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Preface

Human beings as far back as recorded history is able to recount have waged war and violence. In contemporary times especially, there are few if any places on earth with human habitation that have not, at one time or another, been trampled by the armies of mighty nations. Perhaps the most astounding statement I can make as a peace educator is that war and violence, in and of themselves, are, generally speaking, not problematic forms of human interaction. That is, war and peace are not, in fact, antithetical to each other, contrary to the common use of these words in the formulation of our language; rather they only appear to be so because many of the sociological methods of investigation currently in operation overlook critical factors regarding the causes of violent behavior and the ways in which those with a propensity to behave violently tend to perceive the world. It is only after a sufficient understanding of these factors is gained that we can hope to live in peace.

As an undergraduate, my major was philosophy. Throughout my undergraduate career I put a heavy emphasis on the social and political aspects of philosophy, enrolling in classes on such topics as Ancient Philosophy (especially Plato and Aristotle), Political Philosophy, Critical Theory, Philosophy of Culture, and even an Independent Study on the work of Hannah Arendt which resulted in a publication. My previous background in philosophy has found direct relevance in my current roles as both a peace educator and an educational theorist. The work, both theoretical and practical that has led up to this thesis
and, indeed, the thesis itself, is influenced in no small part by the thoughts of great philosophers.

For two semesters, as a graduate assistant at The University of Toledo, my assignment was to run the peace education portion of an alternative to school suspension program for a Community Center with the mission of education and empowerment. This program was conceived to respond to the rising number of school suspensions that plagues schools in and around an economically impoverished largely African-American area of Toledo, Ohio. In this position my duties included developing peace related lessons and teaching them to students whose parent/guardians have elected to have them take the alternative to suspension option at the Center. Furthermore, in my second semester, my presence at the Center was also one as a student in my own right, as I was enrolled in a research-based service learning class on peace education at the University. In this role my duties were to assist other graduate students in the teaching of peace related lessons (as well as teach lessons of my own design) and record the data that emerged as a result of this research in fieldnotes. What shall appear in the chapters to follow is, thus, a detailed theoretical synthesis of my observations regarding peace education as a field, based on my experiences in these roles as well as my philosophical background. This synthesis shall in turn serve as the foundation of a new theory of peace and peace education.

The chapter entitled “Teaching a Philosophy of Peace” was written: 1) to offer one explanation of the underlying reasons for the improper and often violent behavior of the students served by The Center; 2) to set forth the definition of peace and its opposite that reframes our current thinking on the subject of peace education; 3) to obviate the fact
that the current systems both suggested and in practice neither recognize nor address the
above stated underlying issues and absence of a specific definition of peace hinders the
formation of a peaceful world, and 4) to propound an alternative to our currently flawed
systematic methods of handling the problems of war and violence. In short the
phenomenon that chapter 1 is meant to address is summed up in these words attributed to
Plato: “A man who found some gold left a noose, and the one who did not find the gold
he had left tied on the noose he found” (Plato 1997, p. 1744). In other words, those who
perceive certain objects to be of immense importance cease to attach importance to the
lives of other human beings. It is a mentality of this formulation that, I argue, is manifest
in the behavior witnessed with regard to students at the Center.

This particular chapter of my thesis (as an essay in its own right) was accepted for
presentation at the American Association of Philosophy Teachers (AAPT) Eighteenth
International Workshop-Conference on Teaching Philosophy at Coastal Carolina
University in Myrtle Beach, South Carolina. This conference is to be held July 29-August
2, 2010. To fit the format of the conference it is planned that some of the ideas in this
chapter shall be exemplified by active participation by the audience in a modified version
of an activity taught at the Center. (I should note that, while the chapter of which I speak
is of my own authorship, the corresponding activity was originally adapted by and
modified with the assistance of a classmate of mine – Andrew Accettola).

The chapter of this thesis entitled “Dragons of Education: the Dangers of a Social
Curriculum” is also firmly rooted in the information gathered as a result of my
experiences as well as extensive review of philosophical literature. However, whereas the
previously described chapter focuses more on the ontological and phenomenological
reasons behind the witnessed behavior of students at The Center, this chapter focuses more on culture and its role in the overall project of peace education. This chapter is, hence, written: 1) to explain the difference between culture and society and why this distinction is important, 2) to address the relevance of race to peace education and, by extension, education in general, 3) to examine the techniques, strategies, and theories currently popular, with reference to culture, within peace education, 4) to suggest alternatives or improvements to the current methods, and 5) to anticipate what the results of the new approach might be. Plato, once again, frames the problem, by means of analogy much more is elegantly then can I.

When one is advising a sick man who is living in a way injurious to his health, must one not first of all tell him to change his way of life and give him further counsel only if he is willing to obey? If he is not, I think any manly and self-respecting physician would break off counseling such a man, whereas anyone who would put up with him is without spirit or skill (Plato 1997b, 330c-d).

The answer Plato provides, in addition to implicitly affirming a positive answer to his own question, suggests the proper response of the counselor or, in our relevant context, the educator. Therefore, the structural framework of both my analysis and new theory is similar to Plato's analogy in that it is the duty of a teacher to realize when he or she can be of no more help and allow the student to make his or her own choices.

The background pertaining to this chapter is a bit more complicated than that pertaining to the chapter mentioned prior. While enrolled in the service learning class one of my classmates – an international student from China by the name of Jing Sun – and I co-authored an essay (provided in the appendix of this thesis) entitled “A Cultural Approach to Peace Education”. Apart from a version of this essay being the final examination for the course, we proposed this essay for presentation at the American
Educational Studies Association (AESA) 2010 Annual Conference in Denver, Colorado. The content of this essay is, in part, an analysis of observations during the course of our research at The Center with the purpose of answering the question – “... why is culture an important facet of peace and peace education and what role does it play?” Whereas this essay was conceived primarily to address practical concerns regarding curriculum, there is also an underlying connection between the ontology and phenomenology of the conditions that deprive mankind of peace and the cultural tendencies of those living under such conditions. This connection is the topic of investigation in this part of the thesis. Incidentally, the title of this chapter alludes to a specific lesson (having to do with dragons) that Sun and I taught as part of our research and which we used as an example in our essay. The fact that this allusion is followed by the subtitle referencing the social signals the connection to which the reader's attention is to be drawn.

All that has been stated thus far constitutes the background information that contextualizes the claims made in the main body of this work. The theory expounded in this work, though based in part on individual experience, is reinforced not only by the thoughts of past philosophers and other thinkers but also by the corroboration of fellow graduate students and can, therefore, be generalized to the extent that the causes of a lack of peace are the same in many if not all places. For, as I said once already, we must first understand peace before we can live in it.
Chapter 1

Teaching a Philosophy of Peace

It is the mark of fine intellects to explain many things in a few words; little minds have the gift of speaking much and saying nothing (Rochefoucauld 1183).

The above quotation, though it was written as advice to help those entering into a social setting, also can be taken as useful advice for educators if interpreted in the proper context. In education, there comes a certain point at which mere speech becomes an insufficient instrument for the conveyance of a lesson. As a peace educator, for students who, with the permission of their parents/guardians, have elected to take an alternative to suspension option rather than traditional suspension, I am confronted with this fact on a regular basis and thus the manner in which I teach must involve more than speech. In order to have a lasting effect on students, many of whom have been brought up in a culture of violence and opposition to authority, the lessons themselves must have not only a strong philosophical backing that must be taught in such a way as to give the student the greatest chance of realizing their utility and application. Experience is a far better teacher than pontification. Therefore, in this essay I shall explain both the methods with which I have chosen to teach my students the benefits of and how to achieve a peaceful lifestyle and the philosophy that has inspired these methods. The purpose of this essay is
to bring more clarity to the mission of peace education and to achieve a greater understanding of existential nature of this mission.

1.1 Power and Authority

There is a fundamental difference between power and authority that often escapes the perception not only of K-6 students but also of more sophisticated people. The conflation of power and authority in the minds of the children is (I strongly suspect) what leads to many of the behaviors for which they are being suspended. That is, the conceptions of power and authority are, because of their apparent similarity, often confused with each other or not distinguished from each other. As a result of this confusion students may feel, and perhaps rightly so in some cases, that they are being dominated in the school environment rather than encouraged to learn new skills and to use those skills in creative ways.

The difference between power and authority must first be elucidated in the mind of the educator before it can be properly explained to a student or put to good use in the field. The political theorist Hannah Arendt lays out this distinction very clearly, and notes the very confusion spoken of earlier, in her book Between Past and Future: "Since authority always demands obedience, it is commonly mistaken for some form of power or violence. Yet authority precludes the use of extreme means of coercion; where force is used, authority itself has failed" (Arendt 92). Arendt's observation is all the more pertinent when it comes to school environments and, in particular, urban school environments. Because of this demand for obedience on the part of teachers and school administrators students feel powerless. That is, because, in a school environment, students are expected to submit to the authority of another, they may assume, again
perhaps with good reason, that they have no ability to control their own situation. Thus, when they perform the actions for which they are being punished when they come to the Center, what they may be reacting to is a general feeling of powerlessness both within the culture and within their school environment.

At least twice I have noted that students may have good reason to assume that they possess no power in a school environment. This is because often new and inexperienced teachers (which is often what is present in the case of urban schools) who may have no concept of a difference between power and authority, may tend to misuse their authority – running a classroom as a dictator might run a country. In such a case the teacher himself or herself is a contributor to the cause of the negative behavior without realizing it. But, whether the cause of these troublesome behaviors be a false perception on the part of the student or a tyrannical teacher, it is important that we understand the meaning of and difference between power and authority so that both problems may be avoided in the future.

Authority is best described as a sort of influential eminence granted by virtue of knowledge, experience, tradition, or some other such distinguishing immaterial factor. Power, by contrast, is the ability to determine a person's activities. Both, as Arendt puts it, ‘demand obedience’ but only power grants a mechanism for enforcing that obedience. Authority, while it ‘demands obedience’, does not do so by imposing direct measures of control over situations but rather only by virtue of the fact that disobedience to a certain authority is at risk of the one who chooses to disobey. In other words, authorities on certain topics or situations are present precisely to assist those who do not have the skills

\[1\] I say behavior here with a very specific purpose. Behavior is the result of social influence and a lack of thought beyond the activity of a group. This is as opposed to action which is thought out and preformed independent of social influence.
to navigate that topic or situation alone. The fact that authority preserves choice is also
not insignificant. “Authority implies an obedience in which men retain their freedom…”
(Arendt 105). However, it is the fact that authority allows for choice that is missed by the
students who come to the Center. Because of its hierarchical nature, authority is often
mistaken, by the students of which I speak as well as others, for a power relation. “(The
authoritarian relation between the one who commands and the one who obeys rests
neither on common reason nor on the power of the one who commands; what they have in
common is the hierarchy itself, whose rightness and legitimacy both recognize and
where both have their predetermined stable place)” (Arendt 93). Authority, unlike power,
not only demands obedience, but recognition and respect or else it can do no good for
those it is put in place to serve.

Power, while often confused with authority, is not to be ignored exactly because
of that widespread confusion. The ability to determine a person's activities is, in fact, a
very important element of a school environment. What is missed by many students and
teachers, is that it is not the teacher who possesses power over the student in a teacher-
student relationship, but the student or students. No one individual actually possesses
power over another although, through poor education, many individuals may be
convinced that they do. The only one truly capable of controlling a person's actions is the
person himself or herself and this is what we are attempting to help the students at The
Center realize. No matter what the dictates of authority may be, it is always up to the
student to accept or reject the lesson being taught or the rules that have been set in place.
“The most conspicuous characteristic of those in authority is that they do not have
power” (Arendt 122). As mentioned previously, however, the rejection of authority is not
without consequence. When a student breaks a rule the teacher or other authority figure does not, or at least ought not, *overpower* the student and impose a consequence (as is believed by many to be the case), rather the student abdicates his or her power when he or she decides to commit the act. In rejecting the authority, the student puts himself or herself at the mercy of the natural consequences of the rejection. In a school environment where students must be protected and where the focus is on education the natural consequence of certain actions is removal from that environment. That is, the requirements of a school environment create a need for the removal of the students who preformed or refuse to perform certain activities and this need is what makes the consequence natural as opposed to being artificially imposed. In rejecting authority, therefore, what is risked is the abdication of one's power. The important piece here is that power is not control of other people but rather control of one's own actions.

1.2 The Quest for Freedom

As stated earlier, students likely perceive their environment as being one that deprives them of power. Inseparable from this perceived powerlessness is a perceived lack of freedom. Freedom, in the simplest terms, can be described\(^2\) as the ability to exercise power. Whereas power is an internal capacity freedom has much more to do with environment and relations with other people. Therefore, while students always have power (whether they realize it or not) certain environments or relations with others may prevent them from using their power in certain ways or in some cases at all. It is a perceived lack of freedom which may also serve as a motive for the behaviors for which

\(^2\) I say described as opposed to defined because freedom is indefinable. Were it to be defined it would cease to be free.
the students that come to the Center are being disciplined. As Jean-Jacques Rousseau wrote in his book *Emile*, “Children will always do anything that keeps them moving freely” (Rousseau 135). In the scenario I have been outlining, where power has been confused with or not distinguished from authority and where the school environment demands a certain level of obedience, students may also feel that their freedom is either threatened or nonexistent and this in turn may compel them to act out in ways that they may feel will allow them to gain or regain their freedom. The remainder of this chapter, therefore, will focus on: (1) how a person can be free in a school environment, (2) why students may feel un-free, and (3) how to help students properly form the project of becoming free.

Once again Arendt's work provides an excellent basis for an account of freedom in a school environment. For Arendt freedom requires three things. The first requirement is the absence of the constraint of necessity. While the complete absence of necessity is not possible and may not even be desirable if it were possible, one must not allow one's life to be organized around the satisfaction of necessity. Right down to the most basic levels (i.e. food, water, shelter, and clothing) necessities, though they must be addressed, cannot be allowed to become the sole reason for an individual’s existence or solely that which guides a person’s actions. This is Arendt's strongest criticism of that which we call society. The social is an overt concern with that which is common to all and since we are all subject to necessity need is the focus of society (Arendt 1998). When people become too focused on necessity they are no longer able to recognize that activities can be for the sake of anything but necessity. Arendt writes in her book *The Human Condition*,

*Cond*
(Modern discussions of freedom, where freedom is never understood as an objective state of human experience but either presents an unsolvable problem of subjectivity, of an entirely undetermined or determined will, or develops out of necessity, all point to the fact that the objective, tangible difference between being free and being forced by necessity is no longer perceived) (Arendt 71).

