

“Peace Education: Current Challenges and Opportunities”

presented by the Kyoto Museum for World Peace and College of International Relations, Ritsumeikan University
December 15, 2007

Betty A. Reardon

The lecture addresses the challenges and opportunities that are facing peace educators in the context of the evolution of peace education and the most significant developments in the international peace education movement. It attempts to demonstrate through this historical evolution and a long struggle with the challenges of innovation, that peace education has established itself as a distinct field of study within the larger field of peace knowledge and that peace education serves a particular and essential function in the process of learning how to achieve peace. It also introduces recent promising developments of peace education in Japan.

Thank you, Professor Akibayashi. Thank you, Dean Ishihara. And thank all of you for spending a Saturday afternoon hearing something about the past of peace education and, I hope, a little more about the future that you will be part of.

I want to speak this afternoon about the challenges and opportunities that are facing those who seek to educate for peace. I will place my remarks within the context of the evolution of peace education and what I see as the most significant developments in the international peace education movement. I hope to demonstrate that through this historical evolution and a long struggle with the challenges of innovation, that peace education has established itself as a distinct field of study within the larger field of peace knowledge. While it is integral to this larger field and complementary to the other sub-fields, peace education serves, as does each sub-field described below, a particular and essential function in the process of learning how to achieve peace.

Peace Education: Most Widely Relevant and Essential Component of the Field of Peace Knowledge

The fundamental assumption of the worldwide peace education movement is that the war system and the culture of violence in which it is embedded cannot be overcome without a broad scale education of the public towards understanding the nature of the war system and the multiple possibilities for changing it. My own perspective on that assumption is that the need is for societal, as well as individual and communal learning of a wider and deeper dimension than education has ever attempted to facilitate. A challenge of such dimen-

sions also requires profound changes in the way we teach.

Of the four realms of learning that contribute to peace knowledge—the over all learning that should inform all the politics of peace making—the various areas of *peace research* that produce the corpus of substantive knowledge, *peace studies* that teach students to analyze and apply that knowledge and prepare future specialist in the field, *peace action* which undertakes a politics of change and conflict intervention toward the elimination of violence, and peace education of which the goal is the education of the general citizenry in the essential knowledge, skills, values and modes of thinking conducive to peacemaking—none are, I believe, as important as peace education. It is imperative that citizens understand the nature of and interrelationships among the violence producing problems that we now face; not only war and armed conflict, but human rights violations, especially the widespread poverty that denies fundamental economic and social rights; the violence to the environment that has brought about climate change; and the various other global crises that inflict avoidable harm on the human family.

So, too, citizens must be aware of alternatives to the policies and forms of politics that accept and employ violence. We need an informed, critical, socially responsible public determined to hold authorities accountable for the welfare of those whose lives are determined by their policies. This is an educational task of great political significance; and therein lays one of the greatest challenges to peace educators: how do we educate for the transformative politics of peace without indoctrinating our own political views? One response of peace education to this challenge is to place great emphasis on

multiple alternatives and multiple perspectives, exploring the problems and alternative proposals to address them from many points of view and the perspectives of those who are affected by, as well as, those who produce the problems.

A second challenge that requires peace education be universally practiced arises from the need to involve the widest possible public in a peace learning process. If the politics of peace are to be a democratic politics, all citizens must be educated to participate. Peace education is the most relevant form of education for global citizenship. To meet these challenges, peace educators advocate the mobilization of publics to demand and pursue the requisite learning.

Challenges to peace education are made more daunting today by the very inhospitable, often violent political climate in which peace educators must work—the most difficult political climate since the time of the Vietnam War. Even in the face of these daunting challenges, it is with considerable hope that I will recount here some of the developments that I see as indicators of positive movement towards such mobilization within the international peace education movement.

It is in this international movement that I have done most of my work and in which my theory and practice of peace education have been formed. Although I believe that intense national efforts are essential, unless those efforts are informed by international concerns and global perspectives, I fear peace education will not prepare learners for the political tasks of working for change toward a more peaceful, equitable, gender-just and environmentally-sustainable world order. So from the beginning, my full-time professional work in the field has been carried out internationally as a learner-practitioner in a field only now coming to be recognized as integral to the larger social and political changes sought by the global peace movement.

I'd like to share some brief descriptions of the challenges encountered in the origins and evolution of the international peace education movement as background to the present developments I find so hopeful. What I will recount is from my own experience and personal perspectives, not from academic research. Others in the movement will likely have different experiences and different perspectives, and I hope you will have the opportunity to learn of them. Indeed, I believe that seeking out other historical perspectives to be consistent with the principle of the necessity of considering multiple perspectives on all issues that is advocated by peace

education.

