



TO EXPLORE THE ROLE OF PHILOSOPHY FOR THE ATTAINMENT OF PEACE: AN HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION OF PEACE EDUCATION

Tariq Mehmood Bhuttah¹, Samina Sarwat², Faiz Farid³, Amna Bibi⁴

¹ Assistant professor, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences at Khwaja Fareed University of engineering and information technology, RYK, 64200 (PUNJAB)

² Assistant Professor & HOD, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences at Khwaja Fareed University of engineering and information technology, 64200 RYK, (PUNJAB)

³ Assistant Commissioner, Government of the Punjab, Pakistan

⁴ Lecturer, Department of Education, Government College for Women, Rajan Pur, 33500 Punjab

E-mail: ¹tmbhuttah@kfueit.edu.pk ²samina.sarwat@kfueit.edu.pk ³faizfarid-@hotmail.com
⁴amanbi1985@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the widely perceived state of perplexity over the philosophical basis of peace studies. Humans are born neither totally passive nor with the intrinsic morality of some sort. A man has an intrinsic tendency to favor goodness and mutual cooperation by showing decency of some sort. The study deals with the changes in the concept of peace, limited to Europe and the period between the 14th and 19th century. This study describes the aspiration of peace education that one should give priority and contribute to peace and reconciliation. The philosophies of peace education in ancient, modern and postmodern times of many educated men, social scientists, philosophers, and theorists such as Plato, Aristotle, Confucius, Augustine, Erasmus, Kant, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, John Dewey, Johan Galtung, Calleja, Harris and Morrison, Reardon and Page's are discussed in this research.

KeyWords: Peace, Education, Greek, Modern and Postmodern thoughts of peace, Philosophical interpretation

I. INTRODUCTION

In civilizations there are a growing numbers of brutalities, the tendency to be generous and peaceful in resolving issues through anger, fanaticism, power and sarcasm inflicted by students in and outside educational institutions. The fact that members are not expected to take realistic measures that are respectful (Vedat, 2015). For bringing about changes education is a most important instrument. It is testified within a decade or two that, Philosophers, scientists, educators, and the laymen, are determined to search out that the most valuable thing is the peaceful existence among all men.

Every educational setup follows the cultural, social, mythological and ideological standards and assumptions of the society it is operating in. When we talk of peace, it is not only absence of a formal aggressive environment but also the presence of a calm and serene atmosphere (Reardon, 1988). All elements of peace are discussed and taught in peace education. Peace must start from one's own self. To encourage the level of understanding, mutual recognition and comrade ship among the masses, new and innovative ways can be formulated through silent and fierce negotiation on the meaning of peace (Bartlett, 2007).

Peace education tries to promote a holistic view of education and is a unifying and broad concept (Castro & Galace, 2008). Fundamentally peace education is transformative, it is not only a movement that advances the culture of peace but it is itself a theory of education. In the first place, to change individual's behavior, attitude and mindsets that make worse violent conflicts, peace education sets the base for knowledge, skills, attitudes and values. This change is possible by raising concerns, creating awareness, challenging personal and social acts, associating and creating circumstances that verify nonviolence, fairness, care for the environment and other values of peace that allow people to make a peaceful living (Castro & Galace, 2008).

To change the behavior of individual, peace education is a practice for developing the ethical standards, skillfulness, knowledge, behavior, and attitudes to avert conflict overtly and structurally for children, youth and adults and give solutions to peacefully eradicate conflicts. And at national, bilateral and international, levels it creates conditions that are helpful in promoting peace (UNESCO, 2011). Building of peace culture can only be created through formation of a culture anchored in golden principles of freedom, justice, endurance, and acceptance. To propagate such common and peace culture, education's help must be sought without which such goals cannot be attained (Demir, 2011).

