Concept of Peace and Purpose of Peace Education in the Changing Times

Kim Hye-Ok

Ph.D. Candidate, Graduate School of Sociology, Ritsumeikan University

This paper discusses the concepts of peace and the purpose of peace education, including the method and student evaluation framework. At present, practicing peace education is problematic in all societies. A sort of cut-throat competition, especially in education, is rampant and taking examinations is overemphasized. Peace education based on textbooks only results in a simple knowledge transfer. But peace education clearly requires a conscious and reflective approach by the teacher. This may result in life-enhancing change for the students.

Furthermore, an understanding of peace education should begin with oneself and each student through the interaction of learning and practice. Critical thinking is an essential part of this process and it is necessary to evaluate various people, organizations and societies. A continuous evaluation and reflection of self is also needed. Peace education that relies only on theory without practice is not enough. It should aim to be the kind of education that recognizes the dynamics of the prevalent power structure in the world and explores the possibilities of peace.

1. Introduction

1.1. Problem in the current peace education

The consciousness is important, but often a conversion of consciousness is required. In many countries and regions of the world, where violence is predominant, people know the importance of peace. Citizens need to reflect on the situation in their own country and in the world at large. They need to ask themselves: Has our country really achieved peace? They need to proceed accordingly. In order to solve non-peaceful situations, peace education is necessary, and now is the time when peace education is actually needed. It should, moreover, play a key role in order to prevent the growth of violence, and build peaceful societies.

Academically, current peace education only gives knowledge about non-peaceful situations. However, teachings about how to develop and practice peace-building skills, such as empowerment and procedures to resolve problems are also essential. Therefore, it is important to teach not only the causes and effects of violence but also the skills based on knowledge and theory to actually solve problems.

In most fields, the acquisition of knowledge on various problems is stressed, and that is all. There is no stress on the practical side. Peace education itself is rather weak in developing problem-solving capacities for the people who could possibly work for human rights and peace. In the modern world, education for social transformation must overcome and reexamine the limits of existing peace education, since it is necessary to develop a more practical program. This study focuses on these neglected aspects.

1.2. Purpose of this study

The purpose of the current study is to seek a more practical peace education which has the potential to resolve actual problems. But we need to appreciate that the meaning and significance of peace education differs from culture to culture and from society to society. How to practice and value peace education programs must be considered with regard to individual communities. Moreover, this paper examines the suitability of peace education for use in real situations, instead of only discussing peace theory.

Again, the meaning of peace may differ depending on individual, local, and national points of view. Because of these differences, a holistic approach towards peace education is necessary. Currently, peace education does only a partial analysis of certain aspect of different field, such as human rights education and education for international understanding. It is not an analysis of the

whole.

As such, this study which is based on theories related to the definition and purpose of peace and peace education stresses on it and proposes a definition and the purpose of peace education. In addition, it will look at what kind of educational content is necessary.

1.3. Composition of this Paper

The composition of this study is as follows. The previous section has explained the purpose of this paper. In section 2, 'the definition of peace' and main concepts of peace are discussed. In section 3, prior research on the conceptual regulation of peace education is summarized. The purpose of peace education is also described, and teaching methods explained. The evaluation of peace education is also introduced. Finally, the result obtained through this research is summarized.

2. Definitions of Peace

2.1. Review of Peace Concepts

What is peace in our everyday life? The word "peace" is well known and it is desired by everyone. Ordinary people desire a peaceful life, home, area, society, and state. Therefore, how should be defined the concept of peace more specifically? Since images of peace vary, the concept of peace has various characteristics and dimensions. In other words, it is natural that the meaning of peace may be different for each person, each time, each family, each country and each cultural sphere. The following is a review of peace concepts.

What kind of influence is brought to our daily lives by peace scholars like Gaston Bouthoul? According to him, the word "peace" used by the general public, is based on knowledge gained in daily life and not systematized. He says, "When people are living in peace they take it for granted as a natural thing. On the other hand, people who experience war feel familiar with it and it is never out of their minds. According to this observation, people think of it in terms of comparing peace to health and war to sickness. This is a viewpoint about health which people are not aware of. At the same time, they are also not aware of peace unconsciously." (Bouthoul, 1974:24-5)

Furthermore, the word "peace" exists in all the languages of nations and races. Ishida (1968) points out that the concept of peace varies in each culture by reviewing the meanings of peace in each cultural sphere. "Shalom" in ancient Judaism implies a religious nuance based on the realization of justice and fairness of God. "Eirene" in Greece, "Pax" in Rome, "He ping" in China, and "Heiwa" in Japan have more political nuances, mainly focusing on order and prosperity. "Ahimsa" and "Shanti" in India emphasize non-killing and nonviolence in its meaning (Ishida, 1968:18-37).

What one may deduce from the above observation is that the myths, religion and politics of each culture had an important role in these ancient societies for dealing with the concept of peace. However, these concepts of peace put forward by Ishida do not suggest the means of realizing peace since they are just describing messianic peace, eschatological peace, peace in the garden of Eden and imaginary peace. This means that throughout history, the concept of "peace" was no more than an ethical movement that tried to prevent war and violence mainly through religious persuasion and moral teaching. It was not able to expand its influence to social or political movements which attempt to practice peace systematically in social structures or international relations.

2.2. Dominant concepts in peace theory

There is a theory which explains the definition of peace among other peace concepts. Dieter Senghaas (1977:242) says that, "Peace cannot be defined as a state of social harmony but as an aim of human action to be discussed and redefined over and over again. Thus, peace policy has to be understood as a continuous process of realizing human conditions among men. Therefore, the definition of peace will most likely undergo various changes in the future, and its conceptualization will become far broader than it used to be."

