

GLOBAL PEACE EDUCATION POLICY:  
A SOCIAL SYSTEM MODEL

BY  
PARIS ARNOPOULOS

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL

-----

INTRODUCTION: Structural-Functional Model.

Since its inception, the interdisciplinary field of Peace Education has been plagued by many problems, not the least of which is a crisis of identity and a search for perspective. This dual issue of what exactly is Peace Education and how does it relate to the broader sociopolitical context, poses some significant theoretical and practical questions which are still debated by the academic community.

This paper will join the debate by attempting a systematic conceptualization of Peace Education and then operationalizing it as an issue of Public Policy Planning. Combining these two fields ensures that both lexis and praxis are treated in a comparative perspective. At the same time, it will emphasize the importance of a Peace Education Policy (PEP) as the centerpiece of our quest.

Peace Education is the middle portion of Peace Studies which begins with Peace Research and ends with Peace Action. By focusing on PEP, we will try to apply the findings of research to action through a policy of education. In this way, we situate this important subject-matter in its proper environment.

The overall thesis of this paper is that: as a basic human value, stable peace can best be promoted by a long-range policy of public education. Before we can develop and carry out such policy, we must first determine explicitly both our ends and means. That is to say, we should elucidate what kind of peace we are aiming for and what educational means are suitable in order to attain it.

That is what we intend to do here by clarifying the concept of Peace Education and then integrating it in the realm of Public Policy. In order to do so, we shall look separately, but cumulatively, into these three concepts: peace, education, and policy. At the same time, we shall also look into the institutions which produce them. In this way, we will end up with a synthetic vision of PEP as a creation of the social system.

This vision may be illustrated by a structural-functional model. The center of the model is occupied by the three structural sectors of the social system: Polity, Economy, Society; while the periphery shows its three functional products: Peace; Law; Enlightenment. These six foci are interconnected by a number of loci, thus forming dynamic cycles and epicycles.

This study will analyse the model, by discussing all its components. That will involve a definition of the main concepts, their necessary and sufficient attributes, as well as their purposes. To do so, we shall utilize the main parameters of systems theory: i.e. structure-function, input-output, and arena-actor. Each of the three chapters of our study will, therefore, follow this three-step procedure to cover the most significant aspects of the subject-matter.

The overall result will not so much dictate the substance of any particular PEP, as it will provide the general characteristics of its validity. Form and method are thus more important than content and substance, since we wish to accentuate a structural and procedural model, rather than a specific and concrete policy. With these preliminary remarks, we are now ready to look into the main parameters of the model.

#### PEACE: Harmonious State of Being.

Since peace is the most important concept of this study, we begin by a discussion of its scope and nature. Peace is usually associated with non-violence and is negatively defined as such. In particular, peace is often juxtaposed to war, thus marking the two opposing poles of a contradictory duality.

As the antonym of war and violence, however, this is a minimal definition of peace that does not take into account its many positive attributes. In order to make up for this deficiency, other definitions give peace a maximal scope by including within it all the values of our civilization. This makes peace more of a rhetoric platitude than a scientific concept, so it is useless for scholarly purposes.

We shall here avoid both extremes of infra-specificity and ultra-generality, thus trying to situate peace in between, where it would be less vague and more meaningful. For this reason, we put forth the following short working definition: Peace is a harmonious systemic condition.

As such, peace is a desirable state of being which forms a basic human need and a fundamental social value. We shall try to support this thesis in the present chapter by first outlining the necessary and sufficient conditions for peace; then

determining the players and their roles, as well as the stage of a peaceful system; and finally the functions served by this important situational value.

CONDITIONS: Desirable Situation.

We begin by considering the desirable conditions which make peace such a valuable existential state. These conditions may be thought of as the inputs to our system, which thereby create the situation which we call peace. As inputs, they are the independent variables, whose combined effect results in the sought-after peaceful state.

Symbolically, this relationship may be shown by the formula:  $P = \ddot{A}(s, b, m)$ , where P stands for peace and  $\ddot{A}$  represents a function of some structural; behavioral and mental attributes. Let us look into each of these variables in turn.

First of all, peace is a structural condition characterized by a definite order of things. This means that peace cannot exist in a vacuum, but only within a given system of stable relations. As such the morphology of peace includes some canonical formality which regulates consistently the connections among the members of the system.