Peace education is based on a philosophy that expresses inequality, love, compassion, trust, justice, cooperation and respect for the human family and the whole life of our world. The base of knowledge provides educators and designers with a focus on curriculum planning, implementation and evaluation. It helps answer what a school is, what it means, how students should learn, and what information and methods should be used. In a high-level decision, the strategy provides a starting point and will be used to make a good decision. It gives us a sense of the value and faith of the foundation on which we work. Salomon a recognized philosopher argues that the need for peace is necessary in absence of which stronger powers gather all resources for them and weaker are left to live a life of misery and hatred and mistrust ensues. Rousseau advocates how peaceful individuals in turn create peaceful societies while Freire presents this concept more fully in 1973 by proposing that humans as social, political and collective entities have basic tendency towards goodness. The concept is pivotal in peace education theory. Its goal being to promote non-savage communities, as well as creating societies free from structural clashes by insinuating institutions in favor of positive peace. Nonviolent

individuals and societies are thus proposed as compatible with the basic human nature. Thus we are interconnected in the web of life and our well-being is directly dependent on each other. We must develop a collective and comprehensive definition of peace for the survival of human race peacefully.

Historical interpretation of peace education

Analyzing different aspects of peace education in today's world is essential for better results. Many scholars, theologians, logicians, and academics have contributed in development of the idea of peace education in Europe (Harris & Morrison, 2003), e.g. Plato, Augustine, Erasmus, Comenius, Kant, Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr., Maria Montessori, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, John Dewey, Teilhard de Chardin, Johan Galtung, Russell and others. The best paradigm used to understand and internalize works of the aforementioned authors is that of Bowen and Hobson's (1987). According to Bowen and Hobson, every perfect educational policy must touch these five aspects. (i) Human nature (ii) knowledge (iii) how learning/teaching take place, (iv) the social aspects of the paradigm (v) educational paradigms.

Educationalists who does not propose some proper approach to education, tends to spurt opinions without some second thought making their ideas incomprehensible or at least irreconcilable for modern educationalists. The philosophy is good if it is possible for people to internalize it by making them realize the nature and reasons of their actions (Brockett, R. G. (Ed.) 1998). The focus is not much on nature but on reasons of their actions (Maddux, M., Dong, B., Miller, W., Nelson, K., Raebel, M., Raehl, C., & Smith, W 2000). A philosophy is bound to assist an educator in formulation, implementation, and access and analyze information to take teaching methodology related decisions. "Philosophy is a perceptual tool that aligns one's referential axis." Peace educators must be aware of their peace philosophy proposed Gorski, because their philosophy affects the nature and causes of their teaching peace. They must also be well informed of ongoing discussions on peace philosophies.

Conceptualizing peace in ancient Greece

The surviving works of the 5th century BCE scholars of Hellenistic Greece show how they endeavored to promote peace and exposed the miseries of warring continuously and thus went on to formulate serious theories about promoting peace and eradicating violence for good.

On the shield of Achilles (Iliad. 18.478-607), Homer portrays at the same time a city at peace (508-490 BCE) and one at war (540-09 BCE). The text is enough proof of how Homer (7th century BCE poet) was aware of dichotomy of war/peace in life of human. Greed and loathing catalyzed wars, which in turn lead to dearth and chaos... while peace promotes fertility, joys, prosperity and equality. Hesiod does the same in "Works and Days", in which the central focus is on justice. Justice is finally served by favor of Zeus (creator of all things) and Dike (goddess of justice). While unjust elements are punished by wars and violence (225-47; cf. // 16.384-92; Od. 19.109-14). Hesiod gives the primary place to peace for the

betterment of human society, and conceptualizes it in accordance within the social ladder of social and political abstractions, in the great genealogical portrait of the Hesiodic Theogony. Even the scarce fragments left from early philosophy (especially Heraclitus) and Orphic religious speculation also shows how dichotomy of peace/violence was the organizing force in most of the Greek history. Orphics and Pythagoreans practically opposed violence, bloodshed, sacrifice, and may be war as well. Ideas of Empedocles on these matters even inspired later thinkers (Patrick 2009). An argument associated to the Lydian king Croesus is recorded by Herodotus as followed: “No one is fool enough to choose war instead of peace – in peace sons bury fathers, but in war fathers bury sons” (1.87.Trans, de Sélincourt and Marincola).