Furthermore, reviewing the changing concept of peace, it can be said that at the national security level during the cold war era, it was one of control and dissolution of war through a militaristic and security approach and in the post cold war era, research for more essential and philosophical approaches for the peace movement have been emphasized. The major researcher on the latter stream is Johan Galtung. He advocates a new approach to the theory of peace.

According to Galtung, there are two types of peace, "negative peace" and "positive peace". Negative peace is the prevention of violence and war. Positive peace attempts to diminish structural violence, such as environmental destruction, discrimination, human-rights violations, etc (Galtung, 1975).

Peace studies during the cold war era focused on research on eliminating war and violence. It was based

on the negative concept of absence of war and violence, and research on the conditions for not generating violence. However, the end of the cold war in the 1990s witnessed a sharp increase in local, cultural, racial and religious conflicts and this led to emphasizing upon the features of peace, as a concept which creates more affirmative peace structures by removing the elements of inconsistency or confrontation more positively.

Galtung tried to expand the width of peace research by using the new concept of cultural violence. Cultural violence actually justifies direct violence and structural violence. It is used in ideology, religion, language, art, academic study, law and education, etc. Furthermore, many factors of psychological violence such as hatred, aggressiveness, and resentment which cause war and violence are not considered to exist in people's minds only. Galtung insists that psychological violence exists in cultural, institutional, and conventional structures like education, law and religion which justify the above factors. He also says that oppression, exploitation, discrimination and alienation are produced because of political and economic structures (1996:196-206).

One may add here that structural violence is a concept which includes not only hierarchical exploitation and oppression of workers under capitalism, but also colonial exploitation by imperialist countries. Since structural violence is caused because of an unequal distribution of power, the right of decision-making and realization of total democracy is an important task in order to overcome structural violence (Galtung, 1980). Other important problems to be considered are the abolition of class, release from the condition of colonization or discrimination, and the dissolution of the gap between developing nations and developed nations.

Realizing peace in terms of positive peace means discarding all forms of violence in social structures, and realizing social justice. In other words, it means a state of liberation from not only violence that oppresses, exploits, or kills humans, but also political autocracy, economic exploitation, social discrimination and alienation, and racial discrimination. Conditions such as life under poverty, illness, oppression, exploitation, and low literacy, are no less important than abolishing war among the third world states. In other words, Galtung analyzes the concept of peace by using a dichotomy of violence and peace, instead of war and violence.

Although many scholars have proposed different theories of the concept of peace, Gultung's theory of

negative and positive peace has been widely accepted. However, it is regrettable that his concept of peace has only largely been accepted by the people and organizations that are predisposed towards peace. This is because the theory and knowledge of peace concept has not, as yet, been disseminated widely enough on a general level.

The following are two modern theories of peace proposed by Hiroshi Sanuki and Mitsuo Okamoto. The peace concept of Sanuki proposes the importance of the new concept of peace which suits the current global situation. He says that the research for a concept of peace should include the nature of history, criticism, and structure. According to his theory, peace is not a simple state of no war but a state with a holistic concept which includes voluntary actions to restructure society and enable peaceful co-existence (Sanuki,1985:232-50). He insists that peace is a way to crisis awareness and a way to live.

Another concept of peace, proposed by Okamoto (1998), implies negative, reluctant, restrictive and static peace, which could be defined as "What peace is not." On the other hand, positive peace, "What peace is", implies more positive, proactive, progressive and dynamic nuances which include a more immediate sense of the absence of violence.[1] The content of peace changes with the transition of time and situation. Therefore, peace is not a state of no-war. Peace is an absence of violence, injustice, inequity, and oppression, and a state where the fundamental needs of human beings are satisfied.

3. Peace Education

3.1. Definitions of Peace Education
3.1.1. General Concept of Peace Education

The general concept of peace education implies various meanings. The following are some of the concepts of peace education as introduced by peace educators.

Firstly, Betty Reardon (2002) suggested that peace education aims for equal participation within human consciousness to search for the means for peace building. The aim of medical students is learning to cure diseases. Likewise, students learning peace education learn the means to resolve conflict and problems caused by violence. Violence and war can be considered as a pathology or illness. However, in the case of violence, people have responded to the violence continuously, time after time, without attempting to eliminate its causes. With this theory, Reardon defines peace educa-

tion as intentional learning to prepare learners to contribute to the accomplishment of peace. Peace education is the curriculum for listening, reflection, conflict resolution, cooperation and inconsistency resolution (Reardon, 1982). The offered curriculum provides learners with a safer world, and power to build a sustainable environment.

Secondly, there is the theory developed by Galtung. His theory is that peace begins with negative peace which emphasizes the maintenance of peace as a short-term goal, and gradually it develops into positive peace which emphasizes peace building as a long-term goal. Peace is not only the absence of violence but is also the active creation of peace to prevent violence (Galtung, 1976). According to him, the aims of peace education are to provide the ability to create peace which enables learners to imagine the future with sustainable peace in their minds. Peace educators should keep striving to specify their educational content from negative to positive peace. Peace education is for learning the methods and skills to resolve direct, structural, and cultural violence nonviolently, create peaceful values in daily life, and aim for the accomplishment of self-innovation.

By identifying problems in the third world such as structural violence caused by the structural paradox of the North-South problem, Galtung propounded a theory which has not grown out of a Western point of view. From this perspective, peace education can be considered as education to obtain knowledge on the risks which war, violence, poverty, oppression, and discrimination can bring to human and social life, and to promote the transformation of values and new attitudes of individuals through a change of consciousness in people. Furthermore, peace education is education for overcoming the North-South problem structurally at global level, and eliminating undemocratic and political authoritarianism inherited through colonialism. It is also education to narrow the gap between the rich and poor, promote nonviolent justice and political and democratic education.

