

# NONKILLING EDUCATION

Edited by  
Joám Evans Pim  
and Sofía Herrero Rico



Center *for* Global **Nonkilling**

Honolulu  
December 2017



You are free to share, copy, distribute and transmit this work\*

Under the following conditions:

- ① **Attribution.** You must attribute this work in the manner specified by the author/licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- ② **Noncommercial.** You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- ③ **No Derivative Works.** You may not alter, transform or build upon this work.

\* For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work.

\* Any of the above conditions can be waived if you gain permission from the copyright holders.

Nothing in this license impairs or restricts the Authors' moral and legal rights.

The Center for Global Nonkilling does not necessarily endorse the views expressed by the authors.

Also available for free download at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>

© The Authors, 2017

© Center for Global Nonkilling, 2017 (this edition)

First Edition: December 2017

ISBN-13 978-0-9839862-9-4

---

Cataloging in Publication Data (CIP)

Nonkilling Education — Vasa Explorations / Edited by  
Joám Evans Pim and Sofía Herrero Rico.  
ISBN 978-0-9839862-9-4

CDU - 172.4 : 327.36

---

A catalogue record is also available from the Library of Congress.



Center for Global **Nonkilling**

3653 Tantalus Drive  
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822-5033  
United States of America  
Email: [info@nonkilling.org](mailto:info@nonkilling.org)  
<http://www.nonkilling.org>

# Contents

**Foreword**..... 9  
*Joám Evans Pim and Sofía Herrero Rico*

**Vasa Statement on Education for Killing-free Societies**..... 15

**Introduction**..... 25  
*B. Jeannie Lum*

*Part I. Questioning Educational Traditions*

**Learning to Live Together: Exploring Nonkilling from the Peace  
Education Reconstructive-Empowering Approach**..... 39  
*Sofía Herrero Rico*

**Educating for Global Citizenship and  
Fostering a Nonkilling Attitude**..... 59  
*Emiliano Bosio*

**A Nonkilling Mathematics Education?**..... 71  
*Ubiratan D'Ambrosio*

*Part II. Nonkilling Ethics in Education*

**An Educational Model for Teaching a Nonkilling Ethic** ..... 101  
*Todd Junkins and Darcia Narvaez*

**Recognition and Compassion at Stake:  
Towards a Nonkilling Education**..... 127  
*Irene Comins Mingol and Sonia París Albert*

**Not Unlearning to Care: Healthy Moral Development as a  
Precondition for Nonkilling** ..... 143  
*Eveline Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger*

*Part III. Communicating Nonkillingly*

**A Call for Collaborative Dialogue Within Peace Education,  
Nonkilling Linguistics, and Early Childhood Education** ..... 177  
*Lauren Chamberlain*

**Nonkilling Education for Peaceful Conflict Transformation:  
A Philosophical Study** ..... 205  
*Sonia París Albert*

*Part IV. Case Studies and Implications*

**A Future Without Killing: Laying the Foundations  
for a Nonkilling Generation** ..... 219  
*Shelley Hymel, Lina Darwich, Alexander Gist and Sonja van der Putten*

**A Nonkilling Education proposal for the  
Public Educational System in El Salvador** ..... 245  
*Amaral Palevi Gómez Arévalo*

*Afterword*

**Nonkilling: A Foundation for Peace Education** ..... 269  
*Victor Kobayashi*

# Learning to Live Together

## Exploring Nonkilling from the Peace Education Reconstructive-Empowering Approach

Sofía Herrero Rico  
*Universitat Jaume I*

### Introduction

This article is devoted to the reflection on the possibilities of education for nonkilling societies (Paige, 2012) in the context of violence and killings in which our societies are currently involved. I will take as starting points the human capabilities and competences to make peace(s)<sup>1</sup> (Martínez Guzmán, 2005; 2009) and the recognition of diversity (Rupesinghe, 1999). This analysis will be done in the framework of the Peace Education (hereafter PE) «Reconstructive-Empowering» (hereafter REM) approach, proposed in the research being done at the UNESCO Chair of Philosophy for Peace, Interuniversity Institute of Social Development and Peace, Universitat Jaume I, Castellón, Spain (Herrero Rico, 2009; 2012; 2013).

PE has become a discussion topic in modern science and research. The culture of violence and killing deeply affects our society and is reproduced in educational terms at different levels: direct violence, structural violence and cultural violence (Galtung, 1993). Considering the educational reproduction of violence, PE has a crucial role in transforming the current culture of violence into a Culture of Peace(s). 2000 was declared by UNESCO as the international year of Culture of Peace due to the global need for creating new cultures for making peace(s), to reach both international understanding mutual understanding among human beings. Culture of Peace, as presented by UNESCO over a decade ago, can only be possible with a PE that follows common aims, ideals and proposals.

The REM approach of PE that is here proposed has as its main target the reconstruction of human competences or capabilities to make peace and to empower us to transform our daily conflicts through peaceful means

---

<sup>1</sup> The plural of the term peace is remarked as it is as diverse as different peoples and cultures. There is no single way to make peace, so we can refer to peace in many ways.

(Herrero Rico, 2009; 2012, 2013). This approach to PE is designed for its application in formal, informal and non-formal educational contexts.

