traced to simple sheets of paper known as ‘Olive Leaves for the Press’ distributed to two hundred newspapers in New England by an early peace pioneer named “Elihu Burrit”, who was also the editor of “Advocate of Peace” a peace journal whose aim was to mould the minds of youth to oppose war. In 1835 the Bowdoin Street Young Men’s Peace Society was established in Boston with the goal to expose the evils and sins of war.
Horace Mann, who was one of the founders of the common school movement in American Education, propounded that societal war and violence were flaws that could be changed through moral conscience and action. By 1900 practical educational plans such as curriculum guides and textbooks were in use for educating children for a peaceable society.

1.4.4.2 First Half of the Twentieth Century [1900 – 1950]:

Prior to the First World War, Fannie Fern Andrews started the American School Peace League. She started observing May 18 as Peace Day. She started a library and journal for world citizenship and friendship. She gave importance to the economic causes of war that grew into a new dimension of peace education.

Jane Addams and John Dewey also contributed to a larger extent towards Peace Education. Jane Addams is considered as a worker and activists of international peace movement. John Dewey, the philosopher considered always school as an agent of social change. During this age peace educators were labelled as pacifist – socialists. Strangely enough during the onset of communist ideologies, the same peace educators were termed as communists and socialists. As a result their efforts in establishing peace was very much under clouds. There was something interesting that took place during this time with regard to peace education. The Nye Committee hearing in 1935 said that the war was profitable for a few, notably the manufacturers of ammunitions and other war equipments. But the senator Gerald P. Nye said that an equal place for peace also should be given. In 1940s the conflict resolution was given more importance in peace education. In fact this idea was developed by Lentz Peace Research Laboratory in 1945.

1.4.4.3 The Atomic Age - The Space Age (1950 – 1960):

Since America was very much involved in warfare after 1950, the educators felt the period as a state of warfare. Though the Second World War had ended, the cold war going on between USA and the USSR – for the supremacy. Hence Peace Education suffered a big blow during the time. Never the less there was some education in America for international friendship. Patricia and George Mische who
were the pioneers of this kind of global education founded “Global Education Associates” in 1973. The Global education focused on the development of skills in peacemaking, conflict resolution and social justice.

1.4.4.4 Peace Education in Nuclear Age (1960 – 1979):

This age could be termed as a turning point in the nature of peace education in the United States. So far the peace education was towards the prevention of war, but from onwards they focussed upon a future world without war characterised by social justice. Besides there were many internal conflicts and antiwar movements emerged in USA. Hence children were made use of in non-violent efforts and movements.

In this age famous philosopher John Dewey’s ideas of participatory education was introduced in USA, where the freedom school for black students were established. During the summer, students learned through the experience of living in a classroom where democracy was the foundation (Lynd, 1969). All had to work together on a peace and social justice project, balancing idealistic dreams with the realities of deprivation and violence that marred their everyday lives. Doug McAdam (1988;1989) assessed the impact on 212 participants and demonstrated that they politically active throughout the 1960s with many of them engaged in teaching and other area of civil services. In 1970s the consortium on Peace Research Education and Development (COPRED), a branch of the International Peace Research Association came into existence. Bethy Reardon (1967; 1973) the founder of the Peace Education Centre at Teacher’s College, Columbia University, began to shape the field by expanding on its theoretical foundations. But the growth of peace education was shunted because peace groups were accused of being communist propagandist. 1968 witnessed a series of violent events which mainly included the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr….As a result in 1972 a work by Maria Montessori known as “Education and Peace” provided strong impetus for the peace education. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) in 1973 published a work called “Education for Peace Focus on Mankind” which was a catalyst in the field. Several organisations played a vital role in the course. The Peace Education Commission (PEC) a network of elementary and secondary teachers became a part of
the International Peace Education Research Association (IPRA). Similarly the Peace Education Network (PEN) focused on introducing and developing non-violent conflict resolution as a central concept of American Peace Education.

1.4.4.5 Peace Education in 1980 – 2000:

During this period the peace education took a definite form. The model schools and curricula based on peace education principles came into existence. Peace museum in Chicago, community based peace centres in Richmond, Virginia, Bluffton College, Ohio, Wilmington College, Cincinnati and Pax Educare Centre in Hartford are a few examples in this regard. Peace education was integrated with the arts and humanities. Websites and internet media was made use for this purpose. Post secondary institutions also began to motivate young people to carry out peace education programme. One thing that has to be borne in mind that all these developments took place against a backdrop of the non-violent, bloodless revolutions in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, etc. It also signified the end of communist prominence. By this time in Europe the memories of Gandhi’s non-violent tactics and Martin Luther King Jr.’s campaign for civil rights were thoroughly applied. The peace educators pointed out to the growth of peace education and conflict resolution as viable alternatives. Another important feature of this era was the inclusion of human rights education to the agenda of peace education. Many fine models of peace education were being carried out in individual classrooms such as “Robert Muller Schools”, “Montessori schools” and integration of conflict resolution and peer mediation in public schools. Creation for research base for peace education and conflict resolution by David and Roger Johnson of the University of Minnesota, contributed largely towards conflict resolution, peer mediation and peace making programmes in schools. A special programme like “Teaching students to be Peacemakers” was praiseworthy. In this programme the students serve as peer mediators after mastering the basic skills of peace making. Educations of these programmes revealed that it had created a co-operative and peaceful school culture.

1.4.4.6 Peace Education from 2000 – 2007:
Undoubtedly as the civilisation has taken a giant leap in the 21st century, similarly the concept of peace education has undergone a drastic change. Even in this term the peace educators are trying newer and newer means to bring about peace education in schools. Internet became the prominent means or channels, as a result of which the 2007 First International Education for Peace Conference was highlighted on the internet. Today peace educators have journals to carry out research and fort the dissemination of knowledge. They include “Journal of Peace Research”, “Peace and Conflict”, “Peace Review - a journal of Social Justice”, etc. Some of the schools have their own initiative for Peace Education. In fact in one of the schools in Michigan, the students themselves asked for Peace Education.

Thus the above description my give us the growth of Peace Education down the century in America in particular. But the fact cannot be denied that not only in America but also in India and elsewhere there is an urgent need of Peace Education. It is high time that we thought about making Peace Education a part of both primary and secondary education.

1.5.0.0 Prerequisites and components of effective peace education

Based on the insights emerging from peace education research and lessons learned from five years of implementation of the Education for Peace (EFP) programme to thousands of students in 112 schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH), four prerequisite conditions for effective peace education are identified. These prerequisites constitute the main components of peace education. In other words, the requirements and components of effective peace education are identical and give peace education a self-regenerative and organic quality. Thus, peace is a requirement for effective peace education, and peace education creates higher states of peace.

Danesh 1997) in his Integral Theory of Peace gives the following diagram on the components and prerequisites of Peace education
1.5

1.0 Prerequisite I: Truly effective peace education can only take place in the context of a unity-based worldview

Peace education and civilization are inseparable dimensions of human progress. Expressed differently, peace education is the only route to true civilization and true civilization is both peaceful and peace creating. However, in practice, nearly all segments of society ignore this fundamental fact and train every new generation of children and youth in accordance with conflict-based perspectives. The reason why peace education is ‘such a difficult task’, (Ruth Frier, 2002,p-55)observes ‘the continuous war education that youngsters and adults have been receiving since the beginning of mankind’. Firer’ further validates that” when we critically review the current underlying worldviews that shape and inform our pedagogical philosophies and practices and it becomes evident that most current approaches to education revolve around the issues of conflict, violence and war”. This is equally true about
education at home, in school, within the community, through the example of ethnic and national heroes and leaders and through the mass media

In the context of family, not infrequently, parents find themselves facing conflicts that they are often unable to resolve effectively and positively. Many parents intentionally or inadvertently—provide their children with the notion that the primary purpose of life is to ensure one’s own survival, security and success in a dangerous, conflicted and violent world. Many teach their children that the most primal and powerful forces operating in life are those of competition and struggle. Children receive the same message from other influential sources of education in their homes, namely television, Internet and video games. In school, children once again are introduced to these conflict-based views through the actual experience of school life—with its culture of otherness, conflict, competition, aggression, bullying and violence—and through concepts provided by teachers and textbooks that further validate these conflict-oriented ideas and experiences. History textbooks, by and large, are the accounts of rivalries, conflicts, wars, conquests and defeats, with men as the main actors on the stage of social life. Many works of literature are renditions of the same processes in dramatic, emotionally charged and highly stirring manner. In social studies, children are taught the dynamics of in-group and out-group and the notions of foreignness and otherness. Political science revolves around issues of power, competition, winning and losing and economic theories promote various concepts based on the notion of the survival of the fittest. Usually children are taught that the world is a jungle, that life is the process of survival in this jungle and that power is the essential tool to emerge victorious in this highly conflicted and violence-prone world. It is, therefore, not surprising that every new generation matures with much greater familiarity, certainty and comfort with the ways of conflict, competition and violence than those of harmony, cooperation and peace. Truly effective peace education can only take place when the conflict-based worldviews which inform most of our educational endeavours are replaced with peace-based worldviews. In a detailed review of peace education efforts aimed at creating a culture of peace in Northern Ireland (Duffy 2000, p-26) concludes that ‘it is difficult to be optimistic about the long-term possibilities of promoting change’ in conditions of conflict in Northern
Ireland unless a ‘dynamic model of education’ is introduced that ‘will encourage young people in Northern Ireland to question the traditional sectarian values of their homes’. In his review of various approaches to peace education in Northern Ireland, Duffy observes that no satisfactory approach has been found, despite considerable effort and expenditure of human and financial resources. It is maintained that nothing short of a comprehensive, all-inclusive and sustained curriculum of education for peace could possibly alter the current attitudes and worldviews that contribute so greatly to conflict, violence and war afflicting human societies worldwide. The long, disturbing history of human conflict and education’s role in promoting conflict-based worldviews demand a new approach to education delivered within the framework of peace principles. In fact there are some positive and hopeful signs that a new consciousness regarding the need for a change in our approach to education is emerging. An example is the work of the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 1998) that sees ‘education as the key means to spearhead the movement towards a culture of peace’. Another example of this awareness is reflected in the inclusion of the issue of education in various attempts at peace between Israeli and Palestinian negotiators, who during their Oslo I, Oslo II, and Wye Plantation Agreements agreed to remove all hostile, inaccurate, untrue and misleading propaganda from their respective communities, including school curricula. In particular, the Palestinian Authority agreed to remove from its textbooks all prejudicial references against Israel. However, an Israeli (1999) has observed, the Palestinian Authority has not fulfilled this commitment, a fact that has contributed negatively to the Israeli–Palestinian relationships. Currently, concerted efforts are under way by the authorities of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the international community in that country to create a school curriculum that will educate students in the principles of interethnic harmony, collaboration and peace, rather than the opposite, as has been the case (Spaulding, 1998; Hays, 2002; OSCE, 2005a). This attention to issues of education and peace is not surprising, because it is through education that our worldviews are profoundly influenced and shaped, and it is through the framework of our worldviews that we become suspicious or trusting, conflicted or united, peaceful or violent.
1.5.1.1 Prerequisite II: Peace education can best take place in the context of a culture of peace

In a review of 50 years of research on peace education, Vriens (1999, pp. 48–49) finds that peace education is a difficult task even in relatively more peaceful communities and concludes that although ‘studies of children’s conceptions of war and peace are very important for the realisation of a balanced peace education strategy’ nevertheless, ‘research cannot tell us what peace education should be’. Peace research has a better potential to tell us what should not be done, rather than what we need to do to create peace. However, common sense dictates that we cannot educate our children and youth about peace in an environment of conflict and violence. The culture of peace is based on the principles established in the Charter of the United Nations and on respect for human rights, democracy and tolerance, the promotion of development, education for peace, the free flow of information and the wider participation of women as an integral approach to preventing violence and conflicts, and efforts aimed at the creation of conditions for peace and its consolidation (A/Res/52/13, 15 January 1998, para. 2). Following these objectives, the consultation was held with the educators in the schools and it was learnt that although significant number of courses and projects on such topics as human rights, democracy, tolerance and equality have been and were continuing to be offered in the respective schools, the overall level of satisfaction with the effectiveness of these programmes was low. Several reasons were identified for this dissatisfaction. In each school only a small number, usually one or two classes, received training in one or another of these issues for a short period as extracurricular activities. At the psychological level, the participating students were not ready to deal with such issues as tolerance, democracy and human rights. They needed careful preparation to tackle these potentially painful and bewildering issues. This applied not only to the students, but also to their parents and teachers at a deeper level because of the direct participation of most adults in the recent war, just five years earlier. At the social level, the necessary degree of trust and confidence has not been developed among members of the participating school communities, who came from other cities and regions of the country, generally viewed by each group as the home of ‘the enemy’. The necessary interface, communication,
dialogue and joint activities—essential for removing the stereotypes, misconceptions and flawed information that many of the teachers, students and parents had about the ‘other’ groups—had not yet taken place among members of participating school communities. In the absence of such close encounters, study of these issues can be perceived as being either unrealistic or not applicable to the realities of the life of these students. The fact that the subjects of human rights, tolerance, democracy, equality, freedom, etc., which the students were learning in these special classes, were not yet present in the mindsets and practices of their respective communities. The discrepancy between theory and practice always has a detrimental impact on students’ learning processes as it places them in a state of conflict between what is said and what is done. It is for this reason that peace education needs to help the students to develop a worldview based on peace principles within a peace-based environment. As UNESCO states, ‘first and foremost, a culture of peace implies a global effort to change how people think and act in order to promote peace’ (UNESCO, 1998, p. 1).

The issue of the necessity of change of mindset and the behaviour emanating from it is not only a social and political necessity, but is also strongly needed in the religious thinking of people and their leaders. It is a fact that religions have always played, and continue to play, a cardinal role in the worldview and behaviour of their followers and not infrequently have been, and continue to be, the cause of conflict and war in human history. The following statement is of a particular importance with regards to the role of religion in development of peace: Religion should unite all hearts and cease wars and disputes to vanish from the face of the earth; it should give birth to spirituality, and bring light and life to every soul. If religion becomes a cause of dislike, hatred and division it would be better to be without it, and to withdraw from such a religion would be a truly religious act … Any religion which is not a cause of love and unity is no religion (‘Abdu’l-Bahá, 1961, p. 130). However, the task of worldview transformation is very difficult, even under normal conditions. But, under conditions of conflict, violence and war a new and more fundamental challenge to the goal of changing ‘how people think’ is encountered. Conflict and violence afflict and damage all aspect of human life. They destroy the physical habitat of people. They inflict physical and psychological injuries on people. They cause social dislocation, poverty
and disease and weaken the moral and spiritual fabric of individual and community life. Conflict, violence and war negatively impact every aspect of life: environmental, medical, psychological, economic, social, moral and spiritual. These injuries make the task of creation of a culture of peace very difficult and point to yet another prerequisite condition for effective peace education—a culture of healing. Successful peace education can only take place in a peace-oriented milieu—a culture of peace—which in turn requires the opportunity for the participants to heal their conflict-inflicted injuries in the context of a healing environment.

1.5.1.2 Prerequisite III: Peace education best takes place within the context of a culture of healing

One wide-ranging review of peace education activities and research concludes that ‘peace education is an extremely difficult task in war and post-war situations primarily because of the tremendous need for children to overcome the catastrophic impact of war on all aspects of their lives and grieve their monumental losses’ (Vriens 1999, p. 46). Ervin Staub (2002), reporting on his work in Rwanda, points to the importance of healing from trauma and states that ‘without such healing, feeling vulnerable and seeing the world as dangerous, survivors of violence may feel that they need to defend themselves from threat and danger. As they engage in what they see as self-defence, they can become perpetrators’ (p. 83). Here, Staub is describing the relationship between culture of healing and culture of peace. An important aspect of healing is the process of reconciliation, which has received considerable attention in recent years through the institution of Truth and Reconciliation Commissions in several different countries. Luc Huyse (2003) identifies three stages in the process of reconciliation: (1) replacing fear by non-violent coexistence; (2) creating conditions in which fear no longer rules and confidence and trust are being built; and (3) the involved community is moving towards ‘empathy’ (p. 19). He furthermore states ‘all steps in the process [of reconciliation] entail the reconciling of not only individuals, but also groups and communities as a whole’ (p. 22). These conclusions, drawn from the recent experiments with truth and reconciliation commissions in South Africa and elsewhere, point to the need for the creation of special environments required for the
process of healing the wounds of conflict and violence. The notion of creating a culture of healing includes the realization that ‘healing is inevitably a lengthy and culturally-bound process’ (Hamber, 2003, p. 78). Cognizant of these challenges, we began the EFP programme in BiH by focusing on those issues that could help students, their teachers and, indirectly, their parents, to gradually free themselves from the immediate psychosocial conditions that were keeping them in a continuous state of considerable fear and mistrust, on the one hand, and deep resentment and anger, on the other. We needed to create a safe and positive atmosphere of trust in and between the participating school communities, whose populations came from all three ethnic groups and who until recently had been at war with each other. By the end of the first year of the implementation of EFP this objective was achieved at a very significant level through multiple modalities including: conceptual and cognitive instructions; creative and artistic presentations; meaningful, effective and sustained dialogue; complete transparency and openness; and full appreciation and profound respect for the rich and unique cultural heritage of all participants. Gradually, students and teachers began to discuss the impact of war on themselves and their families and communities in an environment characterized by mutual trust, optimism and a sense of empowerment and a culture of healing began to permeate these school communities.

1.5.1.3 Prerequisite IV: Peace education is most effective when it constitutes the framework for all educational activities

The first three prerequisite conditions for peace education—the need for a unity based worldview, a culture of peace and a culture of healing—together point to the need for a peace-based curriculum. The notion of peace-based curriculum demands a total reorientation and transformation of our approach to education with the ultimate aim of creating a civilization of peace, which is at once a political, social, ethical and spiritual state. Political and social dimensions of peace have historically received considerable attention, and in recent decades, moral and ethical aspects of peace have also been incorporated in humanity’s agenda, through national and international declarations of human rights and focus on the issue of nonviolence. However, the
spiritual aspect of peace has received considerably less attention, which is especially significant in the light of current political and social dialogue about the place of religion and spirituality in the individual and collective life of humanity. This is so because, as is evident in our world today and as the history so graphically demonstrates, the political, social, legal and ethical efforts of leaders and peoples combined cannot yield their ultimate desired result—peace. Peace in its essence is a spiritual state with political, social and ethical expressions. The human spirit must be civilized before we can create a progressive material, social and political civilization. Peace must first take place in human consciousness—in our thoughts, sentiments and objectives—which are all shaped by the nature and focus of our education. To meet these requirements, the peace education curriculum needs to integrate and pay equal attention to all aspects of peace: its psychological roots; social, economic and political causes; moral and ethical dimensions; and transcendent spiritual foundations. Without any of these factors, achievement of peace remains an aspiration rather than an established reality. Such a comprehensive, sustainable, restorative, transformative, inclusive and integrative programme of peace education requires a multifaceted and multi-level approach. This curriculum needs to be formulated within the framework of a peace-based worldview. It needs to take into consideration the developmental processes of human understanding and consciousness that shape the nature and quality of our responses to the challenges of life both at individual and collective levels. A comprehensive peace education must address the all-important issue of human relationships. At home, in school and within the community, children and youth are constantly learning about relationships, if not in a measured, thoughtful, systematic manner, then in a haphazard, careless and injurious manner. This curriculum must teach the children and youth not only the causes of conflict, violence and war and the ways of preventing and resolving them, but also the dynamics of love, unity and peace at individual, interpersonal, intergroup and universal levels. In the words of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1961): ‘Love alone is capable of uniting living beings in such a way as to complete and fulfil them, for it alone takes them and joins them by what is deepest in themselves’.

1.6.0.0 Peace Paradigms:
Paradigms of Peace put forward by Nathan C Funk:

Conceptions of Peace span religions and culture, incorporating such values as security and harmony as well as justice and human dignity. Every major system of faith and belief, whether religious or secular in character has in some way or other promised peace as an outcome of the implementations of its precepts.

While peace is undoubtedly one of the most universal and significant of human ideals, Raimon Panikkar describes it as “one of the few positive symbols having meaning for the whole humanity” – the ways that we think about peace are often diffuse and content-dependent. We profess to honour peace in the abstract – for example, within a framework of religious precepts and affirmations – while organizing our thoughts about life and politics around more mundane ends and objectives. Implicitly we circumscribe the meaning of peace to accommodate a system of largely implicit beliefs about how the world works, about what power consists of, and about what is expedient. As a result the peace ideal is either co-opted by competing value priorities or remains distant from our daily activities and experiences. The “ideal” becomes separated from the “real”, and peace becomes a pious invocation, a means to an end, or an empty term of rhetorical self-justification.

1.6.1.0 Power Politics: Peace through Coercive Power

The first peace paradigm, power politics or “real politick”, is the traditionally dominant framework in the field of international relations. This paradigm, grounded in classic works such as Thucydides’ History of the Peloponnesian War as well as in a more recent body of political theory that invokes reading of human nature and a competitive model of international politics. Advocates of this paradigm, who refer to it as “political realism,” contend that there are no universal values that can be held by all actors in the international system. Furthermore, the absence of a world government or “higher power” to which states must submit themselves renders politics among nations anarchic and unpredictable, characterised by shifting alliances and the ever present threat of violence. In the face of chronic insecurity and shifting balances of power, states must craft policies that serve the private good of their immediate
“national interest” – construed as the acquisition of material power and military capability to compel and deter others – while steering clear of broader, humanistic ideas that depend on the trustworthiness or goodwill of others for their fulfilment. In other words, because there is no shared moral yardstick that can be used as a basis for stable cooperation among nations, states have no choice but to compete with one another for scarce resources and for the security that these resources are believed to provide.

Though not necessarily indifferent to global problems linked to widespread poverty and ecological deterioration, exponents of power politics argue for an outlook of moral minimalism, in which the world is construed as a “self-help” system. Justice is defined as an absence of gross abuses of human rights, such as genocide, and peace is conceptualised simply as an absence of war or, more precisely, as a temporary suspension of hostilities secured by military power. “If you want peace,” argue proponents of the power politics paradigm, “prepare for war.” Violence arises inevitably from human competitiveness and covetousness; peace is secured through the forceful imposition of order.

1.6.1.1 World Order: Peace through the Power of Law

The second approach to peace explored by the class is the world order paradigm. This paradigm, which views the “order” created by practices of power politics as a form of disorder, purposes that sustained cooperation among states and other significant actors, such as non-governmental (activists) organisations and inter-governmental organisations, is both possible and necessary. Cooperation is possible because human nature contains the potential for both selfishness and altruism; cooperation is necessary because the unmitigated competition favoured by the power politics paradigm cannot be sustained.

To affirm that principled cooperation is possible, the world order paradigm emphasizes human choice and intentionally while asserting that nation-states do not have a monopoly on power to shape global politics. The nation-state is not the only forum for political activity and accountability, and the national interest is not the
exclusive criterion for desirable behaviour. In an age of globalisation, politics involves a complex interplay of global and national as well as local loyalties, values, and interests. Modern communications and transportation technologies have empowered citizens to form transnational networks for advancing concerns linked to peace, human rights, ecology, and development. The concerns of these citizen networks have helped to define agendas both for national governments and for such institutions of global governance as the United Nations. Through conscious design, states and engaged word citizens can operate within the framework of these value-maximising institutions to move beyond fearful and reactive behaviour, extend the rule of law into the international sphere, and provide global public goods.