Challenges Encountered in the Origins and Evolution of the International Peace Education Movement in the 1970s

The evolution as I have observed it, has taken the movement from European academia into the struggles of global civil society. In these present days I see a shift in the sources of initiatives and energies of the movement. This shift is manifest in the phenomenon of civil society—the peace action realm—recognizing the relevance of peace education to the politics of change. I find most significant and important among these civil society groups that have embraced peace education, two multi-sector groups, the Hague Appeal for Peace and the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflicts. The acknowledgement of the need for peace education to achieve the goals that brought these groups together has opened significant new possibilities, inspiring some of the significant new developments and raising new challenges.

The early movement I experienced in the days of my first involvement was in formal education—higher education and secondary schools—introduced and carried primarily through the work of individual professors and teachers. There were also some early childhood education initiatives, but these were few and did not become an integral part of the international network of which I speak. It should be noted, however, that a few among us learned some significant principles of pedagogy from early childhood educators, such as the principle regarding the importance of a sense of self worth as essential to socially constructive learning and to acceptance of the human worth of others. This principle is foundational to the pedagogy practiced by the peace educators with whom I have collaborated since the 1960s.

In 1963, a US-based international peace research organization, later to be widely known in the field as the Institute for World Order (IWO), undertook a Schools Program of which I was appointed director. By 1965, IWO was conducting international consultations on what we then called world order education. These consultations included primarily among professors of education and peace researchers from Europe and the United States with one or two from Latin America and Asia. These sessions were the beginnings of international networking and constituted an attempt at collaboration between these two realms of peace knowledge,

research and education. It was one or two of these professors, coming to identify themselves as peace educators who together with IWO staff lobbied the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) to include peace education in its purview.

That was a difficult lobbying task. There were quite a few researchers who did not see the relevance of education to what peace research was supposed to be about. The struggles for recognition of peace education were not only with governmental and educational authorities and citizens suspicious of its intent, but also, with some colleagues in the academic and scientific realms of peace knowledge. In this case, as is many others, the resistance we faced was primarily due to lack of understanding of what peace educators conceived of as peace learning, a field defined as much by pedagogical philosophy as by subject matter, that assumed that how learning was facilitated was as relevant as the content of the learning to developing the capacities of responsible global citizenship, especially peace making.

Although few researchers actively advocated and supported the inclusion of peace education within the Association's activities, the lobbying resulted in a significant step forward when in 1972, IPRA, which is organized into commissions based on the themes and issues that comprise the over-all field of peace research, established a Peace Education Commission (PEC). This commission comprised European and a few American academics and educationists gradually came to include Latin American, Australian, Asian and African educators as well. However, those from the Global South were always in the minority, making it a primarily European commission.

Nonetheless, this group became the active network that laid the foundation of the theoretical development of the field. Extending the traditional limits of formal research, from its beginning PEC reached out to the South and to non-formal educators whom others in the field viewed as activists rather than scholars. The early members of PEC forged strong collaborative relationships at a series of seminars run by IPRA during several summers in the 1970s. A number of the early members of the Commission still continue to work with each other on furthering the field. In recent years a larger and more global commission has established a refereed journal in peace education. (*Journal of Peace Education* sponsored by the Peace Education Commission of IPRA and published by Taylor and Francis: <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/17400201.asp>)

Shortly after the establishment of PEC another international organizational initiative, the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction (WCCI) was launched as a consequence of a world conference on education called in 1971 by the US-based Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. At this world conference the decision was made to form an organization for international, professional to professional—or in the council's own language “person to person”—cooperation in education. The first world conference on peace education, the first of the Council's triennial conferences was held in 1974 at the University of Keele in the UK. That conference introduced Paulo Freire and his work to the participating educators, among them many peace educators, including some members of PEC. His book, *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and other writings have had a significant influence on the pedagogy of peace education. Freire is now recognized as one of the major founders of critical pedagogy, a teaching-learning methodology directed toward the cultivation of reflective thinking and critical consciousness of social, economic and political realities with special focus on injustice and violence.

At this first conference, reflecting the global realities of those years, there was considerable tension between some of the older, particularly American, traditional educators who were suspicious that peace education was subversive of the value of scholarly objectivity, and those educators from other world regions, particularly the Global South and some Europeans and Americans who had experience in and appreciation of the perspectives of those parts of the world. However, through dialogue and continued “person to person” interaction, the organization worked through these tensions and continues to work in peace education in the many countries where it has membership chapters. Most active among these, the Philippine chapter has played a significant role in disseminating and developing peace education. This WCCI chapter has also worked in collaboration with other international peace education organizations to mutually support efforts to strengthen peace education efforts in the Philippines. Among these other organizations are Global Education Associates (GEA) and the International Institute on Peace Education (IIPE).