In the early 21<sup>st</sup> century, humanity has faced many social and political problems, including migrations and refugee situations that involve differences of cultures, beliefs, religions and lifestyles. These situations and new challenges are also reflected in educational systems. Our societies are increasingly deteriorating in terms of the distribution of health and power and the consequences of these shifts are that the majority of people cannot live with dignity and cannot realize their human potentiality. Our educational and cultural systems sadly reproduce these social patterns and injustices, in which racism, sexism, militarism and other forms of oppression remain (Barash and Webel, 2009). Thus, in the proposed framework learning to co-exist is a very important component.

Every human relation implies a concrete coexistence model which includes different variables: values, ways of organization, relational systems, and strategies to face conflicts, linguistic forms, ways of expressing feelings and emotions, social demands, educational paradigms and ways to take care of each other. There is no possibility to live without coexisting; we, as humans, are social beings and we need others in order to survive (Jares, 2006: 11). Learning to live together is necessary and inherent in every educational process, and this is the way it has been in historical terms. We must really consider what kind of coexistence model we want to live and teach being conscious of the important implications this choice will have in the future. In this context, Jaques Delors (1996) proposed four main goals of education for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, with a focus on learning to live together, and also learning to know, to do and to be. Learning to live together is necessary and, therefore, it is the responsibility and commitment of the whole society (Jares, 2006):

Learning to live together, to co-exist, to learn to accept difference, to make the world safe for difference will be one of the great challenges for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Coexistence is a term that have been used synonymously in several contexts and used as a key phrase in the emergence of a number of great social and political movements. The key characteristic in the definition of the word coexistence is the relation with the 'other' and the acknowledgement that the 'other' exists (Rupesinghe, 1999: 67)

While such issues topics have always been included in the history of PE, this was probably not in the same context of concern and urgency of the present time, considering the shifts in immigration indexes and the refugee

crises, and how in turn these have been connected to violence and lethality. Education in the current century must modify the traditional patterns of closed and static life and has to be open for a better understanding among people, through peaceful and harmonious exchange between different cultures and religions. PE from the REM approach must promote diversity, appreciation of cultural diversity as an enriching fact and the recognition of different people, values, rights and lifestyles (Honneth, 1997). By doing this, the PE REM approach will undoubtedly contribute to killing-free societies.

### **Peaceful or violent? Is it possible to educate for nonkilling and peace?**

In this chapter the hypothesis that our genes do not determine violence is taken as a point of departure. Violence and killing are learned through the socialization process. Nurture, not nature, in other words. According to Martínez Guzmán (2001: 117) if we analyze the concept of violence we see that it is etymologically related to *vita* (life). Violence is a part of our daily lives and our current human condition, but this does not mean that it is justified, or that it is an inevitable dominator of our human relationships or relations with nature. In fact, violence is a change in this natural state through the use of (lethal) force. It is the violation of something or somebody by force. However, it is acknowledged that violence is not a genetic trait, but rather a social construction that is learned during the course of our lives. UNESCO has emphasized this particularly since the 1986 Seville Statement, adopted by the international body in 1989. As explained by Martínez Guzmán (2005: 94-95) and according to the Seville Statement (Adams, 1992; Paige, 2012: 76-77) war and violence are not a biological fatality and, therefore, killing can be prevented.

Even if, as the Seville Statement concludes, war and violence are not human nature, they are not genetically determined behaviours, there are other reasons for violence and killing that have effects on the individual and collective level which are in turn related to social, cultural and educational experiences (Barash and Webel, 2009: 100). But these go hand in hand with other human behaviours that represent viable alternatives to the use of violence, destruction or killing. Other more respectful, peaceful and just possibilities exist, so “To make peace or war is our responsibility” (Barash and Webel, 2009: 187). Among these nonkilling capabilities a large scope of alternatives can be refereed (Paige, 2012: 78):

1. Public policies devoted to the contribution to nonkilling societies.

2. Social Institutions, which make efforts in support of a nonkilling world. For instance we have created spiritual, political, economical and educational nonkilling institutions, among others.
3. Nonkilling forms of expression, such as smiling and crying, very common human forms of expression for peaceful values.
4. Cultural resources, such as artistic and intellectual creations that inspire humans to become involved in the reconstruction of nonkilling societies (Paige, 2012: 89).
5. Nonkilling political struggles. In history humans have organized around the world in many different nonviolent movements to demand peace and social transformation (Paige, 2012: 89).
6. Historical roots. The study of history offers great examples of human capabilities for peace and nonkilling even in tragic and violent periods such as wars, humanitarian crisis, and other conflicts. This can also be found in religious manifestations (Christianity, Buddhism, Islam, Judaism, etc.) (Paige, 2012: 91-92).

Considering these human nonkilling capabilities, they must have space within our PE proposal. Alternatives to achieve peace exist, as expressed by US President Herbert Hoover: “Peace is just around the corner” (Barash and Webel, 2009: 219). Previous experiences with such capabilities may not be sufficiently innovative, thoughtful, careful, creative; others can be unpractical or unachievable in certain circumstances. Options for peace and nonkilling exist but we must be responsible and committed in order to proceed with large effort to implement them toward common goals.

