Global Citizenship and Education for Peace

By Dr. Amani Jarrar[1]

Peace is a human goal and a noble aspiration towards which humanity has been trying to achieve down through its cultural history. The call for peace, laying down its foundation, and spreading it worldwide has gained momentum in modern age as a means of creating a rallying point around which the mutual understanding of all peoples of the world may revolve.

Peace studies became an area of academic research in universities worldwide as of 1950s. At the onset, the focus was on peace vis-à-vis direct violence, as it is the case with aggression, torture, persecution, and wars. Later, research expanded to tackle indirect violence, i.e. human suffering under social, political, and economic systems that lead to death or belittling people's dignity and violation of their rights. Racial discrimination, exposure to famine, and denial of human rights are typical examples.

Speaking of "education," it is an invitation to life—and life, in essence, is peace with self, with others, and with the environment. Hence, education for peace ranges in its expanse from peace among nations and peoples, to individual peace in the family or community and, ultimately, to inner peace of the individual him/herself.

Peace is inevitable for humankind; otherwise humans would live under destabilizing fear and develop antagonisms towards each other. Man is

---

[1] *Dr. Amani Jarrar* is a Jordanian scholar, researcher, and university professor specializing in political education and development for peace and democracy, multi-disciplinary cores, and human rights. She speaks Arabic, English, and French, has participated in many international conferences and workshops and has published numerous books and articles. Dr. Amani Jarrar has served as an official judge for such prestigious awards as the King Abdullah Award, the Queen Rania Award, and the Mohammed Bin Rashid Award for Excellence. She has worked as a consultant for different international organizations and societies advancing civic education, human rights peace education, global citizenship, and democracy and sustainable development for world peace.

inherently social and loses social peace and experiences isolation and reclusiveness, should he/she fail at social adjustment and harmony. Peace is a social need as well, for conflicts affect an individual's productive capacities and leads to income loss and diminishing economic potentiality. A just peace cannot be at the expense of other people's interests. Rather it safeguards the interests of an individual so that he/she may pursue the path of collaboration and coordination with others for the establishment of a strong economy. In general, peace as an individual economic need interacts reciprocally with peace as a national economic need. However, the level of prosperity that the individual might enjoy may be attributed to the economic level of the state that he/she bears citizenship.

There are a number of approaches through which the individual may be acclimatized to coexistence and collaboration with other individuals on both local and international levels. The world and this planet are but a common homeland to all human beings, irrespective of their color, belief, or religion. Additionally, we live in a world that is governed by a collection of ideals, values, goals, and common international principles such as the UN Charter. Hence, it is incumbent upon us to cooperate internationally in areas such as health, sciences, education and economy, in order to achieve peace and other objectives of sustainable development.[2]

Here we can pursue various approaches to teach citizenship, such as through preparation of the good citizen—an approach that is widespread and still prevalent in regions that hold traditions in high regard and give space to the dominance of knowledge for the purpose of creating allegiance to traditional values. As such, this approach does not encourage critical analysis. The best approach, however, is the one that nurtures responsibility for critical thinking. This approach relies on channeling social education towards seeking information and problem-solving. It also gives much regard to structural and value analyses, and comprises instruction on the constitutional process and the value of political systems. If education for peace is primarily concerned

---

[2]   Adams, E.M., "The Ground of Human Rights," *American Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol 19, No 2, 1982

with affecting change, then the latter approach would be more consonant with its objectives.

In this connection, we can present five methods for the education based on the concepts of peace. First is the method that educates on peace through emphasizing power. It is a method that wins the support of governments and armed forces. The concept here is based on the premise that maintaining peace can be done through perpetuating military force in order to achieve military ascendancy. Second is education for peace through mediation and resolution of conflicts. Under this method individual and social conflicts are analyzed and resolved without the use of violent means. The shortcoming of this method lies in the fact that it may give rise to inequality in cases of force imbalance. The third method is that of education for peace through achievement of inner peace. This method primarily focuses on personal need for sympathy, forgiveness, and cooperation. Fourth is education for peace as being a component of world order. It takes into consideration the need to admit that violence is the main impediment in the path to peace. This method requires also detailed analysis in order to effect both personal and social change. Lastly is education for peace through the abolition of power relationships. This approach views human values as if they, themselves, are outcomes of certain structural variables. Consequently, the focus here is on increasing awareness of structural violence and sympathizing with the struggle of persecuted groups.

It might be said that, foremost among the duties of the educational method that must be met in the field of education for peace is the emphasis on the fact that there is no contradiction between patriotism and humanism. The goal here is to imbue the learner with the a sense of belonging to his/her homeland emanating from loyalty to the family and local community inclusive of its agencies and institutions, allegiance to the national society with its organizations and other entities, and concluded by the wider global loyalty. Our goal should be also to edify the learner and develop his/her sense of responsibility in order to create the human factor on which the global society is based. Therefore the educational approach will feature a number of themes by virtue of which the objectives of education for peace can be achieved and the global citizen created. Peace education objectives can be attained through

training and practice in procedural actual-life situations both within and without the educational institutions.