If the system is a human society, peace represents an institutionalized order, where everyone has a secure place as an integral part of the whole. Order, however, is a qualitative concept of varying degree: from maximal to minimal rigidity. Ideally, peace ranges in the middle ground of this continuum, between the polar extremes of order and chaos. In this sense, too much order is just as unwelcome as too little; so that a peaceful system is reflected in a flexible arrangement between the regimented oppression of totalitarianism and the amorphous freedom of anarchism.

The soft structure of peace is also reflected in the relaxed behavior of its members. Peaceful activity is slow and easy, thus permeated by a general quality of tranquility. Here again, this condition falls between the two extremes of high energy and entropy, or the frenzy of violence and the passivity of death. Too much energy produces dangerous tensions, frictions and conflicts, whereas too little energy results in stagnation, indolence and enervation. Peace, however, combines the right proportion of static and dynamic ingredients to create convenient behavior and smooth interactions.

As to the psychological aspects of peace, they originate in a particular state of mind which is of internal consistency and external conviviality. Peace of mind comes about by a clear conscience in which there is no cognitive or normative

dissonance. Out of this balanced mental condition arise the positive attitudes of comity and community. Peace rests at least on a sense of mutual civility, if not amity. It is therefore to be found between the opposite extremes of love and hate, or within the range of a cooperative and a competitive mentality.

Together, the above variables form the three-dimensional framework of peace and define its basic conditions. It is important to note that this framework allows for different kinds and degrees of peace, although it does admit of a single central focus in the balanced conjunction of them all. In this conceptualization, peace can become excessive or inadequate, if its attributes are carried to their maximal or minimal extremes. The difficulty, of course, is to find and keep the elusive condition of the golden mean.

SYSTEMS: Dynamic Stability.

On the basis of our definition and condition of peace, we shall now look into the constitution of a peaceful system. Since a system may be considered as any set of units, peacefulness qualifies both the state of a system's elements and their relationship. Such a system would therefore be characterized by a dynamic stability, brought about by a flexible structure, relaxed behavior and congenial disposition.

As a systemic quality, peace may be found in various realms. We shall here consider the three kinds existing in reality. The largest, system we can deal with is the natural ecosystem, which includes everything within it. As such, it is easy to see that nature has both peaceful and violent aspects. The natural state of things is therefore a combination of many variables, including concord and discord, struggle and detente, order and chaos.

Even if we could attribute mental characteristics to nature, as the Gaia Hypothesis does, it would be difficult to assign to the ecosystem such anthropomorphic qualities as love or hate and preferences as life or death. Since we do not know if nature has motives, we cannot say if it acts benevolently or malevolently. All we can do is observe and describe natural phenomena of great violence as well as profound peace. But in doing so, we cannot help but engage in qualitative judgements which reflect our human values.

Consequently, we have no choice but to look at the world from a human point of view. This brings us to the second kind of system which is the human being. As the paragon of animals, humanity represents a unique creation of nature that has transcended its own natural origins.

As an organic system, a human may be in peace in the same way as any other being. This means that he may enjoy spiritual tranquility and behave non-violently. In that sense, we could say that someone may be at peace both internally with oneself and externally with the world.

Between human and natural systems, exist a third kind of system: i.e. society. The social system is composed of human groups along with their creations and possessions. Since society is the work of humanity, it is an artificial system. At the same time, however, this human creation has in turn reshaped the nature of humanity; so that humans have evolved into partly natural and partly social beings. Social systems have become increasingly important in human existence; so that by now their characteristics may even determine the survival of life on Earth.

For this reason social peace has taken on a crucial significance in the contemporary world. According to our definition, social peace describes a situation brought about by non-oppressive institutions and orderly relations, so that human beings feel relaxed and behave with civility towards each other. We do not yet know all the ingredients that go into producing such a peaceful society, but we suspect that it is intimately related to a complex of other social values, such as justice and liberty.

Although, we cannot go into the etiology of peace here, we will look into the kinds of social units which are engaged in it. Since we take the fundamental unit of society to be the individual human being, social peace is basically a condition of interpersonal relations and actions. Certain traits of human behavior, e.g. aggressiveness, may be instinctive or natural; so a role of social institutions is to suppress or channel such inherent drives for the sake of social peace.