Global Education Associates is another significant international peace education association with origins in the 1970s. Although based in the United States, its primary work was in networking with educational institu-

tions, largely Christian based in South Asia and East Africa where one of its founders served in the Peace Corps. As WWCI formed chapters, GEA formed councils in various countries, and like WCCI one of its most vigorous was in the Philippines where the two organizations developed a good collaborative relationship, co-sponsoring events and programs aimed at involving and training classroom teachers and professors of education in the practice of peace education. The two were co-sponsors of two IIPes that were held in Manila in 1988 and 2002 respectively. It should be emphasized that while such efforts, in whatever country, were firmly rooted in their respective national education systems, their perspectives were as global as was possible in those years, and their practice was international, being both informed by and informing of the international peace education movement. Both also publish periodical bulletins and journals. (*The International Journal of Curriculum Inquiry* (IJCI) published by the WCCI Secretariat of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction: <http://www.wcci-international.org/invitation-tocontributors.html>; *Breakthrough News* (the newsletter of Global Education Associates) www.g-e-a.org)

Efforts to Institutionalize International Peace Education in the 1980s and 1990s

In its first two decades the progress of the movement was achieved through the efforts of individual practitioners whose work was influenced by that of colleagues in other countries through the medium of these organizations and associations, then the main vehicles for the development of the field. As noted, it was also during these years that peace studies courses and degree programs were being established in colleges and universities in the United States, Europe and Japan. While peace studies courses and program flourished—largely as a consequence of the American war in Vietnam which raised concern among citizens throughout the world as well as among those in the field of peace knowledge—peace education was not taken up by departments and schools of education.

It was similar concern over the nuclear arms race arising in the 1980s that provided the climate for peace education to be introduced into the university education of classroom teachers. The first, and for many years, the only graduate offering in a school of education was what became known as the Peace Education Program at Teachers College Columbia University in New York. This program, too, from its inception in the academic

year 1981-1982 was global in perspective and international in its practice. In addition to the course offerings that the program developed into an academic degree concentration, Teachers College became the base of other activities for the development and dissemination of peace education. In 2003 these activities came under the direction of the newly formed Peace Education Center at Teachers College. The most significant of these activities was the International Institute on Peace Education (IPE).

The International Institute on Peace Education, founded in 1982, became the agent that contributed most significantly to the present stage of the international peace education movement. It was the earliest attempt by the Peace Education Program at Teachers College to provide in-service education for practicing teachers. It brought together practitioners of all levels of formal and non-formal education from various world regions. This annual peace education immersion experience was held for several years in New York at Teachers College. Participants soon requested that institutes be held in their home institutions. So, since the mid 1980s the IPE has been held in a different country each year. The Institute has served various purposes beyond intensive in-service education and international networking. The last IPE held at Teachers College in the closing years of the Cold War included several Soviet educators. In those years concern over the nuclear arms race inspired American and Soviet educators to reach across the political conflict to work together so that peace education might in some ways be able to contribute to transcending that conflict. Similar exercises are now being conducted between American and Chinese educators. Sadly, we may need to revive cross-conflict collaboration between the Americans and the Russians.

UNESCO, of course, throughout the decades of the 1970s and 1980s played an important role in maintaining the field, providing an international venue for contacts among peace educators and giving it legitimacy through issuing of normative statements calling for universal peace education. In the 1974 “Recommendation on Education for International Understanding and Peace and Education concerning Fundamental Rights and Freedoms” and the 1994 “Declaration and Framework for Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy” the ministers of the member states declared the need for peace education. Perhaps the most significant among UNESCO contributions to legitimiz-

ing and strengthening the field is the Peace Education Prize, awarded annually to an outstanding practitioner. In honoring practitioners, UNESCO gives honorable status to the field.

While UNESCO's normative statements were not fully implemented, they did prove useful in helping those who were striving to implement peace education to legitimate their efforts, countering the notion that education for peace was indoctrination in a form of pacifism that would undermine national values. Statements acceded to by the member states of UNESCO, although not fully convincing to all publics, strengthened the field vis-a-vis ministries and education authorities. They provided peace educators with definitions of and rationales for peace education still useful in the quest for institutionalization.