As Paige (2012: 103) stated, there are ancient and current evidences, experiences and creative capabilities in humanity to contribute to a peaceful and killing-free world. Violence and war are not a prerequisite. We can choose how we want to act and, therefore, the possibility of nonkilling futures are within our reach. As Barash and Webel (2009: 220) explain:

The problem of peaceful accommodation in the world is infinitely more difficult than the conquest of space, infinitely more complex than a trip to the moon... If I am sometimes discouraged, it is not by the magnitude of the problem, by our colossal indifference to it. I am unable to understand why... we do not make greater more diligent and more imaginative use of reason and human intelligence in seeking... accord and compromise...

Even if we acknowledge that peaceful nonkilling societies are within reach, this does not mean that the REM PE proposal needs to look away



from violence and lethality. Galtung (1993) proposed three different forms of violence which are also reproduced in the educational system:

1. Direct Violence, its alternative being negative peace
2. Structural Violence, its alternative being positive peace
3. Cultural Violence, its alternative being Culture of Peace

PE must consider these three types of violence in order to promote peaceful nonkilling alternatives that allow for their transformation. This also relates to how we understand conflict. Some academic explanations and traditions define humans as conflictive. In this sense, conflict is related with different interests, needs and/or perceptions. Therefore, conflict is always present in all societies, cultures and human activities. Jares (1999: 111) also defines conflict as a situation in which people or social groups look for or interpret contrarian goals, antagonist values or diverging interests. In this context, conflict is understood as an incompatibility or a clash of interests.

Conflicts are omnipresent and are a daily issue in our social life. They can be big or small, short or long, simple or difficult, obvious or hidden. They can occur in international, national, local and interpersonal settings. But, even if conflicts are inevitable in our social relationships, we have the option to face them destructively or constructively (Opatow *et al.*, 2005: 304). When faced constructively and cooperatively, conflicts can provide advantages and challenges in order to avoid injustice, suffering and killings. According to Lederach (1984) we learn that conflict is neither positive nor negative in itself, but reactions depend on the way the conflict is resolved, which can be through violent or peaceful means. In the proposed framework, conflicts and their nonviolent transformation are the principal part of PE.<sup>2</sup> Following Lederach (1985: 1) in PE “we have to detail, to learn and to practice methods so as not to eliminate the conflict but to regulate it and to lead it towards productive outcomes” (Lederach, 1985: 1). Conflict and cooperation are linked (Rapoport, 1992) because in order to transform conflicts peacefully the cooperation from the other side is needed. The REM approach of PE promotes teaching conflict as a transformative process. It is dedicated to the transformation of conflict

---

<sup>2</sup> ‘Conflict transformation’ is used because we consider it most adequate in order to emphasize that conflict is not always negative; it can even be positive as well as creative. Conflict is needed in our lives; therefore, we do not have to avoid it nor solve it by force, but we need to transform conflict by peaceful means. We believe that this proposal of understanding conflict will contribute to create culture(s) of peace(s).

situations as new learning opportunities by seeking peaceful alternatives to overcome conflicts fairly.

A nonkilling society is not a society without conflicts. Following Paige (2012: 40) the key characteristics are the absence of purposed killings among humans, technology for killing and social conditions, which depend on the use of lethal force for maintenance or change. A nonkilling world may now be unthinkable to most. To shift that way of thinking will require not only human dedication but also a solid basis of knowledge under which a nonkilling science can be elaborated, implemented and evaluated. This science must also have nonkilling problem solving and conflict transformation at its core. Global awareness, consciousness and mobilization are needed to work together for this important challenge. The current culture of violence (Galtung: 1993) and killing can be changed into cultures of peace and respect for life using PE and through global action, not only with individual efforts. If our antecessors invented war and killing, we can also invent peace. But, as Hicks (1993: 293) argued, "All of us, each one in its proper place, have to be responsible and committed with our task". For this, we must understand that human beings have competences and capabilities for nonkilling and peaceful coexistence.

### **What is coexistence?**

Coexistence means to learn to live together, accepting diversity, and implies a positive relationship with 'the others'. Our identities are defined in relation with the other. When these relationships are affirmative and equal they improve our dignity, freedom and interdependency. In contrast, when they are negative and destructive they diminish human dignity and self-esteem. This can be applied to people, groups and states. The promotion of coexistence in all levels is an imperative for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (Rupesinghe, 1999: 67). A basic conceptualization in modern philosophy argues that something exists only when it is recognized by another subjectivity. Mutual recognition is a necessary condition for freedom as well as interdependency. According to Hegel (Rupesinghe, 1999: 67) the conceptualization of the term is that 'existence' is already 'coexistence'. This is true for people, communities and classes. In fact, one of the most important challenges for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century is that coexistence between different people, nationalities, religious groups, clans and tribes, among others. In today's intercultural world, identity, ethnicity and coexistence have become the great challenge for this civilizational era, explains Rupensinghe (1999: 69):

Learning to live together, to co-exist, to learn to accept difference, to make the world safe for difference will be one of the great challenges for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Coexistence is a term that has been used synonymously in several contexts and used as a key phrase in the emergence of a number of great social and political movements. The key characteristic in the definition of the word coexistence it is the relation with the 'others' and the acknowledgement that the 'other' exists (Rupesinghe, 1999: 67)

PE must set the basis for coexistence and for learning to live together among different people, contexts, religions and cultures. Education is the main key to liberate new generations from the limitations of ethnocentrism and will allow them to be interested in knowing about other cultures, peoples, societies, lifestyles and thoughts. PE must work on the idea of educating citizenships free of prejudices and manias. Through PE new generations will be prepared to explore and enjoy the enrichment of diversity. To teach them to live in a world of differences, learning to live together is the challenge of this new millennium (Rupesinghe, 1999: 72).