By and large, social institutions have succeeded in curbing natural behavior by acculturation. But this socializing process solved some problems at the cost of creating others. One of the new problems was the development of war: i.e. organized large-scale violence. As a noxious by-product of civilization, collective aggression has surpassed individual violence in the depth and extent of its destructiveness. It seems that when people act as nation-states, they multiply both their creative and destructive qualities, thus magnifying the dangers and opportunities facing mankind.

The increasing spread and impact of social problems has made social peace a more complex and delicate systemic condition which can only be attained and sustained with great thought and effort. This is especially so in the world level where the accumulation of destructive power is at its highest. At that

level, international peace is often the child of nuclear terror and thus little more than the mere absence of direct physical violence. This minimal peace is precariously maintained at the expense of other social problems and the exacerbation of environmental entropy.

If social and particularly global peace is to be improved qualitatively and quantitatively, human beings will have to improve their collective as well as individual behavior. Promoting world peace would go hand in hand with improving national and local peace, so that one level is not sacrificed at the altar of another. Similarly, social peace need not be bought at the price of either psychological or ecological peace. The increasing integration and interdependence of the global system requires holistic and interdisciplinary treatment which only a sustained vertical and horizontal cooperation can provide.

Such peace action would be reflected in all three social sectors: cultural, economic, and political. Firstly, cultural peace would expand our sense of commitment and community to the global level. Secondly, economic peace would multiply our efficiency and synergy in producing goods and services. Finally, political peace would enhance our security and involvement in public affairs; so that the destiny of the world becomes more and more the collective responsibility of humanity. Together, these social activities characterize the dynamics of a peace system at all levels of aggregation.

FUNCTIONS: Value Promotion.

The dynamics of peaceful systems outlined above lead us to the functional aspects of peace which we shall discuss in this chapter. As was already mentioned, peace is not merely any condition, but a desirable one at that. This makes peace one of the major human values, which is sought after both in the personal and social realms.

Although peace may be valued for its own sake, it is most likely attractive as an instrumental value. People seek peace as a condition in which they can best pursue other individual and collective goals. In these cases, peace becomes a prerequisite for the fulfilment of various basic social needs, as well as ultimate human aspirations. Let us take a look at this broad range of peace functions and thus justify the widespread preference for peaceful conditions.

In the first place, peace is always associated with prosperity, in the material or economic sense. In this area, peace promotes productive and constructive activities which increase social goods either for capital accumulation or human consumption. In contrast to violence, peace conserves matter and

energy much more efficiently, thus making better use of natural and social resources. Conditions of security, law and order, give people greater incentives to work and save for the long-term, thereby developing the economy and increasing their standard of living.

On the basis of an improved economic infrastructure, peace also promotes the values of the larger social system and its natural environment. Cooperative activities maximize life and health, both in society and the ecosystem. The relaxation of tensions, whether in the internal or external worlds, makes for a longer and saner existence; thus increasing the quantity and improving the quality of life.

Beyond its physical and biological impacts, peace also promotes the spiritual aspects of humanity. Peaceful conditions develop both the ethic and esthetic qualities of mankind. Peace makes for a more humane world, in which man's inhumanity to man is minimized and the love of humanity is maximized. Finally, peace is a precondition for enlightenment and transcendence, which are considered the ultimate state of grace to which anybody could aspire.

Of course, like any other value when carried to extremes, peace also gives diminishing returns and eventually may prove to be counter-productive. As we already mentioned, too much of a good thing loses its value and is no longer appreciated, even if it does not actually become malignant. It seems that maximizing one particular value can only be done by minimizing all the others. Thus excessive pacifism will ultimately lead to extinction, just as excessive violence will.

This means that some violence, i.e. the fast and forcible destruction of some values; is not only natural and unavoidable but functional and acceptable in many respects. The necessity of some violence under certain conditions often makes it a lesser evil and hence relatively desirable. The question, therefore, is not whether violence or peace; but how to avoid violence and especially war as a means of attaining one's ends, even when the ends include peace. To answer that question, we now move on to the next chapter on peace education.

#### PAIDEIA: Cultural Process of Becoming.

In support of the thesis that social peace is an artificial construct which requires artificial means for its creation and preservation; we contend that education is the best such means for a stable peace. This contention will be argued in this middle part of the study as a result of which it would then be possible to see how it can be applied in the present world.

Firstly, however, we should define our concept of education

as it pertains to this study. As a working definition we present the notion that education is a cultural process of becoming. By this we affirm the social character of education and emphasize its creative aspects; thus comparing it to the classical concept of paideia.