The salient features of the educational approach in general may include human experiences in their wider sense, provided that they should be taught early from childhood. As to the international problems and their root causes, the support of communities, cultures, and human pursuits must be enlisted in order to guide the footsteps of the learner toward today's and future's world. It would be then befitting to study various human traits as to their agreements and differences and their concern for other people. The aim would be that the individual learns the importance of respecting people irrespective of their cultural or economic differences, and notwithstanding their intellectual or ideological variances. Here comes the importance of developing a global philosophy of life that fosters global human values, and raising up learners to the principle of peaceful coexistence in order to be able to influence decisions on peace and war and participate in formulating political objectives, as well as educating learners to life in a society of tolerance and sublime values—a society that would not condone racial, religious, or ideological prejudices.

There is also a necessity to endow learners with that which contributes to achievement of goals that emphasize the value of peace as a way of life when it comes to human interactions. Additionally, the learner should be armed with educational principles that invoke a belief in his/her fatherland as well as his/her global human country. Therefore, a proactive and flexible behavior" would be imparted to the learner, vis-à-vis problems: problem-solving skills, even-handed perspective of passion and fact, practicing educational activities on both national and global levels. In a like manner, if the educational institutions at all levels of schooling constitute an important factor in elimination of value contradiction and cultural struggle among citizens of the same nation, this institution can play the same role on the global level in order to contribute to international cooperation and peace. And if the educational institution assumes an important role in normal circumstances, its role takes an even greater importance during periods of social transformation and cultural change, where societies move away from traditional social norms towards values, thoughts, and new parameters that require scrutiny for selection through practice. Education and cultivation are means for achieving all these goals and objectives.

The individual's right to safety stands as one step towards achieving political peace, since it is also a step towards social peace, followed by international peace up to a stage that entails global political peace. The "right to security" assumes many forms, foremost among which is **the right to a secure existence**. The state should not seek safeguarding security and order in society in a manner that compromises the just legal guarantees of individual rights. Otherwise we would be risking overstepping the secure boundaries of social stability, not to mention violating the code of ethics—something that would cost the government or regime their legitimacy, both within and without.

The right to security includes the right to be protected from genocide of all sorts—social uprooting, transgressions that lead to elimination of heritage of language or religion, in addition to perpetual armed conflicts, crimes of mass murder and various torture methods. In order to prevent violations of nations' right to secure existence, the international law grants neutral countries the right of continued investigation and search to ascertain the absence of all evidences of armament for waging war. The aim of such investigation and inspection is to achieve, first, armament limitation and, second, disarmament in order to guarantee security on all fronts.

In order to guarantee the individual right to a secure existence, it has to be protected, by yet a higher guarantee, from unjust actions of the nation-state's executive arm. The aim here is to bar the executive arm from assuming the prerogative to disable basic individual rights, primarily the right to a secure existence. As to the international level, security can be only achieved through the general provisions of international law. This is because the instinctive or primitive condition, i.e. the non-abidance of states by any law, and the inherent tendency of every state to achieve its own limited interests and ambitions, would entail conflicts that pave the way to wars of untold consequences. Therefore, the nation-states of the world have conclusively formulated a set of rules of international relations in order to prevent such wars from breaking. What stands out among these rules is the principle that recognizes the right of every nation to peaceful existence, followed by the principle of permanent peace in pursuit of a means for peaceful coexistence among all nations.

It is necessary to point out to the reader that, starting from the sixteenth-century, several attempts towards devising an abiding law on peaceful coexistence and political security are worthy of notice. Here, three distinct schools of thought developed: First, the School of Salamanca in Spain, spearheaded by Francisco De Vitoria (1480–1546) and Jesuit Francisco Suarez (1548–1617). It is the view of the proponents of this school that political authority is based on Natural Law derived from Divine Law. Authority, thus, is defined through Natural Law. Suarez, however, is of the view that humanity is divided into nations and peoples, and that, in order that humanity may progress and maintain its security, it is not necessary that all nations must unite into a single political group—something that is impossible to achieve. Practically, he says, that there is no overarching authority that dominates all nations such that they all abide by its laws. However, he has no objection to the presence of an "international life" that consists of secure interstate relations and is based on the relative solidarity among them. Therefore, the human race is divided into several peoples with some sort of unity in politics and ethics existing among them. Consequently, the "Law of Nations" is a collection of ethical and legal rules formulated by the Commonwealth of Nations in order to coexist peacefully. In other words the "Law of Nations" assumes a middle position between the "Natural Law," which is characterized by natural necessities, and the "Political Law," which is determined according to the **statutory law** peculiar to each country.[3]

Second was **School of the Law of Nature** that was spearheaded by the Dutch scholar and jurist Hugo Grotius (1583–1645), who is regarded as the prime author of international law according to the precepts of his work, *The Law of War and Peace* (1625). He wrote, "Where judicial settlement fails, war begins" (*DIB* II.1.2.1). Wars may be justly undertaken in response either to "wrongs not yet committed, or to wrongs already done." In this book, Grotius presents his doctrine on "just war," and states that what justifies war is that it is an instrument of right where judicial settlement fails, as it is the case with international conflicts. He sees also that the foundation of every sound national or international system of norms is the "Law of Nature" that is a

---

[3] Barker, Ernest, 1962, *Principles of Social & Political Theory*, Oxford, Clarendon Press

dictate of "right reason" in consonance with moral baseness or moral necessity, and in conformity with rational nature.