Youth must learn to respect and to live with the others, with difference. This cannot be done from morning to night. It must be a structured process at all levels: from the formal level (teachers, schools, educational institutions in general, governmental organizations, political and social corporations, mass media) to the informal one (families, friends, celebrities, writers, artists, poets, etc.). The 'know-how' for living together can be learned, but it is a deep process in which all actors (schools, politicians, communities and the whole society) have to be involved and committed. It requires a revolution.

To educate for a nonkilling leadership and citizenship an educational revolution is needed (Paige, 2012: 119). This educational revolution implies an updated educational curriculum (Rupesinghe, 1999; Paige, 2012) that must be in accordance with the political and social challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century in the framework of the nonkilling science (Paige, 2012). In this sense, the curriculum characteristics should be (Rupesinghe, 1999: 74):

- To show the needs of all the socio-cultural groups
- To include the current international, national and local concerns
- To increase the plurality of voices, cultures, religions and images
- To be democratic, open, active, flexible and intercultural
- To adopt a decentralized perspective which allows the participation and opinions of all actors and interested groups (pedagogues, teachers, families, community leaders, and students themselves)
- To promote nonviolence, nonkilling and peaceful coexistence

The educational revolution to achieve a nonkilling world paradigm has different important aspects to be developed, including (Paige, 2012: 120):

1. To expose the horror of human lethality, in the past and in the present, so we can be aware of it and encourage ourselves and others to contribute to the end of the human motivation for killing
2. To solidly present the global evidence for the human potential for peace and nonkilling
3. To propose peaceful and nonkilling transformations at the individual, relationship, community and societal levels
4. To offer a review of the human ingenuity for the creation of social and political institutions for the nonkilling societies we desire
5. To challenge human creativity for the conception of the characteristics of killing-free societies and of possible ways to achieve them

Under these principals we can construct the educational innovations of nonkilling peace education. PE must emphasize how humans, regardless of their differences, may still learn to live together; how we are competent and responsible to assure a peaceful coexistence and the preservation of the planet. Nonkilling is for all of us, for every human being, not just for heroes, saints, leaders or gifted people. Kant said that it could even be for a society of devils. Peace is, thus, for people like us who can hate, marginalize, exclude, and even kill; but we can also love, recognize, integrate, respect and be competent to give reasons and promote feelings and emotions to behave in this peaceful way (Martínez Guzmán, 2005: 66).

A Great Compassion makes a Peaceful Heart  
A Peaceful Heart makes a Peaceful Person  
A peaceful Person makes a Peaceful Family  
A peaceful Family makes a peaceful Community  
A peaceful Community makes a Peaceful Nation  
And a Peaceful Nation makes a peaceful World.  
May all beings live in Happiness and Peace  
(Rupesinghe, 1999: 220)

These words by Rupesinghe resonate with the social-ecological model to understand violence prevention and how risk and protective factors shape not only our attitudes but also chances of facing violence in our lives. The same author (1999: 75) highlights that the process of knowing the others and coexisting with them is structured by four elements that are equally relevant to Nonkilling Education from the REM PE approach:

1. Confrontation (crash among differences)
2. Understanding (recognition of differences)
3. Reconciliation (deeper and closer relationships)
4. Transformation (peaceful coexistence)

Learning to Live Together is therefore crucial: “The child should be fully prepared to live an individual life in society, and be brought up in [...] the spirit of peace, dignity, tolerance, freedom, equality and solidarity” (Arigatou Foundation, 2008: 3). This learning process can be developed through the comprehension of the differences of the ‘others’, of their specific history, traditions, values, spirituality and lifestyles. Under these premises we can take significant steps forward toward a new human spirit based on the recognition of diversity, our interdependency and a common analysis of the common risks and challenges of the future. In the face of these challenges, this basis will “allow people to implement projects together and to afford the daily conflicts by peaceful means” (Rupesinghe, 1999: 269). Education is a key factor for a peaceful coexistence, as it requires “a broader paradigm in which diversity will be the principal value, creating spaces for mutual recognition and tolerance” (Rupesinghe, 1999:76).

### **The enrichment of diversity**

According to Elise Boulding (2000) difference is a basic fact of life. PE must therefore promote recognition, interculturality, coexistence, solidarity, understanding among cultures and ways of thinking and tolerance towards diversity. Following Boulding’s research (2000: 2) we can argue that we are born with two basic needs which allow us to be competent for peace and nonkilling: a) the necessity of affectivity, to be close to others and be accepted by them; b) the necessity of having our own space to be ourselves, to be autonomous. A society which could build an equilibrium between these two basic needs—creation of affectivity among its citizens and the autonomy of themselves—learning from each other, participating in cooperative activities, while simultaneously having sufficient space to be free, will have established the conditions for a Culture of Peace. Boulding argued that human beings live this tension between the necessity of developing relationships with others and one’s individuality. A Peace Culture is based on learning to live with this tension between the individuality of humans and the connection with the rest of beings. As Cavin adequately reframes it:

Every human being needs to bond with others. We need to be part of a community; we need others to care for us; we need to care for others. At

the same time, we need autonomy, our own space—room enough to express our individuality (Cavin, 2006: 403).