In this line of thought, education is a human invention by which the natural attributes of human beings may be reshaped into socially desirable qualities through conscious and concerted efforts. In this way, the educational process can transform inherent biological instincts into acquired cultural traits, thereby changing the physiology and psychology of a person.

Of course, the capacity of education to change the nature of man is rather limited. So far, it can account for only a part of human attitudinal and behavioral characteristics. Moreover, it is doubtful if its effects can be transmitted genetically through a species; so at best, education is a partially successful process and must be repeated for each generation.

Nevertheless, it may be possible to improve our educational methods, so as to increase their effectiveness. The desirability of such attempt, however, is a moot point and will depend on the importance of the purpose they will serve. As our purpose here is peace, it may be assumed that its importance warrants some effort to make education more suitable for service in this domain.

This part of the study will, therefore, take a look at the learning process as it could be carried out by the cultural institutions of a social system in order to promote a more peaceful world. The following three chapters will discuss each of these topics and thus indicate both the feasibility and desirability of peace education.

#### LEARNING: Potential Development.

Education is characterized by the learning process through which a cybernetic system can improve its performance and thereby its viability within a changing environment. Learning utilizes the feedbacks from a particular action to adjust the next action and so on until it reaches an optimal level. By storing and recalling past experiences through memory, learning accumulates knowledge and then utilizes it for a more adept behavior.

Accordingly, the learning process can continue until the full potential capacity of the system has been reached, at which time education comes to an end. The degree of fulfilment of a system's potential indicates its stage of development or maturation. All systems have a given potential which may be realized to an extent by the learning process; so, it is



important that the learning potential of the system is developed as much as possible.

As complex cybernetic systems, human beings undergo an autonomic development process, controlled by their biological nature. This process of growth and maturation is genetically determined by their physiology as it evolved over the millennia. During this very long period, natural selection favored organic learning which eventually led to "I homo sapiens" as its crowning achievement.

But, the evolutionary development of human self-consciousness also marked the turning point in its learning process. Whereas until then learning depended on genetic transmission, human beings began transferring it to their mental faculties. Unlike genes, brains can learn very fast, so the evolutionary process was accelerated tremendously.

As a result, humanity developed culture to supplement nature as its principal learning vehicle. With the rise of different cultures, learning became differentiated and education was born as a culture specific activity. This uneven but rapid process, first towards civilization and then industrialization, separated humanity from all other creatures of nature and set it apart as the only cultural animal on earth.

In order to maintain their exalted position, humans must now make a conscious effort to accomplish what comes naturally to all other living systems. As their social systems become larger and more complex, the educational process becomes longer and more sophisticated. Thus, it moves further away from natural determinism and approaches social voluntarism.

This means that the problems facing humanity now have to be solved by conscious efforts and cannot be left to natural solutions. Included in these problems, of course, is social violence and above all war. As a man-made problem, war awaits a man-made solution; since nature cannot help us there. If war is a result of the wrong education, it is more than likely that the right education can bring about peace. It is to this possibility that we now turn.

#### CULTIVATING: Conscious Socialization.

Since the development of intellect and the atrophy of instinct transferred the main drives of human behavior from nature to nurture; evolution thrust upon us the responsibility not only for our own survival but for the destiny of the entire ecosystem. This blessing or curse corresponds to man's loss of innocence and challenges humanity to ensure the perpetuation of life on this planet by our proper wits and means.

This may be considered as a dirty trick played upon us by

the Gods, but it can also be a unique opportunity to loosen the grip of natural determinism and supplement it with cultural voluntarism. The question is whether mankind will be able to control the forces it unleashed and channel them into constructive pursuits or it will succumb to hubris and be destroyed.

In order to realize the first option, we have to close the gap between our overdeveloped destructive potential and underdeveloped cybernetic mechanisms by slowing down the former and speeding up the latter process. Assuming there is enough time to effect this transition from violent to peaceful systems; it is our thesis that a concerted educational effort is the best way to do so.

If the task of peace education is to tame the most violent or destructive aspects of human nature, then its process parallels that of civilization in general. Both try to adjust human thoughts and actions in line with changing social realities. These realities include more people living in less space, greater activity happening in shorter time and more power accumulating in fewer hands. As a consequence of increasing human density, historical acceleration and dynamic potential, peaceful coexistence becomes more difficult as it becomes more necessary.