The institutionalization of peace education proved to be one of the most difficult of the challenges peace education has faced in all the forty years of my experience in the international movement. The acceptance of peace education within its own field, the discipline of education, was perhaps the hardest won of all the movement's struggles. While within the realms of peace knowledge, peace education had claimed its place during the decades following the establishment of the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association, most academic institutions, even those where peace studies had been undertaken showed little interest in making room for the realm that focused on the learning process itself.

This task of developing new approaches to teaching and learning conducive to effective public education for peace making and of delivering the learning to the widest possible audience is now acknowledged by many peace movements as necessary to achieving peace—or in current parlance, developing a culture of peace. Peace education has come to this point of recognition partly because it has been able to derive knowledge both from peace research and peace action, both of which provide important peace making learning. Recognition also comes from attempts of the wide and varied audience, students and teachers in schools, scholars, university students, the politically active in civil society, ordinary citizens through popular education, even the media, in sum all citizens. To date its mission has been carried out mainly in elementary and secondary schools, and in popular education, the methods of which have come to influence formal classroom pedagogy. However, it has not yet become a common com-

ponent of standard teacher education.

I am sad to say that attempts of peace education to obtain a place in institutions such as the universities that educate teachers, met with only limited success and only now is the situation changing. Perhaps this was because peace education was not understood to be distinct from peace studies, a more traditional academic form; nor is it yet appreciated as an important topic for inclusion in peace studies programs. Peace educators believe that some of the problem solving techniques and other skills they teach would benefit students of peace studies who seek to apply what they learn in academic courses to actual life situations. All this considered, it is still teachers who constitute the most crucial audience for peace education, so the institutionalization of teacher education remains, in my opinion, the greatest challenge of the international peace education movement.

In fact, institutionalization of teacher education was seen from the earliest days of the movement as a very important area, yet it took great tenacity to make even minor progress in this field. Our colleagues in peace studies in their departments of political science or international relations seldom reached across departmental lines to make contact with departments of education to explore mutual cooperation. Few in the other realms of peace knowledge are familiar with the particular purposes and theoretical bases of peace education.

I must admit, however, that even some who focus on teaching methods still do not give adequate attention to substance per se and its relationship to the choice of pedagogy. The international peace education movement is giving more and more attention to this relationship and the equal and integral importance of both content and methodology to an effective learning process. This attention is especially evident in emerging in-service teacher education. The relationship between content and method is also evident in current curriculum development projects undertaken by practicing teachers. Some of these projects focus on comprehensive peace education and developmental and trans-curricular or "transversal" approaches which make possible the introduction of peace education in appropriate forms at all grade levels and in most subject areas. A comprehensive approach to peace studies should include peace education among its offerings.

This trend towards a comprehensive and holistic approach, widespread through this diverse peace education movement, contributes to the linking function

peace education sometimes serves among the four realms of peace knowledge. It also probably accounts for its being the channel through which new substantive areas such as gender and ecology have become integral to other realms of peace knowledge. Over the last two decades theorists and philosophers of education and many teachers have advocated holism as the most appropriate approach to education in a global age. Peace educators have been among the strongest advocates of this approach as it is consistent with the practice of building curriculum on the bases of sets of inter-related concepts. It also lends itself to organizing curriculum around the core problematic of violence. All the relevant issues and problems can be seen as forms of violence which we define as unnecessary or intentional harm, the consequence of human choice of means to an end. Thus, most major issues addressed by the entire field of peace knowledge, including gender and the environment, can be studied as forms of violence that can be overcome through choice and effort.

I believe that the holistic, comprehensive approaches arise from the source discipline of peace education. Whereas peace researchers are essentially scientists inquiring into the nature, causes, consequences and the cures for the pathologies of war and other forms of violence; and peace studies practitioners are scholars, primarily but not exclusively of political science, international relations and sociology. Peace educators come, again primarily but not exclusively, from the discipline of education. A major social purpose of education is preparing the citizenry for constructive lives in society. For many this means the capacity to change the problems that impede the living of constructive lives. So the concerns of peace educators obviously focus on the problematic of violence that holds the various components of the field of peace knowledge together. However, they approach the problematic from the perspective of the what, why and how of educating both particular and general audiences about the problems and potential solutions.

As with the rest of academia, the discipline of education was at first no more welcoming to peace education than was the peace research establishment. Nonetheless, the establishment of the Teachers College Columbia University courses offered as a graduate degree specializations in peace education, especially directed toward those who would become teachers of teachers were followed by a few other universities beginning similar efforts in the 1980s and 1990s.