In other words, in modern socialized environments people are not free in a worldly objective sense and, perhaps even more shocking, do not even conceive of this freedom as a possibility. This point is especially relevant for students such as those who come to the Center. Until such students are able to conceptualize their lives as able to be primarily about something other than necessity they will be unable work toward the goal of freedom in any meaningful way.

The second requirement for freedom is a clear distinction between a public space and a private space. This requirement is similar but not altogether the same as the first requirement we have discussed. In order to keep our worldly circumstances from becoming socialized, Arendt argues, we must maintain a separation between the area or areas in which we deal with needs and the area or areas in which we appear to others to discuss matters of importance which have nothing to do with needs.

Under no circumstances could politics be only a means to protect society – a society of the faithful, as in the Middle Ages, or a society of property-owners, as in Locke, or a society relentlessly engaged in a process of acquisition, as in Hobbes, or a society of producers as in Marx, or a society of laborers, as in socialist and communist countries. In all these cases it is freedom (and in some cases so-called freedom) of society which requires and justifies the restraint of political authority. Freedom is located in the realm of the social and force or violence becomes the monopoly of government (Arendt 31).

In other words, in all the cases mentioned by Arendt, politics became about merely protecting those things which people have conceived of as needs and was, therefore, no longer about freedom. Human beings, while still physically in the presence of other human beings, begin to live entirely private lives when living in society, and the private,
being the realm of necessity, is not free. Moreover, and perhaps more importantly for educators, if Arendt's argument that under society ‘force and violence’ is the ‘monopoly of government’ is correct, then our schools may in fact be contributors and indeed instigators in the violence observed in students. It is not to be forgotten that public schools are government institutions and if the students perceive the institutions to which they are subject to be about imposing force or violence then it is to be expected that they will or at least might react with force or violence in return.

The third requirement for freedom is what Arendt calls ‘natality’. It is natality with which we are most directly concerned at the Center and which shall, therefore, receive the most in-depth analysis and be the primary focus for the rest of this section. Unfortunately natality is also that aspect of and requirement for freedom which is most difficult to explain. Natality, according to Arendt, is the human capacity to perform new and spontaneous actions. In *The Human Condition* Arendt writes, “[A]ction has the closest connection with the human condition of natality; the new beginning inherent in birth can make itself felt in the world only because the newcomer possesses the capacity of beginning something anew, that is, of acting” (Arendt 9). But determining if and when one has this capacity is a challenging and complicated task.

It is at this point that consideration of the work of another great thinker – Jean-Paul Sartre – becomes helpful. To avoid confusion it is worth mentioning that Sartre has taken that which Arendt calls natality to be freedom itself. That is, for Sartre, freedom is our capacity to do something. Everything, even down to our very existence, is, for Sartre, a function of our freedom. “Thus freedom is not a being it is the being of man...” (Sartre 569). We, then, have no choice but to be free. This de facto freedom, however, is the first
theoretical problem with which we must content. When we consider the work of these two existential thinkers in comparison with one another an interesting paradox arises with regard to the experience of freedom. According to Arendt it is only possible to experience freedom if it is also possible to experience a lack of freedom. “[I]n spite of the great influence the concept of an inner, nonpolitical freedom has exerted upon the tradition of thought, it seems safe to say that man would know nothing of inner freedom if he had not first experienced a condition of being free as a worldly tangible reality” (Arendt 147). In other words, we would have no concept of a free will if not for the fact that people had experienced freedom as something like a freedom of mobility or freedom of the body and this bodily freedom would not have been experienced unless people had first liberated themselves from necessity. Not only does Arendt's work suggest that Sartre's idea of freedom is incomplete, it also suggests that the experience of freedom is dependent on an experience of un-freedom. Moreover, the implications of Arendt's discussion are profound almost to the point of devastation for Sartre’s theory of freedom as an ontological fact of humanity. In a previously published article I argue:

The incoherency can be drawn out if we consider Sartre's discussion of a question posed by Gide. Sartre writes:

“What difference is there, Gide asks, between a willed feeling and an experienced feeling? Actually, there is no difference. “To will to love” and to love are one, since to love is to choose oneself as loving. If the πασχω is free, it is a choice” (Sartre 595).

When this reasoning is applied to freedom, however, the conclusion is absurd; it would mean that at the same time one could be both free and un-free, since, according to Sartre, “we are not free to cease being free” (Sartre 567), and yet one can experience a feeling of un-freedom, which if it is willed is the same as actually experiencing un-freedom. But it is exactly the point that we cannot will our own un-freedom, and thus we cannot experience un-freedom; we can only think (falsely) that we experience un-freedom. That is, one cannot will to feel something that one cannot experience, and if un-freedom cannot be experienced, then all one can experience is a false belief that one is un-free. The existential doctrine is that that which is not experienced does not exist, and if Arendt is
correct in asserting that un-freedom must be able to be experienced, then Sartre must be mistaken in his assertion that one only experiences freedom and is not able to not experience freedom” (Templin 98).

What Sartre failed to grasp is that the ability to will – natality, – as a conscious ability, can only be realized if we can conceive of the possibility of an absence of this ability. To act out of natality then, one must be consciously aware of the choices one is making in public and recognize that the results of these choices are his or her own doing. In other words, one who has behaved out of necessity (or a perceived necessity) or behaved out of ignorance of the fact that he or she could have acted otherwise has not acted out of natality.

After enough time with a student an educator may be able to find out whether or not a student is capable of acting out of natality but it is immensely important not to assume that a child is not capable of acting out of natality from the beginning. Beginning with this assumption may lead the student to believe that he or she is not intelligent or valuable in the view of the educator. Most important for the educator is to listen to the ways in which students justify their actions. If a student repeatedly justifies his or her actions based on need or a perceived need it is reasonable to conclude that the student, in his or her current state, is not capable of acting out of natality but instead has behaved or is behaving out of un-freedom. Given this, the task now becomes to understand the un-freedom students may be experiencing and to find a way to help them either solve or come to terms with the problem.

1.3 Understanding Un-Freedom

Now that we can see that there is, in the minds of many students and perhaps even in the greater cultural context of their lives, a struggle for freedom, we must attempt to
conceptualize the un-free state in which students may find themselves in order to devise and execute a proper response. That is, we must first imagine the state of un-freedom as a possibility in the world of experience if we, as peace educators, are to develop appropriate methods to counter the violence that such a state enables or even encourages. To conceptualize the state of un-freedom it is essential to gain an understanding of three facets of our current existence, i.e. necessity, the social, and the self, as well as the interplay between them. For, it is only after we understand the surprisingly complex dynamics of un-freedom that we can decide the best way to proceed in the facilitation of knowledge regarding peaceful action. Whereas the previous section was meant to illustrate the philosophical basis for the quest for freedom in general terms, this section will investigate the logical structure of the thought system that the state of un-freedom is capable of and likely is producing in the minds of students.

As was mentioned before, there are three conditions that must be met in order for a person to be free – absence of the constraints of necessity, a public and a private space, and natality. While no one is truly free without existing in an environment with and experiencing these qualities simultaneously, it is necessity which is at the root of a un-freedom. All three of the aforementioned qualities have to do in some way with a distance from necessity. Avoiding the constraint of necessity means setting up or existing under conditions such that necessity is not the primary motive for one's actions. The distinction between a public and a private space allows for both a realm where necessity can be attended to and a realm where activities unrelated to necessity can take place. Finally, natality involves a capability for action corresponding to the realization that one's life need not be about the satisfaction of necessity. Arendt, while she recognizes the
idealized object of necessity as an important driving force for life, refers to it at the same time as “a deprivation of freedom” (Arendt 70). The point here is that though necessity is an important force the fact that it is a force (that which forces one to do something) means that it is incompatible with freedom.

Unfortunately it is quite possible that the children that come to the Center perceived their world entirely in terms of necessity. The causes of this perception could be any of numerous factors including social pressure to conform, discrimination, or family life but the constant subjugation to the force of necessity produces a specific mindset. When one perceives one's world to consist merely of a series of tasks that one must, of necessity, perform there is, for that person, no opportunity to develop a unique identity. In her book *Between Past and Future*, Arendt wrote an essay addressing what she calls “The Crisis in Education” in which she argues that a dangerous assumption made by educators is that children are capable of forming and actually have formed a society unto themselves.

For the authority of a group, even a child group, is always considerably stronger and more tyrannical than the severest authority of an individual person can ever be. If one looks at it from the standpoint of the individual child, his chances to rebel or to do anything on his own hook are practically nil [sic]; he no longer finds himself in a very un-equal contest with a person who has, to be sure, absolute superiority over him but in contest with whom he can nevertheless count on the solidarity of other children, that is, of his own kind; rather he is in the position, hopeless by definition, of a minority of one confronted by the absolute majority of all the others. There are very few grown people who can endure such a situation... children are simply and utterly incapable of it (Arendt 178).

In other words, under social conditions (i.e. conditions where needs have become the primary concern of all) a child becomes simply one more being in a world of beings who must compete for resources. In such a state the self is, thus, reduced to an infinite vacuum in an environment of consumable things. That is, where necessity has become the
primary and, in fact, the only concern people cease to recognize the utility and importance of things and even other people the beyond the attempted satisfaction of needs which can ultimately never be satisfied. Sartre describes this mass objectification in his *Critique of Dialectical Reason* where he writes, “... the organic individual, simply in his movement to organise [sic] the practical field, develops a comprehension of the group-object as an instrumental construction. Anyone who can shelter behind rocks can shelter behind those other masses – men” (Sartre 531). The use of the term ‘group-object’ is telling. When one has surrendered his or her consciousness to a group nothing, not even the people who make up the group, are anything but tools valuable only insofar as they can be used in the fulfillment of some objective. The end result for the individual is not only a lack of concern for others but a lack of self-esteem as well; for the individual subconsciously says to himself or herself, “If other people and things have so little value to me, why should I believe that I am any more valuable in their eyes?”

The implications for the field of peace education here are numerous but two stand out as being particularly relevant. The first is that the effect that such circumstances have on the individual person's perception of the educational process. When one is constantly constrained by necessity, education, like everything else, become seen as valuable only in its definite perceptible and often instant instrumentality. Arendt writes in *The Human Condition*, “Tools and instruments ease pain and effort and thereby change the modes in which the urgent necessity inherent in labor once was manifested to all. They do not change the necessity itself; they only serve to hide it from our senses” (Arendt 125). This view of education presents a major challenge to educators. It means that education, rather than enhancing the spirit or serving a purpose other than fulfilling necessity, is simply
one more mundane process that must be performed. Further complicating the challenge is the fact that often students do not understand the need that education is said to fulfill and thus may be further devalue it as an irrelevancy. In short the point here is that, rather than being a lack of interest in peace, the issue may be a general lack of interest in learning.

The second implication to consider is that a life committed to nothing but the entertainment of necessity can easily lead to the belief that all violence is justified. Subjugation to necessity on the scale of entire communities sets up conditions such that everyone is a threat to the life of everyone else. In a situation where a person has not been able to conceive of himself or herself as being anything other than a vacuum in a consumable world – a sort of living black-hole – all things are scarce because an infinite need cannot be satisfied. It is precisely this perception of the scarcity of all things which dehumanizes those around the person with such an outlook. Sartre explains,

>[S]carcity, as a mortal danger, produces everyone in a multiplicity as a mortal danger for the Other. The contingency of scarcity (that is to say, the fact that relations of immediate abundance between other practical organisms and other milieux [sic] are not inconceivable a priori) is reinteriorised [sic] in the contingency of human reality. A man is a practical organism living with a multiplicity of similar organisms in a field of scarcity. But this scarcity, as a negative force, defines, in communicativity [sic], every man and practical multiplicity as realities which are both human and inhuman: for instance in so far as anyone may consume a product of primary necessity for me (and for all Others), he is dispensable: he threatens my life to precisely the extent that he is my own kind; he becomes inhuman, therefore, as human, and my species appears to me as an alien species (Sartre 735-736).

In other words, when one person threatens to consume items that are necessary for another, he or she becomes dehumanized in relation to the other and the other is, hence, compelled to stop the consumption of the necessary resources by any means available. Arendt provides further elaboration. “Because all human beings are subject to necessity, they are entitled to violence towards others; violence is the prepolitical [sic] act of
liberating oneself from the necessity of life for the freedom of the world” (Arendt 31). Thus, here we can see the double effect that necessity has (or at least can have) on the individual in regards to violence. Necessity is at once the driving force and the justification for violence. On the one hand, the individual must do something to preserve his or her life and, on the other hand, the very fact that the action taken was for the sake of preserving one's life provides justification. But, in a situation where everything is taken to be a necessity all violence is and cannot help but be perceived to be justified. Such a situation bears a striking resemblance to that which, Thomas Hobbes called the ‘state of nature’ which he describes in his book *Leviathan* as being a “... war of every man against every man...” (Hobbes 85). The apparent resemblance of the subjugation to necessity to a state of war will be addressed in greater detail later but for now it is sufficient to understand the psychology that constant need tends to produce. Having analyzed the effects of un-freedom, we now have to determine not only what must be taught, when it comes to peace, but also how best to teach these lessons.

### 1.4 Toward Pedagogy

This section shall be devoted to explaining exactly how the principles of peaceful action ought to be conveyed so as to give the lessons the best possible chance at overcoming the difficulties previously laid out. The first step in this explanation is to dispel any notion that the purpose of the educator is to ensure peace. As I hope has been made abundantly clear, the only way to even come close to ensuring peace would be to eliminate necessity. Not only has mankind been trying to perform that very feat since before the dawn of history, but furthermore I find it hard to believe that, even if such a feat is possible, humanity would not be inventive enough to find an excuse to fight.
Instead, a much more practical and peaceful approach is to attempt to help children understand that options other than violence are open to them even in the most desperate circumstances and, perhaps more importantly, why it is important to seek these other options. Therefore, in the section I shall explain the reasoning behind peaceful action as a rational ascendancy and present a structure that may be used to transmit such a message to those who could benefit most from it. To accomplish these undertakings will require a profound reimagining of what we mean by both peace and education. Ergo, this section will be the most practically applicable as well as the most interestingly ironic. While the work of authors who deal in depth with the issues of freedom and authority will be discussed, we shall also discuss the thoughts of those who, quite literally, wrote the books on war. These authors include: Sun Tzu, Carl von Clausewitz, and Homer.