Under the circumstances, education in general and pacification in particular are increasingly complex, crucial and lengthy undertakings. As such, they require greater knowledge, responsibility and permanence in their conception, promotion and application. The social institutions, people and processes most suitable to the task of human cultivation are of course scholars; schools and schooling. It is to these that the primary responsibility of peace education must then fall.

Starting with the people at the vanguard, peace researchers and educators have already produced a plethora of theories and methods for the transition to a more peaceful world. It is therefore, not so much the lack of knowledge of what should be done, but the difficulty of spreading and practicing this knowledge as far and fast as the present precarious situation demands.

The first task is how to bridge the gap between the few producers of peace knowledge and its many consumers, through the intermediacy of peace educators. In order to accelerate this process, the crucial middle link must be strengthened by educating the educators. These people, of course, are not only the professionals who teach children but also the mass media communicators who shape public opinion.

Thus, peace education is not merely a formal process conducted in schools for students. It is a social practice which

begins primarily in the family but continues throughout life in one form or another. Thus it permeates both work and leisure environments; public and private arenas; as well as formal and informal education. It is for this reason, that it is so difficult to reverse the vicious circle of violence biased systems which have traditionally dominated key social structures and functions.

But what may have been functional in the past is now obsolescent. An increasing number of people are becoming aware of the contradictions between their personal experience and formal education. It is here that peace education can enter the breach and fill the vacuum left by the unsatisfactory performance of outdated contents and methods.

As a social process, however, education is rather slow and needs time before its effects are evident. Given enough time, it is most likely that the human mind will grasp the increasing social need for peace and thus devise the ways and means for its promotion. This schooling of humanity begins as enforced training but ends as reasoned thinking. In this social process of internalizing a new paradigm, peace education sector could play a catalytic consciousness-raising role by riding the present wave of historical necessity.

ENLIGHTENING: Meaningful Existence.

The actors, arenas and actions of peace education, mentioned above, provide the tools and techniques which will have to be utilized to produce a more desirable world. The pedagogical structures and methods for this purpose have been well developed elsewhere, so we will not go into them here. What we will do in this section is outline the theoretical supports which justify their use.

Since we claim that education as the best means to peace, we wish to show that only peace education will produce the necessary and sufficient conditions for our ultimate objective. The kind of peace we have defined here can only come about by the type of education we are presenting in this chapter. In this way, we are postulating a cause-effect relationship between these two concepts.

Of course, as a result of feedback, the effect of one cycle becomes part of the cause of the next one and so on ad infinitum. As the conditions of peace improve, so do the means of education which then become more effective to produce an even better peace. The two variable then create a virtuous circle of ever increasing quality.

The reason for this improvement is the potential of education to augment human capability, adaptability and

tolerability. Since education is a process of enlightenment, it gives meaning to human experience and deepens understanding of the things or events which impinge upon us. On this basis, social education and natural maturation are parallel and complementary processes which promote more peaceful thoughts and actions.

In the first place, increasing information and knowledge improves the ability of a system to solve problems, including resolving conflicts. Consequently, one can make better use of matter and energy, thus becoming more efficient. Well-informed people are, therefore, less likely to choose such inefficient methods as violence to settle their differences.

Moreover, education makes people more adaptable to environmental conditions, both natural and social. Knowledge increases options and hence the flexibility of response, thus making one more effective and viable in changing circumstances. As such, intelligent people have less need to resort to force as the most direct reaction to disturbing stimuli.

Finally, educated people have greater understanding of the realities of life and their place in it. They are less egocentric and more humble, therefore, they have greater tolerance of deviations and oppositions. Increasing awareness increases conscience and makes for more considerate behavior which is the basis of peaceful coexistence as well as meaningful existence.

By a combination of these three functions alone, education in general advances the cause of peace as one of its most significant by-products. More directly, peace education does so consciously and consistently by emphasizing these aspects above all others. In this way, means and ends become equally important; thus mutually supportive and enhancing in the long run.

#### POLICY: Contingent Proactive Intention.

We have now arrived at the third parameter of our model which is public policy. Together with the other two, Peace Education Policy completes our thesis that the fastest and widest application of peace education is through the concerted efforts of the global society. The desire for peace and the process of education need a third component in the proper social policies which will put them into effect.

If we define policy as the contingent intention to proact, then it becomes apparent that any purposive behavior requires some preliminary thought as to its effects. This conscious effort to foresee possible situations and prepare effective responses to them before they actually arise, engages one in the

process of policy-making which is one of the main characteristics of humanity.