Transition from Challenges to Opportunities in the 1990s

Movement participants rejoiced when a chair was established in the Netherlands at Utrecht University, but it was a limited-time chair and was not renewed in spite of vigorous efforts to have it continue into the new century. Peace education has never been a priority item on education budgets and this chair fell victim to budget cuts. In the 1990s some UNESCO Chairs were devoted to Peace Education under matching funds through which UNESCO's limited funding was augmented by the participating university.

An indicator of a bit more acceptance in higher education was the inclusion of peace education courses in master's degree programs in peace and conflict studies, notably in international programs. In various countries such programs have been established. While there are still very few graduate offerings in peace education as such, its inclusion into these other master's degrees is an important step. Peace education courses are offered in master's programs at the European Peace University in Austria, Jaume I University in Spain and the UN-mandated University for Peace in Costa Rica. It was developments such as these that lead me to believe that an important breakthrough in the institutionalization and acceptance of peace education was taking place in the closing years of the century. (see, Reardon, B. "Peace Education: A Review and Projection" in Bob Moon, Sally Brown and Miriam Ben Peretz, eds. *International Companion to Education*. New York, Routledge, 2000). Tragically, the bellicose events following the attack on the Twin Trade Towers in New York on September 11, 2001 that should have made the urgency of peace education even more evident, created a climate hostile to peace education to which I referred in my opening remarks. Yet the truly committed peace educators who had carried the field to that point sustained and even advanced a bit what had been accomplished to date.

One very promising university-based bridge between the challenges of the first decades and where the movement now stands, one that helped to sustain the expansion of peace education through this period is EURED, the European Peace Education Network. EURED was established in the 1990s as a regional collaboration among educators from various European universities to develop in-service programs for teachers in the schools of their respective countries. In order to do

this, the initiators convinced relevant personnel in the Council of Europe and UNESCO that peace education was the most appropriate form of citizenship education for a united Europe. This initiative serves as a model of regional cooperation to be emulated by peace educators in other world regions.

The educators of EURED continue to deal with institutional challenges and some of them with challenges of new forms of peace education pedagogy, forms of what some have called a pedagogy of engagement and or emancipatory education, quite different from traditional educational practice. Emancipatory education, is practiced primarily in base communities in the developing world and in deprived and excluded sectors of the techno-industrial nations, directed towards developing critical consciousness and political efficacy in the service of the learners own struggles for justice. An equally significant struggle is that of changing teaching practice. This is a personal and professional challenge, as well as an institutional one. Some peace educators have yet to face it.

Some EURED participants have contributed to one of two successes I can report in governments' active embrace of peace education. In both of these cases authorities turned to peace education in the wake of violent, costly conflicts. The government of the Basque Country in Spain and the government of Liberia have both elaborated full scale plans to implement peace education in their schools as a means to reduce the possibilities of the continuation and/or recurrence of such conflicts.

To summarize the achievements of the international peace education movement up to the present decade: peace education has gained acceptance in the larger field of peace knowledge; some courses and programs have been institutionalized at a few universities; there are at least two professional journals in the field; there are special interest groups in peace education in many professional organizations; there are a number of detailed, globally informative web-sites; two governments have undertaken official peace education programs; and there is a dynamic fully global network of active practitioners that is carrying the field forward to the realization of unprecedented opportunities.

The Nature, Agents and Venues of Present Opportunities

With newly emerging opportunities, the challenges have shifted from work within the standard institutions

of education and research to the issues of practice, exploration of transformative forms of pedagogy and active collaboration with civil society movements. Among the most significant changes I see in this decade have been efforts to emancipate education itself from some of the forms of organization and practice that many believe serve to perpetuate the social and political behaviors and habits of mind that underlie the war system. Changes in learning context and practice from traditional methods to more open, varied approaches are being introduced into formal education as non-traditional and non-formal methods come to be seen as more effective to educate for the development of the critical capacities and independent thinking required to prepare citizens to change that system.

The content shift has been in part from multiple and parallel topics and approaches to more integrated holistic ones, more inclusive of realms of positive peace and ways to achieve it, including the aforementioned environmental and gender issues perspectives that few peace educators had integrated into curricular frameworks until recently. Current pedagogy seeks to cultivate understanding of the interrelationships among the various problems of violence and injustice we address, to help learners to think always in terms of connections and consequences, inquiring into who may be harmed by a policy and what possible alternatives may be pursued.