More specified versions of peace education can be observed in other philosophies of peace. For example, Sanuki (1994) says that peace education is not only simple learning of values and concept of peace, but it is an experience and practice of active participation and the right for co-existence to realize peace. Moreover, peace education increases the level of trust, and love with subjectivity of learners in their daily life. They will learn

how to seek and share "truth" and "fact" in their life through peace education. In the structure of peace education, which creates a humane way of life, learners are able to change their way of life through peace. Especially, it is important to emphasize "peace as a means" which will be obtained by discovering the significance of the world through experiential learning, by participation and as a result, discovering one's self. That is, in order to transform peace education into education for creating a new way of life, learners should rediscover the meaning of the region and the world in which they live, and systemize themselves to function as a "creator" of the world with significance (Sanuki, 1985). They teach learners how to resolve conflict with dialogue, how to create a civil society through education for democracy, and how to create change through the power of individual citizens.

In the light of the above, peace education is generally seen as activities that promote the knowledge, skills and attitudes that will allow people of all ages, and at all levels, to develop the behavior changes that can prevent the occurrence of conflict, resolve conflict peacefully, or create the social conditions conducive to peace.

3.1.2. Emphasis of Peace Education

The content of peace education will change depending on how teachers define peace. How teachers teach peace should be an important theme in the actual teaching curriculum.

It is widely recognized by many peace scholars that education is the most powerful means to carry out peace in a truly non-violent way. In order to create a framework of peace education, various concepts and significance of peace education need to be discussed to construct peace subjectively. Firstly, it is important to note that the preamble to the Constitution of the UNESCO includes the following sentence, "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed." [2] (UNESCO, 1945). What this statement clarifies is that it is important to search for the root causes of war by isolating visible phenomenon, but it is more important to search for it within the underlying basis. Also, it expresses the nature of peace, "that peace is something created".

Secondly, UNESCO emphasizes the worth and importance of education and "the right to learn". [3] (UNESCO, 1985) "The right to learn" is indispensable for a people to survive. If people wish to avoid war, we have to learn how to live in peace and how to understand

each other. Furthermore, it emphasizes the right to satisfy the human need to produce as well as the right to have a healthy and peaceful life. In the other words, "the right to learn" emphasizes the learning of people who are disadvantaged in the world, working on fundamental tasks such as poverty, human rights and peace, and recognizing the subjective construction of history.

Therefore, peace education not only prevents war and maintains a state of peace, but also according to UNESCO, actively creates a culture of peace among individuals and societies. During the 44th UNESCO International Conference on Education in 1994, "The Declaration on Education for Peace, Human Rights, and Democracy" (UNESCO, 1994) was issued, and during the 28th UNESCO General Conference in 1995, "The Integrated Framework of Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy" was issued with the aim of promoting peace education as a holistic practical outline. Thus, UNESCO emphasized the importance of peace education through a culture of peace.[4]

UNESCO also identified eight areas that form the framework within a Program of Action (Mayor & Adams, 2000:3-13). These are Education for a culture of peace; Sustainable economic and social development; Respect for all human rights; Equality between men and women; Democratic Participation; Understanding tolerance and solidarity; Participatory communications and the free flow of information and knowledge; and Internal Peace and Security, including disarmament and economic conversion. Hence, the transformation from a culture of war and violence to a culture of peace encompasses all these areas.

Additionally, in order to build up a world without war and violence, the United Nations emphasized the importance of peace by declaring the year2000 as a year of peace and nonviolence. Meanwhile, 100 million signatures from all over the world were collected a petition for peace was filed.

The perspective of peace education which emphasizes that a culture of peace should be created within the minds of people and society was also stressed in "The Hague Agenda for Peace and Justice for the 21st Century".[5] In the 50-point plan for global action introduced in this agenda, implementation of peace education is emphasized most.

It can be said that this is the time to reassess the issues listed above. With issues, themes and a desire for individual fulfillment of needs, learners and educators can accomplish mutual understanding and consensus. A new form of educational curriculum in which students and educators can function as the main actors is acutely required in current education. The question of "what, why, and how educators teach" is an important theme to be researched in the field of education. Conversely, action to emphasize the importance of peace education itself is proof of awareness of the dangers of a non-peaceful society.

3.1.3. Towards a New Definition of Peace Education

The discussion on dialogic education emphasized by Paulo Freire is important in the area of peace education. What Freire tries to explore in his book, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970:2000) is a theory and methodology of self-liberation, mutual-liberation, and ways to direct oneself towards humanization by reforming the current global situation. He proposed "education for consciousness" and "problem-posing education" (Freire:83-86) as a method and a way to make people human, and transform people into new humans. This education is the process of practice and reflection to consciously and actively transform the oppressed situation.

According to Freire, a dialogue is a method for humans to get close to one another and build trust. A dialogue cannot be realized without deep love for the world and human beings. Likewise, trust in humans is an essential element to practice this dialogue. Dialogic education is to discover language and the structural element, which is the whole point of dialogue. The meaning of "language" includes reflection and action. To speak of a true language means to transform the world. Dialogic education is to recognize the aim of oneself and of one another. It is important to understand the feelings of others and to be together with one's heart, that is, to "sympathize". However, "sympathizing" does not mean that people have the same opinion against one's beliefs. Dialogic education aims to promote tolerance and understanding which is urgently required in the current non-peaceful situation. Traditionally, true dialogue has not been practiced in education since teaching is usually a one-way process, from teacher to student (Freire, 2000:88-124). A dialogic encounter is necessary in order to diminish violence. In mutual conversation during a dialogue, trust and mutual understanding will be realized. It is also important to obtain skills for dialogue and training for empathy in peace education to create a culture of peace which enables true communication since the discontinuation of dia-

logue can be a cause of linguistic violence.