One of the outstanding characteristics of the doctrine of "just war," as seen by Grotius, is that it would be motivated by a just cause. Only great evils, he states, come in the wake of wars. Therefore, whatever is unjust paves the way for a just war. The proponents of this theory hold that, solemn wars are formally declared wars between sovereign states. Such wars are called 'just ' or 'lawful 'in the sense that by international agreement they assert legal effect; they need not be 'just 'according to natural law. A formal declaration of war is required to attest that the war is fought by 'Consent of both Nations, or of their Sovereigns'. They also assert that the armaments and other military means used should be in agreement with the desired moral and political goals. Among the matters mentioned by them in this connection is the principle of differentiation of what may be fought, as there should be a distinction between what is military and what is civil.

Here, I do strongly disagree with this premise, since I reject any justification for the outbreak of war. Man is the most precious entity and is superior to any goal of any sort.

Third was the School of Political Realism (Realpolitik), which was championed by Niccolo Machiavelli (1469–1527), and aimed basically at securing success of the state in its workings, irrespective of the means used to achieve this aim, based on the principle of absolute state sovereignty.

Kant's comment on the precepts of this school was that "the principle that the aim justifies the means is not applicable to man as a citizen who must participate in enacting just laws that guarantee security. Man is not merely a means, but rather an aim.

Speaking of war, it should have its justifying reasons, such as being waged as an expression of people's will, even when the people were passively acted upon, rather being positively active in the matter of war. War may be the only permissible means to the state—in natural circumstances—to achieve security and regain its right from other states, in addition to the right to protection through military preparedness. On this principle, the right to

secure existence might be achieved among nations in a balanced manner with the aim of securing wholesale security and permanent political peace.

Consequently, the proponents of this theory are of the view that wars generally occur for two reasons: In the absence of a prohibitive international law, a state may regain its right forcibly from other states, because there is no upper legal authority that can adjudicate on conflicts. Another reason is when a wronged state retaliates by a counter-aggression for the purpose of retaliation rather than chastisement. This is because the relation among states is not like that between a superior and his subordinate. In order to achieve a state of "peace and security," war must be distanced from acts of genocide, enslavement, or subjugation through moral extermination, such as the dissolution of certain populace into the masses of the conquering people.

War has a legal character inasmuch as it is quite similar to legal penalties. Murder in war is like a death sentence passed as a penalty to those who have ignited the fire of war. In other words, it is a penalty that is deserved only by those who have actually participated in military combat.

As to security, it is not merely a matter of good neighborliness between two states, but also that of exchange of peaceful ideas, benefits, and goods through adoption of laws on peace on the premise that states are legal entities that seek peaceful existence.

To achieve political security in its comprehensive meaning, we need first to begin with national security that relies on invincibility of society. Our aim here would to strengthen the society's inherent resistance in order to safeguard the nation and its integrity. We should also guarantee the security of the people and their freedom. Last but not least, we must provide the citizen with elements of a decent life such that would secure the citizen's psychological and social stability. Here we should be mindful of the dangers of particularism, whether regional, sectarian, and the like. Equally dangerous is heteronomy, or submissiveness, since previous practices showed how perilous this is to political, economic, or social security.

As to the **Principle of Universal Peace,** it certainly cannot be established in the absence of guaranteeing the freedom of all concerned. Since the third century BC, the Stoical philosophers advocated humanity's right to peace

through its liberation from that which differentiates man from his sibling—differences based on language, religion, or homeland. Once removed, all humans may be viewed as one family whose law is reason, whose constitution is morals, and whose ultimate goal is peace.[4]

The crux of the problem is that the barrier to achieving such goal is that "[t]he chances of reaching a peaceful solution are few in a society where its tribal tradition dictates the use of force."

Perhaps the magic key at hand here is the need for justice in government so that we may achieve peace, which is the noblest duty of man.

There are references in Western thought to "toleration" as a road to peace. John Locke, for example, in his famous letter on toleration, argues that tolerance is indeed a Christian virtue and that the state as a civic association should be concerned only on what secures civil peace. Thomas Hobbes is of the opinion that man does not naturally seek peace *per se*, but for being frightened by the consequences of war. Individuals, he argued, surrender their rights to their rulers only for the establishment of social peace.