It is precisely because of the failure of competitive, state-centred models of international relations to secure human interests that advocates of the world order paradigm argue that broader and more intense efforts to achieve international cooperation are necessary. In a shrinking and increasingly technological world, issues such as poverty (well over a billion of the world’s people live in conditions of “absolute” poverty), and the spread of weapons of mass destruction are of concern to all. These problems cannot be addressed within the overwhelmingly competitive framework of the power politics paradigm, and require the articulation of new values, norms, and programmes for multilateral action through international dialogue and cooperation. When government pool sovereignty in international institutions and collaborate with non-governmental organisations and social movements to provide global public goods, amore equitable and sustainable system can be realised.

The world order paradigm paints a different picture of the world than the politics paradigm, a picture that foregrounds the roles of concerned citizens and ethical values in politics. Power is not only the ability to coerce others through the capacity to hurt or punish (destructive/ threat power – “the power of the stick”), but also the ability to reach shared objectives through collaboration (productive/ exchange power – “the power of the carrot”) and the solidarity (integrative/ social power – “the power of the hug”). Whereas the “power politics” paradigm views peace as a temporary absence of war within a self-help system of sovereign states, the world
order paradigm equates peace with presence of certain value conditions that are required for human flourishing and for long-term survival within a global context: non-violent conflict resolution, human dignity, development, ecological balance, and political participation. “If you want peace,” purposes the world order paradigm, “prepare for peace.” Peace can be actively sought through policies and efforts that build consensus, reduce injustice, create opportunity, and provide multilateral frameworks for responding to common challenges.

1.6.1.2 Conflict Resolution: Peace through the Power of Communication

The third paradigm, conflict resolution, offers a highly pragmatic approach to peace through the development and refinement of skills for analysing conflicts and responding to them with effective strategies of communication and negotiation. Where protagonists of world order concern themselves primarily with macro-level, structural issues such as distributive justice and the institutionalisation of international cooperation, practitioners of conflict resolution focus more on processes of interaction among individuals and groups and on the relationships that characterise them.

According to the conflict resolution paradigm, conflict is natural at all levels of human interaction and organisation, from the interpersonal to the interethnic and international. Although it can cause estrangement and great human suffering, conflict does not inevitably lead to violence, and is often necessary for major changes in relationships and social systems (e.g., the American civil rights movement). Peace, then, is understood as a continuous process of skilfully dealing with and, whenever possible, preventing or transforming conflict. To manage and resolve conflicts effectively, we must become aware of our attitudes towards conflict and our habitual conflict management styles (competitive, collaborative, avoidant, submissive, etc.), so as to attain to greater freedom to define our own responses in a proactive and coordinated (as opposed to reactive and incoherent) way. Such awareness increases our chances of achieving “win-win” rather than “win-lose” or “lose-lose” solutions. We learn to understand and work with our own emotions, to generate openness to more authentic communication, and to control processes that might otherwise lead to escalation.
To respond effectively to conflict, conflict resolution theorists and practitioners underscore the importance of cooperative, non-adversarial processes for problem solving and relationship building, which are often conducted with the assistance of an external third party or mediator. These processes direct attention to underlying interests and human needs (e.g., security, identity, bonding, control, development) beneath superficial positions and demands, and highlight the significance of culture in human interactions. They affirm the importance of empathy, creativity, and “shared positive power” (“power with” rather than “power over”) in all conflict resolution processes, whether between individuals, groups, or states. They also underscore the potentially positive role of non-official processes of dialogue and engagement in today’s major international conflicts, most of which involve powerful feelings of ethnic and communal identity. Proponents of the conflict resolution paradigm, then, approach peace through direct interaction with the “other”. “If you want peace,” they suggest, “train for the processes of peace”. Develop skills for communication and coexistence.”

1.6.1.3 Non-violence: Peace through Willpower

One of the most common misconceptions about the fourth approach to peace, non-violence, is that it is a paradigm that enjoins passivity. From the standpoint of non-violence activists, the assumption reflects the dominance of power politics assumptions, which equate power with the ability to hurt and therefore regard it as the exclusive possession of governments and armed militant groups. In response, the non-violence paradigm proposes that the power of any government derives primarily from the consent of the people, and only secondarily from coercion. By consenting to any given state of affairs and operating within the framework of norms that it offers, human beings empower that offer and, if its norms are dehumanizing, disempowering and dehumanize themselves. Alternatively, by defining their own behaviour as moral agents irrespective of external norms and pressures, they may become agents of change who can awaken others to new possibilities.

As Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr., and many others have underscored, non-violence is action animated by principle and informed by the proposition that means
and ends are inseparable. Rhetoric about the ends of social change must always correspond with the actual effects of the means that have been chosen to advance these ends. Peace between human communities cannot be achieved through violence, nor can democracy be secured through armed insurrection within a society. Peace, then, cannot be disconnected from justice and justice entails an absence of oppression, whether perpetrated indirectly by inequitable structures and institutions or directly through use of weapons. In other words, peace entails an absence of violence, broadly conceived as avoidable insult to human needs (and, we might add, to the balance of nature). Genuine peace can only be attained through peaceful (and therefore just and non-violent) means of action – actions that seek to undo conditions that degrade human beings and to break cycles of retaliation that cheapen the value of human life.

The paradigm inspired by non-violence maintains that, in situations defined by unjust laws or oppression, change may be sought by steadfast, principled measures (Satyagraha – “clinging to truth”) through which individuals with shared commitments refuse to participate in any actions that they deem unjust and immoral. These measures may take many forms, from symbolic protests to boycotts, parallel institutions, and direct non-violent intervention. Actions taken to promote non-violent change are intended both to initiate a process for realizing shared objectives and to invite a response – be it cooperative or repressive – from the society or governing authority. By refusing to dehumanize their adversary even in the face of repression or provocation, non-violent activists empower themselves to work in creative ways rather than enter into destructive, “eye-for-an-eye” behaviours that, as Gandhi put it, “leave the whole world blind”. Instead, by overcoming their own fear and anger, they offer to others a new way of seeing the reality around them, and deny legitimacy to institutions and actions that violate human community and the principles of ahimsa (“no harm”).

According to the non-violence paradigm, genuine power derives from willpower and human solidarity rather than from violence, which undermines community and sows the seeds of its own destruction. Non-violence offers an approach to peacemaking that has been used not only to counteract forms of social
discrimination and political repression but also to resist foreign imperialism or occupation. “If you want peace,” assert non-violence activists, “work for justice – justly.” This commitment to work for peace by peaceful means through training, strategic planning, constructive programmes, and personal discipline implies a revolution of the human spirit, and points to the possibility of a shift in human consciousness in which ahimsa becomes a way of life transformation.

1.6.1.4 Transformation: Peace through the Power of Love

The final approach to peacemaking investigated in the peace paradigms course is the transformation paradigm, a paradigm that focuses on the centrality of education, cultural change, and spirituality in all genuine attempts to make peace a reality in daily life. From the standpoint of the transformation paradigm, peacemaking is not only an effort to end war, remove structural violence, or establish the presence of external value conditions. It is also a profoundly internal process, in which the transformation of the individual becomes a metaphor for and instrument of broader changes. Transformation, then, involves the cultivation of a peaceful consciousness and character, together with an affirmative belief system and skills through which the fruits of “internal disarmament” and personal integration may be expressed. Transformation unites doing with being, task with experience. Inner freedom is felt in the midst of action, and sacred ideals are personalised for application by the individual. Peaceful behaviour is learned behaviour, and each individual is a potential and needed contributor to a culture of peace.

From the standpoint of the transformation paradigm, spirituality implies insight into the deep interconnectedness and sacredness at all levels and compartments of reality. It is innate to the person, and may be understood as a universal human “attempt to grow in sensitivity to self, to others, to non-human creations and to God” that recognizes and seeks to accommodate the presence of the divine in all actions and relations. Recognition of this divine presence and claim begets spontaneous loyalty, which cannot be restricted by boundaries of religion, race, class, or gender. This universal loyalty, in turn, inspires actions born of loving commitment to the wholeness and integrity of creation. The personal has become the political in the most
creative and inclusive sense possible, as we seek to make public life reflect non-
partisan spiritual value. We become present in the moment, yet responsible for a
shared and hopeful future inspired by injunction, “If you want peace, be peace. Be an
instrument of peace.”

Taken together, these five paradigms – power politics, world order, conflict
resolution, non-violence, and transformation – attest that the paths to peace are many
and that they are travelled not only by statesmen and diplomats, but also by advocates,
educators, volunteers, and many other varieties of “ordinary” citizens. By exploring
each paradigm, we learn to more actively wrestle with our assumptions and evaluate
claims in the light of our full range of experiences. We exercise both our reasoning
faculties and our intuitive sense of what is “right,” “real,” and “true.” In such a
manner, we make peace a more integral aspect of our lives, and become more aware
of the homes we have built for our moral imaginations. We prepare to lay the
foundation for our own unique and original peace paradigm – a structure built of
precepts and practices of our own choosing.

Part III

1.7.0.0 Peace in the Vedantic Age of Hindus

As the Investigator went through some literature related to Major Religions of
the world in order to know the perspectives of these religions on Peace he came across
the following material on Peace which is presented below as a data base for the
reference.

Sebastian Pianadath has the following ideas expressed in his article on “Peace
in the Vedantistic age of Hindus”. Peace is harmony, harmony within oneself, with the
world and with the Divine. This holistic harmony is achieved through the integration
of oneself with the totality of reality. Integration is possible only through self–
restraint. The Sanskrit word for peace, santi, comes from the root sam, which means
to restrain oneself, to pacify, to renounce. Through self-restraint one attunes oneself to
the broader horizons and deeper dimensions of reality. One renounces the ego-centred attitudes of life (ahamkara) and wakes up to deeper Self-awareness (atmabodha). The consciousness sinks to the perception of the Ground of being in which all things are interrelated. Peace comes from this waking of oneself to the truth of the interrelatedness of everything. Peace is the awareness of the web of reality.

1.7.1.0 The Santimantra

The expansion and deepening of consciousness has a three-fold dimension: one is at peace within oneself, with everything else and with the Divine. This is expressed in the Invocation of Peace, Santimantra: Om, santi, santi, santi! The invocation is an essential utterance at the beginning, and especially at the end of any sacred action or the recitation of a sacred text. Before anything is undertaken, one tunes oneself to the totality of reality: hence, the word santi is repeated thrice referring to the spiritual (adhyatmika), the cosmic (adhibhautika) and the divine (adidaivika) aspects (Sankara, on the Santimantra, Taitiriya Upanishad 1.1.1.). These three are the essential constituents of an integral process of peace. With the santimantra one prays for the blessings of all the three realms, invokes blessings on the three realms and asks for the removal of obstacles coming from these three realms. The opening verse of Iswara Krishna’s Samkhyakarika speaks of the ‘triad of suffering’ (dukhatraya) caused by the mental, the physical and the metacosmic elements. Peace means the overcoming of this threefold obstacle. Through a life of discipline (sraddha) and renunciation (tyaga) one experiences peace with the divine powers embedded in the universe. Rabindranath Tagore describes the process of peace as follows: “From universe to Infinity – this is the soul’s normal progress”.

1.7.1.1 Peace within Oneself

The term adhyatmika refers to not only the spiritual dimensions of human life, but to the diverse aspects of the life of the individuated self. In the inner process of the realisation of the true self there are three levels of consciousness: the mental, the psychic and the intuitive. At the mental level the mind (manah) objectifies everything and reaches out to reality through the senses. In the psyche (chittah) the memories of
the past are stored. Deeper than these two spheres, the intuitive faculty of perception (buddhi) dives into a unity in the transcendental consciousness. Mind pursues the logic of things; buddhi enters into the mystique of reality. Mind speculates on the horizontal level; buddhi intuits vertically into reality.

In the mystical consciousness that emerges at the buddhi level one perceives the Self in the self through the Self (atmani atmanam atmana pasyati) – this is the all-pervading intuition of the Upanishads. When one thus touches the ground of reality in oneself, all the faculties of perception are brought into as inner harmony. The human individual experiences an inner grounding and this is the peace within oneself. The activities of the senses are controlled (viniyamya) by the mind; the mind is focused (samyamya) on the inner Self; thereby the movements of the chittah are streamlined (uparamate); the buddhi is brought to steadiness (dhruti gruheeta); and thus the entire inner realm is attuned to the inner Self (Bhagavad Gita 6:14, 20, 24, 25).

“When the movements of the chittah are brought to rest
Through the practice of meditation, then one perceives
The Self in the self through the Self, and rejoices in the Self”;

This, the supreme delight in which one transcends all suffering (Gita 6:20-23).

This is how the deepest spiritual experience is described in terms of the experience of genuine inner peace and harmony. According to the Gita this inner peace is ultimately a gift of the grace of the personal divine Lord (Bhagavan):

By my grace you will overcome all obstacles…and attain the ultimate abode of supreme peace (Gita 18:58,62).

The way to peace is to transfer the centre of one’s being from egoism (ahamkara) to Self-awareness (atmabodha) (2:71) through total personal surrender to the divine Lord (18: 56, 62, 66, 5:12). It is a movement from the possessive attitudes of the mind (kama) to a total anchoring of the buddhi in the Lord (12:2, 7, 8,14). The fruit of this is ‘peace, the ultimate state of being in the Lord’ (6:15, 12:12, 9:31). This is not something that one experiences only after this life, but is in an abiding
consciousness right in this life, an experience of inner harmony in a busy life in the world.

The Upanishads too describe this basic process towards inner peace and harmony. The quest there is not so much for an objectified knowledge of things, but for an inner awakening to the depth of reality. “Through the knowledge of what shall all this become known?” This is the fundamental question (Mundaka Up. 1. 1. 3). “Knowing what shall I know the knower of all?” (Brihad Up. 4. 5. 15). There is a constant invitation for a meditative entry into the consciousness of the ultimate subject of all the objects of the mind. And finally, the sage makes a breakthrough into the transcendental consciousness in which he exclaims: I am Brahman! That thou art! (Aham brahma asmi, tat tvam asi) (Bri. Up. 1. 4. 10; Chand .Up. 6.8.7). This is the deepest experience and this is the ultimate abode of peace.

“The one Eternal amid the transient,
The Conscious amid the conscious,
The one amid the many,
who grants their desires,
to the wise, who perceive It as abiding in the Self,
to them is eternal peace and to no others” (Kath Up. 5. 13).

One who is thus ‘grounded in the Brahman has overcome all fears’ (Tait. Up. 2:7,
Chand. Up. 1.3.1). There is no space for disharmony and grief.
“When one understands that in oneself the Self has become all beings,
When one has attained this unity,
What room is there for sorrow;
What room for perplexity? (Isa. Up. 7)
The life that evolves out of this experience is oriented to truthfulness
(Mundaka Up. 3.1.6; Tait Up. 2.1.11)
Hence the santimandras:
“May my speech be firmly established in my mind.
May my mind be firmly established in my speech.
O self-manifested One, be manifested to me.
Be for me the cornerstone of the Veda.
May what I have heard not depart from me.
By that learning I maintain days and nights.
I will speak the right, I will speak the truth.
May that protect me.
May that protect my teacher…

Om santi santi santi!

(Aitarya Up. 1. 1.).

Peace with the World”.

The Supreme Self that one experiences as the depth of one’s being is the
Ground of the being of all. Inasmuch as one wakes up to the consciousness of oneness
with the Self, one grows into the awareness of unity with all beings. The
consciousness gets a cosmic expansion and consequently a compassionate attitude
transforms one’s life. Thus, one grows in peace with all beings, human individuals,
living organisms as well as with the things of nature. Sarvabhutatm bhutatma – one’s
Self has become the Self of all beings. Then one sees the ‘reflections of one’s self in
all beings’ (Bhag. Gita 6:32).

“The well-integrated one perceives the Self in all beings,
and all beings in the Self.
One and the same is seen everywhere.
One then perceives the divine Lord in all things and
all things in the Lord.
With such a person the Lord is ever united.
In deep love and unity one worships the Lord
present in all beings.
Such a person lives and moves ever in the divine Lord,
whatever be one’s mode of life.
In all things one then sees only reflections of one’s self.
Thus one overcomes the duality of pleasure and pain” (Gita 6:29-32)

The inner freedom and equanimity that evolve out of this integral cosmic vision
make one’s life at peace with all beings in nature. One is then ‘passionately concerned
about the wellbeing of all things’ (sarvabhutahiteratah, Gita12:4). One commits
oneself to the ‘integral welfare of the entire world’ (lokasamgrah, Gita, 3:25). In this
world-view one realises the mutual dependence of human endeavour and the well-
being of nature. Concern for the protection of the environment is consequence of a
spiritual vision of the cosmos. Only by nourishing the powers of nature (deva) can
humans attain prosperity.

Inasmuch as humans nourish the powers of nature through their service (yajna),
nature blesses them with the gifts of life. If on the other hand one exploits nature
without maintaining it, one is a thief, Those who cook food only for themselves are eating sin! (Gita 3: 10-13)

Having attained inner peace one enters the world with the attitudes of ‘compassion and friendliness, non-violence and non-possessiveness, equanimity and even-mindedness’ (Gita 12:13-19). Peace within oneself creates peace with all being outside, for the entire world is experienced as the ‘body and abode’ of the divine Lord (9:4, 18:61, 11:9).

In the Upanishadic vision too the inner experience of the Self blossoms forth into an integral world-view that renders peace with all beings. The Atman that one intuits within oneself is the Atman that pervades all beings.

“Verily this whole world is Brahman.  
This Atman within the cave of the heart is  
greater than the earth  
greater than the atmosphere, greater than the sky,  
greater than these worlds.  
It encompasses this whole world”(Chand. Up.3:14)

Hence, the enlightened person sees ‘the Self in all and all in the Self’; the entire world is seen as ‘permeated by the divine Lord’ (Isa. Up. 1. 1,6). The effect of such a universal theophany on the life of humans is harmony and peace with all beings. Already in the Vedic times this cosmic dimension of peace was upheld in the spiritual evolution of humans:

“Peaceful be earth, peaceful ether, peaceful heaven,  
Peaceful waters, peaceful herbs, peaceful trees.  
May all gods bring me peace,  
May there be peace through these invocations of peace.  
With these invocations of peace which appease everything  
I render peaceful whatever here is terrible,  
whatever here is cruel,  
whatever here is sinful.  
Let it become auspicious,  
Let everything be beneficial to us” (Atharva Veda 19.9)

With this spiritual vision people live with the abiding awareness of living in a sacred sphere. Hence, one cannot covet anything or possess with greed. It has been an
ancient insight of the sages that greed (kama) is the root cause of all conflicts and sufferings in the world. What makes life joyful is the inner freedom that comes from renunciation, tyaga (Isa Up. 1.1). What makes life peaceful is the compassion that comes from equal-mindedness (samadarsana). Mahatma Gandhi was fully convinced of the basic value of peace: “My service to my people is part of the discipline to which I subject myself in order to free my soul from the bonds of flesh. For me the road to salvation lies through love of humanity. I want to identify myself with everything that lives”. When the Creator Lord was asked what it was that made life worth living, the answer was: damyata, data, daya, self-restraint generosity and compassion (Brihad Up. 5.2.1-3). The final instruction given by the master to the disciple at the end of long years of gurukulavasa is:

“Speak the Truth, Pursue the Dharma
Continue self-study
Do not desist from your duties to bring welfare to beings
Give your mother and father, teacher and guest the respect due to gods”
(Tait. Up.1.11.1-2)

A peaceful social order can result only where individual citizens are respected and the civil duties are performed. Aswapti, a king of the Upanishadic period, was proud of the peaceful situation in his kingdom. “In my kingdom there is no thief, no miser, no drunkard, no man without sacrificial fire, no ignorant person, no adulterer, much less an adultress” (Chand Up. 5.11.7)

In the Mahabharatha peace is understood as the social outcome of dharma. The basis of dharma is this principle: “Endued with self-restraint, and possessed of righteous behaviour one should look upon all creatures as one’s own self” (Mbh 12.292). From this spiritual outlook comes the golden rule of peaceful coexistence.

1.8.0.0 PEACE: A Buddhist Metanarrative

Rosario Rocha presents the following ideas on “Peace in Buddhism”.

Buddhism is properly regarded as a religion of peace. Peace is a supreme value in the teaching of Siddhartha Gautama. Siddhartha Gautama, revered by the people of his time as the Buddha, namely, the Awakened One, spoke of peace to his followers. His words have been compiled into various works, the Sutta, Vinaya and Abhidhamma Pitaka, that make up the Pali Canon. The contents of the Sutta Pitaka are discourses or sermons of the Buddha. In order to render the discourses intelligible for those far removed in time and to prevent misunderstanding of the message on account of unorthodox exegesis, orthodox explications and glosses were written. They were mostly exegetical commentaries. The commentaries on the Abhidhamma Pitaka in particular highlight the universal nature (paramatthadesana) of the Master’s teaching.

In this essay we seek to explore the nature of the Buddhist discourse on peace. It is our presupposition that it is a metadiscourse or metanarrative. Its insight is that a human person is peace by his/her very nature. The Buddha came to this insight by his relentless search for the cause of suffering and violence in the world.

1.8.1.0 Nature of Buddha’s Discourse:

The method of enquiry in the dispensation of the King of Dhamma (Dhammarjassa ssane) is characterised by Pariyayabhasitam, Sandhayabhasitam, Sabhavabhasitam, in the introductory verses to the Mendakapanh in the Milindapanhana. In his pedagogy his teachings were contextualised. Pariyayabhasitam are understood to be those expositions by the Master for the benefit of the one who has directly approached him. The Sutta literature is generally assigned to this group. Sandhayabhasitam are explanations enjoined on all. It refers to the common regulations in the Vinaya literature. Whenever an opportunity (sandhi) offered itself, the Teacher spoke what was appropriate for the occasion and enjoined it on all. Sabhavabhasitam means teachings that pertain to the nature of all. These teachings are compiled in the Abhidhamma literature. They seem more abstract in their bid to interpret the teaching with more universal outlook.

The universalist dimension of Buddhist ethics in its psychonoetical foundation is ascertained as non-sectarian. Its starting point is human experience. All experience is understood to be rooted in the very nature (sabhava) of being. In the history of
ethical philosophy, this is an entelecheic perspective in the Orient different from the
teleological standpoint. The Abhidhamma philosophy, thus, distinguishes itself as the
*Paramatthadesana*, teaching on the ultimate meaning of life and reality. *Paramatthadesana* is generally rendered as ‘the instruction in the ultimate nature of things’. *Para* is the superlative form of *para*, meaning beyond, highest, excellent. It points to the universal principle to analyse human reality. *Attha* conveys the sense, meaning, denotation and significance of Dhamma. The Buddha’s role is referred to as *atthassa ninnetar* (M.1.-111), bringer of the good; bearer of meaning or value. Literally, it should mean one who leads to meaning, to the ultimate truth. The Buddha then is one who leads to the highest good, to the ultimate realities. He does so through his teaching, *desana*, which is *Dhammadesana*. This discourse of the Buddha can be a metadiscourse, a metanarrative. One of the post modern thinkers, Jean-Francois Lyotard, explains post modern and metadiscourse as:

“I will use the term *modern* to designate any science that legitimates itself with reference to a metadiscourse...making an explicit appeal to some grand narrative, such as the dialectics of the Spirit, the hermeneutic of meaning, the emancipation of the rational or working subject, or creation of wealth.