Education for a culture of peace is dependent upon teachers and learners who are able to communicate and assimilate information, knowledge and truth (Paris, 2001). Participatory communication replaces secrecy and manipulation of information in a culture of peace. Education for a culture of peace has been superceded by a culture of war and violence for the current generation of children and young adults. A full generation of a comprehensive pedagogical program coupled with behavior modification programs and trauma counseling for both victims and perpetrators before or along on the imparting education for a culture of peace. "Social relations in the dialogical classroom must be structured to resist the injustices and denial of difference characteristic of the world outside the classroom." (Brookfield & Preskill, 1999:19)

Considering some of the problems of peace education, it is necessary to think about the connection between peace education and school education. It makes a difference in the approach towards educational content and method, depending on whether schools are recognized as a natural space where various conflicts and compromises co-exist, or as a space only to transmit knowledge.

In the current peace education system it is observed that there is a distance between students and teachers, because classrooms are full of writing language, reading assignments, and assessments that only measure the amount of knowledge. In order to resolve these problems, peace educators should discuss problems and propose changes in its educational methodology. The curriculum being proposed would emphasize mutual learning of the teacher and student in a system that enables voluntary dialogue. True dialogue always includes critical thinking. Peace education does not merely focus on knowledge of war and peace, but attempts to transform the school system which oppresses the human dignity of individual students.

Peace exists in a paradox of a non-peaceful reality. Therefore, the value of peace, importance of peace, and means of peace can be learnt out of this reality. Peace education promotes critical awareness. In other words, peace education can be positioned as critical education. When peace education becomes true critical education, criticism of reality will be put into practice and peace action and practice including critical thinking will be promoted.

Galtung includes practice in both research and education. He, in fact, proposes peace research, peace education, and peace action at five levels: analysis, clarification of purpose, criticism, proposal, and action (1974:153-71). According to him, peace education is not only acquisition of knowledge, but searching, practicing, and evaluating the way of realizing peace, and experiencing the limit and the possibilities of peace.

Peace education should mobilize and influence all academic fields and skills to understand specific problems related to peace. This should not stay within certain academic fields, but should be developed in other fields with applicable methodology. Peace education teaches for the future. Learning without a vision of the future does not have value. Education for peace has to build a belief in the future by creating a sense of hope in the students that the world will be better and the differences that peace educators bring about through creating a peace consciousness are important.

Peace education is therefore a creation of a new right to learning and also a right to new learning, the promotion of the capacity to create peace, and the acquisition of peaceful skills by combining knowledge and techniques. It should be remembered that peace education is education for self transformation and social change. It is both a tool of prevention and of social reconciliation. It is crucial from the start to clearly define what is meant by peace and what model of social coexistence is being envisaged in each specific context.

3.2. Purposes of Peace Education
3.2.1. Peace Scholars and Purpose of Peace Education

All educational activities have a purpose. The purpose and objective of peace education differs depending on what kind of peace education is being aimed at. Depending on the purpose and objective, the level of content and methodology will differ. In this section, the purposes of peace education as proposed by the peace scholars are summarized as under:

First, according to Kekkonen (1985), "The goal of peace education is to create an individual capable of critical thinking, feelings of solidarity with the less privileged and empathy, and one who on the basis of his or her own conviction has a humanistic orientation towards life and is able to act in cooperation with others to create a more just world" (1985:3816). In other words, peace education aims to create actors with critical consciousness who can resolve the paradox of unequal and unjust globalization by building relationships with people in the third world, who are effected by

structural violence most directly.

In peace studies, Galtung introduced the concept of structural violence in the 1960's and it became highly relevant those days as North-South problem was of great concern to peace education. Education on disarmament with discussion on nuclear weapons was also emphasized, while the problem of development with unequal distribution of wealth between rich and poor nations was also raised (Born & Aspeslagh, 1996:10-11). At this point, positive peace appeared clearly with its objective. In this way, education for positive peace came to be developed in the form of education for development, human rights, international understanding, racial and gender equality.

According to Harris and Morrison (2003:32-36), the following are ten important purposes of peace education:

1. Peace education provides in students' minds a dynamic vision of peace to counteract the violent images that dominate culture.
2. Peace educators address people's fears. People upset about violent situations often have strong emotions.
3. Citizens of all countries need information about how best to achieve security.
4. Students in peace education study the major causes of violence and war.
5. Peace education promotes respect for different cultures and helps students appreciate the diversity of human community.
6. Peace education, by providing students with a "futures" orientation, strives to recreate society as it should be.
7. While peace education emphasizes knowledge, it also teaches skills.
   Peace education focuses on strategies to achieve both individual and societal change.
8. Peace education students learn about the problems of human rights and justice.
9. Peace education teaches a respect for all forms of life. Peace education students need to develop positive self images, a sense of responsibility for self and others, a capacity to trust others and a caring for the well-being of the natural world.
10. The ultimate goal of peace education is to manage conflicts non-violently.