This does not mean that in these societies conflicts and tensions have been eliminated—as they are inherent to our human relationships—but the human capability to transform them by peaceful means needs to be operational (Boulding, 2000: 4). Human relations are complex and human beings can be violent and destructive, but they can also be peaceful and cooperative. Following Kant, human relations are based on our “unsociable sociability”: we need each other but we bother each other too. We have many possibilities and competences to realize any kind of behavior. Our responsibility as human beings to create and promote certain kinds of behaviors or relationships and not others must be stressed. We know that we are not genetically determined to be violent. We know that violence depends on our environment and culture. Violence and killing are avoidable. Considering our total potentials, our response depends on the long run on what kind of education we receive and in what kind of environment we are socialized. Our responsibility and commitment to make peace and build nonkilling societies is essential in this regard.

As an example, we can reflect about the consequences of the terrorist attacks of September 11 (USA), March 11 (Spain) and July 7 (UK) and how school materials and pedagogical contents have and should be updated to reflect such events in order to contribute to PE and to avoid the transmission of prejudices and stereotypes resulting from such attacks. Such a revision and actualization would have to take into account the following problems to be adequately addressed (Jares, 2004: 80-82):

1. The dual ideology and the construction of the enemy. “We” the good against “the others” the bad, specially related to the Muslim culture. This polarization brings the justification of the enemy and the demonization of the other.
2. Fear together with the feeling of vulnerability has spread among the population to support armament, killings and war politics, as well as a growing hate to immigration.
3. The lost of freedom and the vulnerability of human rights. The dichotomy or duality, which has been established between security and freedom, is contradictory and morally unacceptable because it provokes the increasing of racism against foreigners and even more with Arabs. In this sense, more than a clash of civilization proposed by Huntington (1997), we could consider it as a clash of ignorance. Ignorance of each other’s ways and lives has been a common cause, through the history of mankind, of that suspicion and mistrust between

the people of the world through which their differences have often broken into war (Boulding 2000: 5).

There are also five important factors that are connected to the current situation of dangerous and difficult coexistence and killing (Jares, 2006: 13). These factors are a consequence of the kind of society we live in, increasingly individualistic, competitive, self-seeking and dehumanized. These challenges must also be faced through education, including: 1) A socio-economical system which is based on competition and achievement of success at any cost, 2) Lack of respect for the basic values for coexistence, 3) The increasing complexity and social heterogeneity (stemming from globalization and migrations), 4) The loss of educational leadership over the two most important educational systems (family and school), and 5) The constant process of growing exposure, visualization and trivialization of violence. Following López Martínez, violence has become banal in our daily lives (López Martínez, 2006: 51). Within this context, PE must introduce positive content regarding other cultures to help prevent the danger of clashes and increased bloodshed in future generations.

PE implies a deep critical component of the selection and organization of school and teaching materials (what we teach) and a careful revision of the curriculum (what is included and what is not), because different types of violence are hidden in the current educational settings, and they must be deconstructed if we are to educate for peace and nonkilling. PE has to be aware of the fact that we are living in a multicultural world and, thus, learning to live together, to coexist with 'the others', to deal with 'the different' will be the main key in the construction of cultures of peace.

We are eventually learning how monocultures are dangerous both for society as well as for the environment. Cultural diversity is as important for human beings as biodiversity for the survival of the planet. Boulding (2000) explains this through the metaphor of the fingers of the hand: all of them are different, but it is precisely for this reason that the hand works perfectly, it can do all its functions correctly. Nevertheless, if all the fingers were alike, the hand would not function. The ethnographic example of the Malinke people is also used to explain the benefits of diversity and cooperation. In this African culture it is understood that all individuals, humans and animals, are different and that if they are forced to be the same, this can only be done by putting some of them in a higher position than others; and doing that creates conflict, war and killings. For the Malinkes, heterogeneity means interaction for mutual benefit (positive sum of relations). However,

within many modern Western cultures, heterogeneity means competing, fighting for power and against enemies (negative sum of relations). In the PE approach diversity is considered as a form of enrichment at all levels: personal, educational, socio-political, cultural, etc.

Humans have the competence to make peace and to transform conflicts by peaceful means. PE from the REM approach is the reconstruction of these abilities and capacities. This approach of PE is a tool for the construction of a fairer and more peaceful society that may contribute to the transformation of the culture of violence and killing into Cultures of Peace(s) and Nonkilling. The concept of Culture of Peace has been explained by Reardon (Ben Porath, 2003: 527-28) who defines it as “the human analogue of a healthy ecosystem composed of complementary, functionally integrated forms of biodiversity”. This definition features moral inclusion, celebration of diversity, tools for the peaceful resolution of conflicts, care, hope, awareness, environmental consciousness and gender sensibility among others. PE promotes the enrichment of diversity, as Saint Exupéry expressed: by differing with you, rather than injuring you, I am helping you grow (Jares, 1999: 130).