Simplifying to the extreme, I define *post-modern* as incredulity towards metanarratives”.

The Buddha’s discourse on peace, the concern of the essay, could be considered a grand narrative. As seen in the preceding discussion, the discourse of the Buddha was to bring into focus meaning, value in reference to the human context. It was to suggest the way the Buddha led others to peace and even indicated how all human beings could attain to the ultimate peace (*nibbana*). There seems to be an appeal for peace as a value in a world at war with its understanding of the other and its relationship with the other than oneself. It may be gainsaid that the Buddha was not inclined to the kind of incredulity referred to by Jean-Francois Lyotard about metanarrative, particularly peace.

1.8.1.1 The Buddha’s Language of Peace
From India, the land of its origin, the message of the Buddha spread to different parts of the Eastern hemisphere and continues to do so in the West in our own day. It is, without a doubt, a peaceful entry into different cultures. J. B. Pratt studied the peaceful spread of Buddhism and suggested insightfully that Buddhism is remarkable for its elasticity and adaptability:

Buddhism has been emphatically a missionary religion. Its transplanting to new lands has been accomplished never through conquest or through migration but solely by the spread of ideas. Yet almost everywhere it has gone it has completely adapted itself to the new people and the new land as to become practically a national religion.

Religions of Indian origin manifest similar dispositions of peace and non-violence. With David J. Kalupahana, it would be rightly helpful “…..to examine the theoretical underpinnings of this enormously significant practical achievement” of Buddhism in its missionary pilgrimage to other parts of the world. Our author seeks the theoretical underpinnings of “the philosophical foundation of peaceful coexistence and critical tolerance”.

At times the language of the Buddhist discourse on peaceful coexistence and critical tolerance may have a ring of negativity to it. The term for peace is arana. It is to be found in the Aranavibhanga Sutta, the “Discourse on the analysis of peace” (M. 3. 235). The term seems to suggest a negative nuance, namely, arana as non-conflict. Similarly, the attainment of complete liberation is known as nibbana, the cooling of desire, passion. The sense of conflict embodies a struggle within oneself as well as with others. One’s views of reality, whether it is permanent or impermanent; whether eternalist or annihilationist, should they be absolutized may lead to conflict and cause disruption. The idea of non-violence is central to Buddhism. It is more a deep sense of respect for life. Should there be non-compliance with these principles, though expressed in some negative tone or nuance, by individuals or communities, the result may turn out to be an obstacle to people living in peace together, peaceful coexistence or critical tolerance.

In a more positive expression, Jayatillake has rightly pointed out that “peace” constitutes a central concept in Buddhism”. So much so that the Buddha was regarded
as the King of Peace (*santi-rayā*). After his Awakening he began communicating his peace. His was a purposeful communication to initiate others to the way of peace and liberation that would lead to peaceful coexistence. The Buddha was concerned about communicating the ultimate meaning of reality. In the *Dhammapada* we have two valuable verses to highlight the communication of meaning to bring peace to the hearer:

> “Better than a thousand utterances composed of meaningless words is one sensible word on hearing which one becomes peaceful”
> (8:100)

Evidently the goal of one’s communication is to bring peace to the other, the hearer. Then peaceful coexistence and harmony are distinct possibilities. This was the goal of the Buddha’s discourse. It manifests the metanarrative character of Buddha's teaching.

The initial reluctance of the Buddha to undertake a metadiscourse after his Awakening is quickly overcome by his decision to share his *dhamma* with the five ascetics. In the “Discourse on the setting in motion the wheel of righteousness” (*Dhammakkhapavattna Sutta* – S.5) he advocated the Middle Path to attain ultimate peace, liberation. The Middle Path is an explicit appeal to a grand narrative concerning the human quest. It is set in the context of the two extreme forms of individualistic behaviour of the self-indulgent materialist on the one hand and the self-mortified, life-negating, ascetic on the other. The Buddha opines that the nature of their discourse is painful, not worthy of human beings and incapable of achieving the ultimate liberating peace which is the yearning of the human heart. He advised those ascetics to avoid the extremes and follow the Middle Path which brings insight, knowledge, peace and full enlightenment.

### 1.8.1.2 Peace a Metanarrative in Buddhism

Buddhism, as it spread through the sub-continent, raised the discourse about the nature of humans and human predicaments to a universal level from the earlier ritualistic perspective of birth or caste-based stratification. The Hindu ethos in which Siddharatha Gautama was brought up had its areas of non-intelligibility. The
inequality of humans and the lack of fellowship could not stand the test of rational investigation. The latter was employed by Siddhartha Gautama to understand the social ethos of his day. By employing criterion of verification about the manner of birth of children, of the high or of the low, through the birth channel of a mother, the Buddha demythologized the Hindu notion that the Brahmins are born from the mouth of the Brahman and so on. All humans are born the same way, with the exception of contemporary caesarian procedure.

The early Buddhists were convinced of the fact that the phenomenal personality was in a constant state of flux, and that there was no eternal soul in the individual. On the other hand the perfected being had reached nībbana, and nothing could be meaningfully predicated about him. The clear concept of the constitution of a person among the Buddhists is that he/she is essentially nībbana, ultimate peace. Besides, early Buddhism understood that a person is also a pudgala, a psycho-physical entity (the five skandhas). When the psycho-physical personality is analysed, the original nībbana is realised, “Physical forms are like foam; sensations like bubbles; perceptions like mirage; mental constructs like the flimsy trunk of a banana tree; and consciousness like phantoms”. This view of the Buddha is eminently apophatic. De Smet has insightfully appreciated that “he (the Buddha) stands forever as a warning against any facile solidification of man according to the constructs of his desires and instinctual drives. Only the ego belongs to the realm of naming, the true person cannot be reached by the modes of speech”. The way to the realisation of the ultimate nature of a person, namely, sublime peace, is the eightfold middle path, particularly the five precepts (pancasila). They awaken in a person the meaning of life and instruct one to desist from:

- Taking life;
- Speaking contrary to the truth;
- The abuse of sexual relationship;
- Stealing the goods of others; and
Using intoxicants.

In spite of the precepts, humans can follow a path of extremes in the matter of each of them. Such a way of life can lead to disharmony in society and disrupt peaceful living. Life is an inviolable value in the teaching of the Buddha. Violence to life in any form, human or otherwise, is a violation of peace. So is the violation of the other precepts. On account of the significance for peace of each of the precepts, Buddhism teaches us to uphold non-violence. Buddhism believes that there is a just moral order in the universe. Humans reap the way they sow. If they sow goodness they reap goodness, and if they sow evil they reap evil. If they sow peace, they would only be true to their ultimate nature. Thus, they would uphold the just moral order in the universe to ensure peace and peaceful living.

1.9.0.0 PEACE: BIBLICAL PERSPECTIVES

“Samuel Rayon expresses” his ideas on Peace in Bible in the following way. Quoting Jean Lassere he observes that “from the point of view of Christian ethics, a study of the Old Testament is bound to be disappointing. By and large the Old Testament ignores that respect for human life, that unconditional love, that non-violence which forms the general climate of the New Testament. Everywhere is the Old Testament human life is cheap and the best believers have scarcely felt any scruple about shedding blood; believers are almost all warriors; only Jeremiah is non-violent”. Nevertheless, scattered through the Old Testament’s pages, “there is another strain, universalistic and pacific”.

Albert Randall concurs. In the Hebrew Bible war is a dominant theme. Conflict and bloodshed receive twice the attention given to peace. Peace seems inconsequential during the oral tradition and the writing period – centuries of violence and destruction, of conquest and defence, and loss of sovereignty. But there is also “a spiritual theme whose importance far transcends that of death and war: peace”. The need for peace and the hope of peace were always there, “awaiting the right voice to bring them to awareness”. Indeed, the spiritual foundation of the Hebrew Bible is peace; “the reality
which lies at its core is a God who created humans for peace. Thus the spiritual
greatness and genius of the Hebrew Bible is found in its awareness of the relationship
among peace, righteousness, justice, salvation and God.”

Already in the period of the Judges, in the days of Medianite oppression,
Gideon experienced God as peace. “Peace be with you”, is what Angel of Yahweh
said to him; “have no fear”. Gideon built an altar there to Yahweh and called it
“Yahweh – Peace” (Judges:6:14-24). There are passages in the Bible that disapprove
of bloodshed, and there are prophetic texts that demand and foretell an end to wars.
David is glad that Abigail’s intervention prevented him from killing and exacting
revenge (1 S 25:31-35). God declares David disqualified to build a temple to
home the Ark of the Covenant because David was a man of war and had shed blood
(1Ch 28:2-3). Isaiah proclaims that

“….in the final days nations will hammer their swords
into ploughshares and their spears into sickles.
Nation will not lift sword against nation,
no longer will they learn how to make war “(Is 2:4)

Micah, prophesying in the same period, delivers the same message of peace:
“when God will judge between many peoples and mighty nations,
They will hammer their swords into ploughshares
and their spears into billhooks.
Nation will not lift sword against nation,
or ever again trained to make war.
But each man will sit under his vine and fig tree
with no one to trouble him” (Mi 4: 3-4)

Isaiah continues to project his vision of peace. He names the future Messianic
ruler the Prince of Peace. In the days of this Prince, the oppressor’s yoke and rod shall
be broken; the clanging footgear of soldiers and the clothing rolled in blood shall be
fed to the flames; and the scion of David, given to us, will be named

“……Wonderful – Counsellor, mighty – God,
Eternal Father, Prince – of – Peace,
to extend his dominion in boundless peace.
In fair judgment and integrity” (Is 9:3-6)
The entire entourage of the Prince of Peace will bespeak peace. He will not ride on a war horse, so powerfully described in Job (39: 19-25), but on a donkey, as foretold by the prophet:

“Rejoice, daughter of Zion,
Your king is approaching.
Humble and riding on a donkey.
He will not banish chariot from Ephraim
And horses from Jerusalem.
The bow of war will be banished,
He will proclaim peace to the nations” (Zechariah 9:9-10)

When this King rules with God’s own justice, the Psalmist can ask the hills and mountains to

“bring peace to people.
In his days uprightness shall flourish
and peace in plenty till the moon is no more.
From oppression and violence he redeems their lives,
their blood is precious in his sight” (Ps 72:1-3, 14)

Sometimes prophets urge Israel to surrender to an invading army, not because war is evil in principle, but because the invasion is divine punishment to which one must submit (Jr 21: 8-10; 2: 8-13). On other occasions they denounce weapons of war and warlike alliances not, once again, because war is immoral but because it is futile (Is 30:1-; 31:1-3; Jr 17:5). In disqualifying David, man of war who had shed blood, to build a house for the Divine Name, it is not clear whether war is being condemned as unethical or merely as ritually polluting (1Ch 28:1-3).

But there are two stories that constitute a firm rejection of war and violence, and resound as a powerful advocacy of peace and friendship. A large armed force with horses and chariots, sent by the king of Aram to capture Elisha, (who through prophetic visions had been revealing to Israel’s king every sinister move of Aram), was struck sun-blind and led by the prophet to Samaria. Israel’s king was happy, and proposed to put them to death. The prophet’s reply reflects the spirit of the Prince of Peace: “Do not kill them…offer them food and water…and let them go back to their master.” This was done. The outcome? “Aramean raiding parties never invaded the
territory of Israel again” (2 Kg 6: 8-23). The message is, if you want peace, practise peace and love the enemy.

A similar scene is enacted later through the intervention of another prophet. In the days of the idolatrous king, Ahaz, of Judah, Israel invaded the south, killed thousands and “took two hundred thousand captives, with quantities of booty carrying everything off to Samaria.” The prophet Obed went out to meet the victorious troops. He castigated them for the slaughter they had committed and for their plans to enslave the survivors. “Now listen to me,” said the prophet; “release the captives you have taken from your brothers, for the fierce anger of Yahweh hangs over you.” Some of the chieftains supported the prophet. So “the soldiers gave up the captives and the booty.” The captives were given clothing and sandals, food and drink, and donkeys as needed and taken back to their brothers in Jericho (2 Ch 28:1-15). That is how the biblical tradition of unlearning war and building peace kept growing.

Progressively the Hebrew people did demythologize military might and reinterpret the meaning of their call. They were not chosen to dominate the world but to witness God’s saving justice and universal love, and to assume the burdens of our common humanity and be a suffering servant (Is 42: 6-7; 49:6; 53; Am 9:7; Jon; Swaim 1983:17). The conviction spread that the king should not acquire more and more horses and chariots and that security did not lie in arms and armies. Those who trust in horses stumble over corpses. The prophetic judgement on war and weapon may be summed up in a word: “Not by might, not by power, but by my (Yahweh’s) Spirit” shall the people live and prosper (Dt 17:16; 1 S 8: 11-12; Ps 33:17-17; Na 3:3; Zc 4:6).

When Yahweh will cleanse Israel of her infidelities, and betroth her to himself anew, life and society and the earth as a whole will be refreshed too; mainly through the abolition of war:

“…..When that day comes I shall make a treaty for them
With the wild animals, with the bird of heaven
And the creeping things of the earth;
I shall break the bow and the sword and warfare,
And banish them from the country,
And I will let them sleep secure” (Hos 2:20-21).

The psalms see the dawn of peace as one of Yahweh’s wonder-works:

“Yahweh puts an end to wars over the whole world,
He breaks the bow, snaps the spear,
Shields he burns in the fire” (Ps 46:8-10)

The psalms invite us to be still and experience the peace which enfolds the earth, and thus come to ‘know’ the God, supreme over the whole world as distinct from the godling who cares only for one tribe, and is ready for their sake to destroy the cosmos. The King whom God has promised and the people have been dreaming of will redeem the poor, the weak and the needy from oppression and violence; their blood is precious in his sight; and in his days “mountains and hills (will) bring peace to the people” (Ps 72: 3-4; 13-14)

In brief, after the fall of Jerusalem (587 BCE) the promise of peace became central to the message of the prophets, especially to the Deutero Isaiah. In this collection the covenant of peace comes to be viewed eschatologically. This world, now under God’s judgement and broken, will in the end be new, created and made whole in righteousness and splendour (Is 65: 17-19; 11: 6-9; 29:17-24; 54:10; 62:1-9). And Yahweh is going to “send peace flowing over her like a river” (Is 66:12). “The message concerning the renewal of the covenant of peace blossoms into the promise of the universal and everlasting peace; and the coming of the day of salvation is frequently linked with the Prince of Peace (Is 9:5-6), who s God’s Anointed (Is 61: 1ff), is the bringer and the founder of the Kingdom of Peace.”

1.9.1.0 Christ and Peace

Peace (shalom, eirene) is the opposite of chaos; of external chaos like war and famine; and of internal chaos like lust, greed, fear, despair, anger and confusion. It is more than the absence of social – political conflicts and wars. Positively it designates the state of being well, being complete and whole, being victorious, prosperous,
healthy, safe and free and having sufficient physical and spiritual resources. It includes friendly relationship between persons and peoples (cf Jg 4:17; 8:9; 1K 5:4, 26; 9:25; 22:27, 45; Is 7:14; Mi 3:5, Zc 8:12; Mi 2:5). Associated with covenant and judgement, peace is something to be sought and achieved (Ps 34:14; Zc 8:16-19). It is inseparable from commitment to justice and truth, and is indeed often synonymous with these (Na 1:15; Jr 6:6; 8:11, 15). Righteousness and God’s peace are indivisible: justified by faith we are peace with God (Rm 5:1-3). That is why the Prince of Peace is also the bringer of justice (Is 6:5-6; 11:1-9; 40; 48:18; 60:17). Justice and peace embrace (Ps 85:10-13). Ultimately shalom is God’s gift, closely linked to grace and justification (Is 9:5-6; 26:6,12; 48:18; 52:7; 54:10; 55:12; 60:17; 66:12; Jr 6:13; 8:11; 14:13). In fact, it sums up all the blessings of God and is associated with God’s blessed presence. Hence, it approximates salvation.

For God is the God of peace and not of disorder and chaos (1 Cor 14:32-33; Rom 15:33). The God who overcame primal chaos and established an ordered world of beauty and peace (Gn 1), also raised Jesus from the dead, thus overthrowing the ultimately chaotic, and disclosing Himself as the God of life and peace (Heb 131:20-21). Through Christ, God continues to undo disorder and death, and to reconcile all things and make peace (Col 1:18-20). God makes peace by putting us and the world in right relationship with Himself in forgiving love through Christ and the Spirit (Phil 4:4-5; Eph 4:2-3; Gal 5:22-23; Rom 16:20; 1 Thess 5:23; 2 Thess 3:16). And the right relationship or righteousness, which God has enshrined in history for everybody’s taking, is the Person of Jesus: Jesus, the Peace of God enfleshed. “Justified by faith we are peace with God through Jesus Christ” who died for us to reconcile God. In his death Jesus also reconciled us to one another, breaking down divisive walls and hostilities which separated persons and peoples, cultures and traditions, thus uniting them into a new humanity, in his crucified Body. He therefore is himself our Peace (Eph 2:13-18).

That is why at his birth angels sang peace (Lk 2:8-14). Peace is named in nearly every New Testament writings. There are almost 150 references to peace in the NT, while there are but 180 in the entire OT, which is more than double the bulk of
the New. Peace then is a major theme of the Christian scriptures. These identify Jesus with the Prince of Peace of Isaiah 9:5, and with the humble King of Zechariah 9:9-10, who banishes chariots and horses and bows of war, and proclaims peace to the nations.

Jesus stood for complete non-violence not only of the hand and the outward deed but also of the heart as well as inward dispositions. He radicalized the old commandment, you shall not kill. He deepened it: you shall not be angry with your sister or brother, nor hurt them even with an abusive word, not even if they are unfriendly, hostile and oppressive. Rein in every instinct to hit back, and reverse all traditions and philosophies of revenge and retaliation. Meeting stench with stench only fouls the air the more, and that, for everyone. Jesus wants our response to every situation to be positive and creative, and capable of transforming it for the better: love your enemies; pray for your persecutors; offer the other cheek; let go your tunic too; offer to carry the baggage a second mile; forgive seven times seventy times, endlessly; recognise the primacy of reconciliation with your sister/brother over worship of God; and know that what God wants is mercy, not sacrifice. In short, “set no bounds to your love as your heavenly Father sets no bounds to His” (cf Mt 5-6). Such gentle relationship is the Temple of the God of Peace.

Jesus turns down the offer of kingship and armed power. He refuses to join the Zealot movement and its violent struggle against colonial oppression. He offers pardon, life and peace to a sinful woman, setting aside the death penalty prescribed by the law (Jn 8:1-11). The entire framework and horizon of his ministry, traced by healings, feedings and raising of the dead and befriending of the outcasts, spell life and peace. His inaugural sermon, his ‘manifesto’ (Lk 4:18-19), implies critique and rejection of military action: the passage he cites from Isaiah 61 points to a series of sufferings caused by wars, by the Babylonian conquest of Jerusalem in particular. So does also his decision to devote much of his time and attention to the service of victims of hunger, disease and derangement caused in large measure by the deep exploitation of the land and its people by the Roman imperialism for almost a century (since 63 BCE).
Jesus is peacemaker. His life and death constituted a peacemaking ministry through which he reconciled alienated groups among themselves, and an estranged world with God. Peacemakers therefore resemble him, and share in his special relationship to God, and will be called God’s own children, God’s daughters and sons (Mt 5:9). It is not surprising then that both before and after his death Jesus should bequeath to us his peace – a peace which the world cannot give, and which is vastly different from the Pax Romana achieved through total war and slaughter, and maintained by sword and repression (cf Jn 14:27). Jesus’ peace is not born of the sword but of the unspeakable love that led him to lay down his life for his friends and to pray for his killers (Lk 23:34; Jn 15:9-16). The word about “his” peace/ “my peace” seems to suggest some import to the peace – salutation with which Jesus greets his friends (Lk 24:36; Jn 20:21; Mt 28:9) and which otherwise would be no more than social custom or convention.

No wonder the early Christians soon came to recognise Jesus’ message as ‘the Gospel of peace (Acts 10:36). For the New Testament perspectives on peace place us in a world vastly different from the Old Testament world of human holocausts and wars of annihilation. The New Testament, even Paul, once a man of violence, now a disciple of Jesus, urges us “to be at peace with everyone” to the utmost of our ability; never to pay back evil with evil; never to try to get revenge; to give food to your enemy if he is hungry; never to curse persecutors but ever to bless them (Rom 12:14-21). We are to “seek peace with all people, and let no root of bitterness poison life and relationships (Heb 12:14-16). Wisdom that comes from above is pure and peaceable and “the peace sown by peace-makers bring a harvest of justice” (Jas 3:17-18). Our call is to be loving and compassionate, to repay wrong with blessings, and to “seek peace and pursue it” (1 Pet 3: 8-12).

The Christian scriptures then, are suffused with the gentle light of God of peace, and permeated with the breath of the Prince of Peace, with the presence of the Spirit of Peace, and with the memory of peace-makers, of bonds of peace, and of grace and righteousness which are inseparable from peace. Our mission, then, is to preach peace, to make peace, and to prepare hearts and communities to welcome the
gift of the Kingdom of truth and life, of holiness and grace, of justice, love and peace. God’s gift of peace, our experience of peace and our hope of everlasting peace in life with God is the heart of Christian revelation.

But on the other hand, what about New Testament texts that speak of battles and wars and New Testament writers who use military language? And about Jesus who, too, speaks about swords? These passages have been cited in the past in support of a theology of ‘just war’, and in justification of numerous conflicts and massacres committed by ‘Christians’! Did not Jesus say that he had come to bring not peace but a sword? Not unity and harmony but dissension and strife? (Mt 10:34-36; Lk 12 51-53; 2:34). And on the night of his arrest, as the crisis was drawing near, did he not tell his disciples to sell their cloak and buy a sword? They replied that they already had two swords. And he said, “That is enough” (Lk 22:35 -38). A note in the New Jerusalem Bible interprets this to mean, “The sword will be needed for protection”. And did not St. Augustine and others after him use these sayings to support holy war? However, in both passages, ‘sword’ is used figuratively; it stands for suffering and martyrdom which discipleship was sure to bring with it. In Gethsemane the disciples fail to understand, and Jesus cuts the conversation short. Is not the word ‘enough’ a mild rebuke? A literal interpretation would contradict Jesus’ command to a follower to put his drawn sword (dagger) back in its scabbard (Mt 26: 51-54; Jn 18:10-11). It would go against the whole tenor of Jesus’ teaching and practice of endless forgiveness and love of enemies, and his consistent refusal to be king after the pattern of Herods and the Caesars. It would also be ridiculous to suggest that two swords – actually two small knives – were deemed enough with which to confront the armed might of the empire. Jesus praises a centurion’s faith (Mt 8:5-13; Lk 7:1-10); the Baptist instructs soldiers to be just and fair (Lk 3:14); a Roman soldier is baptised and received into the Christian community (Acts 10:1-9). Would it be proper to argue that, since none of these was asked to leave his profession, Jesus and his friends had no objection to military action in a just war? The letter to the Hebrews recalls some judges like Gideon and Barak who, through faith, became brave fighters and victorious conquerors (Heb 11:32-40). This could be interpreted as showing believers to participate in war and as providing basis for a theology of political war. But what
the text is actually saying is that neither faith-based war nor war-linked faith brought their practitioners perfection and salvation. They were “not to reach perfection except with us” and for us God did make better provision, which is Christ, our peace. The solitary military metaphor Jesus once used refers not to political war but to the cost of discipleship and the spiritual struggles required to overcome covetousness and selfishness (Lk 14:30-33). Paul is more generous with military terms (Rm 7:14-25; 2 Co 10: 3-5; Ep 6:12; 1 Th 5:8; 1Tm 1:18; 6:12 also 1Pt 2:11; Jm 4:1-2). But every case is a metaphor for spiritual war against passions and dispositions, which tend to breed spiritual conflicts.