Although policy-making can be an individual activity, we are here interested in it as a collective enterprise. Public issues, such as peace and education have become too important to be left entirely to private initiative; so it is imperative that they be handled in conjunction with social institutions. Thus, in the present complex systems we live in, public policy is a necessary prerequisite in responding to all crucial social problems.

Moreover, since peace is a global issue, its resolution will have to be sought in global terms. Although a local and limited peace is possible in some cases, the interdependence of the contemporary world requires the coordinated efforts of the international system in general. In order to solve its most intractable problems, then, one must tackle them at the highest systemic level.

Accordingly, we shall focus on the problem of PEP at the global political level, where it may be considered in terms of its overall import and impact. The three sections of this chapter will present the inputs, conversions and outputs of such policy-making process, thus showing the significance of global politics in peace education.

POWER: Willful Influence.

By making policy the third parameter of our model, we are introducing intentional influence as a causal factor of peace education. Since social evolution has brought us to the point where most of our problems are man-made, so must be their solution. But, whereas, we do not intentionally create problems; we must quite consciously intend to solve them, unless we believe in an invisible hand that will do so for us.

Without denying the possibility of a Deus ex Machina who will be good enough to get us out of whatever mess we get ourselves in, it is prudent to make an attempt at least towards some solutions of our own. For this we have to make a correct diagnosis of our social pathology, so that we can prescribe the proper therapy. As was described in the first two chapters, it was to these ends that peace research and education have been working for a generation now.

What is needed in addition, however, is the motive power to apply the proposed cure. We contend here that this power consists of the political will which is indispensable for the implementation of our intentions. If peace education is to advance from the conceptual planning stage to the actual performance, it needs the effective application of power in the

servo-mechanisms of the social system.

Since power is defined as the rate of doing work, social power is the ability to get people to do something rapidly. The more people one can move and the faster or farther one can move them, the more power one exercises.

Obviously, the powerful have such ability to move people to action and they derive this ability from the possession or control of large energy resources.

If, apart from that, one can make people change their minds, one has influence, which depends on the manipulation of information. Obviously, power and influence are related, as action is related to thought. So, although the exercise of power may suffice to get things done in the short run; influence is a better incentive for long term social change. It is for that reason that we prefer education as the motivating factor for a lasting peace.

Meanwhile, a judicious use of power is mandatory in order to speed up the slow evolutionary process of social change. For that to happen, a lot of energy must be expended in a short time; something which is both difficult and costly. If peace is not to be forcibly imposed by physical power, it would require the expenditure of great amounts of human energy, and such amounts may be forthcoming only when people are forced by circumstances to act.

That necessity is the mother of invention is a well-known motive which will increasingly serve the cause of peace. But this environmental pressure must be sufficiently felt and correctly interpreted for it to be an effective trigger for non-violent action. So, as societies realize that violence does not pay, they choose more peaceful means of influencing their environment.

Obviously, the peace movement is at the vanguard of consciousness raising and pressure applying to influence social choices towards the direction of peace. As members of public interest groups, peace activists can and do make a difference in accelerating the rate of peaceful social change. Their greatest power is when they reflect as well as create public opinion, whose demands cannot be ignored by the political systems of the world.

These increasing grassroots demands, together with the mediating pressure of the peace movement and the spreading influence of expert knowledge, enter into the power equation which makes governments decide their public policies. For peace education to be included in these policies, the political power of these people must be sufficient to overcome the opposition of vested interests and obstacles of systemic inertia. It is to this struggle that we now turn.

## POLITY: Dialectical Dynamics.

On the assumption that the present educational system will need external help to speed up its reorientation from war to peace, we have to recruit on our side the powerful institutions of the world. Peace education will thereby have to ally with political education for its most effective realization. Only such holy alliance can overcome the traditional apathy and inertia of the masses.

By relating peace to political education we postulate that social peace is a function of political development. This means that improving the peace content of education must be carried out within the larger context of a maturing polity. That critical correlation forms the thesis of this section and underlies the conclusion of the study.

The core of our argument is that politics is a dialectic activity that transforms conflicting positions into common policies. Political dialectics confront opposite ideas or interests and then accommodate them by a synthesizing calculus. This process of dialogue and negotiation permits the ideal polity to resolve public issues in a civilized manner, thus avoiding violence.