### **Recognition in the PE REM approach**

PE from the REM approach promotes the recognition of every single being as equally valid with special attention to her/his ethnicity, culture, social class or religion (Martínez Guzmán, 2009). Recognition is understood as a step further from tolerance. According to the *Diccionario del Uso de Español* by Moliner (1994) recognition is the action of recognizing, defined as:

- To be aware that one person or thing is precisely one determined, known, and identified.
- To admit that a certain person is what she/he expresses and recognize him/her with his/her legality, authenticity.
- To recognize that a certain thing or person exists and has its own value even if it is disliked.

These meanings are relevant to the proposed framework, in which the role of recognition is crucial. Human beings have the capability to recognize each other as valid speakers with competences to reconstruct what is being demanded from each other. PE starts with the recognition of others as equal. We can recognize each other and his/her communicative and moral competences. We recognize that we are able to collectively reconstruct what we



should do to each other, what we should say or what we should not say through the recognition of every human being. Mutual recognition:

recuperates the definition and meaning of 'person': each human is recognized as what he/she is, with the possibility and power to express how he/she wishes to, to be listened or even with the respect and autonomy to be in silence, silence as communication (Martínez Guzmán, 2009).

Following the philosophy for making peace(s) of Martínez Guzmán (2005: 68) we can argue that our starting point in PE is the recognition of all humans and their competence for peace as well as for violence and war. The notion of competence has very different meanings: it can be defined by the idea that we compete to win promoting fighting and hate, even killing; but it also can also imply the capabilities we have to do other things. If we are competent to do something it means that we are able to do it, we have capacities to do it. Another sense of competence is related to responsibility. If something is of your competence it means that you we are responsible for it. PE assumes this recognition of capabilities, capacities, competences, responsibilities and powers to make peace and build nonkilling societies.

In order to better understand the concept of recognition I refer to Honneth (1997), who defines it by taking into account three types of disrespect based on a proposal from Hegel: the contempt of the body, of human rights and of lifestyles. Recognition serves as the alternative for these three types of disrespect. According to Honneth (1997):

1. The first kind of recognition is the recognition of the body. This recognition is fundamental because through the body we define our identity since we start to take note of it, to trust it and to be recognized by others. Lack of recognition of the body has as a consequence the alteration of our identity and the loss of self-trust. The recognition of the body promotes tenderness, love, esteem, care and self-trust.
2. The second type of recognition is the recognition of every single person's legal rights. Lack of recognition of human and legal rights implies not only the loss of self-trust, but also the lost of self-respect as the person is considered excluded from the legal and moral community. The recognition of these rights promotes identity, integration, solidarity, empathy and self-respect.
3. The third form of recognition is the recognition of different lifestyles. This is the alternative to behaviors that disrespects other kinds of lifestyles because they are different from one's own, not

considered valid, disliked or because it considered inferior or unworthy. This disrespect leads to the feeling of exclusion, marginalization and underestimation; and, consequently, the loss self-esteem.

PE must promote the reconstruction of self-trust, self-respect and self-esteem through the three forms of recognition proposed by Honneth.

### **The REM approach of PE**

The Reconstructive-Empowering approach of PE, interpreted from the Philosophy for making peace(s) of Martínez Guzmán (Herrero Rico, 2009; 2012; 2013) is an ongoing initiative at the Interuniversity Institute for Social Development and Peace (IUDESP). The proposal is 'Reconstructive' because its central point is the reconstruction of our human competences to make peace(s) and 'Empowering' because in this proposal our own power and capacities are highlighted in order to transform daily conflicts by peaceful means. Peace is for all of us, it is our duty and we can make peace through our personal relations and everyday experiences. Humans are able to make peace; they are competent and responsible to do so. The PE proposal positively reflects on the possibility of teaching for peace and nonkilling. It is focused in our capacities to create one kind of behavior and not another. Following Martínez Guzmán:

From the perspective of the Philosophy for making peace(s) we believe that all human beings have capacities and competences to make peace and sadly to also marginalize, exclude, destruct and even kill. PE will be, then, the interactive learning of the reconstruction of these capabilities to make peace(s).

If, following the Seville Statement, we are not genetically determined to be violent; violence is an option, just like peace and nonkilling. We can make peace (Martínez Guzmán, 2005): in the long run it will depend on the education we receive. In this sense, our responsibility to make peace and to contribute with our performance to the creation of cultures of peace(s) and killing-free societies must be emphasized.

Besides the concept of recognition, the PE REM approach includes other elements to achieve this (Herrero Rico, 2013):

- I. *Capabilities and Competences*: humans have capabilities and competences to make peace (Martínez Guzmán, 2005; 2009)