In sum one might say that the recorded teaching of Jesus (a) provides only “highly questionable grounds for a theology of just war”; (b) repudiates all wars of extermination; (c) provides excellent foundations for spiritual war; and (d) shows that the descriptions of eschatological wars (Mt 13; Lk 19 and 21; Mt 24) are clearly symbolic.

Then there is the Book of Revelation, the most war-oriented and intimidating book in the Christian Bible. Numerous passages speak of war and conflict: the wars of the Dragon (ch 12 and 13); of the foul spirits (16); of the kings and the Beast (17); and two battles of the end (19 and 20). These eschatological visions are marked by powerful images of combat and violence. “They dominate so powerfully that the Lamb, the Suffering Servant, the Prince of Peace, seems overshadowed by the Warrior Messiah of God’s harem (holy war of extermination) against evil. Although Revelation ends with vision of eschatological peace, the metaphorical (or, for some, real) violence and destruction preceding the New Jerusalem is as spine-chilling as the Hebrew Bible’s herem”.

Nevertheless, the central message of the New Testament is unconditional, infinite love and compassion. “This peace rather than war lies at the heart of the Christian revelation”. “Neither in the Gospels nor in the other books of the New Testament is there an unquestionable foundation for a theology of political war”. Those who seek to base such a theology on the NT are trying to beat ploughshares into swords rather than follow Jesus in sowing and reaping (Mt 13; Jn 4:35-38). M.
Langley, having explored the subject of Jesus and revolution, comes to the same conclusion as Hans Kueng. “No strategy of violence, but only one of non-violence, can be deduced from the example of Christ”. He adds that “we would not be true, either to the example and teaching of Jesus Christ, or to the demands of a God of justice and love, if we did not seek to advance the Kingdom by recognising the Rule of God and by working for a more just and humane society.”

1.9.2.0 The Church and Peace

The Catholic Church has always stood for Peace and is working towards achieving a society of peace lovers. “Kurien Kunnupuram” clarifies the same idea in his article on “Church and Peace” in this way.

In the Old Testament, the Hebrew word shâlôm, which is usually translated by ‘peace’, is very rich in meaning. It “may be said to signify in general completeness, perfection – perhaps most precisely, a condition in which nothing is lacking”. According to G Von Rad “Its basic sense is not the narrower one of ‘peace’ but the wider one of ‘well-being’. It may be used for good fortune of the wicked, for health, and for national prosperity, which implies stability”. In many passages it denotes friendly relationships, whether between states (1 Kgs 5:26) or individuals (Zech 6:13). It is thus linked with covenant; a covenant initiates or seals it (Josh 9:15; Ezek 34:25). In Ezekiel it is God who makes the covenant that results in peace, so that the term can finally express the relationship between God and His people (cf. Is 54: 10).

Shâlôm is always a religious term since all the elements involved in peace are looked upon as God’s gifts (see Jg 6:24; Job 25:2 Ps 35:27; 122:6). There is a pregnant passage that sums up the blessings associated with peace which God bestows on the righteous (see Lev 26:1-13). Roland J. Faley explains the text thus:

“The blessings centre chiefly around fertility of the soil (3-5 and 10), with the abundant yield of the harvest presented in vivid, if exaggerated, imagery (cf. Am 9:13). The people’s future is described as a life of peace and accord with the forces of nature and easy victory over their foes (6-8), abundant offspring (9), and crowned with the inestimable blessings of the Lord’s presence (12). Such favour is viewed...
wholly in terms of the Sinai alliance (9b), the outcome of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage” (!3).

It is quite significant that shālôm is an element in Israel’s eschatological expectation (see Is 2: 2ff; Zech 9:9-10). In fact ‘prince of peace’ is one messianic titles precisely because the Messiah is the one who guards and guarantees enduring peace (see Is 9:6-7; Mic 5:5).

It is worth noting that the Old Testament does not refer to inner peace. As G Von Rad has said “An interesting point is that for all its wealth of meaning in the Old Testament nowhere denotes specifically an attitude of inward peace”.

In the New Testament eirênê, is the term for peace. It is at first used in greetings (see Mk 5:34; Js 3:16; Jn 20:19), often together with mercy or grace (see 1 and 2 Timothy; 2 Jn).

According to W. Forester

The main meaning in the New Testament is obviously not the Greek one but salvation in a deeper sense. This embraces human concord, as in Acts 7:26 etc., but also peace with God. Closer to the Greek are the use for the opposite of war in Acts 12: 20; 24:2; Mt 10:34 and Paul’s use for peace of soul (cf. Rom 15:13). The Old Testament basis comes out plainly in such expressions as “making peace” in Jas 3:18 and “giving a greeting of peace” in Jn 14:27…in the material use of the NT we find peace as a feeling of rest, peace as a state of reconciliation with God, and peace as eschatological salvation; the last of these is basic.

In the gospels peace is spoken of in relation to Jesus. At his birth the angels announce peace to those whom God loves (Lk 2:14). During his triumphal entry into Jerusalem the multitude of disciples joyfully shouts out the message of peace (Lk 19: 37-38). However, it is Paul who clearly explains the link between Christ's saving work and peace. As Leon – Dufor writes “Being “our peace”, Christ has made peace; He has reconciled the two peoples uniting them into one sole body” (Eph 2:14-22). He has “reconciled all creatures through Him, whether on the earth or in the heavens, making
peace through the blood of His cross” (Col 1:20), thanks to the Spirit who weaves between us one solid bond (Eph 4:3). Every believer, once justified, is in peace through Jesus Christ with God (Rom 5:1), the God of love and peace (2 Cor 13:11), who sanctifies him “completely” (1 Thess 5:23). According to W. Foerster, “Peace, then, embraces the salvation of the whole person, and in Christ this is already present as the power of God”. J. L. McKenzie agrees with him when he says: “Peace comes through union with Jesus Christ and surpasses all human thought; it cannot be effected by human ingenuity (Phil 4:7). It reigns in the hearts of Christians, who are joined in the peace of the one body of Christ (Col 3:15). Peace is the fruit of spiritual-mindedness (Rom 8:6); in this verse peace is coupled with life, of which it is the fullness”. Paul’s phrase, “the God of peace” (Rom 16:20; 1 Thess 5:33f) is equivalent to “saving God”, as peace in the NT becomes very nearly synonymous with salvation. The Magisterium of the Church has been greatly concerned about peace in the world, especially after the First World War, and has systematically elaborated a body of teaching on peace.

What is most striking about this teaching is the positive understanding of peace that it has developed. As Vatican II expresses it: “Peace is not merely the absence of war. Nor can it be reduced solely to the maintenance of a balance of power between enemies. Nor is it brought about by dictatorship. Instead it is rightly and appropriately called “an enterprise of justice” (Is 32:7). Peace results from the harmony built into human society by its divine Founder, and actualized by men as they thirst after greater justice” (GS 78).

The Church has consistently taught that justice and charity are the foundations of peace. It may be right to think of “charity as the soul and justice as the substance of international peace”. In fact Pius XI believed that “a true and lasting peace is more a question of love than justice”. For it is the function of justice merely to do away with obstacles to peace; for example, the injury done or the damage caused. Peace itself, however, is an act which arises only from love”. And Vatican II concurs with the pope when it declares that “peace is likewise the fruit of love, which goes beyond what justice can provide” (GS 78).
The council teaches that peace is the gift of God who through the death and resurrection of Christ, reconciled humans with Himself and with one another. However, peace is also a human achievement since it is to be ushered in through the practice of love and justice. Hence, Vatican II exhorts us to plead for peace as well as to bring about (GS 78). Besides, it points out that “since the human will is unsteady and wounded by sin, the achievement of peace requires that everyone masters his passion (GS 78).

Pope John XXIII discusses the issue of peace at length in his Pacem in Terris. His basic thesis is this: “peace on earth, which men of every era have most eagerly yearned for, can be firmly established only if the order laid down by God is dutifully observed” (PT 1). The pope is convinced that there is a divinely established order in the universe and that humans can understand that order. In his words: The progress of learning and the inventions of technology clearly show that, both in living things and in the forces of nature, an astonishing order reigns, and they also bear witness to the greatness of man, who can understand that order and create suitable instruments to harness those forces of nature and use them to his benefit (PT 2).

But created as we are in the image of God, we humans are quite different from the rest of creation. Hence, relationships between humans are not governed “by the same laws as the force and irrational elements of the universe”, but rather by the laws God wrote in the nature of us humans (PT 6). Pope John XXIII goes on to elucidate the content of these laws:

“By these laws men are most admirably taught, first of all, how they should conduct their mutual dealings among themselves; next, how the relationships between the citizens and the public authorities of each state be regulated; then, how states should deal with one another; finally, how, on the one hand individual men and states, and on the other hand the community of all peoples, should act towards each other, the establishment of such a world community of peoples being urgently demanded today by the requirements of universal common good”. (PT 7).
The pope then exhorts us to follow these laws and preserve the order established by God so that there will be peace on earth.

Pope Paul VI adds a new dimension to the discussion of peace. In his “Populorum Progressio”, he declares that “development is the new name for peace”. He explains:

“Excessive economic, social and cultural inequalities among peoples arouse tension and conflicts, and are a danger to peace. As We said to the Fathers of the Council when We returned from Our journey of peace to the United Nations: “The condition of the peoples in process of development ought to be the object of our consideration; or better: our charity for the poor in the world – and there are multitudes of them – must become more considerate, more active, more generous. To wage war on misery and to struggle against injustice is to promote, along with improved conditions, the human and spiritual progress of all men, and therefore the common good of humanity. Peace cannot be limited to a mere absence of war, the result of an ever precarious balance of forces. No, peace is something that is built up day after day, in the pursuit of an order intended by God, which implies a more perfect form of justice among men”.

Paul VI has a comprehensive understanding of development. He articulates the Christian vision of development: In the design of God, every man is called upon to develop and fulfil himself, for every life is a vocation. At birth, everyone is granted, in germ, a set of aptitudes and qualities for him to bring to fruition. Their coming to maturity, which will be the result of education received from the environment and personal efforts, will allow each man to direct himself toward the destiny intended for him by his Creator. Endowed with intelligence and freedom, he is responsible for his fulfilment as he is for his salvation.

Pope John Paul II is a tireless champion of peace who has dealt with the theme of peace often and at some length. Like his predecessors, John Paul II sees a close connection between justice and peace. In his Message for the World Day of Peace, issued in December 1997, the Pope states:
“Justice goes hand in hand with peace and is permanently and actively linked to peace. Justice and peace seek the good of one and all, and for this reason they demand order and truth. When one is threatened, both falter; when justice is offended, peace is also placed in jeopardy…Justice and peace are not abstract concepts or remote ideals. They are values which dwell as common patrimony, in the heart of every individual. Individuals, families, communities and nations all are called to live in justice and to work for peace. No one can claim exemption from this responsibility”.

John Paul II believes that justice is rooted in love and “finds its most significant expression in mercy”. Hence, justice, “if separated from merciful love, becomes cold and cutting”. On the other hand, Justice is an active and life – giving virtue: It defends and promotes the inestimable dignity of every human person and is concerned for the common good insofar as it is the guardian of relations between individuals and peoples. No one, in fact, ever lives in isolation. From the first moment of life, each human being exists in relationship to others in such a way that the good of the individual and the good of the society go hand in hand. Between the two there exists a delicate balance.

The pope quotes with approval the following passage from United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights: “Recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world”.

John Paul II lays stress on the universality and indivisibility of human rights and calls in question the use of the argument of cultural specificity to justify the violations of human rights:

These distinctive features must be strongly reaffirmed in order to reject the criticisms of those who would use the argument of cultural specificity to mask violations of human rights and the criticisms of those who weaken the concept of human dignity by denying juridical weight to social, economic and cultural rights. Universality and indivisibility are two guiding principles which at the same time
demand that human rights be rooted in each culture and that their juridical profile be strengthened so as to ensure that they are fully observed.

The pope pleads for justice in a world on the way to globalisation. International efforts are necessary to promote a sense of responsibility for the welfare of all. As he points out:

The challenge, in short, is to ensure a globalisation in solidarity, a globalisation without marginalisation. This is a clear duty in justice, with serious moral implications in the organisation of the economic, social cultural and political life of nations…If the aim is globalisation without marginalisation, we can no longer tolerate a world in which there live side by side the immensely rich and the miserably poor.

In his Message for the World Day of Peace, issued in December 1996, John Paul II underlines the importance of forgiveness in our pursuit of peace. He realises that “there are many factors which can help restore peace, while safeguarding the demands of justice and human dignity”. But he is convinced that forgiveness is the most basic factor:

But no process of peace can ever begin unless an attitude of sincere forgiveness takes root in human hearts. When such forgiveness is lacking, wounds continue to fester, fuelling in the younger generation endless resentment, producing a desire for revenge and causing fresh destruction. Offering and accepting forgiveness is the essential condition for making the journey towards authentic and lasting peace.

The pope knows that many individuals, groups and nations find it difficult to forgive because of the situation of injustice and oppression in which they are forced to live. Besides there is the burden of history:

History carries with it a heavy burden of violence and conflict which cannot easily be shed. Abuses of power, oppression and wars have brought suffering to countless human beings and, even if the causes of these sad events are lost in the distant past, their destructive effects live on, fuelling fear, suspicion, hatred and division among families, ethnic groups and whole peoples.
That is why individuals and peoples need a “healing of memories”. This does not mean that they have to past events. Rather, they have to learn to look at them in a new way. Instead of remaining prisoners of the past, they have to recover their freedom to forgive. As the pope says: “The deadly cycle of revenge must be replaced by the new-found liberty of forgiveness”.

John Paul II believes that truth and justice are prerequisites for forgiveness. As he points out:

“The evil which has been done must be acknowledged and as far as possible corrected. It is precisely this requirement which has led to the establishment in various parts of the world of appropriate procedures for ascertaining the truth regarding crimes between ethnic groups or nations, as a first step towards reconciliation”.

And justice is the other essential requisite for forgiveness: “Forgiveness neither eliminates nor lessens the need for the reparation which justice requires, but seeks to reintegrate individuals and groups into society, and states into the community of nations.”

According to John Paul II, it is through their experience of God's forgiveness that humans are enabled to forgive: “God's forgiveness becomes in our hearts an inexhaustible source of forgiveness in our relationships with one another, helping us to live together in true brotherhood.”

In his effort to promote peace in the world, the pope makes significant points. The first one is the need for the preservation of ecological balance. He calls attention to the growing awareness among people today “that world peace is threatened not by arms race, regional conflicts and continued injustice among peoples and nations, but also by lack of due respect for mature…”. Hence, he feels that there is an urgent need for solidarity and cooperation among the nations of the world in order to preserve the integrity of creation.

The second part is the importance of intercultural dialogue s a step towards the establishment of peace and harmony among the peoples of the world. John Paul II is
convinced that dialogue between cultures is “an intrinsic demand of human nature itself as well as of culture”. Hence, he declares:

“Dialogue leads to a recognition of diversity and opens the mind to the mutual acceptance and genuine collaboration demanded by the human family's basic vocation to unity. As such, dialogue is a privileged means for building the civilization of love and peace that my revered predecessor Pope Paul VI indicated as the ideal to inspire cultural, social, political and economic life in our time. At the beginning of the Third Millennium, it is urgent that the path of dialogue be proposed once again to a world marked by excessive conflict and violence, a world at times discouraged and incapable of seeing signs of hope and peace”.

From what has been said so far it is clear that to work for peace and reconciliation is central to the mission of the Church. For the Church exists in order to carry on the saving work of Jesus under the guidance of the Spirit. And his saving work is interpreted in the New Testament as reconciliation and peace-making. According to Paul, Good was in Christ Jesus reconciling the world to Himself (see 2 Cor 5:18-21)> the Letter to the Ephesians points out that Jesus Christ brought about peace and reconciliation not only between God and humans, but also among humans. For he broke down the wall of hostility between the Jews and the Gentiles (see Eph 2:13-16). And the letter to the Colossians tells us that the work of reconciliation extends to the whole of creation since “through him God was pleased to reconcile to Himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, by making peace through the blood of his cross (Col 1:20). Hence, it is an essential part of the Church’s mission to work for peace and reconciliation.

There is another way of looking at this. It is generally held today that the Kingdom of God was central to the life and mission of Jesus. According to Vatican II, the Church has received the mission to proclaim and establish among all peoples the Kingdom of God (LG 5). Peace is one of the parameters of the Kingdom (see Rom 14:17). It is also one of the fruits of the Spirit. When a person is touched and transformed by the saving God, he/she will be at peace. The Church led by the Spirit
has to endeavour to establish peace within and among humans. As John Paul II has stated:

“Jesus not only taught his disciples the duty to forgive, but he also intended his Church to be the sign and instrument of his plan of reconciliation, making her the sacrament "of intimate union with God and of the unity of all humanity.

In the light of this responsibility, Saint Paul described the apostolic ministry as the "ministry of reconciliation" (cf. 2 Cor 5:18-20). But in a certain sense every baptized person must consider himself a "minister of reconciliation" since, having been reconciled with God and the brethren; he is called to build peace with the power of truth and justice”.

1.10.0.0 PEACE: ISLAMIC PERSPECTIVES

“Prof. B. Sheikh Ali” has following things to say on “Peace in Islam”. Peace stands for a state of mind in tranquillity where one is free from all sorts of worry. We say a man is at peace when a kind of satisfaction exists in his mind, body and soul. An element of joy, happiness and fulfilment thrills his life. Peace is needed for his creative work. Peace is the purpose for which he exists. Peace is the law of nature where everything functions smoothly. Peace is a concept peculiar to man, for it is taken for granted elsewhere in the creation. Man is the only entity that disturbs peace, but man is the entity that is conscious of peace. Peace is an abstract subjective experience so far as individuals are concerned. It becomes an objective condition of life when collectively it is applied to society. If the members of a family quarrel, peace vanishes, creating a void. If groups clash, peace disappears, causing social tension. If nations fight, peace is shattered, resulting in destruction. Peace is central to all, a condition for any social good, whether it be for individuals, societies, states or nations or for the world. When the question of peace is discussed in a journal of religious studies, it is an inquiry into how peace is viewed in different religions; how it is attained; what has been the contribution of each religion to the establishment of peace, either at individual, social, regional, national or global level; and where does
Islam stand in respect of these queries. An answer to the questions would form the substance of this essay.

1.10.1.0 Meaning of Islam

It is good to know what Islam is for it may carry answers to most of our other questions. Its very meaning is to be at perfect peace, to have done one’s duty to the Master, to strive after righteousness and to gain safety and salvation. The term is derived from the word *aslama*, indicating the submission of Abraham and his son Isaac to the supreme test of the sacrifice of the son by his father. A Muslim is one who gives himself up entirely to God and believes that in obedience to God alone lies the way to peace, prosperity, happiness and salvation. Adam disobeyed, lost his peace, reverted to obedience, and got peace. Islam is the youngest, simplest and most clear-cut of all the great religions of the world. Its two revolutionary principles are the unity of God and the unity of man. Faith in the oneness of God would confer on equality, solidarity, brotherhood, freedom and peace. Islam says: the ONE remains, the many change and pass; so get attached to the eternal. Here, in the unity of God, there is a change from heterogeneity to homogeneity, from diversity to unity, and from confusion to order. Islam demands loyalty only to God, and not to any intermediary. Since God is the ultimate basis of all spiritual life, loyalty to God virtually amounts to man’s loyalty to his own ideal nature. In such a situation one is bound to be at peace with oneself.

Islam says that God dwells in man. It is his conscience. When conscience is kindled with the torch of learning, he realizes that he owes something to society. What he owes is indicated in the conduct prescribed in Islam. When he discharges his duty well, he is at peace with himself. From unity of God he moves to unity of man. The striking feature of Islam is equality and brotherhood. It attempts to raze the barriers of caste, colour and class, and takes a stand on the bedrock of humanity. This concept of the unity of man is of great social value that helps peace at all levels, from the individual to the global. It removes all distinctions in human society which disturb peace. History shows that human kind has suffered because of social discrimination, racial discrimination, the divine right of kings to do as they pleased, disregard for
individual rights, economic exploitation, caste confrontations, wealth disparities and so on. Islam put an end to all such usury and no priesthood. The humblest of the humble and the lowest of the low could rise to the highest position. In Islamic history even slaves have become kings and queens, as is evident from the slave dynasty of the Delhi Sultanate. Bilal, the Abyssinian black, was the favourite companion of the Prophet. Even an emperor has to stand shoulder to shoulder with the commoner in a mosque. The Islamic concept of equality has surely contributed much to peace.

We are discussing here what every faith or religion possesses as that intrinsic worth which would be helpful to peace and not whether votaries of that faith actually conform to their teachings or not. Followers of all religions have departed from their principals at some time or other, yet they stand for certain values and ideals. Buddhism stands for patience and righteousness, Jainism for truth and non-violence, Hinduism for humanism and tolerance, Christianity for love and service, and Islam for equality and brotherhood. There are basic absolute values present in each of them which are more prominent than other moral values. Each religion has something special about it, for which it is well-known, besides a bundle of other values which become its moral code.

Judged from this standpoint, the Islamic creed, rooted in the unity of God and unity of man, sprouted into a robust tree of wide dimensions that was helpful for peace. In its doctrine regarding what should be the attitude of man towards the affairs of this world it differed a little from other religions. To a Hindu this world is not significant at all, as man is tied up in a chain of births and deaths, and in every birth he has to improve until he attains salvation. To a Christian this world is significant but not decisive, because his hope is on Jesus Christ to plead for his forgiveness. To a Muslim this world is both significant and decisive, but not final, for he believes in life after death where his salvation would depend entirely on his good deeds done in this life. The meditation between man and God is his righteousness. It is in moral behaviour that the human and the divine meet. If he is a sinner, Prophet Muhammad cannot plead for him. Every iota of good or bad that a man does here would help him to gain timeless salvation in the next world. In contrast to religious beliefs, to a
Marxist this world is significant, decisive, final and all in all. Thus, to a Hindu this world is Maya, “a veil that religious insight pierces to the motionless truth beyond”, but a Muslim is more pragmatic and says that this world is reality, where what you sow you will reap in the next world. He is unlike the Christian who has implicit faith in Christ for redemption. He is totally against the Marxist, who regards the world as the be-all and end-all. The approach of Islam is conducive to peace.