In Book 19 of *De civitate Dei*, before starting an argument of heavenly peace, Augustine portrays a grand observation of the several tapestries in which peace, favored by all humankind, is in fact the ultimate desire of every being on earth. St. Augustine proposed the view to transcend the limits of historical violence. St. Augustine, following the tradition of Socrates, argues for redemption to the possibility of attainment of transcendence for getting true knowledge. According to St. Augustine one cannot conceive “the city of God” disconnected from “the earthly city” - they are always to be conceived in their mutual relations. A western philosophical tradition is proposed by Saint Augustine which was then secularized by Kant, Hegel, and Marx to make it universal in the sphere of which postmodernists could share their ideas about education. A linkage between a peaceful society and education has been proposed by many educationists. The education of philosopher king is the most important in Plato’s *Republic* for the formulation of a just community. Philosopher king was intended to get rigorous education of mathematics, logics and other things. Through education the fundamentals of justice and peace could be set and that setting of such diction would finally lead to effective actions according to Plato. Aristotelian approach to education that masses be trained about good morals which Aristotle calls “habits”. It was the duty of society to inculcate in youth the golden principles of morality (Aristotle, 1964, p. 268). The Greek tradition founded by Plato and Aristotle continues to influence west of today where seeking truth is more valuable than seeking justice and morality. Despite their greatness, Plato and Aristotle did not illuminate much on the topic of peace. “Neither of these philosophers ever articulated a coherent doctrine on war and peace, so that their views must be patched together from isolated statements, usually made incidentally and in contexts primarily concerned with other matters” (Martin Ostwald, 1996: 103). Both Plato and Aristotle considered clashes part of human essence and thus focused on maintaining peace without city states through appropriate laws, regulations and education. Their vision of peace was not utopian or ideal but informed of ground realities and the supposition that “peace exists in a society which, guided by law and trained by education, pursues excellence in the use of the goods it has, a society which knows that leisure is needed for the good life but also that this leisure is imperiled if men are not prepared all times to defend it by military means” (Ostwald 1996: 118). It is important to mention here that leading Chinese philosophers of past reached the conclusion that continues clashes

could only be eradicated if small city states were replaced by a single ruling authority and all rival factions were united under a single monarch (Raaflaub 2007: 21-23 with bibliography).

Educational thoughts of Aristotle and Confucius

Present is the result of past. What we are today is due to our forefathers. Hence, after accepting the proposition that education's role is great one need to formulate certain teaching methods and techniques which are effective and to apply them practically. Chinese cultural heritage is transferred to us through Confucius (Chen, 1993; Fung, 1966), the founder of Confucianism (Moritz, 1990), While the western philosophy of realism was established by Aristotle (Gutek, 1972, 1988; Ozmon & Craver, 1990). These two great men of past were responsible for formulating the theories of east and west roughly.

Werner Jaeger (1923) thinks that Aristotle was the first thinker to reconcile his historical conception with his ideology (p. 1). His educational principles are also related to his principles just like his historical conception. In the *Nicomachean Ethics* and the *Politics*, Aristotle advocates state sponsorship of education. "Purpose of the state is to educate its citizens" claims Aristotle in *The Politics* (Book VIII, Ch. 1), and all circles and classes different need for education (Book, VII, Ch. 13, 1332a). In *Politics*, Aristotle refers to education as "paideia" a term also used by Plato. Its lexical connotations are much larger i.e. training, teaching, education, mental culture, and learning (Liddell & Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 1968, p. 1286). In a broader sense, the term means much more than just its literal meaning. It connotes not only youth's education but also the mature people's culture. Education for Aristotle transcends the formal educational settings to include ethical, social, and political phenomena considered essential for developing a positive character.