The teaching process is shifting from formal and Socratic to a more student-centered pedagogy of engagement, facilitating the sorts of discussion that should be taking place in the arena of public policy. Classroom process is taking on more aspects of communal learning of the type that is necessary when citizens cooperate to confront problems in their communities and nations. They are encouraged to engage critically with the content so as to learn to be independent interpreters capable as citizens to critically interpret all sources of information, and to assess, on the basis of their own values and the universal international norms on human rights, gender and environment, the policies for which their governments seek their support. Some will see this as education for democracy. Peace educators in Latin America put this on top of their list of educational goals. For some, in the tradition of nonviolence, the task is to educate for constructive resistance when the policies of their governments are clearly unjust and in evident violation of the international norms, the bases on which we hope to build a just and nonviolent global

order.

Most important among the opportunity producing contemporary developments is the shift of the center of innovation in peace education from the Global North to the Global South. These innovations are disseminated through the networking of local and regional movements and activities on the ground with the global networks, a development which has had significant impact on practice in the North. While the international peace education movement has always been inclusive to some degree of all world regions, the realities of economics, publications and communications technology contributed to the appearance of imbalance in the field that gave greater visibility and thereby undue influence to peace education development in Europe and America. This shift is being advanced by several of the most promising developments that I would designate as the agents of opportunity: most especially, the International Institute on Peace Education, the Global Campaign for Peace Education and the Community-based Institutes on Peace Education.

The International Institute on Peace Education, I noted earlier, has been significant to this new phase, having served both as a medium of change and an observation point for seeing change unfold. The institute has become a venue for putting into practice, for about one week each year in a different country, the practices and forms of this new wave of peace education. It brings together peace educators and activists who use learning modes to empower groups to confront their own problems of peace and injustice. For one week the participants live in a learning community in which the principles and pedagogies of peace education are enacted in the way the institute is organized and the inclusive, participatory process it follows. Active networks of solidarity and international collaboration, some of them similar to the US-Soviet activities of the 1980s across conflict lines, have emerged. From a fairly traditional effort at short-term in-service education, IPE has evolved into an annual manifestation of critical pedagogy for peace.

IPE 2008 is to be held in Haifa, Israel, sponsored and organized by the Jewish-Arab Center of the University of Haifa and the Critical Pedagogy Institute of the Kibbutzim College of Education. The theme "Critical Pedagogy: Educating for Justice and Peace" will inform an exploration of the complexity of peace education in unequal societies.

Among the offshoots of IPE is the International Network of Peace Education Centers based in universi-

ties and institutes in several countries. These centers undertake to do in-service education, services to educators, and research into particular aspects of peace education. The network now comprises centers in Austria, Japan, Lebanon, the Philippines and the United States, with various others in process of development and affiliation with the network. They cooperate on some common projects in addition to working on their own distinct and unique programs that ultimately enrich the work of all in the network and in the field.

Probably, the most significant recent outcome of IPE was the inauguration of the Community-Based Institutes on Peace Education (CIPE) announced at the 25th anniversary celebration conference of the Institute which was held at the United Nations in August 2007. I will speak of the first CIPEs of 2007 later in this presentation. The event at the UN brought together nearly four hundred peace educators from all parts of the world to consider the future of the field. Many of these educators were active participants in IPE and in the Global Campaign for Peace Education.

The Global Campaign for Peace Education (GCPE) involves some old hands at peace education and a whole new group who are striving to realize the intergovernmental commitments agreed to in the previously described UNESCO statements. GCPE takes as one of its main goals the implementing of the aims of UNESCO's 1974 and 1994 statements. The Campaign is particularly important as an NGO initiative of civil society. While some few peace organizations, such as the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and The War Resisters League, have advocated peace education, this campaign marks the first serious engagement of civil society peace movements with the practical necessity of peace education for the achievement of civil society goals. The 10,000 peace movement activists who met at the end of century peace conference in the Hague, called by the Hague Appeal for Peace and organized in cooperation with peace movements and NGOs throughout the world, recognized that their proposals put forth in the final document, the Hague Agenda for Peace and Justice in the 21st Century, could not be fulfilled without education; not one point of that agenda could be achieved without extensive peace education.

The Global Campaign became the main project of the Hague Appeal for Peace. It produced teaching materials for widespread use—one of them translated into Japanese—"Learning to Abolish War". Hague Appeal

for Peace, New York, 2002, Japanese translation, Akashi Shoten, Tokyo, 2005.)—and undertook collaborative efforts with the UN, such as the project with the Department for Disarmament Affairs that involved local formal and non-formal education in post-conflict areas of Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe and Latin America. This project resulted in the giving up of residual weapons and in education for alternatives to armed conflict.