Again in Christianity, man’s will is corrupted. Man is born in sin. In Islam intelligence comes before ‘will’, and the will is not corrupted. In Christianity love is taken to the extreme. One has to offer the other cheek, if a blow is given on one cheek. Islam believes in justice and permits retaliation. It is noble to forgive but human to respond. Since justice is an attribute of God who has ordained accountability in the next world, man is permitted to so behave in this world, for justice it is difficult to establish peace. Justice is to give everyone what is due to him. Islam is the religion of the Absolute, as Christianity is the religion of love and miracles. Contemplation is basic to Christianity, whereas guidance of God is basic to Islam. The ‘will’ to do good in Islam would depend on guidance from God. A Muslim surrenders totally to God and seeks equilibrium. In Christianity ‘will’ controls man; a Christian need not wait for guidance from above to do his penance. If he is inclined to do it, he does it. In Islam ‘will’ is subordinate to Supreme Guidance. The intellect in a Muslim is a gift of God. Not only life is a gift of God, wisdom too is a gift of God given to those whomsoever God likes. There is something higher than man’s knowledge, skill, wisdom and understanding, and that is God’s will. Muslim prayer to God is not to seek what man wants but to say that His will may be accomplished in him, and that His will is his peace.

In Christianity the fall of Adam and the incarnation of Jesus are events, but in Islam the fall of Adam is a necessary manifestation of evil. Evil, however, cannot determine the true nature of man. Islam is not founded on miracles. Prophet Muhammad was just a man, as anyone else. He did not bring any man to life or cure any leper to health. He had to run away to escape persecution, and had to fight wars when attacked in a distant place. To a Muslim, neither sacrifice nor renunciation
would be helpful for salvation, which is possible only through righteousness. In Islam there are two types of actions; we must do certain things which are ordained by God, and we must not do certain other things which are prohibited. We must not do wrong, for God never does wrong. We must act like Him, for He always does good, and we too must do good. This is because on the one hand we are like God, for He breathed in our soul and we exist, and on the other, we are very much opposed to or unlike Him, for we are tempted to do wrong. We disturb the peace He created in the universe. Man, therefore, is both Divine and devil, saint and Satan. If he is good, he is better than an angel; if he is bad, he is worse than a devil.

1.10.2.0 General Conclusions: After going through the material related to Peace in major Religious Scriptures the Investigator derived following conclusions

- Hinduism has the idea of peace as harmony within oneself, with the world and with the divine. Therefore peace in Hinduism is Adhyatmika, adhibautika and adhidaivika.

- Peace is the realization of the interrelatedness of everything in Hinduism

- Peace also refers to a state where every individual is respected and civil duties are performed suitably (Chand Up: 5:11:7)

- Three Cardinal values like non violence (ahimsa), forgiveness (Kshama) and truthfulness (Satyam) are essential for the culture of peace according to Hinduism

- Buddhism is regarded as a religion of peace

- Buddha preached peace as supreme value

- Abhidamma pitaka says that human person is peace by his very nature

- The term used for peace is “arana” which is found in aranavibhanga sutta

- Peace constitutes a central concept in Buddhism and Buddha is considered as “King of Peace” (Santhi-priya)
• The main purpose of Buddha’s communication was to achieve Co-Existence and harmony

• The following 4 social emotions are very important for harmony and peaceful coexistence—loving kindness (metta), compassion (Karuna), sympathetic joy (Mudita) and equanimity (upekka)

• Islam aims at the annihilation of caste barriers, colour and class distinctions

• It tries to remove all distinctions in human society which disturb peace

• Islam stands for equality and brotherhood through which it tries to achieve peace

• The first part of the Hebrew or Jewish Bible has a stand against the popular understanding of peace i.e. towards war

• The second part of the Jewish Bible upholds peace

• The New Testament takes a firm stand towards peace. Jesus was/is considered the Prince of Peace.

• Christianity upholds justice as a prerequisite for peace.

• The church teachings have held justice and peace in the same footings.

---

Part IV

1.11.0.0 Gandhi as a Peace Scientist

A. Jayabalanc in her article “Gandhi as a Peace Scientist” expresses following ideas on Gandhi’s Peace concept.

Gandhi was acclaimed as a practical dreamer, a prolific writer, a political reformer, and a man of peace. As a responsible leader he dreamt of an India in which
the poorest shall feel that it is their country in whose making they have an effective voice and in which all communities shall live in perfect harmony.

Peace is positive and it has to be sought with all our thought, energy and conviction. Gandhi beautifully states peace as an indirect by-product of other conditions, chief of which are mutual trust and a strong sense of the unity of mankind and its overriding importance. Peace is a value which includes justice, freedom and development. Today the whole world is facing greater problems in the form of inequalities between men and nations increasing fast. Gross violations of Human Rights and fresh manifestations of discriminations, non-colonialism and apartheid continue to raise their ugly heads. People take pride in their faith but fail to testify the truth and essence of their religion through their lives. These are some of the hindrances for peace. Pope Paul VI in his encyclical “Human Vitae” while speaking about current problems, states that such problems violate the integrity of the human person. Pope John Paul II stresses “to reach peace, teach peace”. Today’s world is badly in need to peace makers like Gandhi. Peace does not mean mere absence of war but it is an active and positive approach to the problems of relationships, the cooperation between nations and individuals in various ways.

Gandhi says that peace is efficient than war because “the legitimate object of war is a more perfect peace”. If the peace after the war is to be better than that which preceded it, the psychological processes of the conflict must be such as will create a more perfect peace. In his more than fifty years of political career, Gandhi always indicated the possibility and necessity of a peaceful coexistence of communities of different faiths. For Gandhi, the ultimate happiness lies in peace whether it was confined to the individual or extended to the whole of society. Gandhi held that peace should emanate from the individual nations. Only a nation whose very foundations are peace have the power to bring about peace in the world. He desired to bring about peace not only between Britain and India, but also between warring nations on earth. In order to workout his peace ideals, he founded Peace Brigade (Shanti Sena) which he had desired to become a world movement.
Gandhi has shown us the path of peace through his exalted principles of non-violence which are of vital importance in the context of the present political situation in the world. He was a man of virtues. In his view religion could help everyone to imbibe and to live out the basic principles of life in order we can live in peace.

1.12.0.0 HUMAN RIGHTS AND PEACE

Since the Investigator has considered Human Rights as one of the components of Peace Awareness the following literature is presented here for the reference purpose

1.12.1.0 Violation of Human Rights

The violation of human rights is one of the roots of war—and is a major victim of war itself. These violations, exacerbated by neo-liberal globalization, have resulted in the denial of economic, social and cultural rights as well as political and civil rights on a scale larger than before. The artificial distinction between these two sets of rights should be rejected. We affirm the universality and indivisibility of human rights and call to strengthen mechanisms to implement and enforce human rights treaties and to afford redress to victims for the violation of rights.

Although the right to life is fundamental, it is constantly denied by attacks of various forms on the human person particularly extra-judicial killings, forced disappearances, and torture. The War on Terror in a qualitatively new way causes a denial of human rights. In many countries where wars of intervention and occupation are waged—or where antiterrorist operations are staged—people are denied their collective rights to self-determination and national sovereignty.

The defence, protection and promotion of human rights and support to struggles for human rights are important areas of peace activity.

1.12.1.1 Internal Conflicts, Civil Wars

Ethnic, religious and racial intolerance and narrow nationalism are among the principal causes of armed conflict today. In many countries, internal conflicts, civil
wars, sectarian strife, as well as class conflicts take place leading to killings, destruction, ethnic cleansing, and other forms of large-scale violence. It must be emphasized that various factors contribute to these internal conflicts: Among these are the unjust distribution of political power and economic wealth, feuds over land and resources, ethnic and religious divisions, and intervention by outside forces. Civil wars take place between the establishment and organized groups of those who are denied political and economic rights. Unjustly, many of the wars that are waged against social, economic, and political inequities are redefined as non-traditional acts of terrorism. Under the guise of War on Terror, national liberation movements have been demonized and labelled terrorist. Seeking political solutions and resolving internal conflicts are extremely important for peace actions.

1.12.1.2 Counter-insurgency, Low Intensity War

As part of the War on Terror and under other pretexts, counter-insurgency and low intensity wars are carried out against sections of people in many parts of the world particularly in neo-colonial countries. Counter-terrorism is implemented most often through brutal military actions backed by so-called anti-terrorism laws. Counterinsurgency and low intensity wars, which were developed as Cold War anti-communist strategies, are now increasingly subsumed under the War on Terror. They result in widespread violations of human rights, such as extra-judicial executions and forced disappearances, and the displacement of large numbers of people, their future, and economies. This is an issue, which should receive high priority in planning peace activities.

1.12.1.3 Neo-liberal Globalization, a Threat to Peace

Economic injustice is at the root of war and war results in further economic injustice and exploitation. Economic injustice violates dignity and degrades the human person. Financial capital, integral to neo-liberal globalization, has undermined economies of many countries, especially destroying the livelihood of farmers and those with small business and trade. Neo-liberal globalization has produced more injustice, inequality and poverty. It has marginalized broad sections of the world’s
population, further widening the gap between the rich and the poor, between centers of global capitalism and peripheral countries. The concern is not only about globalization and the plunder and other unjust consequences it creates but also the fact that justice is alien to globalization. Justice has no scope or space in globalization. Globalization sets the paradigm of development only on growth that emphasizes profit maximization. This has directly led to the increase and intensification of poverty endangering peace. Justice and people’s participation, two essential components of development, have no place in globalization. In place of participation, intense competition is encouraged, destroying possibilities of cooperation and solidarity among the people. Exploitation and destruction of environment under globalization are threats to peace.

Under neo-liberal globalization, increased poverty and unemployment is triggering a surge in global migration, its feminization and informalization a major source of human insecurity. In their countries of destination, the human rights of migrant workers including the diaspora migrant communities remain largely unprotected and are often threatened with job discrimination, low pay, racism and xenophobia. Increasingly, women and children are victims of human trafficking and smuggling, with no possibilities of justice and protection.

Globalization and militarism should be seen as two sides of the same coin. On one side, globalization promotes the conditions that lead to unrest, inequality, conflict and ultimately war. On the other, globalization fuels the means to wage war by protecting and promoting the war industries needed to produce sophisticated weaponry and that, in turn, are utilized to destroy national economies and people’s lives. Weaponry is used—or its use threatened—to promote the interests of transnational corporations. Globalization and imperial security go together. Global capitalism, enforced militarily if needed, is integral to building the empire.

Neo-liberal globalization has to be vigorously combated. Struggles for economic justice and for peace have to be fought together.

1.12.1.4 Threats from Denial of Right to Self-Determination
Indigenous and unrepresented people are suffering from the suppression of their right to self-determination, ethnic and cultural genocide, the violation of their cultural, linguistic and religious freedoms, and the militarization and nuclearization of their lives, lands and waters.

Many of today’s violent and persistent conflicts are between states and unrepresented peoples and are characterized by an extreme power imbalance. As a result, unrepresented peoples by themselves are unable to engage states in negotiations for peaceful resolution of conflicts. Moreover, these conflicts tend to continue for decades leading to gross sufferings and cultural annihilation. To counteract the power imbalance, which drives these conflicts, it is necessary for the international governmental and non-governmental community to support actively people’s right to self-determination, to prioritize attention to these conflicts, and to promote their peaceful resolution.

The denial of the right to self-determination has led to several long-term conflicts most of which remain unresolved. It is important to comprehend that what generates conflict is not the legitimate claim of the right to self-determination but rather the denial of this inviolable right. Thus, it is imperative that the internationally-recognized right to self-determination be actively promoted as a basis of conflict prevention and conflict resolution.

The efforts of colonized or neo-colonized peoples toward the exercise of their right to self-determination have to be endorsed by all those who believe in peace. Specifically, the demand for the establishment of a permanent forum for indigenous peoples within the United Nations and the full implementation of the rights under the “Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples” deserve active support.

1.12.2.0 The Oslo Draft Declaration

In 1997, the Norwegian Institute of Human Rights convened a meeting in Oslo to prepare a draft Declaration for UNESCO’s General Conference later that year. The aim of the Declaration was to broaden the human dimension of peace and to divide the right to peace in three interrelated components. The first defines peace as a human
right, understanding that all human beings have a right to peace inherent to their humanity. War and violence of any kind, including insecurity are considered “intrinsically incompatible” with the human right to peace. The section calls on states and members of the international community to ensure its implantation without discrimination.

The second section elaborates on this task by making it a “duty” for all global actors, including individual, to “contribute to the maintenance and construction of peace” and to prevent armed conflicts and prevent violence in all its manifestations.

The third section elaborates the “Culture of Peace” – the means by which the right to peace is to be achieved. As we have seen, the culture of peace is a strategy that seeks to root peace in peoples’ minds through education, communication, and a set of ethical and democratic ideals.

The culture of peace requires recognition and respect for – and the daily practice of – a set of ethical values and democratic ideals which are based on intellectual and moral solidarity of humanity.

In essence, the right to peace is a global ethic of non-violence and reverence for all life and offers a blueprint for identifying the roots of global problems and for addressing conflicts early. It is an attempt to move beyond the day-today crises that make the headline news and to address their deep-seated causes.

The power of this draft declaration is in its challenge to the hypocrisy dominating the world order today, and it was here that the codification of the right to peace came to a temporary halt. A remarkable debate on the Oslo Draft Declaration took place in UNESCO’s General Conference on November 6, 1997. One European country after another either attacked or expressed reservations about the right to peace and accused Mayor of overstepping his mandate. Countries from the South struck back, accusing the North of wanting to protect their arms industries. At the end, Paraguay stated, “This rich discussion shows that the culture of peace is the central issue… and that the Human Right to Peace is needed for individuals and stated.”
Noting that the debate split North and South, Paraguay added, “Perhaps peace is a greater concern in the South where scarce resources are being diverted to war.”

Failing to achieve a consensus, Mayor did not press further with the issue. Scepticism about the human right to peace continued to echo for years after. In the informal discussions at the UN in 1999 that concerned the Draft Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace, the US delegate stated, “Peace should not be elevated to the category of human right, otherwise it will be very difficult to start a war.” Whether the speaker was aware of the irony of this statement or not, he had put his finger precisely on why a human right to peace is needed.

Efforts are continuing at the UN, but they still lack the necessary Western backing. In 2002, the UN Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Committee adopted a resolution calling for the promotion of the right to peace. The resolution would have the UN affirm that the peoples of the planet have a sacred right to peace, and resources released through disarmament measures should be devoted to the economic and social development of all peoples, particularly those in developing countries. Although the resolution had 90 votes in favour, a hefty 50 negative votes (mostly Western countries and the new East European members of NATO) were cast against it, and 14 abstentions were registered. Such division renders the resolution practically inoperable.

Some states are still arguing that the “right to peace” has not been negotiated at a sufficiently high level of international relations. Denmark, speaking for the European Union, said the issue should be dealt with in other forums (the same argument that was used in UNESCO meetings). Canada – speaking on behalf of the US, New Zealand, and Australia – expressed opposition because the resolution focused more on relation between the states, as opposed to states’ obligation to their peoples. The fact that Cuba was the main sponsor alienated many Western states. Nonetheless, an objective reading of the text does not provide any reason for rejection – unless a state wants to keep its options for warfare open. If the peoples of the stated that voted against the resolution knew what their governments were doing, the
governments would not be able to slide away so easily from their responsibility to build the structural basis for the right to peace.

When language is softer the idea of moving away from war as a means of resolving conflict meets less resistance. For example, in 2003, the UN General Assembly concluded five months of negotiations by adopting by consensus a resolution on the prevention of armed conflict. The resolution called on parties to a dispute threatening international peace to make the most effective use of existing and new methods of peacefully settling disputes, including arbitration, mediation, other treaty-based arrangements, and the International Criminal Court, thus promoting the role of international law in international relations. It reaffirmed the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security. And it called on Member States to support poverty eradication measures and enhance the capacity of developing countries; to comply with treaties on arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament; and to strengthen their international verification instruments and eradicate illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. The resolution was hailed as a landmark in efforts to move the world body from a culture of reacting to crises to one preventing them reaching critical mass.

Though shying away from any implication that the prevention of armed conflict sets the stage for a full-scale discussion of the “right to peace”, the resolution contains within it important elements of the culture of peace. Far from being anodyne or just another resolution, it is infused with an obligation to the victims of violence and challenges states to move from rhetoric to reality in preventing violence. It is a significant step forward by the UN in preparing the way for the right to peace.

1.12.2.1 Promotion of the Right of Peoples to Peace

The General Assembly.........

1. Reaffirms the solemn proclamation that the people of our planet have a sacred right to peace.
2. *Solemnly declares* that the preservation of the right of peoples to peace and the promotion of its implementation constitute a fundamental obligation of each State;

3. *Emphasizes* that ensuring the exercise of the right of peoples to peace demands that the policies of States be directed towards the elimination of the threat of war, particularly nuclear war, the renunciation of the use or threat of use of force in international relations and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means on the basis of the Charter of the United Nations;

4. *Affirms* that all States should promote the establishment, maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security and, to that end, should do their utmost to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control, as well as to ensure that the resources released by effective disarmament measures are used for comprehensive development, in particular that of developing countries.

5. *Urges* the international community to devote part of the resources made available by the implementation of disarmament and arms limitation agreements to economic and social development, with a view to reducing the ever-widening gap between developed and developing countries, and to promote the realisation of all human rights for all;

6. *Urges* all States to refrain from using weapons with indiscriminate effects on human health, the environment and economic and social well-being;

7. *Expresses concern* at the real danger of the weaponization of outer space, and calls upon all States to contribute actively to the objective of the peaceful use of outer space and of the prevention of arms race in outer space;

8. *Urges* all States to refrain from taking measures which encourage the resurgence of a new arms race, bearing in mind all the resulting predictable consequences for global peace and security, for development and for the full realisation of all human rights for all;
9. \textit{Decides} to continue its consideration of the promotion the rights of peoples to peace at its fifty-eighth session, under the item entitled human rights questions.

Meanwhile, attention in UNESCO has shifted back from a right to peace to the culture of peace. This was easier to digest for those who did not want their right to make war impeded. Everyone, after all, could be for peace in general, and especially in the abstract. UNESCO showed its wisdom by treading slowly. It developed the concept of the culture of peace into a series of programmes that would, at least in the minds of those who truly understood the dimension of the culture of peace, prepare the groundwork for a later acceptance of the human right to peace.

1.12.2.2. The Human Right to Peace

Here below is the Declaration by Fredrico Mayor Former Director-General of UNESCO

\begin{flushright}
January 1997
\end{flushright}

\begin{quote}
“Lasting peace is a prerequisite for the exercise of all human rights and duties. It is not the peace of silence, of men and women who by choice or constraint remain silent. It is the peace of freedom – and therefore of just laws of happiness, equality, and solidarity, in which all citizens count, live together, and share.

Peace, development and democracy form an interactive triangle. They are mutually reinforcing. Without democracy, there is no sustainable development: disparities become unsustainable and lead to imposition and domination.

In 1995, the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations and UNESCO and the United Nations Year for Tolerance, we stressed that it was only through a daily effort to know others better – I am the ‘other’! – and respect them that we would be able to tackle at source the problems of marginalisation, indifference, resentment, and hatred. This is the only way to break the vicious circle that leads from insults to confrontation and the use of force.

We must identify the roots of global problems and strive, with imagination and determination, to check conflict in their early stages. Better still prevent them. Prevention is the victory that gives the measure of our distinctively human faculties. We must know in order to foresee. Foresee in order to prevent. We must act in a timely, decisive, and courageous manner, knowing that prevention engages the attention only when its fails. Peace, health and normality do not make the news. We shall have to try to give greater prominence to these intangibles, these unheralded triumphs.
\end{quote}
A universal renunciation of violence requires the commitment of the whole of society. These are not matters of government but matters of State; not only matters for the authorities, but for society in its entirety (including civilian, military, and religious bodies). The mobilization which is urgently needed to effect the transition within two or three years from a culture of war to a culture of peace demands co-operation from everyone. In order to change, the world needs everyone. A new approach to security is required at world, regional and national levels. The armed forces must be the guarantors of democratic stability and the protection of the citizen, because we cannot move from systems of complete security and no freedom to systems of complete freedom and no security. Ministries of war and defence must gradually be turned into ministries of peace.

Decision-making procedures and measures to deal with emergencies must be specially designed to ensure speed, co-ordination and effectiveness. We are prepared for improbable. Wars involving the large –scale deployment if inordinately costly equipment, but we re not equipped to detect and mitigate the natural or man-provoked disasters that occur repeatedly. We are vulnerable to the inclemency of the weather, to the vicissitudes of nature. The protection of the citizen must be seen as one of the major tasks of the society as a whole if we really wish to consolidate a framework of genuinely democratic living. Investing in emergency help and relief measures and – above all – in prevention and the long term (for example, in continent-wide water distribution and storage networks) is to be prepared for peace, to be prepared to live in peace. Currently, we are prepared for possible war, but find ourselves surprised and defenceless in our daily lives in the face of mishaps of all kinds.

The United Nations system must likewise equip itself with the necessary response capacity to prevent the recurrence of atrocities and instances of genocide such as those which today afflict our collective conscience – Cambodia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Liberia, Somalia and Rwanda….

There is today a general desire for peace, and we must applaud the clear thinking and strength of mind displayed by all the warring parties in the accords that have been reached in El Salvador, Namibia, Mozambique, Angola, South Africa, Guatemala and the Philippines. These agreements fill us with hope but also sadness, when think of the lives sacrificed on the long road to the cease-fire, and of the open wounds, so difficult to heal. Thus, as we revive the concept of the ‘construction of peace in the minds of men’, we now call on all adversaries who still put their trust in weapons to lay down their arms and seek reconciliation.

Condemnation will not suffice. It is time for action. It is not enough to feel outrage when we learn of the number of children exploited sexually or at work, of refugees or of those suffering from hunger. We must react, each of us to the best of our abilities. It is not just a matter of looking at what the government is doing. We must part with something of ‘our own’. We must give, give of ourselves. We must stop imposing models of development, models for living. The right to peace, to live in peace, implies jettisoning the belief that some are virtuous and correct while others are wrong, and that some are always giving while others are always in need.
It is clear that we cannot simultaneously pay the price of war and the price of peace. Guaranteeing lifelong education for all would enable us to: control population growth, improve the quality of life, increase civic participation, reduce migratory flows, level out differences in income, assert cultural identity and prevent the destruction of the environment through substantial changes in energy use patterns and urban transport; promote endogenous development and the transfer of knowledge; foster the swift and effective operation of justice, with appropriate machinery for international co-operation; provide the United Nations system with appropriate facilities to tackle transactional problems in time. None of this can be achieved in a context of war. What is needed, then, is to reduce the investment in arms and destruction in order to increase investment in the construction of peace.

The distillation of traditions, thoughts, languages, forms of expression, memories, things forgotten, wishes, dreams, experiments, rejections, culture finds its supreme expression in our everyday behaviour. Infinite cultural diversity is our great resource, which is underpinned – this is our strength – by universal cultural values that must be passed on from the cradle to the grave. Family members – especially mothers – teachers, the media, everyone must help to spread the ethical principles, the universal guidelines that are so necessary today for haves and have-nots alike: the latter because they have a right to the basic minimum standards that human dignity demands; the more fortunate because material goods fail to deliver the expected pleasure. Where there is no longing, possession brings no enjoyment. In education, tools are useful. But nothing can replace the friendly words of a teacher, or the caresses and smiles of parents. The only real education is education by example….and love.