Just like the ideas of Aristotle, Confucius also advocated nearly similar principles i.e. the ethical building of social, individual and national harmony, virtue and idealism. Confucius calls education "hsueh" (learning). Learning is broadly intermingled with virtue and education in *Analects*. He said, "I have spent the whole day without eating, and the whole night without sleeping in thought, It was useless but better for learning" (*The Analects*, Book 15, Chapter 30; cited in a translation by Legge, 1971, pp. 302-303). As both philosophers focus on the need of moral education for building individual cultivation, social virtue, and the ideal state so we can roughly assume that principles of both great philosophers are roughly same and might have a similar source.

We find a few major differences in basic ideas of both. While Aristotle forces self actualization through wisdom and attitude, Confucius enforces self cultivation through learning and humanity. While Aristotle considers education a practical abstraction necessary for one's betterment, Confucius regards education as a spiritual quality essential for individual and social perfection. Knowledge (chih), like humanity (jen) is also necessary to achieve self-cultivation in Confucius' universe. Knowledge is defined as followed in *Analects*: "To say you know when you know, and to say you do not know when you do not know" (Book 2, Ch. 17; cited in a translation by

Legge, 1971, p. 151). The concept of knowledge (chih) is “to know” or “to understand” and is used interchangeably with chih i.e. intellect or wisdom. Constant practice and learning is necessary for achievement of Confucius’ principles which is considered a mean for habitual development. On the other hand, for Aristotle education should be concentrated on social and vocational expertise for pleasure, while Confucius thinks that education be concerned with attitudinal development of moral harmony. In both the practical and spiritual worlds of east and west, role of Confucius and Aristotle is undeniable. Most notably the East Asian population has utilized Aristotelian approaches for their industrialization or modernization, while incorporating Confucian ideas on education.

John Dewey’s and other educators views on peace education

Dewey (1916) is the American philosopher who worked the most to study and analyze some linkage between education and nation. Final goal of education is to society in such a way so as to produce more democratic and harmonious society for Dewey. The purpose of school is not only to socialize the individual, but also to “deepen and broaden the range of social contact and intercourse, of cooperative living, so that members of the school would be prepared to make their future social relations worthy and fruitful” (Dewey, 1966, p. 361). Education is to be basic way to survive for Dewey (1966). Unlike Aristotle and Confucius, Dewey does not founded hid educational theory in didactic but pragmatic plain. But in this approach too, like in every other worth mentioning approach, approach of Dewey is rooted deeply in the concept of the purpose of knowledge and the ability of the human subject, and is to be seen as part of the humanist custom despite its fancy divorce from philosophy. Peace is recognized by Dewey with the elevation of human and enhancement of human capacities rationally and pragmatically. It is maintained by John Dewey that “the responsibility of philosophy of education is to look at the current situation and try to find and explain the causes of the conflicts from which problems arise, and then to formulate ideas about the ways in which unity can be brought about” (Dewey, J. 1937). Dewey clearly gave the idea that children "can't leave for themselves". They require the assistance of more experienced people. He described that education is a continuous process of reconstruction of our experiences. He argued that it is obligatory to us that we ought to pay attention to children and try to find out that what type of things that are required in boning with them, which tricks the teacher can use, and how he can develop and renovate them.

Education is not the only way, but it is the first way, the primary way and the most deliberate of the ways through which the most valued values are propagated and goals popularized. Freire who is a Brazilian educator and his influential Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1970b) is a feeble attempt to empower people to deal effectively with subjugation and exploitation. Freire (1970a) speaks of conscientization in these terms: “Our pedagogy

cannot do without a vision of humankind and the world. It formulates a scientific humanist conception which finds its expression in a dialogical praxis in which teachers and learners, together, in the act of analyzing a dehumanizing reality, denounce it while announcing its transformation in the name of human liberation". (p. 20). The role of the teacher is that of a facilitator in Freire's methodology, who leads a group of pupils to teach them into a dialogue about any social evil. Teachers will not thrash their ideas on students but help them carve out their own ideas and conclusions. Within the universe of customary Freirian approach, peace education is universalistic and essentialist, and at the depths envisions hierarchical connection between tutor and pupil as an essential advance term for enhancement in learning.