To begin, as was previously stated, students are likely reacting to a feeling of powerlessness stemming from the conflation of power and authority. The logical conclusion of this conflation, in the mind of the student, is that power is the ability to control others and that freedom is a boundless capability to exercise that ability. In order to obviate this misconception to their students teachers must provide a conceptual framework for understanding the distinction between power and authority. The philosophy of Immanuel Kant gives us a basis for the teaching of just such a lesson. Kant explains that even in a state of perfect freedom we are still subject to at least one authority – i.e. the ‘categorical imperative’.

Since the conception of causality involves that of laws, according to which, by something that we call cause, something else, namely, the effect, must be laid down hence, although freedom is not a property of the will depending on physical laws, yet it is not for that reason lawless; on the contrary it must be a causality acting according to immutable laws, but of a particular kind; otherwise a free will would be an absurdity.... But the proposition: The will is in every action a law to
itself, only expresses the principal, to act on no other maxim than that which can also have as an object itself as a universal law (Kant 203-204).

In other words, even as entirely free beings we still have a moral responsibility to treat others with respect regardless of race, gender, ethnicity, or position within a social or political structure. More importantly, Kant bases the instantiation of this responsibility not on need, (at least in an immediate and material sense), but on the consideration of hypothetical worlds. In fact, it is the very idea that freedom and self-control are inseparably linked, in itself, which constitutes what ought to be a compulsion to act morally. “... for freedom and self-legislation of will are both autonomy, and therefore are reciprocal conceptions, and for this reason one must not be used to explain the other or give reason of it...” (Kant 207). The point here is that freedom is the ability to decide for oneself how one will act and this involves the consideration of consequences and the recognition that even as free beings we live under authority (be it the ‘categorical imperative’ or a person such as a teacher).

A critical point to be made here is that the preceding paragraph should not be taken to say that all authority must be obeyed. As free beings we always have the ability to accept the dictates of authorities or reject them. Arendt argues that it was precisely this misinterpretation of Kant's moral philosophy as saying that authority is to be obeyed in every case which doomed Adolf Eichmann – a man known as the ‘architect of the Holocaust’. In her book entitled Eichmann in Jerusalem Arendt writes about Eichmann's war crimes trial,

The first indication of Eichmann's vague notion that there was more involved in this whole business then the question of the soldier’s carrying out orders that are clearly criminal in nature and intent appeared during the police examination, when he suddenly declared with great emphasis that he had lived his whole life according to Kant's moral precepts, and especially according to a Kantian
definition of duty. This was outrageous on the face of it, and also incomprehensible, since Kant's moral philosophy is so closely bound up with man's faculty of judgment, which rules out blind obedience.... Upon further questioning, he added that he had read Kant's *Critique of Practical Reason*. He then proceeded to explain that from the moment he was charged with carrying out the Final Solution\(^3\) he had ceased to live according to Kantian principles, he had known it, and that he had consoled himself with the thought that he no longer “was master of his own deeds,” that he was unable “to change anything.” What he failed to point out in court was that in this “period of crimes legalized by the state,” as he himself called it, he had not simply dismissed Kantian formula as no longer applicable, he had distorted it to read: Act as if the principal of your actions were the same as that of the legislator or of the law of the land – or, in Hans Frank's formulation of “the categorical imperative in the Third Reich,”...“act in such a way that the Fuhrer, if he knew your actions, would approve it”...” (Arendt 135-136).

All this is merely to say that it is not authority that impinges on one's power or freedom and to lash out at or resist all authority will not lead to one's becoming empowered or free. This is the lesson that we, as Peace Educators, work to pass on. While it is true, Eichmann was condemned because he had a duty to resist the authority of the Third Reich and did not, this duty stems from the fact that there was a higher moral authority at play that, if he was free, he would have and should have recognized. Thus, Eichmann had no one but himself to blame for the lack of consideration for the consequences of his actions, which were the loss of his power, his freedom, and ultimately his life. Arendt ends her book on that very note saying,

And just as you [Eichmann] supported and carried out a policy of not wanting to share the earth with the Jewish people and the people of a number of other nations – as though you and your superiors had any right to determine who should and should not inhabit the world – we find that no one, that is, no member of the human race, can be expected to want to share the earth with you. This is the reason, and the only reason, you must hang (Arendt 279).

Though this was clearly an extreme and, at that time, unprecedented case, it illustrates the logical conclusion of the line of thought that authority figures equate to the creators of

---

\(^3\) The execution of all Jewish people in German territory under Hitler's rule.
pressing needs that must be satisfied as well as the line of thought that the manipulation of social systems and the general environment will bring about peace. The main point is that Eichmann lost his power not when he was finally tried and executed, but the moment he failed to realize that his own self-motivated action could be meaningful and instead became a mere pawn under the control of others.

Up to now peace education has tended to look to social mechanisms for a solution to the problems of violence and war. The prevailing theory along these lines is that, if a network of dependence can be created among people, cultures, and societies then violence and war would come to an end because to harm or kill another would be to damage or remove something on which one is dependent. Swadener and O’Brien demonstrate their devotion to this idea saying, “We feel strongly that our present world requires a commitment to interdependence for a more just society and for the sustainability of our physical and social environments. Living in harmony with each other and the natural world have to become our collective priorities” (Swadener & O’Brien, 122). But, this is exactly the thought process that has characterized every Utopian dreamer throughout history and it has yet to come to fruition because it contains the seeds of its own failure.

First and foremost, it is to be noted that a social solution is dehumanizing. People under such conditions are, once again, associated with need which immediately frames them as objects of utility (something to be used to get what one needs) or worse of consumption. Such an idea promotes not just the perception that others are objects but also that oneself is an object since in ‘living in harmony with the natural world’ we, as humans, would construct ourselves as being the same as any other object of the natural
environment – subject only to the laws of cause and effect and not capable of any sort of self-determination. The ramifications of this kind of thinking can be seen in what is traditionally considered the oldest Western work of literature, *The Iliad*. The following statement is made in the voice of King Agamemnon.

> Often the armies brought this matter up against me – they would reveal me in public. But I am not to blame! Zeus and Fate and the Fury stalking through the night, they are the ones who drove the savage madness in my heart, that day in assembly when I seized Achilles’ prize⁴ – on my own authority, true, but what could I do?

> A god impels all things to their fulfillment:

> Ruin, eldest daughter of Zeus, she blinds us all, that fatal madness – she with those delicate feet of hers, never touching the earth, gliding over the heads of men to trap us all. She entangles one man, now another (Homer 491).

The implications of Agamemnon's speech are significant. In blaming the gods, Agamemnon is saying that his behavior was out of necessity (or at least a perceived necessity) and, as he so eloquently put it, necessity leads to a kind of ‘madness’ which ‘blinds us all’ and, if left unchecked, will in turn lead to ruin. Thus, we see the flaw inherent in basing a theory of peace on the creation of dependence. Because everyone will be dependent on everyone else there will always be a need present to both justify and compel violence. Furthermore, just as Agamemnon used both Achilles and Briseis as objects to fulfill his needs so too will people be dehumanized under such a social system. The fact that the quintessential war story of Western culture brings these points to light is not insignificant. In order to better teach peace, it is important to understand the nature of that which, by doing so, we are trying to prevent.

---

⁴ Earlier in the story, Agamemnon stole Achilles’ favorite slave Briseis causing Achilles, the greatest warrior of the Greeks, to refuse to fight against the Trojans.
The opposite of peace consists neither in acts of violence themselves nor even in the act of war. Rather, the opposite of peace is discord and discord is an inner quality, which finds its expression socially. Let us consider the definition of war as it is propounded by Clausewitz in his book *On War*.

War is nothing but a duel on a larger scale. Countless duels go to make up war, but a picture of it as a whole can be formed by imagining a pair of wrestlers. Each tries through physical force to compel the other to do his will; his *immediate* aim is to *throw* his opponent in order to make him incapable of further resistance. *War is thus an act of force to compel our enemy to do our will* (Clausewitz 13).

From this definition alone we can already deduce that war is much more a conflict of wills than of weapons. Much later in the book, Clausewitz goes on to say, “... war is simply a continuation of political intercourse, with the addition of other means. We deliberately use the phrase ‘with the addition of other means’ because we also want to make it clear that war in itself does not suspend political intercourse or change it into something entirely different” (Clausewitz 252). In other words merely acting upon another with physical force does not remove freedom by creating necessity. If this was the case, there could be no such thing as a friendly competition. As long as dialogue is still possible, one has not left the state of peace and entered into a state of discord.

Discord is only reached at the point when war ceases to be for the sake of political ends and instead becomes a mechanistic social affair. In short the opposite of peace consists in the creation of a war machine. For it is at this point that war, like a machine, becomes about the production of something necessary (or perceived to be necessary) and thus war itself becomes a necessity. The French general Napoleon fell victim to this very circumstance and expresses as much by saying, “‘My power would fall, were I not to
support it by new achievements. Conquest has made me what I am, and conquest must maintain me”” (Bonaparte as cited in Emerson 455).

Discord is a state of being prone to achieve ends by systematic means. It is a constant drive to systematically achieve that which is perceived to be necessary. For this reason, when it comes to making peace possible, our concern has less to do with the war aspect and more to do with the machine aspect of the war machine. Even in war, choice and original thought are possible and this is what preserves peace. Sun Tzu, the ancient Chinese general and author of the book *The Art of War* implies this as truth when he writes, “Hence to fight and conquer in all your battles is not supreme excellence; supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting” (Tzu 26). In other words, the ability to rise above a system, recognize options, and find alternatives to fighting is important even in war. A machine cannot think; it cannot feel; it cannot choose. The objective for a machine is the satisfaction of a need by systematic means and, in a world where people are conceived of as machines, useful only insofar as they serve a function, everyone is thusly objectified. For a machine knows that it needs and cares not how it achieves. However, the scariest part of all is that this is the state that characterizes society and all things social. Hence, wherever people live within a society they live within a war machine; not necessarily one which produces tanks and battleships, but one which produces people and institutions that themselves are meant to carry out prescribed operations with a machine-like disposition.

And having said these things, regarding discord being the opposite of peace, it now becomes apparent that, if peace is to be possible, adjustments must be made in both our theory and practice of teaching. An existential problem must be addressed in an
existential way. The mistake that plagues not only peace education but education generally is the assumption that we will find a solution to what are commonly called ‘social problems’ in systemic change. That is, the common strategy in attempting to solve social problems is to propound that the social system in which we currently live is insufficient and, therefore, must either be improved (so as to increase the efficiency with which it meets its prescribed objectives) or replace it with a different system altogether. But, it is the assumption that we have a systemic problem that is the downfall of these methods. Changing systems does not change the fact that the people affected are subjugated to an objective that appears to be necessary, it merely changes the means used to achieve the objective or shifts focus from one object to another. As I said before, we are not looking to ensure anything and this means that we are not looking for a system.

Education is geared towards the future. That is, our reasons for becoming educated always involve goals we have for the future. In an essay entitled “The Humanism of Existentialism,” Sartre writes, “For we mean that man first exists, that is, that man first of all is a being who hurls himself toward the future and who is conscious of imagining himself as being in the future” (Sartre 36). But, constant subjugation to necessity has the effect of incapacitating the imagination. In conceiving the world as necessity the future becomes yet another necessity. In other words, students lose their capability to imagine that the future can be any different than the past or present. Students say to themselves, “I needed yesterday, I need today, and I shall always need.” Thus, in justifying education by telling students that they need it in order to achieve further things that they will need, the teacher does nothing to change the prospects of a student coming from such a condition. The role of the educator, therefore, ought not be one of instituting
and managing a system, it ought to be in pointing out to the students that their future can be better, or at least different, than their past and present. In order to see how this might be done let us examine Charles Dickens's book *A Christmas Carol*.

In the story *A Christmas Carol* the main character Ebenezer Scrooge – a man who has devoted his life to making money at the expense of all else – is told by the ghost of his friend, Jacob Marley, that he will be visited by three more spirits. The spirits turn out to be the “Ghost of Christmas Past,” the “Ghost of Christmas Present,” and the “Ghost of Christmas Yet To Come”. Marley – a man who has led a life similar to Scrooge’s up to this point – informs Scrooge that he gives him this warning as part of his penance in the afterlife so that Scrooge may not repeat his mistakes. The following passage is what takes place just after Scrooge has been told to expect the three spirits.

“I – I think I'd rather not,” said Scrooge.
“Without their visit,” said the ghost, “you cannot hope to shun the path I tread. Expect the first to-morrow, when the bell tolls one.”
“Couldn't I take'em all at once, and have it over, Jacob?” hinted Scrooge.
“Expect the second on the next night at the same hour. The third upon the next night when the last stroke of twelve has ceased to vibrate. Look to see no more; and look that for your own sake, you remember what has passed between us!” (Dickens 18).

At this point we can see in Marley and Scrooge the educator and the likely reaction of the student. The first step taken in the education of Scrooge was to confront him with the fact that he has a future and that that future will affect him whether he likes it or not. Just as might be expected with any student Scrooge finds this information unpleasant and attempts to resist it. Marley, rather than justifying these events by telling Scrooge that he needs to hear these things, merely allows the inevitable lesson to occur. At the same time, however, it is no less critical that the educator be there to provide guidance. Without the educator it is far less likely that the student will find meaning in the lesson.
The first spirit to visit after the disappearance of Marley was the Ghost of Christmas Past. This ghost took Scrooge back to examine the opportunities that he missed out on in his endless drive to acquire more money. No small part of this journey was the remembrance of his girlfriend Belle. The name Belle is derived from Latin and the fact that Scrooge's girlfriend had this name is very important. In Latin the word for beauty, Bellus, and the word for war, Bellum, have the same root. Thus, in the story Belle can be seen as representative of a choice Scrooge must make between the beauty of a human relationship and the warlike drive to pursue more. Scrooge chooses the latter, but it was a choice that he had not even realized that he made. Upon the realization of his past action Scrooge is greatly distressed but has still not recognized that he has only himself to blame for his suffering and instead turns his rage against his educator.

“Remove me!” Scrooge exclaimed. “I cannot bear it!”
He turned upon the Ghost, and seeing that it looked upon him with a face, in which in some strange way there were fragments of all the faces it had shown him, wrestled with it.
“Leave me! Take me back! Haunt me no longer!” (Dickens 38).