Learning without frontiers – whether geographical, or frontiers of age or language – can help to change the world, by eliminating or reducing the many barriers that today impede universal access to knowledge and education. Education must help to strengthen, reclaim and develop the culture and identity of peoples.

Globalisation carries with it a danger of uniformity and increases the temptation to turn inwards and take refuge in all kinds of convictions – religious, ideological, cultural or nationalistic. Confronted with this threat, we must emphasize the forms of learning and critical thinking that enable individuals to understand changing environments, create new knowledge and shape their own destinies. Indigenous peoples must be placed on an equal footing with other cultures, participating fully in the drafting and application of laws. Peace means diversity, blending – of ‘hybrid, wandering cultures’ as Carlos Fuentes put; it means multi-ethnic and multilingual societies. Peace is not an abstract idea but one rooted firmly in cultural, political, social, and economic contexts.

Above all, this profound transformation from oppression and confinement to openness and generosity, this change based on the daily use by all of us of the verb ‘to share’ – which is the key to a new future – cannot be achieved without our young people and certainly not behind their backs. We must tell them – they who represent our hope, who are calling for our help and who seek in us and in external authorities the answers to their uncertainties and preoccupations – that it is in themselves that
they must discover the answers, that the motivations and glimpses of light that they are seeking can be found within themselves. Although at times it may be difficult, given both their consternation and our own, to present the situation to them in those terms, our position as lifelong teachers and learners obliges us to say to young people, as Cavafy put it in a poem: ‘Ithaca gave you the journey…she has nothing left to give you now’. Each according to his own plan. Each according to his own way of thinking. Free from self-serving outside interference, especially when it robs the young of their own ‘core’, the intellect, talent, and resourcefulness which are the most precious individual and collective treasure of humankind. Sects and the escape provided by drug addiction are the clearest symptoms of this pathological state of mind that is our great problem today. Indeed, education means activating this immense potential and using it to its fullest so that each may become the master and architect of his or her own destiny. We cannot give the youth what we no longer possess in youthful vitality, but instead we can offer what we have learned through experience, the fruit of our failures and successes, of the burdens, joys, pains, and perplexity and the renewed inspiration of each moment.

Let youth hold high the banner of peace and justice! So convinced am I of the relevance of this goal to the proper fulfilment of our mission that I have proposed to the General Conference that it designate ‘UNESCO and youth’ as a central topic for discussion at its next session. That will be an appropriate moment since the General Conference will be considering for adoption the ‘Declaration on the Safeguarding of Future Generations’.

At all the United Nations conferences, regardless of the subject under consideration (environment, population, social development, human rights and democracy, women, housing), there has been a consensus that education is the key to the urgently needed change in the direction pursued by today’s world, which is increasing disparities in the possession of material goods and knowledge, instead of reducing them. To invest in education in not only to respect a fundamental right but also to build peace and progress for the world’s peoples. *Education for all, by all, throughout life: this is the great challenge.* One which allows of no delay. Each child is the most important heritage to be preserved. UNESCO may at times give the impression that it is only interested in preserving stone monuments or natural landscapes. That is not true. Those efforts are the most visible. And the heritage thus safeguarded the least vulnerable. But we must protect out entire heritage: the spiritual, the intangible, the genetic heritage – and, especially, ethics.

These are the basic, universal values that our Constitution sets forth with inspired clarity. If we sincerely believe that each child is our child, then we must radically change the parameters of the ‘globalisation’ currently under way. And the human being must become the beneficiary and main actor of all our policies and strategies.

A system collapsed in 1989 because, concentrating on equality, it forgot liberty. The present system, focused on liberty, will know the same fate if it forgets equality – and solidarity. The din made as the ‘Iron Curtain’ collapsed drowned out the tremor that ran through the foundations of the ‘winning’ side in the Cold War. We
must, then, for the sake of both principle and self-interest, redouble in every field the fight against exclusion and marginalisation. We must all feel involved. We must all work to ease the great transition from the logic of force to the force of reason; from oppression to dialogue; from isolation to interaction and peaceful coexistence. But first we must live, and give meaning to life. Eliminating violence: that is our resolve. Preventing violence and compulsion by going, to the very sources of resentment, extremism, dogmatism, and fatalism. Poverty, ignorance discrimination, and exclusion are forms of violence which can cause – although they can never justify – aggression, the use of force and fratricidal conflict.

A peace consciousness – in the interests of living together, of science and its applications – does not appear overnight, nor can it be imposed by decree. First comes disillusionment with materialism and enslavement to the market, and then a return to freedom of thought and action, sincerity, austerity, the indomitable force of the mind, the key to peace and to war, as affirmed by the founders of UNESCO.

Science is always positive, but the same cannot always be said of its applications. Advances in technology and knowledge can be used to enrich or impoverish the lives of human beings; they can help to develop their identity and enhance their capacities or, on the contrary, they can be used to undermine the personality and coarsen human talent. Only conscience, which is responsibility – and thus ethical and moral – can make good use of the artefacts of reason. Conscience must work in tandem with reason. To the ethics of responsibility we must add an ethics of conviction and will. The former springs from knowledge, and the latter from passion, compassion and wisdom.

We are now approaching the end of a century of amazing scientific and technological progress: we can diagnose and treat many diseases which cause suffering and death; we communicate with extraordinary clarity and speed; we have at our disposal instant, limitless information. However, antibiotics and telecommunications do not compensate for bloody conflicts which have cut down millions of lives in their prime and inflicted indescribable suffering on so many innocent people. All the obscenities of war, brought home to us nowadays by audio-visual equipment, do not seem able to halt the advance of the huge war machine set up and maintained over many centuries. Present generations have almost impossible, biblical task of ‘beating their swords into ploughshares’ and making the transition from an instinct of war – developed since time immemorial – to a feeling of peace. To achieve this would be the best and most noble act that the ‘global village’ could accomplish, and the best legacy to our descendents. With what satisfaction and relief should we be able to look into the eyes of our children! It would be also the best way to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary if the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in 1998.

Other ‘rights’ have been added since 1948. These should all be taken into account, and to them should be added the right which underlies them all: the right to peace - the right to live in peace! The right to our own ‘personal sovereignty’, to respect for life and dignity.
Human rights! At the dawn of the millennium, our ideal must be to put them into practice, to add to them, to live and breathe them, to relive them, to revive them with every new day! No one nation, institution, or person should feel entitled to lay sole to claim to human rights, still less to determine others’ credentials in this regard. Human rights can neither be owned nor given, but must be won and deserved afresh with every passing day. Nor should they be regarded as an abstraction, but rather as practical guidelines for action which should be part of the lives of all men and women and enshrined in the laws of every country. Let us translate the Declaration into all languages; let it be studied in every classroom and every home, all over the world! Today’s ideal may thus become the happy reality of tomorrow! Learning to know, to do, to be, and to live together.

In these first days of the new year – a time for taking stock and making plans – I appeal to all families, educators, religious figures, parliamentarians, politicians, artists, intellectuals, scientists, craft-workers, and journalists, to all humanitarian, sporting and cultural organisations, and to the media to spread a message of tolerance, non-violence, peace and justice. Our aim must be to foster understanding, generosity, and solidarity, so that with our minds more focused on the future than on the past, we may be able to look ahead together and build, however difficult the conditions or inhospitable the setting, a future of peace, which is a fundamental right and prerequisite. Thus, ‘We, the people’ will have fulfilled the promise we made in 1945, our eyes still seared by the most abdominal images of the terrible conflict that had just ended – ‘to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war’, to construct the defences of peace in the minds’ of all the peoples of the Earth’.

Part V

1.13.0.0 PEACE EDUCATION PROGRAMMES IN SOUTH ASIA

As the Investigator was trying to find out whether there are any Peace Education programmes in India or elsewhere he came across the following material in the browsing filed. At an overall, regional level, the answer is affirmative. There are stark imbalances though, with a proliferation of programmes in certain parts of the region. First of all, most programmes have sprung up in response to direct violence (rather than structural or cultural) and are therefore concentrated in those areas that have experienced conflict or war. Secondly, as is common in the development and education sectors, the uneven distribution of resources (financial, human and knowledge) is a deterrent. Thirdly, the existence of programmes has much to do with the nature and existence of civil society itself, which faces several constraints and challenges including the occasional lack of a supportive state and environment.
**Bangladesh**

This study has yielded little evidence of any long term, sustained peace education initiatives in Bangladesh. There are several NGOs that have introduced peace or human rights education programmes in different parts of the country, including Oxfam, Ain O Salish Kendra (ASK), Bangladesh Inter-religious Council for Peace and Justice (BICPAJ), Working for Better Life (WBL), Bangladesh Rural Action Committee (BRAC), Madaripur Legal Aid Association (MLAA) and Mennonite Central Committee. In the case of most organisations, peace or human rights education is a relatively smaller component of a project with broader goals. Moreover, it has not always been possible to gather very detailed information on most of these programmes - Promoting Human Rights and Education in Bangladesh (PHREB), an NGO based in Chittagong in the south of the country, has incorporated human rights education into their broader programme focusing on fighting violence against women and children. PHREB works extensively with schools, colleges, religious leaders and communities to prevent early marriages, dowry harassment and sexual abuse.

**Bhutan**

It must be remembered that Bhutan has embraced a “modern” system of education relatively recently, in the late 1950s. There do not appear to be any peace education programmes in Bhutan, at least not under the explicit label of peace education.

However, in 1999, value education was introduced in Bhutanese schools, with an aim to educate students mostly about the moral values of life. More recently, the Scouting programme, under the Department of Youth and Sports (DYS) of the Ministry of Education has resolved to introduce Life Skills education for all the scout clubs. The National Report on the Development of Education (no date) also refers to the introduction of environment and value education as well as education for sustainable development.

**India**
There is a proliferation of programmes by civil society for young people in India, with vastly differing priorities. However, not all of these are explicitly peace education programmes, and we must resist any sweeping categorisations. It is important to recognise the efforts of the National Council of Education Research and Training (NCERT) that has actively spearheaded a campaign to introduce peace education in schools across the country. The NCERT’s two main priorities have been teacher training, to equip teachers with the requisite skills and attitudes; and curriculum development. Additionally, the NCERT has plans to work with other SAARC countries to introduce peace education throughout the region. Several civil society groups currently work in tandem with the NCERT, and it is hoped that a mutual sharing of ideas and resources will accelerate India’s peace education ambitions.

**Maldives**

As yet, there is little to demonstrate that there are peace education programmes in Maldives. A report dated January 2009, from the Committee on the Rights of the Child (on the involvement of children in armed conflict) “regrets that peace education is not included in the school curricula.”

However, another report by the Human Rights Commission of the Maldives, dated October 2006 lists several indicative activities as part of a long term programme for the Commission. This list makes mention of plans to implement a human rights education programme for different sections of Maldivian society and raise awareness about the Commission’s own work. In addition, the Commission intended to work closely with the Ministry of Education to extend the teaching of human rights to all education institutions across the country. However, it has not been possible to verify if these plans were in fact carried out.

**Nepal**

Nepal’s story resembles that of Bangladesh, in that there are several organisations, both local and international NGOs, working on issues related to peace
and conflict (Care Nepal 2007). In addition, Nepal’s Ministry of Education and Sports has developed human rights education curriculum for secondary school students, with the aid of the Curriculum Development Center (CDC) However, once again, there do not appear to be any full-fledged peace education programmes in the country.

**Pakistan**

Baela Raza Jamil, educationist and Chairperson of Idara-e-Taleem-Aagahi believes that peace and citizenship projects in Pakistan are still largely donor driven and have not really been integrated into the education system.

Programmes in Pakistan look to address both the contents of the present school syllabi, as well as how this syllabus is actually taught. In the past, education for diversity and co-existence has been largely ignored, despite the presence of religious minorities within Pakistan). Today, there are resolute efforts, fledgling and few, to bring about a change in the state of education. There is also increasing collaboration between civil society players in Pakistan and India in the form of peace education efforts, and this bodes well for the region. One example is the partnership between Sanjan Nagar Public Education Trust Girls High School in Lahore and Bluebells International School in New Delhi; plans are underway for students from the two schools to visit each other.

**Sri Lanka**

Human rights education in Sri Lanka dates back to the 1980s, and since then, there have been elements related to human rights in the school curriculum. In 1994, the Centre for the Study of Human Rights (CSHR) at the University of Colombo launched its own human rights programme, along with the Ministry of Education, and helped established student human rights centres as well.

However, the same is not true of peace education efforts in Sri Lanka that appear to have been severely curtailed for various reasons. Initiatives have been launched, discontinued and revived in fits and starts, depending on the political
climate in the country. For example, during the ceasefire years, there was open talk of the urgent need for peace education; this was no longer easily possible once the ceasefire ended. The oscillation between a state of ceasefire and open conflict has also meant that international organisations have, every now and then, faced difficulties with the necessary legal permissions to continue their work in the country.

Moreover, the Sri Lankan education system, unlike that of India or Pakistan, is almost entirely in the public sector, with few private schools and universities. According to a 2006 report, 9,709 of the 10,455 schools are public schools (cited in Fernando, no date). This means that cooperation between government and civil society is even more crucial, but this has not always happened. Nevertheless, there are a handful of organisations and individuals have persisted with their peace efforts despite the extenuating circumstances and their work merits attention.

1.13.1.0 The Why and Where of Peace Education

The “where” and the “why” of peace education are logically linked. By and large, the majority of programmes have been established in response to specific, local events. For instance, there has been renewed interest in madrasa education post-9/11 and its subsequent aftermath in Iraq, Pakistan and Afghanistan. But it cannot be denied that …most of the conflict prevention has been reactive in nature, being initiated only after the conflict has crossed the threshold of violence. Its aim is to limit further escalation (intensity, geographic and duration). Here, too, the price is high. Once a conflict turns violent it becomes not only more difficult, but also more expensive to de-escalate it and to build peace.

We are also concerned with more than just the literal geographical location. Whom do these programmes work with—school students (if so, which age groups), young people in colleges or universities, teachers, parents and families, larger communities?

It must be acknowledged that in the case of Bangladesh and Nepal, the “where’s” and “why’s” are still largely unanswerable at this stage. As previously mentioned, information on peace education efforts is sketchy, and in many cases, it
has neither been possible to verify the information found online or obtain any more details on specific programmes.

**Bhutan**

According to the National report on the Development of Education (no date), until recently, the main objective of education in Bhutan was to ensure literacy, numeracy and other functional life skills; there has since been a marked shift to “all-round and wholesome education,” so as to “produce citizens with spiritual and social values.” With this new curriculum, students are introduced to the basics of health, HIV and AIDS, nutrition, sanitation and reproductive health. There is however no indication of the specific age groups this curriculum is targeted at.

**India**

Asha Hans, scholar and founder of Sansristi in Orissa believes that the violence in Gujarat in 2002 was a turning point for civil society in India. Until then Peace Education was largely linked to the conflict in Jammu and Kashmir and India Pakistan relations. It was the aftermath of Gujarat that brought violence closer home and made it both possible and imperative for educators to step in. It can be contended that the majority of peace related programmes are concentrated in four regions—Jammu and Kashmir, the Northern states, Maharashtra and Gujarat. The “why” is evident. Ongoing, protracted conflicts in both Jammu and Kashmir and the Northeast have necessitated the peace programmes there while Maharashtra and Gujarat have both witnessed phases of communal violence since the 1990s, and reconciliation efforts have played a major role.

The various programmes and projects address different target groups. There are peace programmes for school children from the ages of 5 to 16, there are others for college and university students. Community-based programmes are also not uncommon. Increasingly, the corporate and business sectors are also opting for
conflict resolution programmes. Probably India’s only professional conflict resolution consultancy, Meta-Culture Consulting in Bangalore introduces business and corporate houses to the concepts of dispute management, conflict resolution, negotiation and workplace mediation, Meta-culture Dialogics (MCD), another arm of the organisation, works with NGOs, community groups and a handful of schools and colleges. MCD’s aim is to build “peaceable and sustainable communities by changing how people address conflict” and address conflict arising out of “rapid economic, social and cultural changes in India”. Most recently, MCD has set up its first Community Mediation Centre at Montfort College in Bangalore, where “trained impartial mediators will offer families and citizens of the city, who are in a dispute, an effective out of court alternative for improving communication, resolving differences and reaching mutually acceptable agreements.”

There are also efforts specifically targeting rural populations; these are usually smaller in scale but with well defined objectives and processes, often based in remote, poorer regions of the country. The Garden of Peace day-school in Tamil Nadu is based on the concept of a peace museum; this primary school teaches 100 students from neighbouring rural areas. Although compelled to adhere to the mainstream curriculum, Ramu Manivannan and his team of teachers find ways to maximise outward learning. For example, students learn from an early age to take care of plants, nurture small gardens, and will eventually be equipped, Manivannan hopes, to address issues of cattle and organic farming which are particularly relevant to the local area (Manivannan 2009: Interview). Similarly, the Sita School in Silvepura outside Bangalore works with children who often drop out of the mainstream education system, for a number of reasons. The majority of students at the Sita School are “from the socially and economically underprivileged sections of the Dalit community; children of migrant workers, children of uprooted and unstable families” (Learning Network, no date). These children would normally have limited access to education, for both social and economic reasons.

In Jammu and Kashmir and the Northeast, programmes look to also assume preventive roles. By introducing young people to concepts of peace and diversity, they
hope to inhibit the recruitment practices of terrorist groups based in the region. For this reason, projects working in the area also strive to improve the overall quality of education the children receive, and thereby their job prospects. This in turn could also lower the possibility of young people being conscripted into violence (Bhan 2009: Interview).

**Pakistan**

Educational institutions in Pakistan invariably belong to one of three systems — public, private and madrasas. Ahmed (2007) contends that the relatively expensive private schooling system is beyond the reach of most families, for whom the madrasas, that offer free education, is often the only option. It is for this reason that NGOs are keen to introduce peace programmes in both English and Urdu medium public sector schools, but this remains a challenging prospect. The curriculum is relatively inflexible, and permissions are not easy to obtain; this has resulted in several organizations opting to first work with private schools.

They are then able to present evidence of their work in the private sector to try and leverage entry into public sector schools.

The majority of programmes appear to be based in urban areas, working with schools in the larger cities. For instance the Human Rights Education Programme (HREP) or the Children’s Museum for Peace and Human Rights, as it is presently known, is one of the earliest known peace education programmes, established in 1995. HREP was launched in response to a particular phase of violence in Karachi in the 1990s.

Dissatisfaction with the content of education has been another motivating factor. A school text book project by another NGO, Simorgh, was envisaged as “an attempt to counter the culture of intolerance and violence that was being generated by officially produced school texts” Similarly, Idara-e-Taleem-o-Aagahi (ITA) or the “Centre of Education and Consciousness” Public Trust was “born out of a growing
realization that the most critical of human entitlements, the right to learning, knowledge systems, citizenship skills and a 9,000 years of living heritage is being denied to the citizens of Pakistan”. ITA has initiated several programmes on citizenship education, democracy, human rights and governance for young people, rural communities, and school teachers.

**Sri Lanka**

Peace efforts in Sri Lanka are scattered across the country, although NGOs have not always been able to continue with their efforts in the affected Northern and Eastern regions. Unlike in India and Pakistan, the adult population of Sri Lanka has been the primary target for the vast majority of peace programmes. Jehan Perera of the National Peace Council (NPC) suggests that the urgency of the situation meant that it was imperative to work at first with those who are potential decision makers in the peace process.

…we had decided that schools were too far off. Peace is so urgent that we must bring about a change among the adults, who have to vote on war or peace. Children are a long term investment.

In recent times, the NPC has chosen to focus its energies on working with civil society groups including government officials, teachers, religious and community leaders, journalists and NGO workers. The Berghof Foundation for Conflict Studies adopted a similar strategy in Sri Lanka, working primarily with key stakeholders in civil and political society.

Aside from the human rights and peace education syllabi implemented by the Sri Lankan government, there are few projects specifically targeting young people within the formal education system.

Damian Fernando of Caritas Sri Lanka endorses this view. Although Caritas presently works with 20 schools, conducting workshops and distributing peace manuals, they face difficulties with permissions and hold most of their sessions either on weekends or outside of school hours. Says Fernando, “it is not easy to get
permission to work with schools…it is very difficult to even speak about peace right now.”

Other efforts include those by the Weeramantry International Centre for Peace Education and Research that works with select schools and colleges, along with UNESCO and the Ministry of Education. In September 2005, the University of Bradford, UK, organised a higher education course in conflict resolution and peace for adult students from Kilinochchi, situated at the heart of the conflict in Northern Sri Lanka.

The Butterfly Peace Garden is an example of a peace project that has managed to circumvent the formal education sector but nonetheless works specifically with young people affected by conflict. Based in strife-ridden Batticaloa, this programme works with young Tamils and Muslims from the immediate locality. Neighbourhood schools refer students who have faced difficulties at home or at school, and these students participate in a nine-month long process of experiential learning (Santa Barbara 2004).

1.13.1.1 The Issues of Peace Education Programmes

Traditionally, peace programmes have a broad mandate but in order to have any impact, a programme must have a local context and be particularly relevant to its target group. Jane Sahi, a peace educator based in Karnataka in India and author of Education for Peace, suggests that sometimes, we must look for the simple issues that are closer to home. “Participating in a protest march against George Bush has a certain intrinsic value but it is also necessary to look around us, literally”, she says. What should a peace programme discuss? Is there room for politics, religion, identity, ethnicity, gender, caste? Peace educators have grappled with ways and means to address these problems. None more so than religion, which is seen as particularly contentious. There are differing points of view on this. Some peace practitioners, particularly in Pakistan, argue that there is a surfeit of talk about religion in any case. Others like Gavriel Salomon, Israeli educationist and psychologist, contend that peace education is about “...realisation of the other side’s collective narrative, including...
their past suffering and history. By necessity, this at times includes religion, to the extent that it is central. They believe God is on their side, so do we”.

S. P. Udayakumar, editor of ‘Teaching Peace in South Asia’, asserts that in the South Asian setting, you cannot “wish religion away.” His strategy is to discuss all religions, but to also accompany students on visits to temples, mosques and/or churches. Ensuing discussions extend from religion itself to architecture or the meaning of specific rituals.

Barbara Tint, peace and conflict resolution scholar, points out that people are invariably passionate about religion but sometimes unwilling to talk about it, and peace programmes can offer a conducive platform. Asha Hans warns that educators must be wary of falling into the all too familiar trap of believing that secularism means the absence of religion, rather than the acceptance of all religions. She narrates this incident:

“I had been to Kargil in Kashmir two years ago, to a small, out-of-the-way village, where women had nothing to do all day. There had been a small madrasa there but that had stopped functioning for various reasons. This left the women with such a vacuum in their lives. We cannot ignore this”

Equally, peace education cannot ignore issues of social justice, and focus solely on conflict resolution. Thankfully, there has been a visible shift in the range of issues peace programmes address. Today, it is not rare for a peace education programme to incorporate issues of social justice and development as well as more traditional concerns of war and peace. A draft resolution at the UNESCO Regional Seminar on Curriculum Development for Peace Education held in Sri Lanka in 2001 highlighted the “interrelationship between peace and sustainable development as critical to achieving the objective of social cohesion and living together...to move away from a culture of war and violence in a world beset with strife to a culture of peace and non-violence” (UNESCO 2001).