Under the leadership of the Norwegian, in the 1960s Johan Galtung (1969), one of the founders of the International Peace Research Association, commenced peace research as a major area of intellectual inquiry. Galtung is of the view that "ultimately, peace research is an effort to put Man together again, an effort to transcend all these borders and divisions in order to arrive at something more truthful to the miracle that is Man". He put forward the concept of negative and positive peace and illustrates a significant difference between them. By preventing violence and stop the conflict, negative peace means the absence of direct and personal violence. When environmental stability, nonviolence and social justice eliminate the causes of violence then the situation occur called positive peace. The requirement of Positive peace is the existence of those institutes in society that grant just and unbiased distribution of possessions and the acceptance of beliefs establish by individuals to resolve the conflicts peacefully.

The modern and postmodern debates on peace

It will be very fruitful activity to assess the ideas of peace education within the framework of different philosophies, though theories and principles of peace education are not solely associated to anyone philosopher of orient or occident. Peace education, starting from the ideas of Jean Jacques Rousseau, Dewey, A. S. Neil, Illich and Paolo Freire, portrays a perspective on human nature which is in conformity to the progressive educational norm. According to them, a man is born neither wholly passive, nor with some innate morality embedded in him completely. Though, we are innately inclined in favor of good and praiseworthy values which will help in creation of a peaceful society. The most of the important figures associated to postmodernist movement are challenging the views of traditional peace education. Postmodernists such as Michel Foucault, Derrida, Jean-François Lyotard, and Jean Baudrillard pose a serious threat to the various naïve humanist ideas of peace education.

For Michael Foucault peace education is not different from all other subjects which create, subject, attitudes, and knowledge in the sphere of a meaningless history. The modern debate on peace/war dichotomy began during the period of renaissance, with the tradition of two great scholars associated to this era i.e. Machiavelli (1469-1527), and Erasmus (1466-1536), both contemporaries advocating wholly opposite viewpoints. We can

carve out essential difference between the approaches of two can be found out through the excerpts from their essays intended to teach some prince.

Erasmus says in his teaching that the first and foremost purpose is the instruction of The Prince in the matter of ruling wisely during times of peace, in which he should aspire his fullest to preclude any future requirement for the science of war (Education of a Christian Prince, 1516). While Machiavelli states that a Prince ought to have no other purpose or approach, nor select anything else for his study, than war and its norms and discipline; for this is the only art that is associated to him who rules. (The Prince, 1513)

Kant (1795/1970) in his well known work “Perpetual Peace” promulgated the liberal idea that humans can control violence and clash by constructing legal systems with a check imposed through court of laws and justice and prisons etc. This system of fairness will rely on courts of law assuming that humans can rationally promulgate laws and regulations to force all to work in a systematic manner. Progressive educational amendments were advanced where schools were considered a pathway to the establishment of social progress by teaching learners to learn social problems. Philosophical components such as knowledge, attitudes, expertise, beliefs and practices are advantageous in the process of solving problems until we have no knowledge or awareness we cannot practice in accordance to the values. Very frequently the theory of peace education is just understood but not stated as such.

Philosophical Foundations of Peace

Now we will survey some philosophies related to peace with a bird eye’s view. Most famous of them include Calleja’s Kantian-inspired philosophy of peace, Harris and Morrison’s philosophies of peace, Reardon’s cosmopolitan philosophy of peace and Page’s ethics-based philosophies of peace.

According to J. J. Calleja (1991), a potential philosophy of peace education might be founded on Kantian notion about duty. Calleja after deliberating upon the writings of Kant presented four major essentials for peace. (i) Human Nature, (ii) the Power of Reason, (iii) the Rule of Law, (iv) the Principles of Morality (Calleja, 1991). This is essentially whole basis for Kantian philosophy of peace. Calleja carved out three main pillars emerging from Kantian peace philosophy i.e. (a) cooperation (b) communication (c) confidence. Calleja observed that, “peace is not the ultimate objective of human coexistence but the daily driving force towards more cooperation, more confidence and more communication” (Calleja, 1991, p; 532).