2. *Peaceful Empowerment*: the promotion of our own capabilities to make peace (Lederach, 1994; López Martínez, 2006)
3. *Responsibility and Willingness* in order to behave fairly, respectfully and peacefully with the rest of beings as well as with Nature, avoiding violence and destruction (Martínez Guzmán, 2005; 2009).
4. *Change of attitudes and perceptions*: generating positive attitudes for the peaceful transformation of our daily conflicts and analyzing conflict from a different perception or perspective than the winner or the selfish one. We must also restore our capacity of indignation and empathy (Strawson, 1995).
5. *Performative Attitude*: the *performative* attitude is the attitude which assumes commitment for what we do and what we say, even when we are silent, being responsible for the consequences of our behavior. This role is a participant role. We construct things by doing, not merely observing. We are not neutral neither objective, but we are committed to the values of peace, respect and justice.
6. *Communication and Dialogue*: our words have an effect on others; therefore, we must be responsible and others can make us accountable for our actions (Austin, 1971). Every human being is recognized as a valid interlocutor and together can construct the normative horizon for peace. Through communication and constructive dialogue we can build peace, agreement and consensus.
7. *Positive feelings and emotions* (Martínez Guzmán, 2005; 2009): generating positive feelings and emotions is highlighted in order to transform our daily conflicts by peaceful means. PE has to deal with emotions and feelings in order for us to transform hate, disrespect, and anger into mutual understanding. According to Porath (2003: 532) “one cannot grow to overcome a specific conflict without learning to address the emotions that sustain it”.
8. *Values*: to promote values of respect, comprehension, cooperation, care, solidarity it is also fundamental to be able to live peacefully with difference.
9. *Peaceful transformation of conflicts*: dealing with our conflicts by peaceful means with the aim of peaceful understanding and the reconciliation of all those concerned. The REM approach of PE promotes teaching conflict as a transformative process aiming at the transformation of conflict situations as new learning opportunities by seeking peaceful alternatives to solve conflicts fairly. “Life without conflicts would mean a society of robots, whose citizens would

have eliminated all diversity, authenticity and difference” (Lederach, 1984: 45).

10. *Cooperation*: the REM approach of PE promotes cooperation. ‘I win, you win’ as an alternative to competition, ‘I win, you lose’.
11. *Deconstruction*: this PE approach is based on the deconstruction of the three kinds of violence proposed by Galtung (1985, 1993): direct, structural and cultural, which are also reflected in education. It is proposed to unlearn cultures of war and killing and learn cultures of peace(s) and nonkilling (Bastida, 1994).
12. *Reconstruction*: the goal of PE is to reconstruct a new education based on peaceful, respectful and cooperative pillars. An education which will be critical, transformative and emancipated (Jares, 1999; Fernández Herrería, 1994, 1996; Freire, 1970)
13. The methodology is focused on the *Deconstruction-Reconstruction approach*. In education, learning is important, but unlearning is also necessary. We adopt the term ‘unlearning’ from the pedagogy of Bastida (1994) as well as from the philosophy of Habermas (1987). We use this methodology of Deconstruction-Reconstruction with the objective of unlearning war, killing and conflict (Bastida, 1994). PE must also study conflicts, not learning to replicate them but to look for peaceful alternatives of transformation. It is obvious that we have learned to face conflicts using violence through our history and culture; it is now time to learn how to deconstruct war and unlearn violence and killing in order to present peaceful alternatives.
14. Fantasy, imagination and hope: the use of another logic that is more peaceful and respectful, promoting creativity and fantasy (Rodari, 1987), hope and utopia (Freire, 1993) is also key to contribute to the creation of cultures of nonkilling and peace.

As Navarro-Castro and Nario Galance (2008: 22) summarize it:

This means that the learning process that it is utilized in PE is holistic and it tries to address the cognitive, affective and active dimensions of the learner. A usual procedure includes the introduction of relevant new knowledge or reinforced knowledge, posing valuing questions and using discussion and other participatory methods to cultivate concern, and eliciting, challenging, encouraging appropriate personal and social action.

## **Conclusions**

PE will not achieve by itself all of the required changes that are needed for a peaceful and nonkilling world, but it will prepare those who want to learn and to be committed to do all they can in order to achieve positive outcomes for a better and peaceful society. One of its main aims is to develop a consciousness for political and social responsibility, guiding and challenging people to be agents of their own learning from individual and collective actions through a nonkilling paradigm shift. PE from the REM approach will encourage people to explore their capabilities and possibilities to transform problems and conflicts peacefully and to establish better conditions for a quality of life among themselves and with others.

PE understood from the REM approach emphasizes a critical dimension, questioning current structures, power, norms, politics and educational values. Even if we consider the limitations of PE, it still offers hopes by showing the human competences and creativity to make peace: “Peace Education can definitively help to provide the requisite inspiration and direction to move beyond a culture of violence to envisioning and working toward a better world for all” (Barash and Webel, 2009: 296).

Most importantly, in this PE proposal, being aware of the possibilities we have for change, and being committed to the power we have to do things in a different way that does not involve killing and other forms of violence is crucial. We also know, as we have been seen in this chapter, that we have capacities and competences for peace and cooperation. We need to be conscious, to build one’s hopes and to start walking to contribute with our peaceful action to a nonkilling world.

‘Cheshire Puss,’ Alice began, rather timidly, as she did not at all know whether it would like the name: however, the Cat only grinned a little wider. ‘Come, it’s pleased so far,’ thought Alice, and she went on:

- ‘Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?’

- ‘That depends a good deal on where you want to get to,’ said the Cat.

- ‘I don’t much care where —’ said Alice.

- ‘Then it doesn’t matter which way you go,’ said the Cat.

- ‘— so long as I get somewhere,’ Alice added as an explanation

- ‘Oh, you’re sure to do that,’ said the Cat, ‘if you only walk long enough.’