Kant was of the opinion that the right for peace presupposes neutrality and securing perpetuity of covenanted peace, and the right to mutual federation or what he called "federation of states," in order to secure a state of joint defense. Kant applies his prime moral rule on states and individuals alike. This rule is: "Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law." Hence war is allowed only to ward-off an unjust enemy who violates this universal law. Should this violation become universal, then no peace could be established among nations.

If "perpetual peace," as an ultimate goal of international law, is not a feasible idea then, instead, a number of treaties may be created between the states in order to bring them nearer to this goal. Kant calls such federation the "international federation of the peoples." Later, his idea was realized for the first time through "The League of Nations," which came into being after World War I with the aim of creating a supreme international authority.

---

[4]   Diggs, B.J., "Liberty without Fraternity," in *Ethics*, Vol. 87, No. 2, 1977.

The ultimate goal of international law is, according to Kant, to reach the "international treaty of perpetual peace," which does not merely take us to a moral principle such as that of human fraternity. In other words, the aim is to agree on an international legal principle on the public rights of mankind, such as the right of every man to travel freely over this planet, and the right to covenant with all other people.

The motives that urge peoples and states to join this treaty are either material, which are as round as the globe with its limited resources where all must share benefits and goods, or moral motives, such as those of sharing of sciences, arts, literature, the inherent human tendency to associate with others, and the unity of human rationality.

Kant's "Perpetual Peace Project" provided for six Preliminary Articles that indicate the passive conditions for peace. These are:

- "No secret treaty of peace should be held valid in which there is tacitly reserved matter for a future war."
- "No independent states, large or small, should come under the dominion of another state by inheritance, exchange, purchase, or donation."
- "Standing armies should in time be totally abolished."
- "National debts should not be contracted with a view to the external friction of states."
- "No state should by force interfere with the constitution or government of another state."
- "No state should, during war, permit such acts of hostility which would make mutual confidence in the subsequent peace impossible: such are the employment of assassins, poisoners, breach of capitulation, and incitement to treason in the opposing state."

As to the three Definitive Articles for peace, which constitute the positive conditions, they are:

- "The civil constitution of every state should be republican" based on "the political principle of separation of the executive power (the government) from the legislative power."
- "The law of nations should be founded on a federation of free states."

- "The law of world citizenship should be limited to conditions of universal hospitality"[5]

Such are the conditions for perpetual peace that a philosopher can identify theoretically before their actual application. But the guarantor of perpetual peace is of a nature that exposes the human tendencies of exploitation and selfishness, which are essentially the antitheses of peace. Therefore, a benevolent political system must endeavor to educate the people morally in a manner such that they would stand up for peace.[6]

While differences of language and religion are some of the main pretexts for war, yet the rapprochement among peoples over principles must increase, especially with flourishing of civilization. Naturalism used the prevalence of exchange of interests among various peoples and its necessity to bring them all together. Had this not been the case, the ideal of international law would not have singlehandedly protected perpetual peace from violence and war. Nations are not compelled by moral motives alone to endeavor to achieve and maintain peace, and intervene at signs of impending war and hamper it. It is as if they have jointly concluded a permanent pact for this purpose. Therefore, nature—thanks to the same human tendencies—is a guarantor of perpetual peace.

As to Kant's 1795 article, "Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch," it deals with the following recommendation: "The opinions of philosophers on the conditions of the possibility of public peace should be consulted by those states armed for war."[7] Therefore, the state tacitly and secretly invites them to give their opinions. The state will let the philosophers publicly and freely talk about the general maxims of warfare and of the establishment of peace.

---

[5] Arabic translation of Immanuel Kant's *Perpetual Peace Project*, by Othman Amin, 1952, Cairo, The Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop

[6] Ethridge, Marcus E. & Handelman, Howard, Politics in a Changing World: A Comparative Introduction to Political Science, by Thomson, Wadsworth, USA, 2004.

[7] Hays, Michael, 1993, *Confronting Chaos: A New Understanding of Ourselves and Our World*, USA, California.

Political wisdom, therefore, will make it a duty to introduce reforms that accord with the ideal of public law, with the aim of producing a lawful constitution founded upon principles of freedom, for only such a constitution is durable.

Some thinkers and psychologists speak of another form of peace: inner peace that is achieved through caring for the inner psychological balance of the individual and the harmony of his/her deeds with self, others and nature.[8] From this perspective, analytical psychologists classify human instincts into two categories: instincts that seek to maintain eroticism, *ad verbatim* with Plato and Freud. The other category of instincts seeks destruction and killing—the aggressive instincts or instinct of death.[9] In the light of this theory, the readiness to wage war is the outcome of the destructive instinct. Therefore, the best approach to prevent war is to inculcate love in order to counter this instinct. Human compassionate relationships that act against war are also of two categories: First, those that resemble those feelings that are generated by a very dear subject and, second, sentimental participation among upholders of important causes such as peace.