Ian Harris and Mary lee Morrison proposes that present education of peace is an amalgamation of a philosophy and procedure. Associated philosophy teaches nonviolent behavior, love, compassion and respect for all and sundry (Harris, I., & Morrison, M. L. 2003, p; 9). For Harris, peace education is a kind of thought or theory that claims to teach people appropriate orientation or basis according to the situation they are facing (Ragland, D (2009) p; 147-153). His philosophy further claims that a man’s attitude and ideas can be modified through proper education of them.

Betty Reardon assumes that defining the meaning of peace is essential for maintaining the philosophy of peace (Reardon, 1988). Reardon focuses on both sides of the peace finally arguing for “authentic peace” attainable only through providing all with their human rights and justice. Reardon’s “authentic peace” refers to ending war promoting system and ensuring an atmosphere of worldwide justice and civilized world (Snauwaert, 2012). Reardon’s philosophy of peace is “grounded in a cosmopolitan and transformative moral and political orientation, [which] provides a powerful framework for the development of a philosophy of peace education (Snauwaert, 2012).” Ideal in her philosophy is attainment of a universal dignity of humanity and moral inclusion of universal moral quality each constituent member of human community is treated without any discrimination (Reardon, Betty A, and Dale T Snauwaert; 2011). Reardon’s ideas about peace education holds that basic aim of peace education is sudden change in social order and its invisible patterns of thought towards the attainment of authentic peace, this type of peace conception is based in global ethical and political positions (Reardon, Betty A, and Dale T Snauwaert; 2011).

James Smith Page also based his ideas on education through his philosophy of peace (Page; “peace education,” 2008). Some previous philosophies of peace education might strengthen personal and collective yearning for peace procedure (Page, “Philosophy of peace education,” p. 3). Five shades of ethics according to Page might serve as the basis of the potential philosophy of peace education: (i) Virtue, (ii) consequentialist, (iii) conservative political, (iv) aesthetics and (v) care. These ethical approaches might lead to “uncover and inform our thinking on peace” (Ragland’ p. 148). Peace education must lead students to learn to care for the well being of others for these qualities are important to nourish positive relationships. (Page; “peace education,” 2008)

For Harris and Morrison (2003), peace education is both a practice and philosophy. According to them, peace education might be considered a structured process of attaining some values and knowledge, and then enhancing and broadening the mindset, attitudes, and expertise, and finally the ability to learn to exist peacefully with one’s own self, with other humans, and with the natural environment (Smith, & Neill, 2005). Thus the bone marrow of Peace Education is associated with building of peace, solution of conflicts, enforcement of peace etc.

II. CONCLUSION

Analyzing different aspects of peace education in today’s world is essential for better results. An historical and philosophical interpretation of peace education was given in the above study. Many scholars, theologians, logicians, and academics have contributed in development of the idea of peace education in Europe (Harris & Morrison, 2003), e.g. Plato, , Erasmus, Comenius, Kant, Martin Luther King Jr., Maria Montessori, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, John Dewey, Johan Galtung, Kant, Calleja, Harris, Page and others. All the thinkers have different views regarding peace and its function in society through education.

This study highlights that Peace education is a field of knowledge whose validation is done through its application which leads to another proposition that peace education is not just some abstraction or unachievable goal but a field of knowledge with practical and utilitarian implications. Thus Peace education is a procedure of encouragement of the knowledge, expertise, attitudes and values required to developing behavioral variations that will lead children, youth and adults to avoid clashes and violence, both random and systematic and to solve conflicts more peacefully; and finally to create the conditions that might lead to peace, at all levels (I.e. intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup, and international.)