The purposes of peace education are to understand the nature and origins of violence and its effects on both victim and perpetrator; to create frameworks for achieving peaceful, creative societies; to sharpen awareness about the existence of non-peaceful relationships between people and within and between nations; to investigate the causes of conflicts and violence embedded within perceptions, values and attitudes of individuals as well as within social and political structures of society; to encourage the search for alternative or possible nonviolent skills; to equip children and adults with personal conflict resolution skills.[6]

Educators can explain the nature of violence and develop in their classes strong visions of peace that motivate people to seek nonviolent ways to manage their conflicts. In order to create a less violent world, human beings must question the basic premises underlying the current global order and reassess fundamental assumptions regarding human motivations, essential values, and ultimate goals. Peace education emphasizes the sacredness of life by developing empathy for the victims of war, and calls for understanding environmental degradation and social injustice.

In this context, it is necessary to have a clear understanding about the targeting groups of peace education: who it is aimed at and for what purpose? Usually, the business of education is determined by the educators for the purposes of research and educating students. In peace education, it is necessary to include the possibility of practical education influencing not only the criteria set up in schools, but also society, region and state and the world at large. Referring to this point, Galtung points out: "At the heart of peace pedagogy lies the interpretation of our lived experiences: The first point is what everybody would assume will be included in a peace education program: analysis of our present, real world, describing its basic facts to the extent they are relevant for peace problems" (1974:223).

Differences in the recognition of peace may cause the different aims and contents of peace education activities. For example, Lee maintains that "The main purposes of the peace education in the third world are participating in the joint fight aimed at having the consciousness that neo-colonialism should be banished, in order to scientifically and correctly recognize the essence of neo-colonialism and to realize permanent peace" (Lee,1990:57). In other words, it implies creating people who can actively participate in building an order for global peace. At the same time, the purpose and aim of peace education will be depending on the situation and environment in which one wishes to live.

3.2.2. The purpose of ideal peace education

Based on the discussion above, the following are a few suggestions for peace education:

1. Peace education should be recognized as a field concerned with much more than the simple transmission of theory and knowledge. Peace education is not education based on a pacifist theory or an anti-war theory only. While it tries to provide a sense of self-satisfaction to the learners, it also aims at education which can provide learners with specific skills for the practice of peace education in modern society.

2. Peace education focusing on the concept of negative peace should be encouraged to stress on concepts of positive peace. Educators should appreciate that fundamental structural and institutional violence is much more serious than direct violence, such as war and conflicts. Peace education should be a kind of education to prevent violence or the return of violence by searching for ways of peaceful conflict resolution while analyzing and understanding the root causes and background of outbreak of conflict.

3. Alternative methods of conflict resolution of various violent problems should be learnt and developed. The paradox of direct violence, structural violence and cultural violence should be thoroughly criticized and analyzed, and active resistance against violence needs to be promoted.

4. The development of multicultural, multi-lingual education and international identity should be emphasized. Peace education should promote the learning of theories and skills for "dialogue" with others in order to feel empathy with and understand others, to accept differences by mutually considering the existence of others as valuable instead of considering the existence of only oneself. Also, peace education should provide ways of learning to express one's opinions and situation clearly.

5. Peace education should include content which corresponds with academic fields. Peace education works to establish an innovative educational system by eliminating non-peaceful and violent elements in various academic fields.

6. Peace education should be based on systems which enable sustainability, and should practice continuous assessment on its value and efficiency.

7. Peace education is not only education to obtain knowledge of non-violence but also the skills to handle violence nonviolently.

8. Peace education must be able to provide the means to create peace. It should be education to develop, implement and practice ways to create a culture of peace.

9. Peace education should be human-centered, life-centered, and nature-centered. These will be realized by constructing a community for co-existence, recognizing value of co-existence and symbiosis, and developing skills for it. This means to trust humans in human-centered society rather than in material-and-ability-oriented society, to create a system in which people can construct relationships, to obtain the ability to live in harmony with humans and nature, and to recognize the dignity and importance of living creatures.

10. In peace education students should be able to develop new thoughts, and strive toward creating a new social system where learners and teachers can seek changes and innovations in the transformation of their thoughts. Both teachers and learners should make efforts to transform and improve themselves, to establish organizational activity systems, and secure sustainable accountability.

3.3. Methods of Peace Education

Various methods are currently in use in peace education. Until now, the reading and writing of books related to peace and war is the main method of peace education. It is teacher-oriented and the teacher takes the lead transmitting his/her knowledge in lectures or seminars. But this is clearly not enough on peace education is able to transform the thoughts and feelings of the students as well. The reality is that the teachers are not utilizing creative methods effectively in the actual classrooms, even though this is absolutely essential. One of the main challenges of current peace education is to develop its methodology. According to Lannert (2003:62), "The form of peace education is possibly even more important than its content."

There can be several possible approaches to teaching peace, such as the content-oriented method in which students learn relevant philosophy and the ideas of peace, and the skill-oriented method in which students learn how to solve actual problems in real life and deal with threats to peace such as war, violence, struggle and hatred. According to Morita (1987), skill-oriented peace education should be realized through teachers by not only giving lectures but also by encour-

aging the students for actively learning, investigating, and expressing themselves. In the skill-oriented method, education mainly focuses on participatory forms of study. It is examination of life style, world studies, photographic language, ranking of ideas/concepts, simulation, role playing, games, field trips, workshops, exposure to difference, and brainstorming. This is an educational subject to advance peace education as a method of touching, viewing, and experiencing different ways of life in today's non-peace situation. Its methods can be listening, reading, observing, singing, creating, researching, discussing, dialoguing, active listening and experiencing.

The methods of peace education should not just aim at a cognitive transfer but at a cognitive transformation. Therefore, the method for peace education requires training for sensitivity and humanity. (Korean Committee of UNESCO, 2000:26). Sensitivity and receptivity training begins by making an effort to see oneself objectively and critically. Then, one makes an effort to see violence, injustice, and non-peaceful accidents happening in other spheres of the world and think about what are the problems occurring in the neighborhoods, societies, regions, and in the world at large. Again, as a method of self-reflection [7] in an actual peace education program, meditation training and education using media to gain interest of the world would be effective.