There is another, albeit indirect, approach to war prevention through educating a higher echelon of people characterized by being of independent mind, not inclined towards terrorism, and motivated by eagerness to seek and find truth. This group would assume the task of giving the necessary guidance to masses that are heteronymous to them. The ideal situation in this premise is the existence of a group of people who have subordinated their life to the rule of reason. For everything that nurtures the advancement of rational culture and promotes control of carnal desires acts simultaneously against war. Consequently, such rational culture will lead to an inner suppression of aggressive motives, such that the idea of war would be diametrically opposed to the psychological attitude that the cultural process constitutes. Under such circumstances we will be urged to stand against those of aggressive motives,

---

[8]   Henderson, Stella Van Petten (1947), *Introduction to Philosophy of Education*, USA: University of Chicago.

[9]   Arabic translation of Sigmund Freud's *Thoughts for Times of War and Death,* by Samir Karam, 1997, Beirut, Al-Tali'a Publishing House.

since a basic rejection, both intellectual and emotional, of war and every behavior that negates peace is needed.[10]

The proponents of the theory of man-made laws are of the opinion that obeying the dictates of mind in order to achieve peace is an imaginary attitude. For, according to them, if you wish to achieve peace you need to obey the law that aims at achieving peace and order. Peace is the fruit of applying the law and is not an extraneous or separate matter. Therefore, failure to achieve peace would be the product of a bad law, or a proper law that lacks proper application.[11]

Undoubtedly, the thoughts of philosophers and legislators have influenced the politicians who are capable of applying such thoughts to a certain extent. For instance, former US President Woodrow Wilson, in his talk of 22 January 1917, said that "there must be, not a balance of power, but a community of power; not organized rivalries, but an organized common peace."

Inevitably, there must be a fundamental change in our understanding of basic conceptions such as those of peace, justice, development and security. Understanding the concept of "development" from the perspective of "security" leads to considering "hunger" as a form of large scale genocide.

In 1966, the Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists was formed in order to draw people's attention to the horrific change that took place due to the tremendous scientific advancement. By the end of World War II, the sublime aspiration of all nations was the emergence of an era of peace and disarmament. Yet, what took place actually was the emergence of an insane competition for armament between the two superpowers to an extent at which terrorizing and fright became guarantors of peace from their perspective viewpoints.

---

[10] Englund, Tomas (2000), "Rethinking Democracy and Education: Towards an Education of Deliberative Citizens," *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 32(1): 305–313.

[11] Bird, Otto A, *The Idea of Justice*, Published by Frederick A. Praeger, USA, 1967.

The Nobel Peace Prize was introduced as a call for halting destruction and solving international problems by relying on rationality and the principle of justice under international law.

The UN Charter was sure to prohibit threatening to resort to force or use it in international relationships. However, it is a prohibition that neither applies, of course, to a state of legal self defense, nor to struggle of colonized peoples for their right to self-determination. By the same token, this prohibition does not apply to cases of resisting oppression and tyranny.

It becomes evident from what has been stated heretofore that the importance of peace is basically due to the fact that wars and violence detract from human freedom and dignity. Security and peace must be maintained by promoting cooperation among nations through education, science, culture, support of universal respect of justice, uncompromising belief in the supremacy of international law—all being themes that have been highlighted in the Preamble of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In its first paragraph, the Preamble refers to "the recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family" and considers it as "the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world." In the same vein, the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace states, under its Article I, that "Every nation and every human being, regardless of race, conscience, language or sex, has the inherent right to life in peace," and that respect of this right is "an indispensable condition of advancement of all nations." Under the same Article I, this Declaration specifies that "war of aggression, its planning, preparation or initiation are crimes against peace and are prohibited by international law," and stipulates further that "States have the duty to refrain from propaganda for wars of aggression," asserts "respect the right of … sovereignty, the territorial integrity of States" and emphasizes that every "State has the duty to discourage advocacy of hatred and discrimination towards other peoples."[12]

---

[12]   Curran, Robert L. (1974), "Inequality, Sociologically and Social Philosophically Seen," *Educational Theory*, 24(4):386–393.

Parallel to the deepening awareness of the cultural dimension of peace, the UNESCO declared in 1974 that peace based on injustice and violation of human rights can never be durable and would, inevitably, lead to violence. For peace does not mean the mere disappearance of armed conflicts but, rather, constitutes primarily a process of advancement, justice, and mutual respect among peoples. This is necessary to create an international community in which every member finds his proper role, and enjoys his share of the world's intellectual and material resources. Inasmuch as wars are primarily born into human minds, it is in these minds, as well, that we must establish principles of peace.

The 1975 Helsinki Accords represent a turning point in global conscience regarding the importance of peace, since it emphasizes the right of every society to enjoy social and political peace through peaceful opposition of various opinions that are substantiated by genuine information, away from ideological taints.