From the above definition, it is evident that politics is closely related to peace. As a civil activity, politics eschews violence and thus promotes the pacific settlement of disputes. Since it depends on verbal communication, it is a distinctly human enterprise which can only take place within a mature social system.

In reality, all political systems are rather underdeveloped, so they do not always succeed in resolving conflicts without the threat or use of force. For this reason the process of political development is crucial to the cause of peace. As social violence is a symptom of political immaturity, the road to peace follows the same direction as that of political evolution. Thus educating for peace can only be carried out in tandem with the process of politicization.

The quality of political awareness and behavior, of course, depends on other social factors, not the least of which are economic. It takes a certain level of economic prosperity to allow the necessary leisure for political activity. If the demands of labor take too much time, the duties of citizenship will be neglected. The political process consumes a lot of time and effort, which only those societies above a certain standard of living can afford.

Moreover, this standard of living must be evenly distributed throughout the social system, if all its members are

to participate to some extent. Some socio-economic "equality" of power and wealth is therefore mandatory for a balanced dialogue and a fair exchange. Otherwise the polity is dominated by a social class and politics become an occupation of the economic elites.

Finally, politics requires a practical knowledge and information system, upon which the dialogue and exchange can take place. For that, citizens must have some general education to be able to understand the issues and communicate their concerns. This understanding is not only cognitive but normative and can only exist within a cultural system of shared principles and values. Without such economic and cultural foundations, a political superstructure cannot exist for too long.

Given these stringent conditions, it is no wonder that relatively developed political systems are so difficult to find and keep. This is especially so in times of great change and crisis when people become insecure and disoriented. The dynamics of complex social systems surpass our knowledge and understanding, so that ignorant self-interest rules our private and public policies.

It is only as people rise in income and education levels that they become political actors and responsible citizens. As societies become more secure, leisurely and informed, they turn to political means for their social problem-solving. As a result, they arrive at more legitimate policies and thereby build a more peaceful world.

PRAXIS: Rational Action.

Ideally, the political process should result in a public policy acceptable to the community at large. This policy may take the form of state law or merely government declaration. In any case, it serves both as a guide for individual behavior and group action.

Let us call such policy motivated action: praxis, and see how it is characterized. According to our thesis, social praxis is the best way to implement peace education, because it optimizes the combination of utility, feasibility, and morality. On the basis of these normative criteria, a PEP is most likely to be humane, as well as effective and efficient.

From what we have said so far, politics fills these functional norms by involving as many people and ideas as possible in public policy-making. Like the scientific method, the political process operates in an agora, where different opinions must struggle to survive and prevail, after they pass the tests of open scrutiny and challenge. This makes it more likely to detect and root out error and less likely to adopt



inept and inane policies.

By having to convince the body politic, a policy gains legitimacy and thereby commitment for its implementation by the people who will be most affected by it. Since the essence of morality is consideration for others, the public consultation demanded by politics makes it a moral as well as a rational process. This political ethic increases the chances for more humane policies and thus avoids the necessity of violent and brutal enforcement.

If peace education is adopted as public policy by the political system, it is its best guarantee of success. Having the political will of a society on one's side makes a policy much easier to implement. This is particularly so for an educational policy which is a long and arduous task, requiring the sustained engagement of many social resources. The overriding importance of peace, however, justifies the extraordinary efforts which will have to be devoted in generating this political will.

What remains to be done is working out the various strategies and tactics in breaking the vicious circle where political unwillingness is the result of social ignorance which is caused by economic underdevelopment resulting from political instability and so on. It is this spiral of complex interrelations and dynamic interactions that makes the planification and application of social policies such a difficult and frustrating enterprise.

Yet, with some ability, patience and optimism, human systems have survived by overcoming the obstacles along the way. Although there is no certainty that nature will allow the human experiment to continue, we have to go on with it for there is no turning back. Having tasted from the fruit of knowledge we can no longer avoid responsibility for our actions. Therefore, it is necessary that our policies are well thought and carried out. Of these, a global PEP is the principal key.

#### CONCLUSION: Summary Explanation.

This short paper does not need a long summary, so all we will do here is conclude with the salient points of the PEP model outlined in the study. Utilizing the Diagram of the Introduction, we can here emphasize the principal centers of power and channels of communication which would determine any public policy, social education and ultimately global peace.

