

Course- 11

Foundation of peace

Name – Sunita Sagar

Email- mail2ssagar@gmail.com

Mobile number- 7766080062

War and conflict leave their mark on a society – even long after the fighting has ended. And it is often underestimated how important the process of reconciliation after the conflict is. Dealing with past injustices and violence is painful for everyone involved and, at the same time, it is necessary to prevent new violent conflicts from cropping up as a result of strife that is simmering under the surface. Peace education encompasses the key concepts of education and peace. While it is possible to define education as a process of systematic institutionalized transmission of knowledge and skills, as well as of basic values and norms that are accepted in a certain society, the concept of peace is less clearly defined. Many writers make an important distinction between positive and negative peace. Negative peace is defined as the absence of large-scale physical violence—the absence of the condition of war. Positive peace involves the development of a society in which, except for the absence of direct violence, there is no structural violence or social injustice. Accordingly, peace education could be defined as an interdisciplinary area of education whose goal is institutionalized and noninstitutionalized teaching about peace and for peace. Peace education aims to help students acquire skills for nonviolent conflict resolution and to reinforce these skills for active and responsible action in the society for the promotion of the values of peace. Therefore, unlike the concept of conflict resolution, which can be considered to be retroactive—trying to solve a conflict after it has

already occurred—peace education has a more proactive approach. Its aim is to prevent a conflict in advance or rather to educate individuals and a society for a peaceful existence on the basis of nonviolence, tolerance, equality, respect for differences, and social justice.

Formal conflict resolution sometimes abides only with the leaders who negotiated an agreement, or in the narrow strata around them, or among only a small part of the society. In these cases, the majority of society members may not accept the negotiated compromises, or even if they do, they may still hold the world view that has fueled the conflict. As a result, formal resolutions of conflicts can be unstable—they may collapse, as in the case.

For reconciliation to develop into a peace culture, the former enemies must develop cooperative relations with one another and manage their inevitable conflicts constructively. Woven into the framework of a culture of peace are values of justice, respect of human rights, sensitivity, acceptance and respect for cultural differences, values and practices conducive to nonviolent conflict resolution, and above all recognition of the superiority and importance of peace as a value and practice. From a psychological perspective, this requires the following bases: Mutual Knowledge. Past rivals should acquire knowledge about each other. The scope of knowledge should be wide, covering various domains, such as the cultural, religious, societal, political, geographical or historical. Knowledge is essential for the development of peace culture since ignorance and distorted or selective information are often the causes of hostility, prejudice and hatred. Mutual knowledge facilitates the development of acquaintanceship, recognition and respect. Mutual Acceptance. Both sides should accept each other on

both the personal and national levels. It means mutual inclusion, legitimization and humanization. Mutual acceptance is a condition for developing cooperative and friendly relations. Building and maintaining trustful relations is the key aspect in mutual acceptance. It serves as a basis for establishing secure existence in the very wide meaning for each group, which is a necessary condition for stabilizing peace. Mutual Understanding. Beyond knowing and accepting, both sides should understand each other by developing empathy and sensitivity to each other's needs, values, traditions, and experiences. Such an understanding prevents many conflicts because both sides realize that their relationship is governed by mixed motives so that conflict may cause both sides to lose and in peace both sides can gain. Respect for Differences and Focus on Commonalities. Peace culture both respects pluralism and differences, and stresses commonalities and constructs common goals. All parties have to look for commonalities as well as identify and respect differences. This respect provides the assurance necessary for the secure existence of each party's identity, a condition for peaceful co-existence. Each group has to be able to fulfil its own needs, including its needs to hold its collective identity. Development of Cooperative Relations. The development of cooperative relations applies especially to the structural and concrete side of peace culture. The cooperation has unlimited scope as it can be part of economic, political, cultural, military, educational and environmental relations. Of special importance are military and security cooperative mechanisms that guard peaceful relations and prevent misperceptions and misunderstandings. Valuing Peace. It is essential that peace be a supreme value. All parties should view peace as a desirable and important value, and as a super-ordinate goal. It should be viewed in concrete and relevant terms, that is, as a realistic and achievable goal. Moreover, it is necessary to establish a common moral as well as

utilitarian ground for maintaining peace and imparting this to new generations. Mechanisms for Maintaining Peace. The culture of peace places great emphasis on mechanisms that allow for the maintenance of peace. This requires the development of various kinds of institutions, organizations, cooperative exchanges, etc., which intend to solidify and crystallize peaceful relations. Moreover, the development of culture requires building new narratives, symbols and rituals that explain, maintain, justify and even glorify peace. Of special importance is establishing continuous peace education that can socialize the younger generation into the culture of peace. Mass media has a role and a mission in maintaining peace, as well as, various cultural channels, such as literature, films or theatrical plays.