Scrooge's outward struggle with the ghost serves to tell us what is happening within his own mind and spirit. Indeed, it is always unpleasant to have to face one's own mistakes. Hence, the role of the educator at this point is to point out that options have presented themselves in the past and to help them through the struggle that that realization may create.

The second spirit to visit is the Ghost of Christmas Present. It is at this point that a subtle change has occurred in Scrooge's attitude.

“Spirit,” said Scrooge submissively, “conduct me where you will. I went forth last night on compulsion, and I learnt a lesson which is working now. To-night, if you have aught to teach me, let me profit by it” (Dickens 41-42).
What we see here is, whereas Scrooge had initially been very resistant to beginning the educational process, after having begun to learn he is now willing to continue. Scrooge is now able to imagine himself as being better off in the future for having done the lesson and, as such, now wants to learn more. The Ghost of Christmas Present takes Scrooge to observe not only the current opportunities that he is missing out on by being so focused on getting more money but also the ways in which his behavior is affecting others. As part of this lesson, they visit the home of Scrooge's employee Bob Cratchit – a man trying to support his family on the wages Scrooge pays him and who is also trying to take care of his crippled son Tiny Tim who is struggling to survive.

“Spirit,” said Scrooge, with an interest he had never felt before, “tell me if Tiny Tim will live.”
“I see a vacant seat, replied the Ghost, “in the poor chimney corner, and a crutch without an owner, carefully preserved. If these shadows remain unaltered by the Future, the child will die.”
“No, no,” said Scrooge. “Oh no, kind Spirit say he will be spared.”
“If these shadows remain unaltered by the Future, none other of my race,” returned the Ghost, “will find him here. What then? If he is like to die, he had better do it, and decrease the surplus population.”
Scrooge hung his head to hear his own words quoted by the Spirit, and was overcome with penitence and grief.
“Man” said the Ghost, “if man you be in heart, not adamant, forbear that wicked cant until you have discovered What the surplus is, and Where it is. Will you decide what man shall live, what man shall die? It may be, that in the sight of Heaven, you are more worthless and less fit to live than millions like this poor man's child.” (Dickens 50).

Thus, at this point the role of the educator is to point out to the student the power he or she has within himself or herself to changed circumstances. It is to say to the student that the future need not be like the past and that he or she has the power to decide for himself

---

5 In the beginning of the story Scrooge told a gentleman collecting charity money that if those the gentleman was serving were going to die they ‘...had better do it and decrease the surplus population’. 
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or herself what the future holds. In the story, the Ghost reinforces this point by letting Scrooge know that his current path leads only to ruin.

“Oh man! Look here. Look, look down here!” Exclaimed the ghost. They were a boy and a girl. Yellow, meager, ragged, scowling, wolfish; but prostrate, too, in their humility....

“Spirit! Are they yours?” Scrooge could say no more.

“They are man's,” said the Spirit, looking down upon them. “And they cling to me, appealing from their fathers. This boy is Ignorance. This girl is Want. Beware them both and all of their degree, but most of all beware this boy, for on his brow I see written which is Doom, unless the writing be erased (Dickens 61).

In other words, the Spirit has now made it known to Scrooge that he can either accept or reject the information he has gained from the lesson. Scrooge can either change his ways or continue down this path of ignorance and infant want which leads to doom. Such is the choice that peace educators are obliged to present to their students.

The final Spirit to visit is the Ghost of Christmas Yet to Come. This Spirit takes Scrooge into the future to witness the logical conclusions of his behavior should he choose not to change his life. Dickens describes the Spirit and Scrooge's encounter with it as follows,

The Phantom slowly, gravely, silently, approach. When it came near him, Scrooge bent down upon his knee; for in the very air through which this Spirit moved it seemed to scatter gloom and mystery. It was shrouded in a deep black garment, which concealed its head, its face, its form, and left nothing of it visible save one outstretched hand. But for this it would have been difficult to detach its figure from the night, and separate it from the darkness by which it was surrounded. He felt that it was tall and stately when it came beside him, and that its mysterious presence filled him with solemn dread. He knew no more, for the Spirit neither spoke nor moved.

“Am I in the presence of the Ghost of Christmas Yet to Come?” Said Scrooge. The Spirit answered not, but pointed onward with its hand (Dickens 63).

In short, what we find here is that the educator's role is to confront the student with his or her future. Like the ghost itself the future is mysterious when one fails to contemplate the
consequences of his or her actions. The ghost, representing the educator, does not speak but only points the way – symbolic of the fact that a student's future cannot be dictated.

In the story, the spirit takes Scrooge to see, among other things, that after his death the fortune he spent his life acquiring was lost and that no one had a pleasant memory of him. Upon the sight of these things Scrooge finally understands the full gravity of the lesson.

“In his agony, he caught the spectral hand. It sought to free itself, but he was strong in his entreaty, and detained it. The Spirit, stronger yet, repulsed him. Holding up his hands in a last prayer to have his fate reversed, he saw an alteration in the Phantom’s hood and dress. It shrunk, collapsed and dwindled down into a bedpost” (Dickens 78).

This passage is also significant; for as critical as it was that the educator be there in the beginning it is also important that the educator not stay forever, even though it will be the tendency of the student to want to hang on. The educator must find the strength to allow the student to take what he or she has learned and make his or her own choices.

From all that was said in this section it is clear that a shift is required in our thinking about pedagogy of peace if peace is even to be a possibility. In systematically trying to bring about peace we, in fact, set up the very conditions that prevent it. When we investigate literature we find that such irony is the premise of tragedy. We need not look beyond the first sentence of *The Iliad* to confirm this point.

Rage – Goddess, sing the rage of Peleus’ son Achilles, murderous, doomed, that cost the Achaeans6 countless losses, hurling down to the House of Death so many sturdy souls, great fighters’ souls, but made their bodies carrion, feasts for the dogs and birds, and the will of Zeus was moving towards its end (Homer 77).

In other words, in his rage against his enemies, Achilles did more harm to himself than he did to them. To avoid this tragedy, it is important not to focus on needs and systems to

---

6 ‘Achaeans’ is another word for the Greeks which, incidentally, was the Army for which Achilles was supposed to be fighting.
achieve a determined end. Dickens's book *A Christmas Carol* provides us with an excellent framework that may be adopted and applied to education which allows us to escape the tragedy of competing systems. Though Dickens's story centers on a very rich man, the very rich and the very poor are victims of the same endless process of systematic acquisition which characterizes war machines and leads to their living in a state of discord. Therefore, the educational strategy is still applicable. We also see in *A Christmas Carol* the implementation of authorities not as the creators of needs or enforcers of a system but as guides for the mind and spirit. For, as Kant suggests, even in perfect freedom our lives are guided by authority.

1.5 Summation

To be effective teachers of peace we must understand that there is a difference between power and authority and that there is confusion among students regarding this important distinction. This confusion leads to an unwarranted resistance of all things representing authority in their lives, for the purpose of achieving freedom. But, the concept of freedom is as muddled in the minds of students as that of authority. Freedom represents for the students not a state in which one is best able to use power (power here meaning self-control) but a state in which all means, including violence, are able to be used to achieve necessities. Indeed, it is the constant subjugation to necessity, and the reinforcement of the subjugation to systems, that has the effect of providing justification for the very violence we are attempting to eliminate. Alternatives to such systems lie not in systemic change but rather in processes of guidance which helps students to see for themselves the consequences of their actions and behavior as well as allowing students to consciously make their own choices. Thus, we can now comprehend the full meaning of
the quotation with which we started. Just as the final Spirit in *A Christmas Carol* did not speak, it is the role of the educator not to justify needs and systems with many words but only to guide the student toward a desirable future. The basic needs of students must be met, but these needs is not the central concern of the educator.
Chapter 2

Dragons of Education: The Dangers of a Social Curriculum

There is, in both the West and the East, a tradition of metaphorically representing social entities and their leaders using the imagery of monsters and fantastic creatures not the least of which is the dragon. What is perhaps the quintessential example of the use of such metaphor in the West can be found in the Bible where the Roman Empire and its leaders (especially Nero) are portrayed as a pair of beasts empowered by a dragon.

Then I saw a beast come out of the sea with ten horns and seven heads; on its head blasphemous name[s]. The beast I saw was like a leopard, but it had feet like a bear’s, and its mouth was like a lion. To [a child recently born] the dragon gave its own power and thrown, along with great authority. I saw that one of its heads seemed to have been mortally wounded, but this mortal wound healed. Fascinated, the whole world followed after the beast (Revelation 13: 1-3).

The Bible goes on to say,

Then I saw another beast come up out of the earth; it had two horns like a lamb's but spoke like a dragon. He wielded all the authority of the first beast in its sight

---

7 The sea represents politics meaning the first beast will be or was a political figure.
8 In the previous chapter of Revelation a child (the future beast) was born and consumed by a dragon, meaning he turned evil.
9 The second beast ‘having horns like a lamb but speaking like a dragon’ is a metaphor for saying that the organization shall appear to be gentle and peaceful but shall have a malicious agenda. At the time Revelation was written this made reference to the fact that Christians could be killed for not obeying the Caesar or his empire.
and made the earth and its inhabitants worship the first beast whose mortal wound had healed (Revelation 13: 11-12).

In other words and in more general terms, it is the tendency of leaders to establish organizations with the purpose of achieving prescribed ends by forcing compliance. The justification for such activities is always that the system is for the benefit of the people. But such systems always, by necessity, seek to expand their influence; thus there is much folklore, in the West, portraying dragons as the hoarders of treasure\(^\text{10}\).

In the mythology of China the dragon, though still representing empowered rulers, plays a very different role. The dragon is a benevolent creature, master of water and rainfall and worthy of godlike status. Werner further explains the role and representations of the Chinese dragon,

In a sense the dragon is the type of man, self-controlled, and with powers that verge upon the supernatural. In China the dragon... is not a power for evil, but a beneficent being producing rain and representing the fecundating principle in nature. He is the essence of yang, or male, principle. “He controls the rain and so holds in his power prosperity and peace” (Werner 208).

Let us examine one such Chinese myth so as to better ascertain the role of the dragon in China. The myth tells the story of a man called the ‘Yellow Emperor’. According to the myth the ‘Yellow Emperor’ struggled against many monsters but always manage to end each encounter in a victorious position thereby slowly bringing order to the world (Palmer & Xiaomin). The ‘Yellow Emperor’ in the myth is assisted by a dragon at two points. The first point at which a dragon assists the Emperor is when he fights the monster ‘Kuei’ which created great storms upon the ocean.

With the winged Dragon [the Yellow Emperor] flew far out across the ocean to the Flowing Waves Mountain. Here he captured the Kuei and slew it. From its hide he made a drum upon which he beat with a thigh bone of the Kuei. The

\(^{10}\text{Wealth often being interpreted as the means by which to influence.}\)
sound resounded across five hundred miles and struck awe into all who heard (Palmer & Xiaomin 50).

The second point at which a dragon assists the Emperor is at the moment of what would have been his death.

Many were the struggles of the Yellow Emperor. Slowly, slowly did he bring the world into order. He taught the people the arts of war and the skills of peace. He was the first ruler and he followed the Tao. Always eager to understand, he sought out sages and immortals who gave him guidance. His rule was just, his laws impartial. He taught the black haired peoples filial piety and he offered Heaven obeisance and honor. From him flowed the wisdom of kingship and when the time came for his life to end, he did not die. Instead a dragon descended from heaven and mounting upon it, Huang Ti ascended, leaving his people grieving below (Palmer & Xiaomin 52).

Here the dragon is once again a source of power for an Emperor but it is a power both used and understood in a very different way from the dragons of Western apocalyptic verse.

In both examples given above, power is represented by a dragon or dragons. In the book of Revelation as well as other stories from the West the dragon represents the power given to leaders by virtue of social collectivity. That is, it represents the power a leader has, or better is allowed to have, when a collectivity is organized around a single objective. The easiest way to focus a group on a single objective is to declare the objective to be necessary in some way so that the group will no longer perceived that they have a choice when it comes to fulfilling the objective. Once the group no longer feels it has a choice in matters concerning its prescribed objectives, the fulfillment of the objective becomes a function of the identity of the group (e.g. in the time of Nero, no true Roman could also be a Christian and, therefore, Christianity was seen as counter to a Roman identity which, in turn, led to the killing of Christians for the purpose of
preserving a Roman identity among the people). But, because the interest of the leadership is power, the leadership also has an interest in seeing to it that its objective is never fulfilled; for if it ever was to be fulfilled the leader’s power would cease to be. Thus, we can see the connection of the metaphor of the Western dragon to the war machine. The dragon, representing the power of collectivity, focuses a group on acquiring or achieving something deemed to be necessary which, in turn, feeds an endless system of production on the part of the institution itself. Such is the reason that imperialism has a negative connotation in the West.

In China, as we have seen, the power that the dragon represents is very different from the Western concept. For the Chinese, as exemplified by the myth mentioned earlier, the dragon is a protector and ally of the people. The dragon does not seek power over people but rather helps to make it possible for people to exercise power in their own right. The monsters fought by the ‘Yellow Emperor’ in the myth represent the forces of necessity which are to be overcome if a peaceful world is to exist. The dragon that assists the ‘Yellow Emperor’ represents not power to control others but rather a power over the self. Thus, the peace that was brought about in the world by the Emperor’s effort was not an absence of war (as per the relevant quotation the Emperor was skilled at the arts of war and taught them to his people), but an absence of the constraints of necessity. Indeed, what the Emperor wanted was to make it possible for others to have the same ability to exercise power over their own lives. The fact that the ‘Yellow Emperor’ does not die but

\[11\] The Roman historian Tacitus tells us, “[The Christians] were a detestable sect, which owed its name to Chrestus, who in the reign of Tiberius, suffered under Pontius Pilate. Suppressed for a while, this dangerous superstition, soon revived and spread not only in Judea but even in the city of Rome, the common cesspool into which everything hateful and abominable flows like a torrent from all parts of the world.” (Tacitus as cited in Ward, Heichelheim, & Yeo 322)
is taken away by a dragon can be seen as a metaphor for his fond remembrance by the people for whom he made self-determination possible.

Though the relevancies is of the story are many, the main point is that we should think very carefully about the kind of power we want in our lives. The fact that these stories have their origins in different cultures is not insignificant; it suggests to us that bound up with the exercise of power is a cultural conception of what power is. Such cultural concepts are of enormous consequence, especially when it comes to peace education. Institutions, as they currently exist in this country, often do not recognize and, in some cases, are designed in opposition to diverse cultural ideas and even choice itself. This section shall, therefore, address the question of how culture and society play into peace education from a theoretical perspective. That is, we shall examine the difference between what constitutes a culture versus a society as well as the current thinking with regard to culture and society in relation to peace and peace education. Once this is accomplished we shall logically deduce the implications of both the current conceptions as well as the new ones to the end that we shall arrive at a strong basis for future methodology.