The three main sectors of the social system contain the key actors or institutions of this scenario: i.e. families and schools in the cultural sector; parties and governments in the political; trades and industries in the economic. They are

interrelated in a circular fashion and interact in a feedback loop, so that the outputs of one form the inputs of the other.

As a result, we have a complex recursive system, in which it is difficult to isolate variables and break into cause-effect chains. Thus, the causes of peace or education are also their effects; so these concepts may be both conditions and objectives of public policy. Peace and education are thereby both necessary and desirable to each other, as well as creatures and creators of the social system in which they exist.

This complex circularity is simplified in the cycles and epicycles of the stylized model which reflects the highlights of our thesis: i.e. peace, paideia and policy are interdependent. Accordingly, the dynamics of the PEP system can only be understood in this overall context which involves the cultures, politics and economics of the world's social system.

For humanity to exercise control over this delicate and vulnerable system by manipulating its variables would take great concentrations of knowledge and power, both of which are hard to come by. Since working up sufficient ability and willingness is so difficult, our efforts must be both judicious and serious. Thought and action will thus have to combine in order to improve and increase the spiral loop of social development.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY: Selected Background.

- Arnopoulos, P.J. (Ed). Prospects for Peace. GAMMA, Montreal, 1986.
- Barnaby, F. (Ed). The Gaia Peace Atlas. Doubleday, N.Y. 1988.
- Bedjaoui, M. (Ed). Modern Wars. Zed, London, 1986.
- Blackaby, F. Defense without the Bomb. Taylor Francis, NY. 1983.
- Brandt, W. Dangers & Options. C.B.C. Toronto, 1982.
- Brock-Utne, B. Educating for Peace. Athene-Pergamon, N.Y. 1985.
- Brouwer, W. Survey of Peace Education in Canada. CIIPS. Ottawa, 1986.
- Burns, T. R. et al. Man, Decisions, Society. Gordon Beach, NY. 1985.
- Carver, F.M.L. A Policy for Peace. Faber, London, 1981.
- Deudney, D. Whole Earth Security. Worldwatch, Washington, 1983.
- Dialogue, Teaching Guide to Nuclear Issues. ESR. Cambridge, 1982.
- Falk, R. The End of World Order. Holmes & Meier, 1983.
- Frank, J. Sanity & Survival. Random House, N.Y. 1982.
- Haavelrud, M. (Ed). Disarmament Education. Westburg, Guilford, 1981.
- Howard, M. The Causes of War. Harvard, Cambridge, 1983.

Isard, W. & Smith, C. Conflict Analysis. Ballinger, Cambridge, 1983.

Knorr, K. (Ed). Power, Strategy & Security. Princeton, N.H. 1983.

Lamb, C.J. How to Think About Arms Control. Prentice-Hall, N.J. 1988.

Lackey, D.P. The Ethics of War & Peace. Prentice-Hall, N.J. 1989.

Overy, B. How effective are Peace Movements. Harvest, Montreal, 1983.

Palme, O. Common Security. Pan, London, 1982.

Reford-McCandless, I. Introducing the World. C.I.I.A. Toronto, 1985.

Richards, E. The Debate about Peace Education. C.I.I.P.S. Ottawa, 1986.

Ripley, R.B. Policy Analysis. Nelson Hall, Chicago, 1985.

Russett, B. Prisoners of Insecurity. Freeman, S.F. 1982.

Sanger, C. Safe & Sound. Deneau, Ottawa, 1983.

Sloan, D. Education for Peace. Columbia U.P, N.Y. 1983.

Smith, D. & Kidron, M. The War Atlas. Pan Books, London, 1983.

Thee, M. Armaments, Arms Control & Disarmament. UNESCO, Paris, 1981

Vayrynen, R. (Ed). The Quest for Peace. Sage, London, 1987.

Walker, R.B.J. Culture, Ideology & World Order. Westview, Boulder, 1984.

-----One World, Many Worlds. Lynne Rienner, Boulder, 1988.

Wallis, J. (Ed). Waging Peace. Harper & Row, N.Y. 1982.

Weston, B. (Ed). Towards Nuclear Disarmament. Westview, Boulder, 1984.

Wien, B. (Ed). Peace & World Order Studies. World Policy, N.Y. 1984.

Wieseltier, L. Nuclear War, Nuclear Peace. Holt-Rinehart-Winston, N.Y. 1983.

Yearbook. Peace & Conflict Studies, UNESCO, Paris, 1980

=====