It is befitting here also to make mention of the futuristic insight of Prince Hasan Bin Talaal of Jordan, in his introduction to *In Pursuit of Peace,"* published 1984, the essence of which is that the best approach in pursuit of durable peace is of a peace between peoples, rather than between governments and states. Instead of what has thus been said, the problem remains since the contemporary man feels the threat to peace, since he/she does not feel peace, either within or without. The challenge here is within one's self, between man and man, and between man and nature. The optimum means of tackling the challenge of peace might lie best through democracy, security, and prosperity. With this fact in mind, peace in Third World countries is linked to the effective control of armaments, solving energy problems, debt management, protection of the environment, and productivity in both business and industry.[13]

Heretofore, since the declaration of 1986 as an International Year of Peace, the relationship between respect of human rights, on one hand, and

---

[13] Bin Talal, Prince Al-Hassan & Agha Khan, Sadruddin, introduction to *Would Humanity Win its Battle*, 1997, 2nd edition, Geneva, Independent Office for Human Causes, editors.

maintaining of international peace and security, on the other, became firmly established in all minds. For the dream of the individual who is librated from fear and destitution can in no wise be realized except under the umbrella of security and peace.

A just peace is one of the fundamental concepts that must be inculcated into principles of global education, through advancement of principles and values global citizenship—something that requires, on the international level, strengthening of international cooperation for peace, and revitalization of the role of international organizations. Yet, such revitalization should be accompanied by introducing innovative measures, such as those of peace intervention, provided that it would be accompanied by reforming the current international mechanism that is used to take decisions on such intervention, in order to make them more expressive of an international public opinion that is motivated by concern for human rights and international law. Here, we may note that the concept of peace is composed of four traditional pillars: peace-enforcement, peace-making, peace-keeping, and peace-building. All four pillars necessitate respect of human rights and related international covenants—an attitude conducive to a just peace.[14]

Our concept of peace, however, includes our understanding that justice is relative—something that requires governments to engage actively in the process of universal education, with the aim of creating generations that show mutual understanding and the desire to deal peacefully with each other.

Discourse that is based on reason is much more in harmony with the language of peace rather incitement to war. Dialogue of peace does not negate that of national, political and economic interests, yet it may interpret interests in a innovative manner as compared to what is currently prevalent. The concept of interests, from the perspective of peace dialogue, mean that humanity should coexist in a condition of peace and assurance, such that every individual gets what is his/her right, that the problems of the trio of poverty, ignorance, and disease find permanent solutions, and that exploitation, slavery, and domineering come to an end. The dialogue of vested interests, rather, leads us

---

[14]   Hayden, Patrick (2001), "Justification for Peace as a Human Right," *Mediterranean Journal of Human Rights*, 5(1): 168–191.

to consider material wealth as being the prime criteria of culture, according to which a greater cultural role is accorded to abundantly rich entities.

Therefore, we have three possible means of resolving and preventing of conflicts: peace, conflict resolution, and weakening the factors that trigger war or cause it to be an acceptable approach to conflict-resolution. In addition, the culture and ideology of peace must replace that of violence. Yet, education alone may not be sufficient despite its importance. The reason is that politicians and military commanders usually assume prime roles in waging of wars. We need, thus, to rebuild and inculcate peace in people's minds and hearts.[15]

Reasons for wars are many and take their roots in past events of history where generations and warring factions became imbued with a spirit of militancy and filled by old and intense grudges passed from a generation down to the next—up to present time! This means that the majority of the triggers of war are political, and that wars that are caused by wrong pedagogic approaches are very few. As to political triggers, they are the product of political world order and the personalities of leaders and their demeanor. Educational triggers, however, are due to a lacking culture of peace and the absence of education for global citizenship. Many of past conflicts had links to patriotic national identities and unbridled nationalism.

It is common knowledge that the possibility of democratic countries' tendency to wage war against each other is quite remote, since the primary concern of democratic populations is that of a peaceful coexistence. Democracy grants opportunity to achieve peace! We should ignore the saying that violence begets violence. Therefore, we should become careful to develop cultural mechanisms that make individuals less prone to propagate violence or the culture thereof. And if we are faced with the question," What should we do to eliminate war?" the answer may well be found in an education that is based on global citizenship and cultivation of peace and democracy. Strengthening the democratic nation may, possibly, be an essential element in our endeavors to defuse causes of armed conflicts.

---

[15]   Graham, Kennedy & Quilliam, Neil (2001), *Dialogue among Civilizations: The Role of Leadership*, Jordan: United Nations University Leadership Academy.