REFERENCES:

- Aristotle. (1964). *Politics and poetics* (B. Jowett & S. H. Butcher, Trans.). New York: Heritage.
- Aristotle. (1985). *Nichomachean ethics*. (T. Irwin, Trans.). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- Augustine, City of God, 19: 13, trans. Marcus Dods. (1887). *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.1st series, vol. I.
- Brockett, R. G. (Ed.). (1998). *Ethical Issues in Adult Education*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1998; Merriam, S. B. "Some thoughts on the relationship between theory and practice." *New Directions for Continuing Education*, 15 (1982): 87-91.
- Calleja, J. J. (1991). *A Kantian epistemology of education and peace: An examination of concepts and values*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Bradford University.
- Castro & Galace (2008). *Peace education: A pathway to a culture of peace*. Center for Peace Education, Miriam College, Quezon City, Philippines.
- Chen, J. (1993). *Confucius as a teacher*. Selangor Darul Ehsan: De Publishing Sdn. Bhd.
- Demir, S. 2011. "An Overview of Peace Education in Turkey: Definitions, Difficulties, and Suggestions: A Qualitative Analysis." *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice* 11(4): 1739-1745.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Scribner.
- Dewey, J. (1937). *Lectures in educational philosophy*. (Stenographic typescript, unpublished.) Center for Dewey Studies, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
- Dewey, J. (1966). *Philosophy of education*. Totowa, NJ: Littlefield, Adams, and Co.
- Erasmus, Desiderius, Rotterdamus [1467-1536], 1514. *Querela Pacis undique gentium eiectae profligat*

Freire, P. (1970a). *Cultural action for freedom*. (Harvard Educational Review Monograph No. 1). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University

Fung, Y. (1966). *A short history of Chinese philosophy*. New York: The Free Press.

Galtung, J. 1969. "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research* 6 (3): 167-191.

Gorski, "Special essay: What is critical realism?"

Gutek, G.L. (1972). *A history of the Western educational experience*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Harris, I., & Morrison, M. L. (2003). *Peace education (second edition)*. London: McFarland & Company. Harris, I.M. (2004). *Peace education theory*. *Journal of Peace Education*, 1(1), 1-33.

Kant, I. (1795/1970). *Perpetual peace: A philosophic sketch*. In H. Reiss (Ed.), *Kant's political writings* (2nd ed., pp. 93-143). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Legge, J. (Trans.). (1971). *Confucius: Confucian Analects, the great learning & the doctrine of the mean*. New York: Dover Publications.

Liddell, H.G. & Scott, R. (1968). *A Greek-English lexicon*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Maddux, M., Dong, B., Miller, W., Nelson, K., Raebel, M., Raehl, C., & Smith, W. "A vision of pharmacy's future roles, responsibilities, and manpower needs in the United States." *Pharmacotherapy*, 20 (2000) 991-1020.

Moritz, R. (1990). *Die philosophie im alten China (Philosophy in Old China)*. Berlin: Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften.

Ostwald, Martin. 1996, "Peace and war in Plato and Aristotle". *Scripta Classica Israelica* 15: 102-18

Ozmon, H. & Craver, S. (1990). *Philosophical foundations of education*. New York: Macmillan.

Patrick M Cronin ed., *Global Strategic Assessment 2009: America's Security Role in a Changing World* (Washington: Department of Defense, 2009), 145.

Ragland, D. "Recasting classical and contemporary philosophies to ground peace education: A review essay of 'James Page, Peace education: Exploring ethical and philosophical foundations'." *In Factix Pax*, 3 (2009): 147-153.

Reardon, B. (1988). *Comprehensive peace education*. New York: Teachers.

Reardon, Betty A. 1988. Comprehensive peace education: Educating for global responsibility. New York: Teachers College Press.

Reardon, Betty A., and Dale T. Snauwaert. 2011. Reflective pedagogy, cosmopolitanism, and critical peace education for political efficacy: A discussion of Betty A Reardon's assessment of the field. *Factispax: Online journal of peace education and social justice* 5, no. 1: 1–14.

Snauwaert, Dale T. "Betty Reardon's Conception of "Peace" and Its Implications for a Philosophy of Peace Education." *Peace Studies Journal* 5, no. 3 (2012): 45-52.

St. Augustine, *The City of God*, 427

Vedat. Aktepe, (2015). Peace Value Education and Its Effects on the Attitude of Students. *PyrexJournal of Educational Research and Reviews* Vol 1 (9) pp. 073-082 December, 2015 <http://www.pyrexjournals.org/pjerr>