Through this program, learners will ask themselves as to how much can they be insensitive to the exposure of violence, and this would eventually raise awareness for critical thinking. Moreover, one of the necessities for this learning is the recognition and understanding of difference. Accepting difference is a condition for co-existence. In this method, both educators and students raise problems to be solved, and try to promote awareness to create peaceful recognition toward the problem through discussion.

In order to make this method more pro-active, audiovisual materials should be used. They should be thoroughly analyzed to explain violent and peaceful images. For instance, we can teach learners how to analyze violent reports in mass media, and use report on media literacy in peace education. "Students can also engage in critical media literacy by conducting content analysis projects about various peace issues, such as how the women are projected in particular film genres or how a specific minority group is represented. The students should be asked to share their findings with their classmates, but also with other audiences via presentations, written materials, and website creation. Rather than simply preparing lectures, students can compose poems and songs, write short stories, do artwork and involve in other creative outlets describing their findings" (Finley, 2005). Media literacy is required to be able to criticize images.

In addition, peace education needs to be an open educational form, based on democratic methods [8] not simply for knowledge transfer but for students' positive participation. It is possible to alter power relations in the classroom by using democratic methods, typically including discussion and small group work of sorts, and realigning the way that courses are structured (Finley, 2005). "Educators can't teach about freedom while constantly telling students to be quiet and sit down; in other words, they can't teach participation through passivity" (Walker & White, 2003:30). The students should be given a much greater voice, both in co-creating the curriculum as well as in their responsibility to provide and share knowledge. According to Brookfield and Preskill (1999:3), "Discussion and democracy are inseparable because both have the same root purpose to nurture and promote human growth." Discussion, for example, has been shown to help students develop empathy because they are asked to attend to other people's viewpoints and needs.

If we admit that one of the goals of education is to create better citizens, we must prepare students to participate in a democracy. This is something that must be experienced, and the classroom can and should be an ideal location to do so. In fact, students who are forced to sit passively in a classroom often feel as though they have no voice, that what they say and do does not matter (Talbert & White, 2003). According to Walker and White (2003:30), "In order for students to be participating members of society, they need to be participants in the classroom; this is not a goal easily reached in a traditional teacher-centered authoritarian classroom".

It should be a student-based learning experience and research must be actively utilized. Most likely, educators' continuous and practical learning will be required in order to expand peace education to participatory learning and practice. Participatory and experiential learning must be included in education in order to practice this.

3.4. Evaluation of students in peace education

The method of evaluating students should be based on the purposes and aims of peace education and

must be continuously reviewed. In peace education there is a different form for every lesson. Importance should be attached to forms of peace studies which emphasize values and participation in the activities for peace and independent study.

A balance of theory and practice in the standards of peace education is required. On the theoretical side, it should be possible to examine the relative importance of each theory and the amount of study that is required. On the practical side, (9) it is necessary to recognize the importance of activities, such as internships and project-based learning. (10) Based on this point, through participation and experiential study, it is important to check and evaluate the consciousness change and attitude of students, and know if peace is being practiced continually in their daily life. Furthermore, and as Okamoto (1987) points out, evaluation criteria for peace education should be based on not only the acquisition of knowledge, but on a change of attitude as well as self-evaluation. (11) Keeping this in view, it is clearly the students who should first of all be required to evaluate their own conduct.

As discussed in section 3.3, the students and the teacher need to engager in skill-oriented learning in order to maximize the practical nature of peace education. In this case, it will probably not be easy to decide a basis for exact evaluation. However, it will be necessary to judge as to how the students adopt a positive and affirmative study attitude. For example, a 'self-evaluation table' (12) served as a bench-mark enabling the students to judge their own behavior patterns, and to think about the hostile and aggressive nature of their conflict-oriented acts (Patrice, 2005:69). Such a system can be based on peer-evaluation with partners or small groups of students utilizing the evaluation basis table.

Harris has conducted several studies of peace education evaluation using quantitative and qualitative methods (Harris, 1995; Harris & Callender, 1995). He found that a holistic approach to peace education is more effective than a piecemeal approach. "Peace education needs to be based on a holistic approach. Consequently, knowledge, values, attitudes, and behavior should go hand in hand" (Bjerstedt, 2002:10). The peace education evaluators can always look at the types of instruction involved in peace education programs. They can also look to see if peace educators are practicing critical thinking skills in their classrooms.

Furthermore, they should also evaluate which parts are lacking and need to be improved in practical study. Through thorough objective analysis and criticism of peace theory, the teachers and scholars of peace education may make an effort to continuously promote practical learning in the educational system and technology. "The tests and exams normally used in schools are unsuitable for the evaluation of peace education outcomes, because they do not evaluate a state of mind, but rather the level of acquired knowledge" (Bar-Tal, 2002:34). They may not see immediate results, but they have to appreciate the importance of taking that first step, of doing something about the violent threats that dominate modern life, and of using their training to build a consensus for peace. Living in a violent world, they teach peace education courses because they want to make the world less violent, but what they do most is to provide knowledge about peace strategies and/or change some students' attitudes or dispositions towards violence.

4. Conclusion

Peace education is influenced by the structure of social situations. Actually, in the present competitive learning environment of current formal education, it is not easy to practice peace education in a school. In competitive societies where most students are required to take examinations, the students tend to focus on studying subjects which they will be tested on. For this reason, it makes it more difficult for the students to study peace education in the end. In addition, textbook-centered peace education in school is in danger of falling into an educational style of simple knowledge transmission. Peace education demands consciousness of teachers as well as students for a change of way of life through interaction of learning and practice.