Democracy is therefore in great demand, not only because it provides greater freedom and secures good government for the citizens of democratic states, but also due to the fact that the probability that disputes over interests between democratic states may lead to violence is much lower than in the case of non-democratic countries. Democratic states are characterized by their abilities to check tendencies to violence, and democracy fosters peaceful patterns of behavior through reconciling of opposing opinions, rather than instigating violence. Democratic rule requires, by necessity, the presence of mechanisms for solving domestic problems through negotiation and avoidance of violence. As to the most flagrant causes of war, they are due to differences of culture, religion, and race that justify war and prove to be insurmountable to individuals. By contrast, peace requires referring to a set of moral rules, and dependence of individuals on positive collaborative action with others, such that gives an upper hand to tendencies of social participation, decent behavior, altruism, and cooperation. A global citizen is a one who enjoys the quality of personhood in a perfect manner – a trait that makes him/her a responsible group member qualified for collective participation that respects human rights.[16]

At this point, we would not fail to mention the importance of the individual harmony with others as a basis for peaceful socialization. Here the Chinese culture emphasizes the concept of harmony as spoken of by Confucius in his philosophy that inculcates a number of virtues, with universal good and peace being in the forefront. In accordance with his cosmic vision, everything in the universe represents a part of one universal system that requires harmony between heaven, earth, and man, all within cosmic relationships. Accordingly, deeds that are in harmony with the universe would be goodly, as it is the case with benevolence towards a group in return of concern in self-realization. The priority here in the first place is human cultural emphasis on a moral golden rule, *treat others in the same way you wish to be treated*. This rule is the moral foundation that a global citizen should have in order to live peacefully and satisfy common human prerequisites for fostering prosperity, based on

---

[16]   Banks, James A., *Educating Global Citizens in a Diverse World*, published by Jossey—Bass Education Series, 2003.

reconciliation, mutual understanding, social association, and education for global citizenship and world peace.[17]

Democracy acts as an effective force towards peace. Its effect greatly reduces the possibility of war. If we are to weigh other pacification factors, the fact remains that sharing a certain common culture or religion proves to be ineffective. Even globalization, in its current form, has more negative impacts on peace more than positive. Likewise, the principle of nuclear deterrence in today's atomic age contributes adversely to the possibility of a military conflict between nuclear powers rather than being a favorable factor. Speaking of sanctions as war deterrents, their efficacy is quite questionable as well. While international law may be a safeguard, yet the weakness of the United Nations does not enable it to impose a forced adherence. With all these factors in mind, we need to focus on educational means of global citizenship in order to establish universal peace. It is through changing the course of human history that we can give due regard to collective interests of the human race and create an environment conducive to international security. Here, democracy stands out as a sure remedy, since embarking on the road to good government serves both citizens of nations across the globe. Other catalysts for universal peace are tolerance, a genuine desire for constructive transformation, good living examples, and ongoing promotion of the values of peace.

Prevention of war is indeed achievable through promotion of global prosperity and spreading a culture for peace. Pursuing ways and means of preventing war requires addressing the fundamental causes of human conflict. Both poverty and environmental degradation stand out as two indirect causes of war. Both factors combined tend to promote the aggressive self and heeding the dominance of leaders who are shorn of morals. By contrast, arrangements that attempt at poverty alleviation and the realization of a greater degree of equality—in terms of incomes, opportunities and freedoms—represent basic elements and causative factors in the elimination of war. Additionally, these arrangements promote mutual trust among global citizens in a global society where its citizens enjoy equality, such that they all

---

[17]   Al-Awwa, Adel, 2001, *Contemporary Ethical Thought*, 1ˢᵗ Arabic Edition, Beirut, Ouwaydat Publishing and Printing.

rely on shared human resources, as well as an array of measures that focus on women's empowerment, water security, nurturing public freedoms, bolstering security, and encouraging sustainable development. Therefore, the assistance of rich countries to poor ones emanates from moral principles under which global citizens respect the values of peace. Wars cannot break out unless there are persons who wish to wage wars through political, racial, religious or cultural agitation and interference. Hence, there is a need to strengthen the contribution of education in bringing about human understanding, international cooperation, social justice, on one hand, and the elimination of misconceptions, antagonisms, and grudges that stand in the way to achieving these sublime human goals, on the other.

It is for such reasons that the role of education stands out as a contributor to mutual understanding among diverse cultures, achieving a degree of tolerance towards, and acceptance of, other nations. Here, a culture of peace must promote a wider culture of the same peace, provided that all humans of all regions of the globe partake of the fruit of shared humanism, since human needs and desires as well as moral principles are invariably the same. Education for peace alone not only helps reduce religious, racial, and patriotic tensions, but also eliminate them through emphasizing the importance of cultural pluralism, the advantages of common humanism, and the value of moral principles that must be incorporated into school curricula. Our aim should be that of finding solutions to problems of immorality, and generating a state of consciousness that brings forth results permeated by values of tolerance, love, and peace.[18]

On the global level, what is required is strengthening of preventive diplomacy, promoting environmental stewardship, and valuing humanity as a unifying bond that surpasses national identities. In brief, the desired social climate is that which fosters moral respect for the benefit of both humanity and world citizens.