(Lewis Carroll, *Alice in Wonderland*, Chapter VI)

## References

- Adams, D. (1992). “El Manifiesto de Sevilla sobre la Violencia,” in Hicks, D., Ed., *Educación para la Paz. Cuestiones, principios y prácticas en el aula*. Madrid: MEC/Morata, pp. 293-295.

- Arigatou Foundation (2008). *Learning to Live Together. An Intercultural and Interfaith Programme for Ethics Education*. Geneva: ATAR Roto Press
- Austin, J. L. (1971). *Palabras y Acciones. Como hacer cosas con palabras*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Barash, D. and Webel, C. P. (2009). *Peace and Conflict Studies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Bastida, A. (1994). *Desaprender la guerra. Una visión crítica de la Educación para la Paz*. Barcelona: Icaria.
- Boulding, E. (2000). *Cultures of Peace, the hidden side of the History*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Cavin, M. (2006). "Elise Boulding's Rethoric: An Invitation to Peace," *Peace and Change*, 31(3): 390-412.
- Delors, J. (1996). *La educación encierra un tesoro. Informe a la UNESCO de la Comisión Internacional sobre la educación para el siglo XXI*. Madrid: UNESCO/Santillana.
- Fernández Herrería, A., Ed. (1994). *Educando para la Paz: Nuevas Propuestas*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.
- Fernández Herrería, A. and Sánchez Sánchez, A., Eds. (1996). *Dimensiones para la Paz. Teoría y experiencias*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogía del oprimido*. Montevideo, Tierra Nueva.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogía de la Esperanza*. México: Siglo XXI.
- Galtung, J. (1985). "Acerca de la Educación para la Paz," in Galtung, J., Ed., *Sobre La Paz*. Barcelona: Fontamara, pp. 27-72.
- Galtung, J. (1993). "Los fundamentos de los estudios sobre la paz," in Rubio, A., Ed., *Presupuestos teóricos y éticos sobre la Paz*. Granada: Universidad de Granada, pp. 15-46.
- Herrero Rico, S. (2013). *La Educación para la Paz. El enfoque REM (Reconstructivo-Empoderador)*. Saarbrücken: Publicia.
- Herrero Rico, S. (2012): "Educando para la paz a través del reconocimiento de la diversidad," in Nos Aldás, E., Sandoval Forero, E. and Arévalo Salinas, A., Eds., *Migraciones y Cultura de paz: Educando y comunicando solidaridad*. Madrid: Dykinson, pp. 41-56.
- Herrero Rico, S. (2009). "La Educación para la Paz desde la filosofía para hacer las paces. El modelo Reconstructivo-Empoderador," in París Albert, S. and Comins Mingol, I., Eds., *Filosofía en acción. Retos para la paz en el siglo XXI*. Castellón: Universitat Jaume I, pp. 33-57.
- Hicks, D., Ed. (1993). *Educación para la Paz. Cuestiones, principios y prácticas en el aula*. Madrid: MEC/Morata.
- Honneth, A. (1997). *La lucha por el reconocimiento. Por una gramática moral de los conflictos sociales*. Barcelona: Crítica.
- Huntington, S. P. (1997). *El choque de las civilizaciones y la reconfiguración del orden mundial*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Jares, X. R. (1991). *Educación para la Paz. Su teoría y su práctica*. Madrid: Popular.
- Jares, X. R. (2006): *Pedagogía de la Convivencia*. Barcelona: Graó.

- Lederach, J. P. (1984). *Educación para la paz. Objetivo escolar*. Barcelona: Fontamara.
- Lederach, J. P. (1985). *La regulación del conflicto social. Un enfoque práctico*. Akron: Mennonite Central Committee.
- López Martínez, M. (2006). *Política Sin Violencia. La NoViolencia como humanización de la política*. Colombia: UNIMINUTO.
- Martínez Guzmán, V. (2009). *Filosofía para hacer las paces*. Barcelona: Icaria.
- Martínez Guzmán, V. (2005). *Podemos hacer las Paces. Reflexiones éticas tras el 11-S y el 11-M*. Bilbao: Desclée De Brouwer.
- Moliner, M. (1994). *Diccionario del uso del español*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Rodari, G. (1976). *Gramática de la fantasía. Introducción al Arte de Inventar Historias*. Barcelona: Reforma de la Escuela.
- Rodari, G. (1995). *Cuentos por teléfono*. Barcelona: Juventud.
- Rupesinghe, K. (1999). "What is co-existence?" in European Centre for Conflict Prevention, Ed., *People Building Peace. 35 inspiring stories around the World*. Utrecht: European Centre for Conflict Prevention, pp. 67-76.
- Strawson, P. T. (1995). *Libertad y resentimiento y otros ensayos*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Strawson, P. T. (2004). *Constitución de la UNESCO. Textos fundamentales*. Paris: UNESCO. Available at: < [www.unesco.org/education/pdf/UNESCO\\_E.PDF](http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/UNESCO_E.PDF) >.
- Strawson, P. T. (1996): *La educación encierra un tesoro. Informe a la UNESCO de la Comisión Internacional sobre la educación para el siglo XXI*. Madrid: UNESCO/Santillana.