2.1 Culture and Society

Let us examine definitions of culture and society as they are set forth by Macionis, “**Culture** is the values, beliefs, behavior, and material objects that together form a people's way of life.... **society** refers to people who interact in a defined territory and share culture. Neither society nor culture could exist without the other.” (Macionis 35). But when we investigate these definitions we find that they, in fact, tell us nothing about what culture or society are. Instead what we have is a circular formulation rather
than definition; for, as is admitted above, each needs the other for its very existence and, therefore, neither can be defined without the other. The problem here being that such a formulation leaves it unclear both that we are dealing with separate entities when we speak of culture and society and how these entities differ.

Furthermore, in framing culture as being in some way inseparable from society, Macionis implies that we, as humans, are fully determined by social behavior. That is, under Macionis’s formulation of culture as being inseparably connected with the social, all individual and original thought or action becomes impossible. Let us examine another statement. “The cultures of the United States and Japan both stress achievement and hard work, but members of our society value individualism more than the Japanese, who are more traditional and group-oriented” (Macionis 35). What might be easily missed is that what is said above regarding individualism in American society is a contradiction in terms. It is impossible for a society, which denotes social behavior, to be individualist which would involve thought or action absent or transcending social interaction. In short, stated differently, Macionis would be suggesting that it is the tendency of the people of the United States to behave as individuals because others in the society do so and pass on the value of doing so. The obvious problem being that, if such behavior is the result of the mere fact that others are behaving the same way, it is not an individual choice.

Finally, given his conflation of culture and society, Macionis essentially states that society is a, or perhaps the, natural state of human beings, yet he offers no defense or justification for this claim.

No way of life is “natural” to humanity, even though most people around the world views their own behavior that way. What is natural to our species is the capacity to create culture. Every other form of life, from ants to zebras, behaves in fixed, species-specific ways. To a world traveler, the enormous diversity of
human life stands out in contrast to the behaviors of say, cats, which is the same everywhere.... But the creative power of humans far exceeds that of any other form of life. In short, only humans rely on culture rather than instinct to ensure the survival of their kind (Macionis 35).

In other words, humans are not bound by biology to behave according to patterns yet patterns of behavior are perceptible. That is, cultures are unique to the extent that each is different from all others but the individuals who make up any given culture are not unique to the extent that their culture has formed a society unto itself. Moreover, the formation of society is, according to the logic here, necessary since society is a function of culture and culture, as Macionis states, is based on survival (necessity). But, the fact that sociologists such as Macionis are unable to posit any explanation for such cultural patterns without reliance on social mechanisms does not mean that society is the or even a natural state of human existence. This assumption, in addition to being faulty, can be destructive and dangerous under certain circumstances. Therefore, it is my claim that sociologists currently misinterpret the meaning of culture and society and that a new framework may be helpful if we are to increase our understanding of these topics, especially insofar as they are related to peace and peace education.

What distinguishes culture from society is the reasoning behind the performance of actions as opposed to behaviors. It is true cultures are characterized by common patterns in activities. Each culture does certain things in certain ways but it is the intrinsic motivation for these common methods and practices which is the crucial factor in the distinction between culture and society. The difference that contemporary sociology seems to have missed is that in culture, though common patterns exist, the motivation for the methodology and practice of activities is something other than the commonality itself; whereas in society the motivation is the commonality. The important point here is that
though, activities take place within certain groups of people the mere fact that these activities are common does not necessarily suggest that the type of relationship often posited by sociologists as the cause of the commonality (i.e. the ‘social relationship’) is actually at work in every case. Aside from the attribution of one cause as being the explanation for all cultural activity being a curious habit for a field that stresses the recognition of diversity, such an attribution means that sociologists may be assuming or even creating societies where there are none.

For clarification a hypothetical example of what I have stated may be helpful. Let us posit two cultures (culture A and culture B) each using a different method for making fire. Culture A’s preferred method for making fire is to rub two sticks together until friction provides enough heat to light a fire. Culture B’s preferred method is to hold a lens in direct sunlight over a pile of kindling until the lens focuses enough light gathering enough heat to make a fire. Let us now suppose that an outsider were to come across a member of culture A attempting to make a fire and ask, “why do you light fires in such a manner?” The member of culture A then responds, “I light fires in this way because sticks are abundant in this area and they are as useful an implement for making fire as any other.” Let us further suppose that the outsider asks the same question to many other members of culture A can receives a similar answer from each one and then continues on to culture B. The outsider, witnessing a member of culture B attempting to light a fire, asks the same question getting the response, “I light fires in this way because everyone else in this area lights fires in this way.” We now suppose that the outsider receives a similar answer to the question from many other members of culture B. In the case of culture A the outsider could reasonably conclude that, though there is commonality in the
way fires are made in culture A and, the commonality is not the result of a society or social interaction. By contrast, in the case of culture B the outsider could reasonably conclude that culture B has formed a society which governs the making of fires in a certain way because the reasoning given for the making of fires by one method as opposed to all others is the mere fact that that method is common to all other members of the group. However, where the outsider to make the mistake, which I argue sociologists have made, of not recognizing a difference between culture and society he or she would conclude that the members of both culture A and culture B were behaving out of social influence when this may not, in fact, be the case.

One might object to the above formulation on linguistic grounds claiming that language communication is a function of society. After all, if it was not for the fact that everyone in a given culture speaks the same language the people of that culture would be unable to communicate. However, the society/culture distinction is applicable even when considering language. For instance, the claim that, “I speak English because I wish to communicate with the other English speakers around me” is not the same as the claim “I speak English because everyone else around me speaks English.” Though it may be true that everyone else around a given person may speak the same language, in the former claim the justification for the speaking of English is a desire on the part of the speaker rather than the mere fact of the language’s commonality to the culture as is the case in the latter claim.

Now that we have established the distinction between society and culture we must consider the implications that this distinction or lack thereof, has for education and in particular peace education. Unfortunately, rather than recognizing a difference between
culture and society the current trend in for many sociologists is to look to ‘collective action’ as a solution to ‘social problems’. Another contemporary sociologist, Sullivan, even go so far as to define a ‘social problem’, in part, as being that which can be solved by ‘collective action’. “A **social problem** exists when *an influential group defines a social condition as threatening its values; when the condition affects a large number of people; and when the condition can be remedied by collective action*” (Sullivan 2). But, this definition ignores any possibility of personal individuality and instead frames the world in which we live as essentially being one of competing social power interests. This claim is further reinforced by Sullivan's definition of power. “**Power** is the ability of one group to realize its will, even in the face of resistance from other groups” (Sullivan 5). The point here being that sociology has conceived social interactions as a basis of all human activity and consequently, as pointed out previously, as defined power as only existing in society and not possible at the level of individuals.

The implications of this framework for education are profound. In saying that ‘social problems’ can be solved by ‘collective action’ some sociologists have defeated any practical purpose for education. Whereas education involves original thought and an active pursuit of knowledge, in an entirely socialized world, such as sociology already purports to exist, education becomes entirely devoid of practicality because all that is required to solve problems is that everyone behave as everyone else. The previously mentioned sociological arguments fail to realize that ‘social problems’ are, in fact, problems stemming from the very existence of society rather than objective isolated problems of some sort of natural human state. Hence, a distinction between culture and society is required not only to recognize phenomena previously unrecognizable because
of our tendency to think only in terms of the social but also to make the act of educating both practically useful and possible. Thus, when sociological methods and ideas are applied to education they defeat the very meaning of the undertaking.

When it comes to the possibility of peace through educational means specifically, sociological methods and the existence of society are especially hindering. The social, being the basis for both sociology and society, is at its root based on necessity (which, as discussed previously is not a new or educational experience). In fact, the social relationship is one in which not only the material conditions of the culture or group are interpreted to be necessary but also the specific reactions to material necessities are perceived or actually made to be necessary. In other words, often wherever a society or social relationship regarding certain conditions has been formed the individuals involved simply forget or are otherwise unaware that they have a capacity to choose their reactions and instead rely on the behavior of the group to determine their reactions. Arendt writes in *The Human Condition*,

> The social viewpoint is identical...with an interpretation that takes nothing into account but the life process of mankind, and within its frame of reference all things become objects of consumption. Within a completely "socialized mankind," whose sole purpose would be the entertaining of the life process – and this is the unfortunate quite utopian ideal that guides Marx's theories – the distinction between labor and work\(^{12}\) would have completely disappeared; all work would have become labor because all things would be understood, not in their worldly, objective quality, but as results of living labor power and functions of life process (Arendt 89).

The point here is that when human interaction is based solely on necessity, which is common to all, the specific reactions to these necessities also become necessary and

\(^{12}\) Arendt makes a distinction between these overarching human conditions: labor which is all activities linked to the basic survival of an organism, work which is all activities which produce lasting objects in the world the proper uses of which do not involve their consumption or destruction and constant replacement, and action which is appearance to other human beings with no material product but which, nonetheless, has meaning.
consequently thought and the skills of thinking become irrelevant because the single-minded objective of the group is a constant satisfaction of necessity. As a result societies either impose negative consequences for non-conformity or lead people to believe that non-conformity will otherwise lead to negative consequences because to not fall in line with the objectives of a given society is to threaten its power structure which is perceived by the members of the society to be a threat to their lives since those in society, being subjected to necessity, are unable to conceive of their lives without that social structure. This has special relevance for peace because in society, which is focused on necessity, violence is always perceived to be justifiable because necessity is omnipresent and need, as we have seen before, is always capable of justifying violence, and the more urgent or desperate the need for greater the violence that is justifiable. Therefore, wherever people exist in society and especially where social mechanisms are used in education violence can and will be seen as an acceptable option for the achievement of objectives. In short, socialization gives rise to war machines.

In the educational theories and practices of this country, both historically and currently, we can detect a latent curriculum which is present as a result of the application of sociology and social strategies to the educational process. Healy writes,

No one knows exactly what proportion of the ultimate differences between mental abilities come from differences in types of environmental input during the years when the brain is being encouraged – or not encouraged – to practice and master different types of skills. It is clear, however, that the closer the culture of the home (or the primary care center) is to that of the school, the easier the child's adjustment is likely to be (Healy 247).

Though she does not distinguished between society and culture and when she uses the word culture here she is actually speaking of society or the social as I have defined it, she is, at some level, aware that success in school is related not to a student's ability to think
creatively or originally but rather his or her ability to do as everyone else in school is doing or defined as being a behavioral need. In other words, the more acclimated a student is to a social environment that defines as needs the same things that schools defined as needs, the more likely a student is to be successful in school. When it comes to students who are considered ‘disadvantaged’ (such as the students I and my classmates and colleagues have taught) the reason that they are disadvantaged is not a result of any sort of mental, biological, or cultural inferiority but a disparity between two social systems (i.e. that of the school and that of the society from which the disadvantaged student comes). Again, Healy says,

> Why, specifically, do so many “learning disadvantaged” children have difficulty adapting to the demands of traditional schooling? Many become school dropouts during the first week of first grade – although they usually continue to occupy a desk (and a great deal of the teacher's physical and mental energy) for several more alienating and unproductive years. In the meanwhile, the growing dichotomy between their level of skill and the demands of the school interfere with the entire mechanism of teaching and learning, and their poorly suppressed rage many erupt in externally or personally destructive forms (Healy 247).

What we have, therefore, is discord caused by the existence of societies, which are one and the same with subjugation to necessity as has been discussed, which manifests itself in the form of rage or violence when societies compete. That is, students who are already subjected to one set of needs, defined by their society, come to school only to find that another set of needs is being defined for them and the most convenient or perhaps the only way they feel they can escape the constant subjugation to the needs defined by others is to rebel violently. This situation is further complicated by the fact that certain societies may define resistance to the dominant culture as a need and thus students from such societies may resist the school environment simply because school is associated with the dominant culture. In any case, what we have in such cases is a conflict of two
rigidly developed social systems – two war machines each focused in their own way on production and consumption of things perceived to be necessary – that compete for dominance in certain areas using schools as their battlefields. Neither system has been able to think beyond its own perceived needs and each has defined the needs defined by the other as contrary to its own.

As it stands schools have created societies that are counter to the very goals they purport to be attempting to achieve. Whether students are ‘advantaged’ or not, because they are living in ever more socialized communities, they are choosing not to think for themselves and are coming into schools that are failing to enable original thought by virtue of the social structure that the schools themselves enforce. That is, whether a student comes to school prepared to accept or reject the school system, schools are not providing an environment that is not ruled by necessity and are, therefore, not providing students with new experiences. It is this constant subjugation to perceived necessities that fosters discord in the hearts and minds of students who wish to escape it and those who cannot find other alternatives resort to violence. Healy writes,

If we want high school graduates who can analyze, solve problems, and create new solutions, adults will have to devote the time to showing them how....

It appears that schools will have to assume a larger share of this responsibility. Students from all walks of life now come with brains poorly adapted for the mental habits that teachers have traditionally assumed. In the past, deep wells of language and mental persistence had already been filled for most children by experiences at home; an educational priming of the pumps made learning flow with relative ease. Now teachers must fill the gaps before attempting to draw “skills” from brains that lack the underlying cognitive and linguistic base (Healy 277).

But as long as schools continue to be set up on sociological models the phenomenon of which Healy speaks will only continue to worsen. Indeed, students cannot think outside the bounds of society until they have experienced and un-socialized environment that
allows for original thought, and similarly peace will not be possible until necessity, which justifies violence, is transcended or, somehow, taken out of the equation altogether. In short, the challenge is to create school environments that do not lead students to believe that life is all about necessity and this means that culture, not society, is the relevant base. To base education on culture would be to truly and more appropriately recognized diversity and allow for creative thinking. Whereas society, by constantly focusing on what is common to all, by its nature does not recognize diversity, an education based on culture would allow differences in the thought to exist and would promote the development of new ideas which would originate with the students. A clearer picture of what such a cultural education would entail will emerge as this thesis continues.