Again, we need to appreciate that peace education cannot create perfect peace. Moreover, peace is not something which can be developed from the outside. On the contrary, it is something which each person should create by himself or herself. Peace education is to teach how to make and maintain peace and to show to the students its possibilities. Peace education creates our future and it is only possible through living one's life peacefully.

The method of peace education should recognize the social conditions and include practice that is not usually included in lectures. One of the problems is that peace education lacks the ability for the self-evaluation of its own curriculum. The influence of peace education on each learner must be measured to give it more sig-

nificance. In other words, peace education requires not only self-evaluation but also evaluation by different people in various organizations, societies and nations. It will widen the range of influence of peace education. Therefore, it is important for peace education to overcome the limitations of existing curriculums which tend to emphasize only the transmission of knowledge for peace, but practicing peace is more important. In order to make peace education more sufficient and worthwhile, it should be evaluated repeatedly with countless trials and errors. It should contain interdisciplinary values among many learning fields, and should reclaim and develop a new way of learning in terms of its principles and roles with the characteristics of originality, assertiveness, and critical thinking, in order to change the existing forms of peace education in academic fields.

Finally, peace education should be education to teach critical thinking and action. It enables students to examine the world and their relationship to it. In other words, the students should recognize the structure of the real world and aim at true peace through peace education. Through peace education, students should be able to understand critical ways of thinking and take actions persistently with reflection of themselves and their voluntary actions.

In order to develop peace education curriculums, continuous evaluation and reflection of contents are required. A peace education that emphasizes only theory without practice is not enough. In order to put the theory of peace into practice, developing and researching possible practical programs is crucial. This study stresses the need for creating a new peace education curriculum which contains practical methods and skills training. A possible topic for future research would be the development of various practical peace education simulations and study their relevance for policy making processes.

《Notes》

（ 1 ） The term 'what peace not' refers to direct violence (war or military conflict) and the term 'what peace is' refers to positive peace (non-violence action or creating peace).

（ 2 ） The Constitution of UNESCO signed on 16 November 1945, came into force on 4 November 1946 after ratification by twenty-countries. In order that a unanimous, lasting and genuine peace may be secured, the preamble declares that the states party to the Constitution believed 'in full and equal opportunities for education for all, in the unrestricted objective truth and in the free exchange of ideas and knowl-

edge' (http://portal. unesco.org/en/ev.php(2006/01/03)

（ 3 ） UNESCO, Declaration unanimously adopted by the International Conference on Adult Education: Paris, 4th, 1985. The right to learn is: the right to read and write, the right to question and analyze, the right to imagine and create, the right to read about one's own world and to write history, the right to have access to educational resources, the right to develop individual and collective skills.

（ 4 ） A culture of peace as a specific concept was deliberated upon in 1989 at the United Nations conference in Yamoussoukro, Cote d'Ivoire, and subsequently developed by emphasizing that learning about peace was a prerequisite to eliminating fear and mistrust that formed the foundation for the culture of war and violence.

（ 5 ） Hague Appeal for Peace, The Hague Agenda for Peace and Justice for the 21st century, UN Ref A/54/98.

（ 6 ） See Learn peace, a peace pledge union project. (http://www.ppu.org.uk/(2006/06/20).

（ 7 ） See *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: a guide to transformative and emancipatory learning/* Jack Mezirow and associates. 1st ed. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990.

（ 8 ） See Patrice Meyer-Bisch,(2005). *Culture of democracy a challenge for schools,* Paris, UNECSO, pp.35-128. For example, choosing joint programmes: a democratic experiment: to select the programmes, boxes were installed in classrooms for the purpose of gathering points of view. The final decision was taken by a class assembly or in consultation with the head teacher.

（ 9 ） The case studies are proof that skills-based Health Education does change behavior. Fresh Tools for Effective School Health (http://www.unesco.org/education/fresh) for 20 years, and the Peace Education Foundation (PEF) has been educating children and adults in conflict resolution skills throughout the world. See Rosemary V. Barnett, Alison Adler, Janice Easton, Keri P. Howard, *An Evaluation of Peace Education Foundation's Conflict Resolution and Peer Mediation Program,* school business affairs, July 2001. (http://www.Asbointl.org).

（10） See Jeffrey A. Nowak and Jonathan A. Plucker, *Do as I say, Not as I Do?* Student Assessment in Problem Based Learning, Indiana University, 1999. (http://www.indiana.edu/~legobots(2006/02/08)

（11） This case study is learning about citizenship at primary school. For example, there is the democratic civic education of the South Korea. This is based on the report by Korean National Commission for UNESCO. See Patrice M-B,

(2005). *Culture of democracy a challenge for schools,* *Paris,* UNESCO.

（12） The evaluation of the project centred on the pupils' 'self-evaluation table', on the daily accounts of their guidance activities recorded by the teachers, on the relational comparison between the pupils in the hot seat and the others before and after guidance, on diaries kept by the pupils, and so forth.

References

Adams,D.(2000b). *Toward a global movement for a culture of peace,* Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 6 (3), pp.259-266.

Bar-Tal,D.(2002). *The elusive nature of peace education.* In G. Salomon & B.Nevo(eds). *Peace Education: The Concept, principles, and practices around the world,* pp.27-36. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bjerstedt,A.(2002). *Peace education and teacher training.* Malmo, Sweden: School of Education.

Bouthoul,G.(1974). *LA PALX QUE SAIE-JE?* No 1600, by Presses Universitaires de France, copyright in Japan by Hakusuisha, *Heiwa no kouzou (structure of peace),* Japanese translation by Kiichiro Nakahara, 1977.