1. Human rights are —basic rights and freedoms that all people are entitled to regardless of nationality, sex, national or ethnic origin, race, religion, language, or other status. 50 human rights were convinced as universal and egalitarian, with all people having equal rights by virtue of being human. These rights may exist as natural rights or as legal rights, in both national and international law.

Peace and human rights are necessary for each other: peace cannot be achieved without human rights being protected and realized, and human rights cannot be achieved in the absence of peace. Peace without human rights would be a weak and flawed peace. People cannot

be said to be living in peace if their human rights are violated, as the

structural and institutional violence inherent in human rights abuse is the

antithesis of peace. Similarly, human rights cannot be realized in the absence of peace; war is itself a human rights abuse for both the military personnel involved and for civilians.

2. Peace and justice –

Justice is the concept of moral rightness based on ethics nationality law natural law religion fairness or equity. Justice concerns itself with the proper ordering of things and

people within a society; justice, therefore, is one essential thing that helps

create peace in society and in the world. Without justice, there will be a lot of problems and there will be no peace in society. Really, true peace cannot be achieved until there is justice for all.

3. Peace and non violence- Nonviolence has two closely related meanings. (1) It can refer, to a general philosophy of abstention from violence because of moral or religious principle. (2) It can refer to the behaviour of people using nonviolent action. Love of the enemy, or the realization of the humanity of all people, is a fundamental concept of Philosophical nonviolence. The goal of this type of nonviolence is not to defeat the enemy, but to win them over and create love and understanding between all. According to Mark Kurlansky, "all religions discuss the power of nonviolence and the evil of violence."⁶⁸ Such principles or tenets can be found in each of the major Indian religious

traditions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism and Sikhism) as well as in the major Abrahamic religious traditions (Judaism, Christianity and Islam). The Chandogya Upanishad, which is part of the Upanishads, one of the principal of Hinduism that dates to the 8th or 7th century BC bars violence against all creature.

Because of nonviolence is an effective way for social struggle in recent centuries, it, therefore, has become an important way to deal with

problems. And when nonviolence is the essential way to deal with problems for social change, nonviolence is also related to peace and regarded as means to peace. That is why nonviolence and peace go hand-

in-hand. Nonviolence is an important step in the process of peace.⁷³ And

peace, accept an end to be reached, can be used as a way when it is brought to get involved with nonviolence. It is called ‘peaceful means’. Peaceful means, in some aspect, are equal to nonviolent methods or nonviolent acts. In this sense, peaceful means and nonviolent methods can be used as a synonym.

4. Peace and gender- Feminist scholars have long argued that organized violence is primarily a functional of gender imbalance and of patriarchal social relations. They point to the fact that in

those few societies where women have held significant cultural and spiritual power, organized group violence has been relatively rare.

Women's studies as an academic

discipline of recent development has made significant contributions

toward the history of women as peacemakers and peace-builders,

recognizing that often women have pioneered alternatives to violence and

have urged their male colleagues to take routes other than violence

toward the advices are

trying to analyse the pressures and dynamics of male behavior that lead

them to violent , or in secret

fraternities of violent criminals. Those involved in the men's movement

argue that it is possible to construct an alternative ethic of nurturing

and

generative compassion for a new masculine self-image that seeks self-

worth and gender fulfilment not through violence and the desecration

of the feminine, but rather in creative co-partnership and responsibility

between the sexes. This pioneering work is carried out both in formal

academic contexts as well as in informal extra-curricula workshop

contexts where a number of innovative organizations have concerned

themselves with peace making between the genders, as both men and

women seek to heal the brokenness and abuse that exist around the

whole issue of gender relations and sexuality and to recover the

capacity for love, creativity, compassion, and mutual respect which lies at the very foundation of the covenant of human life itself.

5. Peace and democracy- The idea that representative liberal governments can diminish the

occurrence of war is one of the most appealing, influential, and at the same time, controversial ideas of our time. For centuries, thinkers have proposed that a world of democratic countries would be a peaceful world. The Democratic Peace Theory is based on several premises. The first argues that in democracies, populations will restrain elected leaders.

This is to say that given the choice, people will be reluctant to bear the costs of war in terms of human life and financial treasure. Second, many

think that democracies will use political institutions to settle their domestic disputes. Therefore, when conflict arises with another democracy, they will be more apt to use international institutions (i.e., the United Nations, International Court of Justice, G-8 Summits, etc.) to resolve their international disagreements. Others believe that democracies produce a political culture of negotiation and conciliation, claiming that people in democracies are taught that violence is not an appropriate means of conflict resolution. The argument holds that if a war-prone leader comes to power in a democracy, other institutions (e.g., Congress) will present cross-pressures (here checks and balances) and prevent an aggressive head of state from moving a country to war. Finally, people in democracies are believed to be more sympathetic and tolerant of people in other democracies.⁹⁹ Thus, whether it is common

norms, institutional constraints, mutual respect, or popular will—
democracy is viewed as a treatment for war.

Without establishing all these elements we will be unable to form a
society having peace as it's constituent frame.