2.2 Hegel, Marx, and the Problems Thereof

In order to satisfactorily imagine education as a cultural rather than a social endeavor it is important that we come to understand that education requires the acknowledgment that human life can be, and ideally, is about more than satisfying necessity. To come to this understanding we will investigate the work of those who have either denied this acknowledgment or who have failed to comprehend its momentous significance. By exploring the weaknesses of the ideas of previous thinkers we will gain a better sense of how culture is related to a life not subjugated to necessity (freedom) and why both ought to be realized in education. That which should be recognized by educators, if they are to acknowledge the possibility of human mental transcendence of necessity, has previously been referred to by many terms including God, spirit, and soul, though it is not the religious nature of such things beyond necessity and, indeed, beyond the entire material world that is of interest to us here so much as the consequences that
some such thing, religiously meaningful or not, could have for educational processes any particular processes that could lead to peace. Just to be clear, I am neither backing nor criticizing any religious tradition nor am I intending to make a religious point by using any of the aforementioned terms.

Let us begin this inquiry by examining the ideas of G.W.F. Hegel, a philosopher whose work constitutes the basis for much present-day social thought. According to Hegel, the history of humanity is based on a dynamic of conflict. Two men fight with each other until just before one kills the other the one who is subdued proposes a deal to the victor saying that if the victor will allow him to live he shall become the victor’s slave. The victor is henceforth known as the ‘lord’ and the subdued man is now the ‘bondsman’. At first it would appear that the lord holds the power in the relationship, but as time goes on the power shifts. Hegel writes in his book *Phenomenology of Spirit*,

The [lord’s] essential nature is to exist only for himself; he is the pure, essential action in this relationship, while the action of the bondsman is impure and unessential. But for recognition proper the moment is lacking, that what the lord does to the other he also does to himself, and what the bondsman does to himself he should also do to the other. The outcome is a recognition that is one-sided and unequal (Hegel 116).

In other words, it is the tendency of the lord to become dependent on the bondsman and once this occurs it is the bondsman, not the lord, who holds the power in the relationship because the lord's needs are only met through the bondsman. It is this dynamic expanded to the scale of entire groups of people which is, Hegel suggests, the true nature of human existence.

By the above formulation people have no choice but to participate in society. Everyone is either a lord or a bondsman and the dynamic created by this fact is what forms social order. The lord, being dependent on the bondsman, must not do away with
him and the bondsman, in order to keep from being killed, must always keep the lord dependent upon him. In this way the lives of both are ruled by necessity; for each is concerned only with the preservation of his life. It is upon the order created by this relationship that our rights and ethics are based. In his “Philosophy of Right” Hegel writes,

In this way the ethical substantial order has attained its right, and its right its validity. That is to say, the self-will of the individual has vanished together with his private conscience which had claimed independence and opposed itself to the ethical substance. For, when his character is ethical, he recognizes as the end which moves him to act the universal which is itself unmoved but is disclosed in its specific determination as rationality actualized (Hegel 396).

That is, the necessity inherent in the social order is what compels ethical behavior and is that in relation to which humans have rights. Hegel's theory is in stark contrast to those of the social contract theorists (Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau being the most notable) for whom membership in society is, or was at one time, a choice on the part of the individual. Westphal, a Hegel scholar explains,

Hegel's objections to the social contract tradition are merely suggested in the Philosophy of Right... Most important, the social contract misinterprets the nature of our membership in society. Our membership in society is inevitable, necessary, and constitutive of much of our character, whereas the social contract models our membership on an elective association of otherwise independent individuals... (Westphal 242).

In this way, Hegel claims, the history of the entire world progressed as a consequence of our subjugation to necessity and hence our necessary participation in society. In yet a third work, Philosophy of History Hegel tells us,

That the History of the World, with all its changing senses which its annals present, is this process of development and the realization of Spirit – this is the true Theodiceae, the justification of God in History. Only this insight can reconcile Spirit with the History of the World – viz. that what has happening everyday, is not only not “without God” but is essentially His Work (Hegel 451).
This is how, according to Hegel, not only society but the very being of human reality exists. Thus, for Hegel, the social is the very nature of human reality.

Hegel’s social theory leaves us with two significant problems regarding the achievement of peace by educational means. First, Hegel sets up society as itself being based on discord. According to Hegel's formulation, the two men who commence to fight, and who eventually become the lord and the bondsman, do so because each perceives the other as a threat to his own life precisely to the extent that each recognizes the other to be a being who needs like himself. In Phenomenology of Spirit Hegel tells us, “... just as each stakes his own life, so each must seek the other’s death, for it values the other no more than itself; the essential being is present to it in the form of an ‘other’, it is outside of itself and must rid itself of its self-externality” (Hegel 114). But, such desperate need, which as discussed always justifies the use of violence, is a perpetual source of animosity for the members of a society. In short, a society based on the lord/bondsman dynamic is one in which the members are set up to have a constant propensity to use violence and feel justified in doing so.

Second, though Hegel mentions ‘Spirit’ and ‘God’ throughout his works, he refers to them not as being anything of higher significance than necessity but rather as the foundation for necessity. ‘Spirit’, as Hegel conceives it, is not anything uniquely human but is, instead, the essence of the fact that our world subjects us to necessity which is, in turn, the basis for society. Again in Philosophy of History we can ascertain that ‘Spirit’ is the essence of necessity where Hegel says, Spirit is self-contained existence (Bei-sich-selbst-seyn). Now this is Freedom exactly. For if I am dependent, my being is referred to something else which I am not; I cannot exist independently of something external. I am free, on the contrary, when my existence depends upon myself. This self-contained existence of Spirit
is none other than self-consciousness – consciousness of one's own being.... It involves an appreciation of its own nature, as also an energy enabling it to realize itself; to make itself *actually* that which it is *potentially*. According to this abstract definition it may be said of Universal History that it is the exhibition of Spirit in the process of working out the knowledge of that which it is potentially (Hegel 16-17).

However, ‘Spirit’ as ‘self-contained existence’ is not freedom, as Hegel mistakenly asserts, but is in fact bondage since it is, according to its own construction contained – the contradiction being that that which is contained is not free. Hence, we cannot understand ‘Spirit’ in its self-containment, as anything other than that which is held within, or more correctly, holds itself within the bounds of necessity. God, for Hegel, is simply the being or force that initializes this necessity as the structure of reality as is evidenced by the quotation from the *Philosophy of History* which appears prior to the one cited in this paragraph. The point here is that Hegel’s conceptions of ‘Spirit’ and God do nothing to give us a sense that life has meaning beyond necessity and are, hence, worthless as educational constructs as well as a basis for peace. Furthermore, by Hegel’s formulation culture, as an independent entity, is impossible since all human activity is, of necessity, based on the social relationship.

The social theory posited by Hegel was adopted and modified to form the basis for Marx’s social theory. The lord and bondsman relationship, for example, was explicitly expanded to the level of entire communities, states, and other collectivities and became, in Marx's work, the two oppose classes – the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. In addition, whereas for Hegel, ‘Spirit’ was the guiding entity for human activity, in Marx's work ‘Spirit’ is replaced by economy. It is precisely this replacement of ‘Spirit’ (which has its foundation in God or religion) with economy (which is founded on physical matter) which gives Marx's theory it's referent as dialectical materialism. Hence, the two
aforementioned classes are distinguished according to the amount of material to which each has access, and all of human existence is characterized by the struggle over material between the two classes. Karl Marx and his partner Frederick Engels write in the “Manifesto of the Communist Party”, “The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles” (Marx & Engels 273).

Marx bases his theory on Hegel's dialectic but distinctly denies that human activity has any significance beyond materiality. Marx even goes so far as to say that his theory is not atheistic but something entirely removed from any semblance of theism altogether. Marx writes in his “Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844”,

\[ \text{Atheism}, \text{ as the denial of this inessentiality, no longer has any meaning, for atheism is a negation of God, and postulates the existence of man through this negation; but socialism as socialism no longer stands in any need of such a mediation. It proceeds from the practically and theoretically sensuous consciousness of man and of nature as the essence} \] (Marx 92-93).

The reason for the denial of theism and indeed of all religious significance of human activity is that, for Marx, religion is only a distraction from the real problems of human existence which are material in nature. Marx writes in his “Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right”, “Religious suffering is at the same time an expression of real suffering and a protest against real suffering. Religion is the site of the oppressed creature, the sentiment of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people” (Marx 54). In other words, oppressed people turn to this drug-like construction called religion for the relief of their suffering only because they are unable to remove the cause of their suffering in the material world. Thus, what Marx has done is to eliminate any possibility of human life being about anything other than physical reality. That is, whereas, given a more conservative reading of Hegel's philosophy it may
have been possible for one to focus on the more immaterial aspects of existence, Marx has framed human existence entirely within the physical world.

Even ignoring the issues that would be inherent in Marx's theory as a result of its being based on Hegel's theory, the Marxist tradition is still a problematic underpinning for both peace and its achievement through education. Marx's theory reduces all human relations to economic relations (giving us such modern terms as socio-economic and social capital), and education too is so reduced. That is, in Marx's materialistic view, knowledge is merely a commodity like any other commodity and the educated among us are simply the owners – the bourgeois class – in relation to knowledge. Hence, the job of a teacher, in a Marxist world, would not be to assist students in becoming able to perform actions for themselves but would rather be to equally distribute the commodity of knowledge, which is itself only valuable insofar as it promotes the satisfaction of material necessity. Therefore, as Marx would have it, education would not be about encouraging students to be self reliant in any way, which would be consistent with its Latin roots. “The word “education” comes from the Latin word educare, to draw or lead out” (Harris 14). Instead, education would be more about putting in, rather than ‘drawing out’ and consequently learning would be about taking in and here we have the parallel with the necessity-based activities of production and consumption.

Marx's theory represents nothing less than an attempt to perform the monumental task of out-producing necessity. His vision was of a society where labor was so efficient that necessity would cease to exist, leaving nothing but time for people to pursue their own interests. In “The German Ideology” Marx criticizes the division of labor in the
society of his time for limiting people's activities to what he thought to be an unreasonable degree.

For as soon as the distribution of labor comes into being, each man has a particular, exclusive sphere of activity, which is forced upon him and from which he cannot escape. He is a hunter, a fisherman, a shepherd, or a critical critic and must remain so if he does not want to lose his means of livelihood; while in communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticize after dinner, just as I have a mind without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, shepherd or critic (Marx 160).

In other words, under communism, society would become so productive that necessities would be instantly satisfied so that no one would have to be enslaved to any system relying upon a division of labor. However, Marx failed to realize that the creation of such a colossal surplus of consumable resources is simply a practical impossibility. That is, Marx did not realize that which the philosopher Francis Bacon had discerned in the year 1612. Bacon writes in his essay “Of Riches”, “Of great riches there is no real use, except it be in the distribution; the rest is but conceit. So saith Solomon: where much is there are many to consume it; and what hath the owner but the sight of it with his eyes?” (Bacon 146). In this quotation, Bacon beautifully sums up the problem that faces Marx’s theory. In a world where economics governs all human interaction, any ‘riches’, that is, any surplus of material must immediately be distributed to be consumed by the populace. The reason for this phenomenon, though hinted at by Bacon and his quotation of Solomon, is further and more precisely explained by Arendt in *The Human Condition*.

Whatever labor produces is meant to be fed into the human life process almost immediately, and this consumption, regenerating the life process, produces – or rather, reproduces – new “labor power,” needed for the further sustenance of the body. From the viewpoint of the exigencies of the life process itself, the “necessity of subsisting” as Locke put it, laboring and consuming follow each
other so closely that they almost constitute one and the same movement, which is hardly ended when it must be started all over again (Arendt 99-100).

This means, where needs are taken to be the collective concern, accumulation is unable to occur because necessity is capable of consuming an infinite amount of resources. Simply put, the faster things are produced the faster they are consumed. All this is significant for education because, according to Marx’s theory, the elimination of class distinction is only possible with the elimination of poverty and social mechanisms, including education, would be directed towards this impossible objective. But, this objective being impossible, education, though it may be an asset to individuals wishing to escape poverty, cannot be conceived as the answer to all poverty or the eliminator of necessity. Nor is it advisable to see education as merely another mechanistic process of production. Doing so, once again, only treats students as objects and creates conditions where an omnipresent need can be used to justify violence.

Yet another problem with Marx's theory is that, like Hegel's theory, it posits the natural state of human existence as being essentially one of conflict with other humans and this fact alone will prevent the existence of peace if the theory is entertained in any sort of practical manner. Whereas, for Hegel, the struggle takes on the character of a physical struggle between two people who want to kill each other, for Marx the struggle is between two classes which struggle over material necessities. The fact that Marx takes struggle to be the natural state of human existence is evident in many places throughout his work including the previously quoted passage from the “Manifesto of the Communist Party” where he suggests that history is the ‘history of class struggle’. Curiously Marx recognizes, at some level, that basing a society on struggle cannot lead to peace. Marx poses the following rhetorical question in an essay entitled “The Coming Upheaval”,
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“Indeed, is it at all surprising that a society founded on the opposition of classes should culminate in brutal “contradiction,” the shock of body against body, as its final denouement?” (Marx 219). However, though Marx's project is about eliminating the struggle, at no point does he suggest to us that the basis for human history is or ought to be about anything other than the struggle for and consumption of material. In fact, in “The German Ideology” Marx tells us that human consciousness and in fact a human being itself is nothing other than continued physical existence. “Consciousness can never be anything else than conscious existence, and the existence of men is their actual life-process” (Marx 154). This would mean, then, that even if it was possible to cease struggling for material, doing so would mean the end of one's humanity since in no longer having to perpetuate the life-process, by Marx's formulation, one is no longer human. Thus, what we are faced with is a perpetual state of struggle on the one hand and nonexistence as humans (or even as conscious beings) on the other. When faced with such a choice it only stands to reason that a rational person would choose anything but nonexistence even if that means a life that consists entirely of the violent activity of struggling. Again the point is that when the necessity of existence is the constant focus of all, peace is not possible.

The nature of Marx's theory would prevent the development of any sort of lasting individuality or efficacy on the part of students, when applied to education. The fact that the communist system Marx designs has its roots and its justification in necessity sets up the system itself as a necessity without which students would come to believe they could not exist or lead a meaningful life. That is, students would come to believe that they have no control over or choice in their own activities and this is what makes Marx's theory the
ultimate expression of the social relationship. Everyone does the same thing as everyone else because, of necessity, they must or believes they must do so. Or, better stated, it is the common membership in the group called humanity that necessitates and compels all people to do the same thing. Once again, under such a limiting social system, culture, as separate from society, would not be possible. Marx's conception of humans as being merely a ‘life-process’ defeats all diversity and forces everyone to participate only in the activity of staying alive. Thus, in its detachment from spirit, Marx's theory leaves only necessity to guide people's activities and thus it is neither empowering, nor freeing, nor respectful of diversity but is rather in many ways the opposite of all these. These are the reasons that both Marx and Hegel's theories are unfit as a basis for both peace and education.