Brookfield,S.D. & Preskill,S.(1999). *Discussion as a way of teaching,* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Burns,R.J. & Aspeslagh,R.(1996). *Three decades of peace education around the world,* Garland Publishing,Inc. New York and London.

Finley,L.L.(2005). *How can I Teach Peace when the Book only covers war?,* OJPCR, ISSN1522-211,(http://www.trinstitute.org/ojpcr/(2006/02/08).

Freire,P.(1970:2000). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed,* translated by Myra Bergman Ramos; 30th Anniversary ed. New York, Continuum.

Galtung,J.(1974). *On Peace Education* In Christoph Wulf eds. Handbook on peace education, Francfurt: International Peace Research Association.

Galtung,J.(1975). *Peace, Research, Education,* Action Essays in Peace Research, Vol.1, PRIO, Copenhagen, pp.29-30 (Peace, International Enoyclopedia of the Social Science, The Macmillan Company & The Free Press, New York, 1968, NO.25-1).

Galtung,J.(1976). *Peace, War, and Defense,* Essay's in Peace Research, Vol.2. Christian Ejlers, Copenhagen, pp.282-304.

Galtung,J.(1980). *Peace and World Structure,* Essays in Peace Research, Vol.4.PRIO, Copenhagen, pp.437-479.

Galtung,J.(1996). *Peace by Peaceful means,* PRIO, Sage.

pp.196-208.

Hague Appeal for Peace, The Hague Agenda for Peace and Justice for the 21st century, UN Ref A/54/98.

Harris,Ian M.(1995). *Teachers' response to conflict in selected Milwaukee schools.* In Horst Ledgren, ed. *Peace Education and Human Development,* pp.197-219. Lund, Sweden: Department of Educational and Psychological Research.

Harris,Ian M. & Callender,A.(1995). *Comparative Study of Peace Education Approaches and their Effectiveness,* The NAMTA Journal,20(2), pp.133-145.

Harris,Ian M. & Morrison,M.Lee.(2003). *Peace Education,* Mcfurland & Company, Inc. Publishers, Jefferson, North Carolina and London.

Ishida,T.(1968). *Heiwa no seijigaku(politics of peace),* Iwanami-shoten, in Japanese.

Kekkonen,H.(1985). *Peace Education for Adult,* International Encyclopedia of Education, Oxford: Tokyo, Pergamon, pp.3816.

Lannert, V.(2003). *Education for peace: Concepts, Contexts, and Challenges.* In Y. Iram(Ed.), *Education of minorities: Peace education in pluralistic societies,* pp.57-74. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Lee,K.H.(1990). *Pyonghwa kyoyuk gwa Minjung kyoyuk (Peace Education and People Education),* Pulbit, in Korean.

Mayor,F. & Adams,D.(2000). *The culture of peace: A programme of action,* Prospects,1.

Morita,T.(1987). *Heiwa no tameni-manabi/shirabe/hyougensuru (For peace? study, investigate, express),* Heiwabunka, in Japanese.

Okamoto,M.(1987). *Nihonnodaigaku ni okeru heiwagaku kanren kouza no zittai tyousa (Research of peace study related university lecture in Japan),* Heiwa Kenkyu (Peace Research), Vol.12. in Japanese.

Okamoto,M.(1998). *Iwanami tetsugaku/sisouzite (Iwanami philosophy and thought encyclopedia),* Iwanamishoten. in Japanese.

Paris,E.(2001). *Long shadows: Truth. Lies and History,* London, UK: Bloomsbury.

Patrice, M-B.(2005). *Culture of democracy a challenge for schools,* Paris, UNESCO, pp.35-128.

Peacelessness and Maldevelopment, Sugata Dasgupta, IPRA Studies in Peace Research, IPRA Second Conference, Vol.2. Van Gorcum & Co.N.V. Assen, 1968.

Reardon,B.A. & Cabezudo,A.(2002). *Rational for and Approaches to Peace-Education,* Hague Appeal for Peace, New York, UN Plaza.

Reardon,B.A.(1982). *Militarism, Security and Peace Education:*

A Guide for Concerned Citizens, Valley Forge United Ministries in Education.

Reardon,B.A.(1988). *Comprehensive Peace Education for Global Responsibility,* New York, Teachers College Press.

Sanuki,H.(1985). *Ikikata wo souzousuru heiwa kyouiku (The peace education which creates a way of life),* Ikkousya, in Japanese.

Sanuki,H.(1994). *Heiwa wo tsukuru kyouiku (Peace creating education),* Sinnihon publication, in Japanese.

Senghaas,D.(1977). *Definitions of Peace,* Hiroshima Peace Science, Vol.1, pp.242.

Talbert,T. & White,C.(2003). *Lives in the balance: Controversy, militarism, and social efficacy.* In C. White (Ed.), *True confessions: Social efficacy, popular culture, and the struggle in schools,* pp.41-55. Creskill,NJ: Hampton Press.

UNESCO Constitution, the Constitution of UNESCO signed on 16 November 1945.

UNESCO, Declaration unanimously a dopted by the International Conference on Adult Education: Paris, 4th, 1985.

UNESCO, 44th International Conference on Education, in Geneva, October,1994.

UNESCO of Korean Committee, *The program of the school peace education for conflict solution, teacher's workshop data, August,* 2000,pp.26. in Korean.

Walker,T. & White,C.(2003). *The struggle for voice: Critical democratic education for social efficacy.* In C. White (Ed.), *True confessions: Social efficacy, popular culture, and the struggle in schools,* pp.21-39. Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press.