Educators are particularly keen to include aspects of gender and environment into their programmes. In Kashmir, students hear of Lalleshwari, a saint revered by
both Hindus and Muslims, who defied caste structures, left her home and husband, and became a leader of the people. Similarly, they listen to poetry on the damage rendered to the great lakes and forests of Kashmir.

In South Asia, questions of diversity, religious identity and secularism, accepting differences, rights of the child, civil and political rights, democracy, and of course the causes and consequences of conflict itself are widespread concerns. History—political, social, cultural, religious, and personal—is high on the agenda. In fact, the need for alternative narratives of history in school textbooks has often been the starting point for a programme. Nevertheless, Jamal Kidwai of Aman Panchayat based in New Delhi contends that conflict and peace programmes are in danger of becoming depoliticized and a historical.

1.13.1.2 The Process and Activities of Peace Education

The actual activities of a peace education programme, as well as the manner in which they are carried out can often determine a programme’s relative impact. These activities follow from programme goals, access to funding and other resources and their geographical context. Another crucial factor is an organisation’s ability to build and nurture partnerships with schools, colleges and universities, and other factions of civil society.

This survey of peace education initiatives has revealed that on the whole, programmes tend to focus on two main activities: teacher training and curriculum development. As discussed previously, dissatisfaction with the curricula of a particular school or schools is often the starting point; and this is particularly true in the case of history textbooks in recent times.

Once an NGO has developed its own curriculum, the next step is to get schools to use it. Here, civil society organisations work in two ways. Some choose (and are permitted) to teach in schools themselves, for X number of hours every week. Others opt to work with teachers, training them to use the curricula. The two approaches have their own set of merits and problems, but the latter’s advantage is the potential it offers for sustainability and long-term capacity building. It is often the more
challenging of the two options, with most organisations identifying the attitude of teachers as a major barrier to a programme’s implementation.

Of course, this broad process is only relevant to organisations with peace education programmes on the ground. Several others focus their energies on research, advocacy, and lobbying with governments for the inclusion of peace education in the mainstream syllabus. Equally, there are schools that have embedded the goals of peace education into their day-to-day activities. There may not be many specific “peace projects” in these schools but the overall attitude towards schooling is geared towards helping students understand the philosophies and practice of peace. Sita School best illustrates this approach to teaching peace.

Irrespective of an organisation’s actual activities, it is important to locate them within the overall process of a peace project. This section presents a brief selection of peace education processes in different South Asian contexts.

In Bangladesh, Oxfam, in association with the Bangladesh Development Partnership, has organised human security and peace building seminars for 3,600 high school and college students (Oxfam), as part of their Campaign for Non-Violence and Peace Culture. Young people are considered particularly vulnerable to being co-opted into the illegal small arms trade in the Gazipur, Jessore and Satkhira Districts of Bangladesh.

The goal is the further adoption, declaration and implementation by the government of Bangladesh of a plan of action against the illegal trade, transfer and use of small arms, in the light of the UN Plan of Action against Small Arms (Oxfam, no date).

The Madaripur Model of Mediation (MMM) involves the setting up of village and district level courts and training of community workers, thereby circumventing the problems people face in accessing the formal judicial system. Additionally, in 2004, the Madaripur
Legal Aid Association initiated human rights education in secondary schools and colleges, establishing human rights cells, and conducting regular workshops. The overall aim was to help young people understand human rights conceptually, and thereby be able to identify human rights violations in their local areas.

The Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) works in the formal and informal education sector in Bangladesh through schools and peer education clubs. MCC trains peer educators in both conflict resolution and peace education. Sarah Wheaton, Peace Programme Coordinator of MCC, says that peace education is rarely formally included in the curriculum. “Sometimes where we are doing other work, and we have a good relationship with the school, they allow us to train some of their teachers or students. But mainstreaming peace education is a big challenge” At present, MCC works with seven schools in the country.

The only known programme in Bhutan that comes close to our understanding of peace or human rights education is the Scouting programme implemented by the Department of Youth & Sports (DYS) under the auspices of the Ministry of Education of the Royal Government of Bhutan. DYS has been ascribed a mandate

“…to complement the academic part of school education by providing “Wholesome Education” through Career guidance, Counselling, Scouting, Games and Sports and School Health so that the Youth of Bhutan are physically fit and mentally equipped with moral values and skills necessary to become productive and responsible future citizens”.

The reference to moral values and the emphasis on responsible citizenship is of particular relevance to this study. In order to achieve this mandate, DYS, through its many divisions, encourages sports and games in schools, organises national and regional sporting events, promotes health awareness among young people, runs a career guidance and counselling services programme in all schools, operates youth centres and forums, and promotes Scouting through youth and culture exchange programs in schools.
The Scouting programme was first introduced in 2003, and according to government records, exists in every school, with a total of over 20,000 scouts in the country. The three sub-programmes (Cub, Scout and Rover) are designed for specific age groups, from 6 to 25 years of age. The Cub programme, for instances, uses the play-way method to make 6 to 12 year olds aware of their environment. The Scout programme focuses on cultivating values of proper, disciplined citizenship. The Rover programme ensures that young people participate in community services and development programs, promoting the concept of volunteerism.

In India, NGOs and other civil society organisations operate in a multitude of ways, occasionally guided by demands of time, funding and operational constraints. As in the rest of the region, there is an emphasis on teacher training and curriculum development, and most programmes incorporate both these aspects.

Women in Security, Conflict Management and Peace (WISCOMP), based in New Delhi, launched its education for peace initiative in 2007. The emphasis is now on working with students, teachers and teacher educators. At present, students participate in workshops on conflict transformation; for teachers, the focus is on how to teach in a multicultural context.

In Mumbai, the Children’s Movement for Civic Awareness (CMCA) works with students between the ages of 12 and 14 from schools across the city, through the formation of civic clubs (45 in Mumbai to date). To begin with, class seven students are encouraged to profile and audit their school—a water or garbage audit, for example. They then move on to discussing relevant global issues such as water scarcity and management or global warming. The overall idea is that every child understands the big picture and realises what s/he can do to make even a small difference. The process of belonging to a civic club is also a mini-lesson in the functioning of a democracy. As active citizens, students name the clubs, elect office-bearers, and go out and campaign on locally relevant issues.
Also in Mumbai, the Avehi Abacus project works with municipal schools through the Sangati programme, training teachers through bi-annual workshop sessions. In addition, they have developed a curriculum that is organised around several interlinked themes: knowing myself and my body, our earth and the web of life, how societies developed, the way we live today and preparing for our future.

aProCh (A protagonist in every child), based in Ahmedabad aims to blur the boundaries between school and everyday life. They seek to get young people to do things—small or big—in their city, to question, to praise, and extend their childhoods into city spaces. aProCh works with local civic groups including the police and the city corporation to make public spaces more child-friendly.

Aman Panchayat has different goals. Aman focuses on research for advocacy (for example, a detailed investigation of small arms and narcotics) but also believes that it is important to build the capacity of communities affected by conflict. “It is not as if Aman will work there all the time; we want to develop their capacities and facilitate the creation of a transparent, democratic institution. Then, we can withdraw. We hope to do this by identifying leaders from amongst them, and working with young people,” says Kidwai, director of Aman

In Eastern Nepal, the Human Rights and Environment Forum (HUREF) ran a one-year programme in nine schools in three districts. Through the course of the programme, HUREF sets up a human rights centre in each of the participating schools; these centres organised human rights related activities inside and outside the classroom and additionally, recorded any human rights violations in their specific areas. In all, 1,500 secondary school students participated in this programme and became familiar with concepts related to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, international conventions, first informant reports, civil liberties, fundamental rights, human rights violations and conflict resolution. Additionally, HUREF also organised teacher training programmes, accompanied students on field trips to neighbourhood police stations.
In 2007, the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) organised a five-day symposium on peace education training for religious scholars and madrasa educators in Islamabad. This was based on the rationale that post 9/11, madrasa leaders were experiencing isolation and criticism from other groups of society, and that there was no “appreciation of the education they are providing to Pakistani citizens” Referring to madrasa leaders, Qamar-ul Huda of USIP who led the workshop contends that, “they are still very suspicious of domestic critiques and of outsiders who are quick to propose reforming their institutions”

Through the course of the workshop, the madrasa educators worked together to develop a peace education curriculum, identifying themes, potential resources and even class lessons. It was agreed that they would continue with this process and hopefully extend this curricula to other madrasas as well. Huda points out that merely branding all madrasas as “outdated outposts for terrorism” would not solve the problem. Instead, there is a need “to recognize the tradition they are working in and build upon their knowledge as scholars and their roles as educators before forming conclusions about an entire educational institution”

The Weeramantry International Centre for Peace Education and Research in Sri Lanka is one of few organisations to introduce what have been called cultural encounter programmes, along the lines of Seeds of Peace. Most recently, 68 university undergraduates from all over Sri Lanka were brought together for four days to discuss diverse issues. Care was taken to ensure that all religions and ethnicities were represented and that there were students from the conflict aras. Neshan Gunasekera, Deputy Director of the centre, hopes that they will be able to repeat this exercise for 5,000 students every year

Sarvodaya, a grassroots NGO with a widespread presence, organises community based discussions on local conflict issues. Additionally young people are trained to become members of a peace corps that conducts conflict resolution and conflict prevention activities in the villages—particularly between members of different communities.
Under the aegis of its National Peace Programme, Caritas works with at least 20 schools and colleges, holding workshops, developing and distributing peace manuals for children. In addition, Caritas is planning to set up peace villages where people of different ethnicities come together to solve their own problems.

1.13.2.0. Peace Education in Bangladesh

There have been a few short-term projects by both local and international NGOs, addressing different human rights issues and occasionally targeted at young people.

At the 2000 Hurights workshop, participants from Bangladesh acknowledged the slow and long drawn out bureaucratic processes embedded in the education system as a primary constraint to the introduction of human rights education. They also referred to the resistance of fundamentalists and religious leaders to “western” ideas of education. The lack of institutional capacity for NGOs and economic restraints were other factors (Hurights).

As it stands, there does appear to be a need for peace education, for more reasons than to acknowledge the presence of conflict. Bangladesh is one of the poorest countries in South Asia, with a surfeit of social and economic development problems. According to researchers, school textbooks do not recognise or help students to understand poverty and the vast inequalities within the country. NGOs such as Working for Better Life contend that there are no creative outlets for students in Bangladeshi schools, and the curriculum fails in being either imaginative or interesting. Moreover, there is little engagement with current affairs or social problems that Bangladesh faces.

“….students are not encouraged to think about the future of their country, to analyze the issues that affect Bangladesh as a developing nation, or to question government policies. …to add to these problems, the culture has lost the traditions that develop listening skills and rational discourse. The ensuing
frustration makes youth easy prey for the sparring political parties which have relied upon passionate and volatile supporters throughout the first decades since Bangaldesh’s independence in 1971 from then West Pakistan”.

It is a classic case of the chicken and egg syndrome. On the one hand, it can be argued that peace organisations and NGOs lack the supportive environment that is needed to introduce peace or human rights into the education system’s curriculum. However, it is also possible that the introduction of peace education can actually help galvanise the system, and make learning more interesting for young Bangladeshi students. After all, peace education, with its emphasis on student participation and interactive methods has the potential to revolutionise the mode of teaching.

To address the misconception that peace and human rights education are primarily western concepts, NGOs must aim to evolve curricula of particular relevance to their culture and language, by drawing on stories and narratives from Bangladeshi literature or folktales. This in turn requires the active participation of local organisations. On their part, international NGOs can train local teachers, thereby developing local capacity for the education sector.

It is necessary to acknowledge the several challenges that this research process has faced in trying to gather information on projects in Bangladesh. It is possible that field research and directly meeting educators and NGO workers in Bangladesh might reveal more on peace and human rights programmes in the country.

1.13.3.0 Peace Education in Bhutan

This study has found no explicit peace education programmes in Bhutan. However, the government has introduced value education into the curricula and there is an increasing focus on issues related to sustainable development and the environment. There are few civil society organisations in the traditional sense in Bhutan working in the area of human rights or peace education.

Within Bhutan, there is growing debate on the changing nature of the education system. Karma Phuntsho argues that there is a widening rift between “traditional” and
“modern” education systems in Bhutan (Phuntsho 2000). The modern system of education, introduced in the late 1950s, has made steady progress over the last fifty years, with increased budgetary allocation and a steady rise in enrolment. Phuntsho laments that this rift has forced parents and young people into an “either-or” situation—to choose either the traditional system of schooling in religious centres or enrol in a modern school.

He notes that traditional systems of learning were geared towards “achieving the omniscience of the Buddha” for the benefit of all beings. In contrast, the modern system is perceived as more selfish, with choices and decisions made to benefit the self primarily. On the other hand, the traditional mode of education has encouraged students to remain passive recipients of knowledge, in contrast to the modern schools where, at least on paper, students are prodded to demonstrate a sense of curiosity and enquiry, and become active participants in the process of education.

The real question is: does a country like Bhutan need peace education programmes? In January 2009, the results of Bhutan’s National Values Assessment survey which focused on three sets of values were released (Evans 2008). This survey was based on The Seven Levels of Personal Consciousness and The Seven Levels of National Consciousness, as developed by the Barrett Values Centre. The seven levels in each set move from survival, relationships, self-esteem, to transformation, internal cohesion, making a difference and finally, to service. It must be noted that level two of both sets, Relationships, focuses on the peaceful resolution of conflict, primarily at the intrapersonal level. Any possible “dysfunction” at this level has the potential to lead to “inter-ethnic or inter-religious violence, and the victimization or unfair treatment of minorities or subgroups based on gender, sexual preference, race, etc” (Evans 2008).

The survey focused on three key areas: Bhutanese personal values, the values and issues perceived to drive the current national culture, and the values that Bhutanese want their society to embrace in the future. According to the results of the survey, friendship is the most crucial personal value for the Bhutanese people. The top-ranked cultural value is continuous improvement, followed by environmental
protection. Education, followed by continuous improvement, was the most desired value for the future.

From this survey it is evident that the Bhutanese people value peace highly. If we accept that peace education also holds the potential to prevent violence and conflict, then surely there is a case to be made for introducing peace and human rights education into the curriculum. However, social structures in Bhutan are such that this appears to be more in the hands of state authorities than civil society groups.

The long-term goals and aspirations of the several thousands of Bhutanese refugees must also not be ignored. It was not possible to investigate the many refugee organisations in Nepal and India for reasons of time and access. It seems natural to assume that human rights will be a matter of concern and relevance to these organisations; but more research is needed to assess if there are any specific programmes for younger generations of refugees.

1.13.4.0 Peace Education in India

There is a strong history of peace education in India, going back to the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi. Peace education programmes in the country are numerous, scattered, intermittent and often highly dissimilar from one another. Moreover, little is known about the impact of these programmes on students and teachers. On paper, there is a supportive environment in place with the active involvement of the education ministry, and various other institutes. However, organisations frequently face logistical issues, particularly in regions like Jammu and Kashmir.

A single model of peace education cannot work across the country. Educational institutions like the Krishnamurthy Foundation, Gandhian organisations, academics researching peace and conflict, human rights groups, newer citizen organisations, a multitude of NGOs –the diversity of individuals and organizations working in the area of peace education is probably India’s biggest strength.
The sustainability of peace education is a major challenge. There is much to be gained from long-term partnerships between similar and dissimilar organisations. However, as of now, the majority of these different groups of people are relatively insular, and there is a need for greater debate and sharing. The efforts of networks like the Learning Network, that bring together organisations working on similar issues can, and must be emulated. This is particularly necessary since few organisations have the resources to sustain peace education programmes in several schools for a long duration. To build on its good beginnings, India needs concerted efforts to sustain the momentum, and create a ripple effect. For example, Citizens for Peace worked with a core group of students in a college in Mumbai and are hoping these students will in turn facilitate more workshops in their college. The Bluebells International School in New Delhi has recently established the Active Citizenship Resource Centre, open to teachers across the city.

Peace education does appear to be concentrated at two ends of the education spectrum—private schools that have introduced their own programmes or government schools where NGOs have intervened. There are several schools that fall somewhere between the two categories and appear to be left out of the picture, and these inevitably have the largest number of students.

It is also somewhat baffling that despite the number of peace programmes across the country, actual classroom presence remains limited. Unsurprisingly, it has been impossible to enumerate the number of hours devoted to peace or human rights education over a specific duration. It is also not clear if organisations have chosen where they stand on the question of incorporating peace education into the syllabus or choosing to address it as a stand-alone subject.

1.13.5.0 Peace Education in Maldives

There is little to indicate that there are any peace education programmes in the Maldives. Peace education is not included in the official syllabus that is taught in schools.
The potential impact of climate change on the islands is the Maldives’ biggest challenge and scholars predict that future conflicts will be over resources. It can be argued that the introduction of peace or human rights education can help create awareness about these dangers, and even give an impetus to the overall quality of the education system, by emphasising enhanced student participation and involvement. However, once again, this appears to be largely in the hands of the administration and not civil society. The political system of the Maldives is still in transition, and it remains to be seen how smoothly the atoll-ation makes a transition to full-fledged democracy.

1.13.6.0 Peace Education in Nepal

In a paper on peace movements in Nepal, Dev Raj Dahal notes that communities for peace in Nepal are too diverse lacking any coordinating mechanism for sustained collective action. Similarly, the multiplicity of actors pursues their interests irrationally. This is preventing the non-violent resolution of conflict.

There are peace organisations and programmes in Nepal but this study has found little evidence of sustained peace education efforts in the country. Moreover, solely relying on online resources and networking has been made it difficult to ascertain any detailed information on peace programmes in the country.

In a National Peace Education conference on “Consolidating Peace Education in Nepal” held in 2007, the organisers noted that it was necessary “to attract Nepali public, pedagogues and media’s attention to the various initiatives for the culture of peace and non--violence for children. This prompts me to speculate that there are initiatives but the lack of documentation means that little information is available in the public domain. For instance, I was unable to obtain contact information for many of the 14 organisations that are listed to have participated in this conference.

There is no doubt that the last ten years of ongoing conflict in Nepal has had a direct impact on education, with students and teachers often too fearful to attend school, especially in remote areas. Nepali participants at the Human rights conference in 2000 referred to the damage to school infrastructure, as well as frequent physical
threats to students and teachers. They called for all schools to be made “zones of peace,” thereby preventing an escalation in the drop out rate.

1.13.7.0 Peace Education in Pakistan

There are an increasing number of peace education initiatives in Pakistan that primarily address the issues of curriculum development and teacher training. However, many organisations face considerable difficulties in working with public sector schools. To a large extent, that is the biggest challenge peace education faces in Pakistan today. On the one hand, there are a growing number of civil society groups and private sector schools that are eager to experiment with new curricula, and innovative methods of teaching. But that is merely the first step. Extending this process or a version of it, to both public sector and madrasa schools is the real necessity, and bigger challenge. This also requires the active support of the Education Ministry.

While actually entering the classrooms is one priority, another must be to innovate in circumstances where infrastructure has been disabled or even destroyed. For instance, the ongoing conflict in the Swat valley has already had an impact on schools and attendance rates. As the number of those displaced increases, this problem will only be further aggravated.

In a sense, the real emphasis in Pakistan is not so much on peace education but on democracy and citizenship education, which are, given the current political climate, likely to be high on the priority of donors. However, educators in Pakistan must seek ways to circumvent and look beyond donor demands (Jamil 2009: Interview). The Children’s Museum for Peace and Human Rights demonstrates the possibilities for sustainability and building partnerships. Indeed, the call for partnerships must find echoes across Pakistan, particularly to ensure that private sector initiatives can expand into the public sector and address the majority of students. Equally, peace educators must focus, as Simorgh has, on the content and language of peace education.

1.13.8.0 Peace Education in Sri Lanka
There are several peace organisations in Sri Lanka, with programmes focussing on peace advocacy, activism, research and education. Both human rights and peace education have been introduced into the school curricula by the Sri Lankan education ministry. However, in recent years, the space for civil society has shrunk, and organisations have found it difficult to introduce peace education programmes.

Peace education is more vital than ever for Sri Lanka. Officially, the civil war has ended but as many would attest, the real work is only now beginning. The humanitarian cost of the government’s military victory is as yet by and large unknown. Given this, the time is right to usher in a period of concentrated peace-building. This requires the active participation of the youth. But equally, it requires open, free spaces, where young people can express themselves fearlessly. As yet, civil society does not appear to have the power to create these without repercussions.

At present, all energies are focused on the immediate rehabilitation and resettlement of the large number of refugees. Once this has been initiated, and the process of rebuilding communities is underway, the focus will and must shift to encompass the rejuvenation of the education system. While it would make sense to continue to introduce peace education into the mainstream syllabus as part of this process, attention must be paid to both the content and tone of these modules. Ideally, these modules must be developed through a collaborative process involving different communities. For such a process to have any impact, the recreation of favourable spaces for civil society is crucial and must be the first step.

1.14.0.0 Peace Education in Primary Schools - A Practicum

These are the original reflections of the Investigator which have been presented here for the purpose of the knowledge enhancing.

Peace education is a recent born child in India though its a grown up adult in European countries. There was an understanding where everybody thought that Peace education is needed only in countries where there is conflict existing of greater magnitude and either civil or internal war taking place. But such Peace Education fosters only negative peace. Where as in countries where there is already peace i.e.
absence of war, even in such places the Peace Education is needed which truly fosters the positive peace. *Peace is possible for life at all stages and it is up to man to choose his destiny or to suffer from the horrors of war. Today mankind is at the cross-road where he has to choose with courage, determination and imagination.*

Federico Mayor

Violence is emerging in an unprecedented manner in human society. Looking at the world today any sensible person feels disheartened and even horrified to see the kind of violent acts being committed by man against man and nature. It is sad to realize that we live in an era of unprecedented violence in the forms of terrorism, war, crimes, injustice and oppression and exploitation amidst a seemingly outward development enjoyed by a few. The majority of mankind lives in stark poverty, struggling for bare survival. There is so much disorder and confusion in the society man has built for himself.

The saddest part of the story is that this state of disorder and confusion in the society is affecting the children's innocent minds. Children naturally absorb the spirit of violence in the atmosphere and will soon grow to be the next generation of perpetrators of violence. Therefore the need to nurture peace in the hearts of children has arisen as urgent issues to be addressed. (NCTE document on peace education)

How can the existing curriculum help a teacher to nurture peace in his/her students? How effectively he/she can make use of the subjects to develop peace awareness in them? Here is an effort to discuss the above matter.

1) Establishment of Special Libraries: Every library is a centre of information and a launching pad or a motivational place for any action plan. If there is a special library meant only peace related issues then surely it will spur many of its readers to be peace advocates or peace soldiers. Even an ordinary library can establish special corner as “Peace corner” where by the readers are provided with special literature on Peace and are motivated there by to be peace workers. Very fact there is a special corner meant for peace it will motivate many of the readers or the public to visit the site and get inspired by the literature provided there. It may help
the students even in the preparation of their projects given in the schools. The schools can think of starting such library corners in the school library and encourage the students to learn more about the peace related issues increase their peace awareness. During the parent teachers Association meetings such library corners can be made more attractive and could thus even the parents be educated towards peace issues.