2.3 A Cultural Education

Having thus far apprehended that many current theories and strategies applied by social science are mistaken in the assumptions on which they rest and that using the social itself as a tool for education is, in many ways, dangerous because of its tendency towards production, dehumanization, and unjust classification of people, we must now consider what a cultural education would involve as well as the affect that a more cultural education might have on students. In the consideration of these things it will be important to discern just what the foci of the goals of education ought to be if they are not to be about or in relation to the social or, more basically, necessity. That is, we must come to understand what things beyond and rather than necessity and social control should be addressed if we are to avoid the perpetuation of violence and the perceived irrelevance of education. Once these new foci of our goals have been brought to light it will also be
important to anticipate what the capabilities of a person who has experienced this new educational process might be.

Yielding to the force of necessity or to social pressures is not an empowering learning activity on the part of the student and so, methods that rely on such force or pressure teach nothing to students other than, perhaps, that they are powerless in the face of necessity or society. Our educational philosophy and praxis, if education is to empower students, must recognize and address the fact that all people have a capacity for self-motivation which goes beyond the material world and any conceivable social coercion. The treating of education and of any other highly political field as though they can be reduced to a science such as physics or chemistry ignores the essential fact that such fields address people and not objects. To gain a sense of how to properly address the personal quality of education and, incidentally, that which is what allows for the being of culture, we shall investigate what Aristotle called ‘the soul’. That is, in order to be effective educators it is crucial to come to understand that which by educating educators are truly affecting and that is not a physical body but something of an altogether different existence.

Let us inquire into the existence of this immaterial quality (described by some as spirit or soul) and the relation that the act of education has to it. Aristotle describes this quality which she calls the soul as follows, “...it is the sole by or with which primarily we live, perceive, and think: – it follows that the soul must be a ratio or formidable essence, not a matter or subject” (Aristotle, On the Soul, Book II, 414a 13-14). Soul, therefore, not being ‘a matter or subject’ cannot be manipulated as though it is. Rather, soul, as that which allows living, perceiving, and thinking, activities that are unpredictable and
uncontrollable to anyone other than the person in which these capacities lie, is to be recognized through guidance on the part of the educator. That is, the role of the educator, rather than to systematically pursue the achievement of objectives with regard to material or to produce a certain kind of person as though he or she were producing a commodity, is to attempt to allow and encourage a student to realize his or her own potential for original action.

The task now becomes to discern in what way and educator is best to understand his or her role and thereby to reach students effectively. Once again Aristotle provides us with some useful tools for conceptualizing this role. Let us examine this insightful though problematically worded passage in which Aristotle describes the process by which the soul can be strengthened or ‘nourished’.

The process of nutrition involves three factors (a) what is fed, (b) that wherewith it is fed, (c) what does the feeding; of these (c) is the first soul, (a) the body which has the sole in it, (b) the food. But since it is right to call things after the ends they realize, and the end of this soul is to generate another being like that in which it is, the first soul ought to be named the reproductive soul. The expression (b) ‘wherewith it is that’ is ambiguous just as in the expression ‘wherewith the ship is steered’; that may mean either (i) the hand or (ii) the rudder, i.e. either (i) what is moved and sat in movement, or (ii) what is merely moved. We can apply this analogy here if we recall that all food must be capable of being digested, and that what produces digestion is warmth; that is why everything that has soul in it produces warmth” (Aristotle, On the Soul, Book II, 416b 20-29).

Though, for Aristotle, the soul is inseparably connected to the body and is, therefore, susceptible to the same needs and desires of the body (e.g. food and reproduction), what he tells us here is, nonetheless, important when we consider it in relation to education. If we consider the soul, not in its relation to the body, but in itself as that which enables original thought, the analogy given here is applicable not in the sense that the soul must be attended to in the same way as the body, but in the sense that the person in which a
given soul resides is responsible for its expression in the form of his or her actions. That is, each person is responsible for the strengthening of his or her soul by means of education for the sake of being able to act in good and well thought-out ways. Hence the role of the educator is to provide an environment in which the student is most likely to realize the existence and capacities of his or her soul and, by virtue of authority, to assist the student in discovering the best application of these capacities.

When speaking of the soul itself Aristotle's formulation becomes a slightly more metaphorical construct but one that is useful in understanding the dynamic between the educator and student. In thinking about the soul itself, we can change the wording of these three factors, outlined Aristotle, to reflect those things which may be beneficial for the strengthening, not of a physical body, but of a person's interests, abilities, imagination, decisions and any other immaterial factor that plays into a person's capacity for thought and action. In this way ‘(a) what is fed’ becomes the soul of the student, ‘(b) that wherewith it is fed’ becomes that wherewith the student soul is strengthened, and ‘(c) what does the feeding’ becomes the educator. To be clear this is not to suggest that education ought to be an endless process like feeding the body but rather only that the soul must be addressed if it is to realize its potential. Nor again is this to say that education is merely a system of production or, as Aristotle suggests reproduction, as a factory might produce or reproduce cars. Instead, Aristotle's formulation, when applied to education, suggests that the educator's role is to demonstrate action in the hope that the student will learn how to take action himself or herself. Aristotle writes,

As we have said, what has the power of sensation is potentially like what the perceived object is actually; that is, while at the beginning of the process of its being acted upon the two interacting factors are dissimilar, at the end the one
acted upon is assimilated to the other and is identical in quality with it (Aristotle, On the Soul, Book II, 418a 3-6).

Taken in the context of education, Aristotle’s statement means that in order to educate the educator acts upon the soul of a student, not to produce another educator like himself or herself, but rather to assist the student in learning how to become a self-motivated actor. This is why, as Aristotle tells us in the quotation from the previous paragraph, the second factor ‘(b) that wherewith [the body] is fed’ which has become that wherewith the student's soul is strengthened, is ambiguous. Where the educator to decide once and for all what education should consist of he or she would destroy the project; for at this point education would no longer be about action or freedom but would rather be about behavior. Each student is different and as such the process of education cannot be etched in stone but is rather a matter of initiative and original action directed toward an immaterial quality of a student whether we describe it as a soul, a spirit, or anything else.

It is the very ambiguousness inherent in this form of education that makes it cultural as opposed to social. The social's primary focus is on sameness and this is why necessity, that to which every human being is subject, is of such importance in a socialized world. Indeed, if the social recognizes difference at all, the differences it recognizes are often superficial and of its own creation (e.g. race is a social construct and without the social racial distinctions would not exist). Hence, when education is taken to have as its objective the functionality of students in the war machine known as society, diversity, if it is recognized, only serves as a tool for categorization so that each person's function can more easily be determined. Whenever the social has taken hold diversity ceases to be of importance (thus to the aristocrats of ancient Rome the people were the mob and to the rulers Marxist societies the masses (volks)). By recognizing, not the
differences between people’s physical bodies nor loosely defined social distinctions but rather the limitless possibilities for differences in choices, educators can truly respect the diversity inherent in the human condition. As stated previously, culture is not representative of difference in our behavior but differences in our actions. Therefore, as a broad conception, whenever students are presented with the idea that as individuals they alone determine their actions, that they alone have the power to control what they do regardless of external conditions, students are experiencing a cultural education.

Now that we have the recommendations for more cultural education it is worth an attempt to anticipate the effects that such education may have if put into practice so that they will not take us completely off guard. It would be contrary to the point to try to predict with certainty specific acts or to try to determine the disposition of students as a group who are educated in such a manner, but the very fact that these things cannot be done are the most telling in regards to the results of a cultural education. In order to gain a sense of what a cultural education is capable of let us consider a historical figure from ancient Greece who, by many accounts, stood out in and challenged the social fabric of the city of Athens. The name of this man was Alcibiades; he was an Athenian general during the Peloponnesian War and, according to Plato, a good friend of the philosopher Socrates.

Alcibiades is an interesting figure in regards to both education and peace. Throughout Plato's dialogues Alcibiades is described as being exceedingly eccentric but not without a strong sense of virtue, and it was this combination of characteristics that often confounded the members of the society in which he lived. Famously, in Plato's “Symposium”, Alcibiades shows up already drunk to a drinking party (to which he was
not invited) at the home of Agathon (another friend of Socrates). But, for all of his rudeness and drunkenness, Alcibiades is still able to give a speech in praise of both love and of Socrates where he makes known his recognition of the importance of calculated thought and in particular Socrates’s philosophical method when it comes to true goodness.

[Socrates is] always going on about pack asses, or blacksmiths, or cobblers, or tanners; he's always making the same tired old points in the same tired old words. If you are foolish, or simply unfamiliar with him, you'd find it impossible not to laugh at his arguments. But if you see them when they open up like the statues, if you go behind their surface, you'll realize that no other arguments make any sense. They’re truly worthy of a god, bursting with figures of virtue inside. They’re of great – no, of the greatest – importance for anyone who wants to become a truly good man (Plato, Symposium, 221e-221a).

Thus, we see the enigmatic unpredictability of Alcibiades’s character. Although he refused to be subject to social norms he is portrayed by Plato as still being a very brilliant and ethically minded person. This is in stark contrast to the character Socrates who, though also brilliant and ethically minded, had a tendency to theorize about ideal systems of government as only being possible once a great degree of social obedience has been established (Plato's “Republic” and “Laws” stand as good examples of this tendency on the part of Socrates).

Aside from his portrayal in Plato's dialogues, Alcibiades also had a reputation for being a very skilled but extremely unpredictable general and politician. Incidentally, his roles as both general and politician were what brought Alcibiades into contact with many different cultures. The historian Thucydides tells us in his book The Peloponnesian War of Alcibiades’s masterful yet curious defection to Sparta. At that time the political system of Athens was growing ever more corrupt and tyrannical, and Alcibiades’s political enemies accused him of seditious activities regarding his military campaign in Sicily.
Rather than be arrested and face trial and possible execution, Alcibiades decided to defect. The following excerpt is part of a speech, said by Thucydides to have been given by Alcibiades to the allies of Sparta, explaining his reasons for the defection.

“Now I must crave this: that I be neither the worse esteem for that, having once been thought a lover of my country, I now go amongst the greatest enemies of the same against it, nor yet mistrusted as one that speaketh [sic] with the great zeal of a fugitive. For though I fly from the malice of them that drave [sic] me out, I shall not, if you take my counsel, fly your profit. Nor are you and these so much, who have hurt but your enemies, as they are that have made enemies of friends. I love not my country as wrong by it, but as having lived in safety in it. Nor do I think that I do herein go against any country I have not. And he is truly a lover of his country not that refuseth [sic] to invade the country he hath wrongfully lost, but that desire so much to be in it as by any means he can he will attempt to recover” (Thucydides 432).

Here are Alcibiades tells the Spartan allies that he does not fight against Athens for the same reasons as them. Though he proposes to help Sparta, Alcibiades does not care to become a part of their society any more than he fit into his own.

While the historical accuracy of these stories of speeches by Alcibiades is debatable, these accounts do provide for us a profound insight into the importance of exposure to the ideas of many different cultures and the recognition of powers beyond the social when it comes to education. In Alcibiades we can see the capabilities with which a life of military and political campaigns that gave exposure to many different cultures (in short a cultural education) has left him. The actions he takes, he takes for his own reasons alone. Though he refuses to be subject to the many different social networks by which he often finds himself surrounded, his actions are neither devoid of conscience nor of reason. Though he is a man of great wealth his wealth was of little consequence to his deeds. In the dialog entitled “Alcibiades”, attributed to Plato, the character Socrates says while praising Alcibiades “I will also mention your wealth, but I think that is the least of
the reasons you hold yourself in high esteem” (Plato, “Alcibiades”, 104c). That is, Alcibiades’s actions were not for the sake of acquiring or preserving wealth. Alcibiades was no one's product; he was a man entirely of his own creation, motivated only by his own thoughts and interests. It is qualities such as these that an education focused on culture and internal capacities as opposed to external conditions would encourage.

Students, having experienced a wide variety of cultural ideas and, most importantly, having an education that recognizes their inner power, whether called soul, spirit, or something else entirely, shall be placed in a far better position for becoming active peacemakers than they currently are under the social schema. Those communities that are most socially rigid are the least tolerant of diversity and are hence the least peaceful. It is true that the techniques suggested here leave much potential for a disorderly educational environment, but disorder is not to be confused with discord. The author Voltaire writes this dialogue between two apparently fictional men – Lord Boldmind and Medroso,

Medroso. People say that if everybody thought for himself it would result in a strange confusion.
Boldmind. Quite the contrary. When people attend a play, they all freely speak their mind, and peace is not disturbed; but if some insolent protector of some bad poet wants to force all men of taste to find good what seems to them bad, then you will hear hissing, and the two parties would throw apples at each other's head, as once happened in London. The tyrants of the mind have caused part of the misfortune in the world. We have been happy in England only since everyone has really enjoyed the right of speaking his mind.
Medroso. In Lisbon where nobody can speak his, we are very tranquil too.
Boldmind. You are tranquil, but you're not happy; it is the tranquility of galley slaves who row in cadence and in silence.
Medroso. Do you believe, then, that my soul is in the galleys?
Boldmind. Yes; and I would deliver it.
Medroso. But if I'm content in the galleys?
Boldmind. In that case you deserve to be there (Voltaire 356).
It is only after educators come to realize that peace is not the product of an organized system directed towards an objective to which all else is subordinate that it will become achievable.