It should be noted that other UN agencies have also undertaken programs in peace education. In addition to UNESCO, UNICEF, the United Nations Children's Fund, UNIFEM, the United Nations Development Fund for Women, UNDP, the United Nations Development Program, UNHCRH, the Office of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, UNHCR, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. All have developed programs and materials. All now see peace education as essential to their own mission, a view we hope will become more prevalent among all international institutions.

Now, I'd like to turn to the Community-based Institutes (CIPEs) that I consider the most significant new development. It is an especially significant undertaking because it shifts the locus of energy from the Global North, urban cosmopolitan settings, to the Global South to the communities in which the global culture of violence is most severely experienced. Community-based Institutes turn the popular phrase, "Act locally. Think globally" on its head because they are about thinking locally while acting globally. The concern is with the lived experience on the ground and how to educate populations to be the agents of their own liberation from violence and oppression. These intensive learning events take into account cultural relevance issues and political differences among those involved in the international peace education movement. CIPEs seek to catalyze, strengthen and integrate into the global movement the many small-scale, local peace education efforts that evolved in the Global South and in post-conflict areas over the past ten to fifteen years, with little or no connection to the other efforts in the international peace education movement described earlier.

While varied in concerns and perspectives, these institutes are joined together through a commitment to a common set of social values and pedagogical principles. The statement of those principles reflects the fundamental philosophy of the strand of the international peace education movement committed to critical pedagogy. I'd like to read just a brief excerpt from that state-

ment:

CIPE upholds the model of nonhierarchical and open learning community in which participants learn with and from each other, understanding that social change is best pursued in sustained cooperative community. Each CIPE seeks to link with other CIPE learning communities towards the establishment of a more systematic, deliberate, effective peace education movement worldwide. (CIPE Statement of Principles, www.c-i-p-e.org/cipe/vision.html)

In this first year of the CIPEs, there have been five, all of which formulated plans for ongoing cooperation among educators and social activists in closer geographic proximity, and each of which will have some connection to the larger network of IPE. The themes of these institutes reflect some of the major peace concerns of the respective regions in which they were held between August and December.

In Colombia, the theme of the CIPE was violence that, in its multiple manifestations, forms the core problematic of peace education. Colombia has experienced and continues to suffer from severe and constant armed violence.

In Peru, the CIPE theme was education for peace and development and the interrelations between them, looking into the roots of violence in poverty and inequality, particularly in the Latin American region.

In Ukraine, a smaller Community-based Institute focused on achievements and future needs in peace education for gender equality.

In Mindanao, Philippines, a Community-based Institute addressed educational responses to the conflict between the Muslim population and the Philippine government. This conflict has fostered religious discrimination and alienation between Christians and Muslims for many years. Under the title of "Interfaith Dialogue, Peace Process and Peace Education: Responses to the Mindanao Conflict" participants explored ways in which peace education could contribute to inter-religious understanding and reconciliation among the conflicting parties.

The last of these institutes was held in India in December 2007. It was the first stage in an effort intended to go through various regions of the country to more local events organized by those in attendance at this first one. It was held in Delhi under the title of "Peace Education for All in India."

The nature of these Community-based Institutes in

Peace Education is summed up in some brief quotes from the report on the one in Colombia.

The methodology of the CIPE is based on transformation of local experiences and situations of violence through joint learning, education and reflection...CIPE Colombia was filled with the spirit of communal and cooperative learning where everyone learned from others...Now we face difficult questions. How do we prepare to help and support other colleagues in their discovery and understanding of the pedagogy of peace? How do we design proposals for peace education that respond to the needs of the community and the needs of the students? (CIPE Report from Colombia—available online at: <http://www.c-i-p-e.org/cipe/reports.html>)

I want to note that these CIPEs are locally organized usually by one educational institution or agent and a consortium of non-governmental groups. So the preparation and organization as well as the process of the Institute itself is conducted is a cooperative, community-building process.

Japanese Contributions to the Contemporary International Peace Education Movement

From the earliest days of the movement, some Japanese educators have been active contributors to the evolution of peace education, but like many educators from other countries, they had not convinced their education authorities, schools and universities to give a significant role to comprehensive peace education—with the exception, of course,—of the narrow space given for study of the Atomic bomb experience. I am, therefore, especially pleased to report to you here today, a number of important Japanese initiatives that are potentially significant contributions to this new phase of peace education that derives from the particular cultural roots and special political contexts of the practitioners. These initiatives respond to the need for in-service education for teachers and for developing models conceptually-designed, comprehensive school programs. They also include activities that address the need for broad education of the public.