2) **Art or Drawing Classes**: Drawing is one of the creative subjects which enables the children to give vent to their feelings, creative ideas and pent up feelings. In fact it is the best medium of human expression. Every human being in some or the other way tries to express himself through art. Great artist though they were not intelligent giants they have given out some of the best creative ideas through their art work. I am sure all the automobiles, beautiful structures and man made landscapes were the outcome of some or the other art work. In that case why can't we make use of this art work for peace education? I am sure students can express their ideas in a beautiful way on a canvas or drawing sheet than on a essay paper. I have a very good experience when I asked my students to write an essay on peace. The students found it very difficult to prepare an essay but they were beyond my thinking in their art work on the same subject. A horrifying scene on war will teach them more on the evil effects of war than a page of write up on the same subject. Whenever the teacher explains the “kalinga war” and its effects on King Ashoka what drives home the point is not the explanation on the war but the sight of the war field filled with dead bodies and the sight of blood flowing. It says just in a minute what otherwise would have taken a considerable amount of time! Hence the teacher or the school can make use of drawing classes or the Art for the peace education. May be it is best suited in the lower classes.

3) **School Annual Sports or Athletic Meets**: It is interesting to know how sports can create so much of goodwill? Many must have questioned the significance of Olympics or Commonwealth games where it is said that they foster international understanding. In fact I remember to have read in George Orwel’s one of the articles where he claims that ‘….Sports is nothing but a mimic warfare. It doesn’t
create goodwill. It is nothing but war minus shooting’….Quoting John Galsworthy, Balvinder Kaur says “Sport, which still keeps the flag of idealism flying, is perhaps the most saving grace in the world at the moment, with its spirit of rules kept, and regard for the adversary, whether the fight is going for ir against. When, if ever, the fair-play spirit of sport reigns over international affairs, the cat force which rules there now will slink away and the human life will emerge for the first time from the jungle…..”

the school is a place where the students learn different sports and games. They may be indigenous or of foreign origin. When the students learn those sports and games they also learn the rules and regulation of the sports. And when they are played with true sportsmanship and respect for the games, it is indubitable that they do not create goodwill among the parties or the groups. It is claimed that the sports creates good will as its organization is carefully controlled and as long as fair play is ensured. Now most of us will understand why Sports between India and Pakistan is urges often. If sports can achieve what we can not achieve even in the Warfield, then why not we try at it ? If sports can create so much of goodwill in the international level, I am sure it can create a lot of goodwill among the students where there is a lot of groupism and under currents which later erupt and cause social unrest. Hence the schools can think of making use of this tool effectively. **It is good to make our students peace lovers than intelligent terrorists!**

4) **Biographies:** We have many great personalities who have contributed in many ways to the development of their nation in particular and to world at large in general. When we make a study of their life and contributions, we realize their ways, means and methodologies made use by them in achieving what they have achieved. Undoubtedly we come to know the nobility of their character, their fearless and self sacrificing devotion to great cause and their constructive work for humanity of a permanent character. E g; when we study about Mahatma Gandhiji, we come to know his principle of non violence, the methods that he used in gaining freedom for our country, his convictions and how he succeeded in following them etc. I am sure in this post modern era all of those facts will be an
eye opener where the nuclear war is largely lurking upon us !. Can we imagine how Blessed mother Theresa could achieve so much in spite of so much of ill propaganda against her ? What prompted Woodrow Wilson to think of UNO ? Great personalities like Louis Pasteur, Abraham Lincoln, Christopher Columbus, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin and Rabindranath Tagore…..etc have made an impact upon the world in their own ways. I am sure when we go through their life accounts they will be more than inspiring. Wont the students will take a leaf or so from their awe inspiring lives ? When we compare the methodologies used by Gandhiji and other extremists in India to gain Freedom, I am sure Gandhiji stands on the summit and would inspire our present generation who always think in instant and nuclear solutions for the unrest existing between the nations. The importance and value given by Mother Theresa to human life would surely make anybody to respect human life in any condition. She lifted the worm filled bodies from the gutter and kissed them. She lifted the living but thrown away old people and bathed them and gave back their human dignity. Wont these incidents make our young students more bent towards humanitarian work than towards violence ? The study of biography leads naturally also to the study of heroism today. Instances of men and women who are making great contributions to the progress of humanity and of those who display heroism in the daily routine life, can be gathered from the news papers and magazines bye the students (Balwinder Kaur, 2006)

5) **Botany**: There is a saying in English which goes like this” A single rose can be my garden”. Today the flower garden or the botanical garden are full of plants of different nature. We are able to see the plants of other countries in our own countries. They are borrowed and grown in the similar condition even indigenously sometimes. E.g The tea and rambler roses, the parents of the modern roses, were brought from China. Chrysanthemums, camellias, peonies, primroses and azaleas also came from China (Balvinder Kaur 2006) When we study these and other plants we realize that they depend on different elements and creatures, insects and situations for their growth. In spite of all that complicated dependence still they live in peace. Cant we the human beings learn something from this inter
dependence? Doesn’t these botany study teach us the principle of cooperation? Are we not in a position to understand the importance of Cooperation as a universal law existing even among the vegetative life?

6) **History**: History is a study of past events which promotes and directs our future life. There is a trend today where students ask a question about the significance of history. They do not realize the importance of history when think digitally and in terms of atolls and molecules. But unequivocally it can be stated that the day we stop studying history, it is the beginning of the end of the world. Do we know why the third world war hasn’t taken place? It is more than the UNO and other international agencies, the study of the other two world wars and its impact upon the human race that has put a automatic stop. King Ashoka realized the impact of Kalinga war only when he saw the bloody sight of the war. Similarly we come to know the impact of such world wars only when we study those wars, causes and impacts. Today we do not have another Chernobyl or Bhopal Tragedies because the history has taught us what a mess they could create if such events re occur. Our present is safeguarded by the history and future is secured too by it. Indirectly the study of history has brought about peace in the world. The study of the life of Christ, Buddha, Mahavira or any other social reformers and their life has initiated millions and millions of people to refine and revise their life and gain inner peace and tranquillity.

7) **Current Events**: We are in the era of the revolution of Information Technology. Today every house has a television and our students have access to internet, broadband and news papers. World has become so small that whatever happens in the north poll is seen even on the farthest end of the south poll instantly. Our news channels give out ‘live’ coverage of certain events. E.g. When Mohammad Kasab and his accomplices were raining bullets upon the commuters in Shivaji Chatrapathi Railway Station and at the Hotel Taj, people every where witnessed the horror filled and blood curdling sight. It has driven a point into the minds of everyone who watched it. The importance of peace and the ugly face of terrorism. Even today when we watch the bombing of Kuwait by Iraq, or the Fights between
Israeli and Palestinian army, we realize what it means to be caught up in such situations and how lucky we Indians are! Events that we come across in T.V or newspapers about Dalit issues, Communal riots, language issues etc make us realize the importance of human rights and thereby of peace in general. The students should be made aware of this facilities and discussions should be organized in the class rooms over certain current events and thus the students could be taught about the peace, cooperation, communication, human rights awareness, conflict resolution etc.

8) **Language Study:** The human civilization has taken place primarily due to the development of language. If not for language development, may be we would have been not what we are today. But do we know that it is the language that solves most of our problems? today we have strong regionalism or for that matter fanatic language attitude. We have people who fight for the mother tongue both in education and administration. But it is an open secret that the language develops harmony and coexistence. When I know how to speak I am in a better position to communicate, convince and argue which automatically makes me well poised. In kannada language there is a well used adage whose meaning is as follows…” One who knows to talk he enjoys good relation and one who knows to eat enjoys good health. Studying a language helps one to communicate better. Openness to other languages makes me a cosmopolitan and world citizen. It increases one to develop the sense of being a part of a larger reality. It removes the narrow blinkers and widens one’s horizons. It reduces friction and strengthens brotherhood. Secondly any language can be made use of in the school for the peace education purpose. Students should be asked to write poetry or couplets or a few verses and rhymes on peace related topics. They are creative and very expressive.

As the Investigator was taking a few sessions on peace education he asked the students of standard VII to contribute to the wall magazines a few verses. To his surprise the wall magazine was always full of poetry written by the students in their own style but very creative and with lot of insights. Sometimes they were in English and sometimes in Hindi or in their mother tongue. But language was not an obstacle for the expressions of their thoughts and language was a medium of expression too.
9) Mathematics: It is an interesting thing to know how mathematics could be made use of for peace education. Mathematics is a subject where we deal with facts and figures. We use the inductive and deductive methods to derive equations and formulae. There is a lot of use of graphs of different types. May be the teacher can think of using the data of over the years the money spent on wars, developmental activities, educational activities etc and make a comparative study with the help of graphs. Now it is like shooting two birds with one bullet. The child has not only studied the graph preparation but it has also realized the importance given to developmental activities and war related activities. May be the teacher can purposefully draw their attention to the fact and thus drive home the point. While deriving the equations and formulae the teacher could again replace those terms with peace related terms and show them how peace could be achieved. May be subtraction and addition sums and multiplication and division sums also could be utilized for this purpose. (E.g; Peace = Tolerance+ Human Rights Awareness+ Communication+ Cooperation…………..etc.)

10) Health Education/Physical Education: Presently there is a lot of importance given by both the government and the other NGOs to the health related issues. Yoga has entered the school curriculum and Physical education has come to mean more than just sports and games. In fact physical education has stressed the aspects of holistic health. The recent outbreaks of HINI, Dengue, any other kinds of plagues has created a lot of awareness among the people and nations have become very careful in preventing such hazards. The schools have taken up certain health related issues. One thing was clear in such cases that most of the countries were not prepared to face such outbreaks nor they had any protective vaccine against them. It was inevitable in such cases to look up to certain developed countries for help who had effective vaccine against such maladies. Certain nations even crossed certain political and international blocks and provided the much needed relief by providing. When the students study these developments they are naturally made aware of the international cooperation that need to exist between the nations
and that in turn will make them to live in good terms with their neighbors whom they need most of the times during some unpleasant events happening around them. The students will also learn how certain medicines and measures are borrowed and used by other countries and mutual dependency exists between the nations. The teacher must make use of these measures to foster in them the spirit of coexistence and cooperation.

11) **Music:** Music is often called the language of the emotions. After silence, that which comes nearest to expressing the inexpressible is music. Whoever has observed a baby growing must have noticed that the baby hummed or sang in its own inimitable style first than speaking in the ordinary sense of the world. Even the history of the old stone age reveals that the human beings expressed their emotions and feelings in the form of songs. Happiness is expressed more in joyful music than in mere words. Music is the language of the world which is understood by each and every citizen of the world. There is no barrier to music. It stands above the political boundaries. Balvinder Kaur in her book “Peace Education” quotes Frances Elliot Clark thus: “Everywhere now we sing ‘santa Lucia’, ‘All through the night’, ‘Praise ye the father’, ‘Silent night’ but we never think that we owe them to Italy, Wales, Netherlands, Tyrol, Scotland etc.” Thus music unites everyone and brings in unity. In the recently concluded FIFA World Cup Inauguration 2010 Shakira sang the song ‘waka waka’ which has united the whole world. Thus music is a powerful weapon which develops respect and appreciation within the people and between the nations. Whenever the music is taught in the classroom the teacher can enlighten the students about the contributions made by different musicians to the world of music. This would make the students to realize the unity in diversity which is an important aspect of the coexistence.

12) **Science:** Science is a systematic body of knowledge. Science is a powerful tool which makes everyone feel that we are one. Because the scientific inventions are meant for the whole world though they are invented in a particular country. Thus Scientists like Louis Pasteur, Isaac Newton, Thomas Alva Edison are universal personalities. While teaching their inventions the teacher can always drive home
the point of coexistence and universal brotherhood. The revolution that has taken place in Transport, Information, Medical Field is not meant for only for the countries where it has been invented but for the whole world. In fact the science has brought the vast world into a drawing room. Similarly it can bring the people together and make them feel that they are one. The cultivation of the scientific attitude of mind insuring patience, willingness to investigate and to test and to be corrected, unwillingness to dogmatize and acceptance of facts regardless of their effect upon earlier beliefs and its application to the study of social and international relations is probably the most important contribution that can be made to the solution of these questions (Balinder Kaur 2006) This in turn would ensue peace and tranquility between nations. It depends how the teacher makes use of these situations in the class room. Instead of teaching only facts and figures the teacher should teach certain values that stem from these inventions and discoveries.

13) School Projects on Peace: Today project work has become an important aspect of the education. It is sad to see that students do not do them properly. Moreover the subject teacher doesn’t give required importance for the same. In order to teach peace and its importance may be the teacher can give them peace related projects. E.g: Collect all the peace quotations and compile them in the form of a booklet., Find out from the daily newspapers the issued related to war and efforts carried out towards conflict resolving, Collect the peace related poetry from the library, Compile the peace related speeches given by great leaders etc. These projects will not only create a peace hunger in the students but it will be good source material for the peace education in the school. There is also possibility where the students could be directed towards local churches, Mandal panchayats, and police stations to study the cases of neighborhood rivalry, or settlement of cases out side the court etc which will make them realize the importance of peaceful co existence.

14) Competitions in the school: Along with the curricular activities the school has the scope to organize the many a competitions. It is possible for the school to conduct them under the banner of Peace. There could essay competition on the
themes of peace, Tolerance, Human Rights Awareness, Cooperation, International Understanding, etc. There can be poetry competition on peace related subjects and dance or drama competitions also could be organized. These competitions not only create the competitive spirit in them but also creates a hunger for peace and changes them into peace loving people.

15) **Peace day Celebration:** Peace day celebration should be an important aspect in every school. Along with creating an awareness it is opportunity to speak to the students on the importance of peace and peace related subjects. Such celebrations should be a regular feature of the school. It makes the children wait eagerly for such celebrations not only with external disposition but with a strong aptitude for peace they would take part in them. Peace day celebration would make them peace loving the peace bearing students. It makes them feel different than others. They would automatically shun the ways of violence and conflicts and try to walk in the just ways. The teacher would find it easy to control them and their internal disposition will always be positive.

**Conclusions:** The practical aspects listed above are not exhaustive. They are just a help or a guidance so as to know how we can make use of the existing resources and structures for the purpose of imparting peace education without making it a burden. It is a light to the path where by every teacher can become a peace soldier and every student could become a peace child.

**Part VI**

**1.15.0.0 Need for the study**

Violence is emerging in an unprecedented manner in human society. Looking at the world today any sensible person feels disheartened and even horrified to see the
kind of violent acts being committed by man against man and nature. It is sad to realize that we live in an era of unprecedented violence in the forms of terrorism, war, crimes, injustice and oppression and exploitation amidst a seemingly outward development enjoyed by a few. The majority of mankind lives in stark poverty, struggling for bare survival. There is so much disorder and confusion in the society man has built for himself. The saddest part of the story is that this state of disorder and confusion in the society is affecting the children's innocent minds. Children naturally absorb the spirit of violence in the atmosphere and will soon grow to be the next generation of perpetuators of violence. Therefore the need to nurture peace in the hearts of children has arisen as urgent issues to be addressed.

There is no doubt that the textbooks in History (a branch of social science) and languages do help in developing peace awareness in children but the adequacy is questionable. The parents are unable to resolve the family conflict themselves sometimes. Inadvertently they ring into the young minds of their children that the primary purpose of their life is to live for themselves, sometimes even at the cost of others. The textbooks in history that our children study are nothing but the accounts of rivalry, conflicts, wars, conquest and defeats. Though the teacher is bound to draw certain moral lessons from these accounts the question is whether the teacher finds time to do it in the pretext of completing the heavily laden syllabus? Political science revolves around the issues of power, competition, winning and loosing. Is it not creating a kind of emotional tension and undue anxiety in the young minds of our students? We have the example in Karnataka and elsewhere in other states where the people themselves revolted against the textbooks which did go against their religious feelings. The adolescent period is the time that our children get into value crisis. The National Framework of Curriculum 2005 (NFC, 2005) highly recommends Peace Education for the pupils in all the levels. Hence it is the conviction of the Investigator that a special focus has to be laid to develop Peace Awareness which requires a special curriculum at this stage.

Hence present study was a sincere effort in this context to develop Peace awareness among the students of standard VII.
1.15.1.0 Rationale of the study

Education is nothing but a process whereby the human beings are formed not only intellectually but essentially in character. It can be recalled here that Swami Vivekananda termed education as Man making or forming the character of a person. The most effective alternative to punishment for violent or disruptive student behaviour is to provide children with tools they will need for living peacefully with one another (Adams H 1994) It is bringing out the best from the man. Most of the times the violence and the peacelessness found in the society is caused by those who are emotionally disturbed and uneducated. It is true that they are politically used by certain vested interests. Hence the investigator feels that such an unwanted situation of violence and peacelessness could be avoided at the grassroots level if our children are properly educated and made aware of their role in the society. Besides as the children pass out of their primary school and as they get into high school they stand in for more threats of violence and social disturbance. Lantieri L and Patti J (1996) assert that schools must educate the child’s heart as well as the mind. Hence it is of paramount importance that they are given a special kind of input whereby “peace awareness” is created within them which not only will form their character but also will help in making them beautiful creatures of God. Since it is the transitional period in both their physical and mental, emotional and social growth the investigator would like to select the standard VII students.

Moreover presently there is a lot of social and religious unrest in the society which is very well but very sadly and intricately reflected in the schools. The present education system is not fostering universal brotherhood and the human dignity (Rani Swaroop and Priya Darshini 2009) India being a secular country which was known for its peaceful co-existence is in itself deteriorating, solely in the name of religion, thus spoiling the peace atmosphere. Hence the investigator felt that certain extracts from the Holy Books of different religions practiced in India are richly blessed with inspiring material like- parables, stories, anecdotes and discourses which not only propagate the much needed values but also help tremendously in creating peace awareness. The world peace should be the top agenda of the present education system.
Therefore the investigator felt that the above said material could be used as special instructional material to develop peace awareness among the children. Moreover English being the most spoken language across the globe and English literature being very rich in its secular presentation, the investigator used certain material from the English literature such as – stories, poetry, historical speeches of well known personalities, articles from the magazines and newspapers as instructional material. **Bruce H E and Davis B D (2000)** support this view in their paper presented on “A Curriculum of Peace”

1.16.0.0 Statement of the problem:

A Study on the Effect of Specially Designed Instructional Material in Developing Peace Awareness among the Pupils of Standard VII in Uttara Kannada District.

1.17.0.0 Operational definition of the terms used in the Problem:

The following terms have been operationally defined for the purpose of the study

**Specially designed material**: It refers to the programme or Instructional Material that was specially prepared by the Investigator for the pupils of standard VII, studying at St. Joseph’s School Karwar. The Instructional Material was taken from the Holy Books of different religions practiced in India, such as parables, discourses, statements etc. Certain material like short stories, anecdotes, speeches, poetry from the English Literature and articles from newspapers were used for the purpose of developing Peace awareness. On the whole the instructional material consists of stories, articles, parables, poetry and certain peace related quotations.

**Peace Awareness**: Peace is, a psychological, social, political, ethical and spiritual state with expressions at intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup and international areas of human life. It refers to the coexistence of human beings in the society without the interference of any unwanted feelings that spoil the good atmosphere
needed for human existence. It is a kind of positive peace whereby each one considers
the other as his own and lives in harmony both with each other and with the nature.

Awareness refers to being aware of ones role in maintaining such a positive
peace and playing an active role and vouching to maintain such an atmosphere in the
society, work place, family and in the institution. In this study peace awareness will be
understood in terms of *tolerance, respect for human rights, cooperation* among
students themselves, students and teachers and students and their parents and
*communicative skills* for better understanding and better relationship among them.

**Pupils of Standard VII:** It refers to the pupils of standard VII of St. Joseph’s School,
Karwar an English Medium School run by the K D E Society, unaided but duly
recognized by the Government of Karnataka.

**Uttara Kannada District:** It is one of the 32 academic civil districts of Karnataka
comprising of 11 Talukas which are educationally, economically and socially not
much developed when compared to Dakshina Kannada.

1.18.0.0 Objectives of the Study

**Baseline Objectives**

1. To measure the level of existing level of *Peace Awareness* among the pupils of
   standard VII

**Experiment based Objectives**

2. To find out the effect of the Instructional Material on developing *Peace
   Awareness*, among the pupils of standard VII

3. To find out the effect of the Instructional Material on developing *Peace
   Awareness*, among the boys of standard VII

4. To find out the effect of the Instructional Material on developing *Peace
   Awareness*, among the girls of standard VII
5. To find out the effect of the Instructional Material on developing **Peace Awareness**, in relation to **Tolerance** among the pupils of standard VII

6. To find out the effect of the Instructional Material on developing **Peace Awareness**, in relation to **Tolerance** among the boys of standard VII

7. To find out the effect of the Instructional Material on developing **Peace Awareness**, in relation to **Tolerance** among the girls of standard VII

8. To find out the effect of the Instructional Material on developing **Peace Awareness**, in relation to **Human Rights** among the pupils of standard VII

9. To find out the effect of the Instructional Material on developing **Peace Awareness**, in relation to respect for **Human Rights** among the boys of standard VII

10. To find out the effect of the Instructional Material on developing **Peace Awareness**, in relation to respect for **Human Rights** among the girls of standard VII

11. To find out the effect of the Instructional Material on developing **Peace Awareness**, in relation to **Cooperation** among the pupils of standard VII

12. To find out the effect of the Instructional Material on developing **Peace Awareness**, in relation to **Cooperation** among the boys of standard VII

13. To find out the effect of the Instructional Material on developing **Peace Awareness**, in relation to **Cooperation** among the girls of standard VII

14. To find out the effect of the Instructional Material on developing **Peace Awareness**, in relation to **Communicative skills** among the pupils of standard VII

15. To find out the effect of the Instructional Material on developing **Peace Awareness**, in relation to **Communicative skills** among the boys of standard VII

16. To find out the effect of the Instructional Material on developing **Peace Awareness**, in relation to **Communicative skills** among the girls of standard VII
1.19.0.0  Research Hypotheses

H₁. There is significant difference in Peace Awareness among the boys and girls of standard VII

H₂. There is significant difference in Peace Awareness in terms of Tolerance among boys and girls of standard VII.

H₃. There is significant difference in Peace Awareness in terms of respect for Human Rights among the boys and girls of Standard VII

H₄. There is significant difference in Peace Awareness in terms of Cooperation among the boys and girls of Standard VII.

H₅. There is significant difference in Peace Awareness in terms of Communicative skills among the boys and girls of standard VII.

H₆. There is a significant difference in terms of Peace Awareness between the group with Conventional Instruction and the group with Special Instruction.

1.20.0.0  Limitations of the Study

The above mentioned study has the following limitations

- It was limited to only the four aspects of Peace Education viz: Respect to Human Rights, Tolerance, Communication and Cooperation.

- The Instructional material was used for a period of 45 days only

- It was administered on 27 teaching periods

- It was conducted for a student group of 64 only.

- The sample consisted of students from a private aided English medium school.

1.21.0.0  Organization of the Study
The research report consists of five chapters. A review of related literature is given in chapter two. Chapter three deals with the methodology followed in this study, which consists of research design, sample selected, tools used and procedure of data collection. Analysis and interpretation of the results are presented in the Chapter four. Chapter five presents a brief summary and conclusion of the study. It does include some suggestions for the future. Bibliography and Appendices are presented on the last pages.