Wars, therefore, need to be proscribed in order to universally attain the goal of a "world without war" towards which every individual aspires. This

---

[18]   Arabic translation of John Locke's *Letter on Toleration*, by Abdurrahman Badawi, 1988, Beirut, Dar al-Gharb

requires relying on an educative strategy at all levels, i.e. by fostering culture for peace and promoting education for world citizenship. To attain the state of a just and humane society, it is indispensable to acquire a sense of loyalty to the human race as a whole, and foster our faithfulness to humanity and the prosperity of mankind—all with the aim of promoting a sense of global citizenship.[19]

The top-ranking rights, which are in consonance with this concept and considered fundamental in achieving global citizenship and world peace, may well be the right to peace, the right of future generations to development, and the right to enjoy the common heritage of mankind.

It is from this perspective that I present this paper to emphasize the overall importance of education for peace within the framework of pedagogic human philosophy where there is a necessity to assert true pedagogic conception of humanity that eschews violence and war and seeks peace.

Ultimately, and in order to ensure the success and sustainability of the democratic transformation towards peace, it is imperative to curb unilateral suppressive intolerant outlooks. This might require overall structural constructive transformations in all spheres, i.e. political, cultural, social, and psychological. Education for peace requires shattering of the psychological barriers and dismantling involuntary stereotype mindsets. The political identity of the individual must be developed such that s/he would become a citizen that is both democratic and global-minded, along a peace-loving and peace-promoting path. I would not hesitate to mention, in conclusion, that, through promoting love and social justice, we can, together, stand up to terrorism. It is in this manner that education for perpetual peace must be done, and the right to secure living provided.

---

[19]   Brownlie, A. (2001), Educational Citizenship: The Global Dimension, Global Citizenship in Initial Teacher Education: A Discussion Paper, Routledge.

Arabic References

- بن طلال، الحسن، وآغا خان، صدر الدين، (1997). هل تكسب الإنسانية معركتها؟ الطبعة الثانية، جنيف: المكتب المستقل للقضايا الإنسانية.

  Bin Talaal, Prince Al-Hassan & Agha Khan, Sadrud-din, introduction to *Would Humanity Win its Battle*, 1997 2nd edition, Geneva, Independent Office for Human Causes, editors.

- العوا، عادل، 2001، الفكر الأخلاقي المعاصر، الطبعة الأولى، بيروت، عويدات للنشر والطباعة.

  Al-Awwa, Adel, 2001, *Contemporary Ethical Thought*, 1st Edition, Beirut, Ouwaydat Publishing and Printing.

- فرويد، سيغموند، (1977). أفكار لأزمنة الحرب والموت، ترجمة سمير كرم، بيروت: دار الطليعة للنشر.

  Arabic translation of Sigmund Freud's *Thoughts for Times of War and Death,* by Samir Karam, 1997, Beirut, al-Tali'a Publishing House.

- كانط، أمانيول، 1952، مشروع السلام الدائم، ترجمة عثمان أمين، القاهرة، مكتبة الأنجلو المصرية.

  Arabic translation of Immanuel Kant's *Perpetual Peace Project*, by Othman Amin, 1952, Cairo, The Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop.

- لوك، جون، (1988). رسالة في التسامح، ترجمة عبد الرحمن بدوي، بيروت: دار الغرب.

  Arabic translation of John Locke's *Letter on Toleration*, by Abdurrahman Badawi, 1988, Beirut, Dar al-Gharb.

English References

- Adams, E.M., "The Ground of Human Rights," *American Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 19, No. 2, 1982.

- Banks, James A., *Educating Global Citizens in a Diverse World*, published by Jossey—Bass Education Series, 2003

- Barker, Ernest, 1962, *Principles of Social & Political Theory*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

- Bird, Otto A., *The Idea of Justice*, Frederick A. Praeger, USA, 1967.

- Brownlie, A. (2001), Educational Citizenship: The Global Dimension, Global Citizenship in Initial Teacher Education: A Discussion Paper, Routledge.

- Curran, Robert L. (1974). "Inequality, Sociologically and Social Philosophically Seen", *Educational Theory* 24(4): 386–393.

- Diggs, B.J., "Liberty without Fraternity," *Ethics*, Vol. 87, No. 2, 1977.

- Englund, Tomas (2000). Rethinking Democracy and Education: Towards an Education of Deliberative Citizens. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 32(1): 305—313.

- Ethridge, Marcus E. & Handelman , Honard, *Politics In a Changing World : A Comparative Introduction to Political Science*, by Thomson, Wadsworth, USA, 2004

- Graham, Kennedy & Quilliam, Neil (2001). *Dialogue among Civilizations: The Role of Leadership*, Jordan: United Nations University Leadership Academy.

- Henderson, Stella Van Petten (1947). *Introduction to Philosophy of Education,* USA: University of Chicago.

- Hayden, Patrick (2001). A Justification for Peace as a Human Right. Mediterranean *Journal of Human Rights*, 5(1): 168—191.

- Hays, Michael, 1993, *Confronting Chaos: A New Understanding of Our Selves and the World*, USA, California.