In the area of in-service education, Seisen University in Tokyo, in association with the International Network of Peace Education Centers is undertaking a certificate program in peace education as global citizenship education. For several years the staff of the Peace Education Center at Teachers College Columbia University conducted a non-matriculating, in-service, professional

development certificate program at its Tokyo base. That base was established many years ago to offer a master's degree in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). The certificate program in peace education that was offered there has been concluded, as the Peace Education Center with a purpose similar to those of CIPEs seeks to encourage autonomously-conceived and designed programs presented in the national languages of the populations being served, tailored to the needs of the respective national systems and of particular peace educators, enabling them to infuse peace topics into existing curricula. Seisen University is inaugurating such a certificate program of four courses to be offered in Japanese, with the first offering beginning in April 2008. I hope that other Japanese universities might follow suit.

As the Seisen program is being developed within the framework of the International Network of Peace Education Centers, in the future there will be possibilities for program participants to take courses offered at any universities linked into the centers' network with credit towards common certificate in which all centers will recognize the courses offered by the other centers. In this way we hope to add to opportunities for international experience open to in-service educators and non-formal practitioners.

For me, as a former junior and senior high school teacher, the most exciting of these Japanese initiatives is the Ritsumeikan School's comprehensive curriculum framework now under development. This is really a groundbreaking effort involving Ritsumeikan elementary and secondary schools, sponsored by the Ritsumeikan University Museum of World Peace and designed by a group of teachers in Ritsumeikan schools, who are now engaged in peace education. This framework could constitute the first school based comprehensive model of an all-grade level, transversal, developmentally-sequenced program in peace education, which could serve as a model for many educators in school systems throughout the world. World-wide access to this model will be available through the electronic networks of the IPE and the Global Campaign for Peace Education. I really look forward to seeing this exciting program evolve.

The third development in Japanese peace education I am pleased to recount is the first peace education course at Ritsumeikan University offered during the fall 2007 term. During the semester I had the delight and the privilege of offering the first peace education course

within the framework of peace studies in the College of International Relations. Should such courses be offered in the future, especially if open to graduate students, it would place Ritsumeikan in the category of peace and conflict studies programs, such as those I previously mentioned, that now attract students from all regions of the world who are seeking a program that includes peace education. Such an offering could provide new opportunities for international networking and learning experiences for all Ritsumeikan students.

Finally, there is one development simultaneously Japanese and international that manifests the bridge and linking peace education has contributed to peace knowledge. The role of peace museums as agents of peace education has been pioneered by the sponsor of this lecture, the Ritsumeikan University Museum of World Peace. Throughout the years of its existence has served to instruct museum visitors, the general public and school students about the costs and consequences of war and initiatives for peace, a practice taken up by other such museums in Japan and other countries. The Peace Museum has enriched peace studies at Ritsumeikan and, as observed earlier, has begun a significant service to design of comprehensive peace education for the Ritsumeikan elementary and secondary schools. As host of the October 2008 international conference of peace museums the Ritsumeikan museum will be breaking new ground in including in the program an exploration of how museum learning experiences can be more intentionally and systematically integrated into formal and non-formal peace education as a more substantive contribution to peace education curricula and structured learning to provide another level of service to the general public, the ultimate audience that must be reached by peace education.

Through such efforts Japanese peace educators will be making important contributions to the general development to the field. I hope that through the expansion of these and other efforts, Japanese peace educators will bring to the field the particular and unique peace learning deriving from the Atomic bomb experience, the constitutional rejection of armed military force articulated in Article 9 and the many works of service to the international community Japanese citizens conduct in impoverished and conflict ridden parts of the world.

It has been not very easy to communicate in a formal lecture the active nature of the struggle that has produced peace education, nor is it easy to enable others to fully understand what these last developments I

have described really mean to those of us who have been working in this arena, for some of us for forty-plus years. So, I want to conclude by emphasizing that I see today greater opportunities and possibilities than ever before to do what peace education seeks to do. We have the possibilities for a massive campaign of education of citizens through a mobilization of citizens to pressure educational institutions and ministries to include peace education as essential subject matter for the education of all citizens, of all ages, in all learning settings. All agents and institutions with the capacity to educate can and must be enlisted.

Above all, we must press for the peace education preparation of present and future school teachers and non-formal learning facilitators, those who are going to be the actual deliverers of peace education. If we call upon them to practice the new forms of teaching I have described, we need to prepare them to do so. We need professionals, activists, ordinary citizens and teachers striving to educate for peace. I suggest we start with teachers because in many teachers, you have all of them in one person.

Thank you very much for your kind attention. And my special thanks to you, Kataoka-san for your excellent interpretation that made it possible for me to share these experiences and perspectives with this audience.

(国際関係学部客員教授)