2.4 Summation

Everything that has been said in this part is meant to make a simple but revolutionary point regarding both peace and education. The point is that the tremendous faith that we have in society and all things social is misplaced. When the foundation of education and indeed of human nature is taken to be essentially social true peace is impossible. As soon as the social network that governs people's behavior is removed the condition of mankind rapidly deteriorates back into a state of violence and this is because the very social network that keeps violence at bay does nothing to stop and, in fact, encourages discord. In this way the point of this thesis is very similar to the theme of William Golding's novel *Lord of the Flies*. This novel tells the fictitious story of a group of British children who survive a plane crash on a deserted island. Although the children come from a very well developed society they find that when the society is no longer present they are unable to live in peace. Golding himself describes the theme of his novel as follows,

“The theme [of *Lord of the Flies*] is an attempt to trace the defects of society back to the defects of human nature. The moral is that the shape of a society must depend on the ethical nature of the individuals and not any political system however apparently logical or respectable. The whole book is symbolic in nature except the rescue in the end where adult life appears, distinguished and capable, but in reality enmeshed in the same evil as the symbolic life of the children on the island. The officer [who rescues the surviving children], having interrupted a man-hunt, prepares to take the children off the island in a cruiser which will presently be hunting its enemy in the same implacable way. And who will rescue the adult and his cruiser?” (Golding as cited in Epstein 204)
In other words, social conditions are of no benefit to individuals who do not realize their own power of self-control. Just as the society from which the children in *Lord of the Flies* came was of no help to them on the island the creation of an educational system based on social principles and measures of control will be of no use to people looking to live in peace once removed from that system.

Incorporating a sense of culture into education provide students with an appreciation for the many different choices that are possible on a personal level. Experiencing even a small portion of the vast number of cultural traditions that exist on the planet can serve as a demonstration of the many possible choices as long as we properly understand the distinction between what constitutes a culture as opposed to a society. That which constitutes culture is not subordination to necessity or to any other external force be it a ruler or a systematized ideology, but is rather the patterns that occur as a result of individual choice. Whereas we began this part by examining dragons as an analogy for the different uses of power, so too shall we end. Indeed the very meaning of the portrayal of the dragons in the book of “Revelation” is that society, when allowed to take on such colossal proportions as entire empires, will ultimately become an all-consuming monster. Thus, to avoid such disasters circumstances, we should consider carefully these words by the legendary Lao Tzu of ancient China – a man Confucius once described as, “… a dragon in flight riding on the wind and clouds, invulnerable to the moral pitfalls that ensnare lesser men” (Ong v).

If you want to grab the world and run it
I can see that you will not succeed.
The world is a spiritual vessel, which can't be controlled (Lao Tzu 59).
The world, therefore, being a ‘spiritual vessel’ and full of beings that themselves possess a spiritual quality, deserves educators that recognize more than mere material conditions and strive to bring peace to the spirit of humanity. It is up to us to decide whether the dragons we allow into our lives resemble the vicious treasure-hoarding monsters of the West or the noble god-like protectors of the East. The difference lies in our ability to act.
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Introduction

As we endeavor to develop as completely and comprehensively as possible the relatively new field of peace education it is important that we, as teachers, prepare ourselves to facilitate learning within and related to a diverse multiplicity of people. Central to our ability to be effective facilitators is a capacity to make intellectually attainable ideas that originate in cultural context with which students are unfamiliar. Equally important is the attainment of a proper command of strategies that may be used to relate this and other information to the culture or cultures of which students are a part. Offering the opportunity for students to gain a broader cultural awareness and validating the cultural background from which students come has been one of the many foci of our work and our research at The Center. The result of this work and research can go a long way towards an answer to the question – why is culture an important facet of peace and peace education, and what role does it play? An answer to this question will provide future peace educators with a well-developed theoretical basis for their lessons, practical methods for teaching peace in a way that students can understand, and a deeper appreciation for the approaches that many different cultures take to solve problems in just and equitable ways.

The field of peace education has only just begun to have a well-developed presence in the 20th and 21st centuries. As a direct result of the horrors of World War II including Nazi concentration camps, the abuse of prisoners of war in Japan, and the invention of the atomic bomb, the United Nations felt it necessary to attempt to ensure
peace by officially declaring the absolute rights of every human being on earth. “One of the first major achievements of the newly formed United Nations was the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 10 December 1948” (United Nations, 2003, 3). This event led to the development of peace education as both a field of study and as an important facet of school curriculum. Over the years peace education has been modified and expanded to respond to concerns such as the Cold War, gang violence, and terrorism but even so it is safe to say that peace receives far less attention than other subjects within education. Whether on an international or domestic scale, it is important to continue to create new responses to the ever evolving nature of conflict.

We (the authors) have been engaged in the project of teaching students from a low-income predominantly African-American neighborhood the importance and benefits of peaceful action. In doing so we have used a vast number of different methods to allow students to connect with new and culturally different concepts and even invented a few of our own. Our goal in this course of action is and has been to offer students a chance both to broaden their understanding of the world in which they live and which we must share, and to use these new understandings to solve the problems with which they are confronted in their own culture and society. Bateson (1994) once said, “Children develop through concentric worlds, gradually able to move further from home but always seeing each larger sphere through the lens of the previous stage” (p. 170). In other words, the new ideas children encounter will always be seen from the perspective of the culture from which they came. Therefore, it is of vital importance that students both have access to information from multiple cultural traditions and know that their own culture or cultures
are valued in an interactive space. In this essay we will explain the theoretical background that has guided us throughout our work on this project and share the methods and results of our original research with the scholarly community. We do these things in the hope that the ideas presented here may be specified or generalized to respond to unique situations at all levels of cultural interaction as they occur.

**Literature Review**

**Right Relationship with Other Cultures**

One of the important documents is the Earth Charter which was created by the independent Earth Charter Commission and was convened as a follow-up to the 1992 Earth Summit in order to produce a global consensus statement of values and principles for a sustainable future. The mission of the Earth Charter Initiative is to promote the transition to sustainable ways of living and a global society founded on a shared ethical framework that includes respect and care for the community of life, ecological integrity, universal human rights, respect for diversity, economic justice, democracy, and a culture of peace. It respects a diversity of opinions in that it is generated from cross-cultural deliberations and agreed upon by citizens from around the globe. It has been formally endorsed by thousands of organizations, including UNESCO and the IUCN (World Conservation Union). The educational purposes underlie itself as a cosmopolitan ethical framework for the pedagogy of peace. The purposes include the following: “awareness of basic values, cultivation of the moral attitudes of respect and care, understanding and application of the moral principles, and the development of the moral capacities necessary for right relationship with self, other persons, other cultures, other life and the
earth” (Snauwaert, 2008, p. 97). The attitudes of respect and care applied to the relationship with other cultures are shaped by the recognition of human dignity inherent in collectivities of people. Thus, the basic moral attitude on this level is respect and care for peoples. Furthermore, as it is required in the Charter, “Our cultural diversity is a precious heritage and different cultures will find their own distinctive ways to realize the vision” (The Earth Charter, 2000). To realize these aspirations, we future educators be universally responsible for the communities in which we live.

Given this framework, our research pays close attention to the values that each culture brings to the table and attempts to identify effective ways to teach aspects of each cultural code to members of other cultures. Inseparable from this process is identification of the ways in which the customs and conventions of one culture are best learned by members of other cultures. Orienting our research toward these goals has provided us with much insight into the views of the cultures from which our students come as well as a frame of reference from which to more closely examine our own cultures. Thus, the methodology of our research incorporates cultural ideas that are unfamiliar to our students while at the same time utilizing different strategies for making the information interesting and relevant to our students.

Possible Solutions of Cultural Conflicts

Nowadays, with globalization and immigration becoming growing trends, children are living and growing up in more diverse communities. It is our responsibility to teach them how to manage conflict nonviolently and to understand and value the pluralistic society they are living in. One of the most feasible solutions of cultural
conflicts is to promote a sense of cultural diversity and tolerance, leading to a win-win situation in which the solution will meet the interests of everyone. “It’s not necessarily our first choice, but it’s one we can all live with. It makes us feel like all parties are winners” (Lantieri & Patti, 1996, p. 65).

To achieve the goal of win-win situation, students need to know how to negotiate with each other. One of the effective methods to solve conflicts is to teach them the core skills. Those skills include defining the conflict and then identifying approaches, such as, avoiding, diffusing, and confronting violently or nonviolently to solve conflicts. As communication is an essential part of conflict resolution, active listening requires that people have their hearts fully present and engage themselves in others’ feelings. After that, people can express their feelings through peaceful means such as I-messages or the “I Care Rules”. Students should be encouraged to explain their positions clearly so as to gain a better understanding of the problem and then work to solve a problem in a peaceful manner and in a way that is acceptable for everyone involved. Likewise, conflict resolutions also relate to the concept of going to a safe place, such as in meditation or a stepping back and counting to ten before we respond to negativity.

Encouraging the adoption of such techniques provide students with a practical understanding of the material as opposed to it being mere factual knowledge. Facilitating peaceful action requires, in addition to a sophisticated theoretical basis, a set of practical strategies for handling real-world situations. The ways in which these strategies are learned are bound up with cultural norms regarding what information is considered relevant and thus the way in which a simple artifice such as an I-message is taught ought
to be in adjustment to the perceptions of the culture that the student is representing. Doing so allows the student to grasp just how the strategies can be employed within a cultural context of their own lives.

Make a Peaceful Classroom

In order to have students learn to be more receptive to the cultural diversity and more tolerant to interact with each other, a peaceful classroom must be encourage by creating a democratic environment where students can cooperate, develop moral sensitivity, think critically and feel empowered. Harris (1988) suggests five important facets of a peaceful classroom. First, the classroom must be a democratic community where students can feel dependable, safe, and agreeable to the group. Second, cooperation should be taught and promoted in the classroom so that students are more willingly to work and communicate in cooperative groups and establish strong, close relationships with each other. The third component is developing moral sensitivity, that is, students are explored to the real-life situations of diversity and allowed to experience the issues and to solve the problems. Another consideration is to emphasize and foster critical thinking in a peaceful classroom. Finally, self-esteem should be developed through the teachers deliberate efforts to encourage and affirm their students. Therefore, in such a peaceful classroom, “students rely on each other, they learn together, and the success of learning activities depends upon the cooperative contributions of all” (Harris, 1988).
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“Dragons as the Symbol of Power” – A Comparative Approach

Culture refers to a set of shared values, norms, and beliefs held by the members of a group, such as a nation or organization (Hofstede, 1994). Recognizing and understanding differences in cultural patterns provides individuals with a framework for interpreting the goals and behaviors of others (Hofstede, 1994). This is especially relevant when individuals are in conflict and must work towards common goals (Jonsson, 1990). Culture is likely to establish strong expectations about the type of relationship that will be created, the goals that the parties are working towards and how the conflict will be resolved. Then such expectations are violated, individuals risk escalating the conflict. Thus, the challenges of globalization and the complexity of cultural differences mean that international negotiation skills will be of increasing relevance and importance for international management and cross-cultural interactions in general (Kremenyuk, 1991). The United Nations even recognizes the promotion of peaceful cross-cultural interaction in education as a human right. The “Universal Declaration of Human Rights” states, “Education shall be directed to full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace” (United Nations, 1948, p. 3). As evidenced previously, increasing such cultural awareness and interaction is also one of the basic principles of “The Earth Charter” (2000) and is
therefore of crucial importance to both our project as a whole and the lesson to be explained here.

The cultural differences we encountered manifested themselves in some of our tutoring activities. When I (Sun) was about to lead the lesson entitled “Dragons as the Symbol of Power”, I deliberately enlightened the students that the dragon is the symbol of power in both western and Chinese cultures, but they are portrayed and treated in different ways due to their choice of using their power, thus, leading to good or bad relationships with people. By contrasting different cultures, I was intended to give the students a wider perspective to understand the following themes: identifying and keeping your inner power, using power for kindness, respecting the power of others, respecting other cultures, and establishing right relationships with others. Meanwhile, I attempted to guide the students to establish right relationships with others and promote a sense of tolerance of other cultures.

I began the lesson with asking the kids about their impressions of dragon. The two male students present that day responded, “They are big, terrible, and powerful”. I compared the symbolic significances of dragons in both Western and Chinese cultures. Western dragons are portrayed as evil because they would eat people or destroy villages; so there is much folklore about the fighting between heroes and dragons. By contrast, I explained to them that dragons play an important role in China and are traditionally considered to be the governors of rainfalls in Chinese culture. They have the power to decide where and when to have rainfalls. They are lucky creatures that can bring happiness and power, and are even worshiped as gods. The Chinese often consider
themselves to be the descendants of the dragon. By saying these things, I attempted to make it known to the students that both Western and Chinese dragons are symbols of power but they are portrayed in different ways due to their choice of using their power. The Western dragons abuse their power to hurt people so that people are afraid of them and hate them; while the Chinese dragons use their power to benefit people by controlling the rainfalls. In doing so the dragon causes people to respect and worship them as gods. With my interpretation, the kids responded in a different way when I asked them about dragons again. L stated “The Chinese dragon is good and the western dragon is bad because the western dragon hurts people but the Chinese dragon helps people.” Based on the difference in responses, I am convinced that it is helpful and necessary to provide students culturally diverse perspectives during their perception of knowledge. Through the activity of contrasting the same object from the perspectives of different cultures, the students will not only take cognizance of cultural differences but also gain a chance to have a different set of experiences and a potentially new and wider perspective for perceiving knowledge that can expand their capacities of conflict resolution in a peaceful manner during their studies and lives.

“Peace Dollars” – A Relational Approach

A major challenge that has faced us since the beginning of the semester has been finding ways of exposing the students who come to this program to culturally different ideas while at the same time making the new knowledge relevant and potentially useful within the cultural context of the lives of the students. One mechanism that we have utilized for making such new ideas engaging and understandable for students is to take an
artifact that is significant to the culture from which the students come and use it in a different way in order to demonstrate a culturally different idea. Theoretically this relational strategy is to have a three-pronged effect. First, because the artifact is something that the culture of the students holds to be important and is something of which the students would almost certainly have an understanding, the students will be more likely to find the lesson culturally validating and consequently will take an interest in it. Second, the use of an already culturally significant artifact in a different way allows the student to conceptualize the incorporation of other cultural ideas into their own culture as a possibility. Third, the fact that this learning experience takes the form of a concrete activity allows students to actually practice this incorporative process. In short, this strategy encourages students to take an interest, see the utility of, and actively practice positive culture interaction. By maintaining a solid grounding in peaceful cultural interaction and demonstrating the possibility and practical use of ideological cultural interconnectedness this strategy also shows great consistence with the tenets of The Earth Charter (2000). “… we must decide to live with a sense of universal responsibility, identifying ourselves with the whole Earth community as well as our local communities. We are at once citizens of different nations and of one world in which the local and global are linked” (The Earth Charter, 2000, p.1). It is this rationale which constitutes the basis for the following activity conducted at the The Center as part of our research.

Over the course of our research it became apparent that the importance of money and the significance of economics in general was, as a matter of culture, very different. This culture difference initially manifested itself in a moment of subtle conflict. During a
previous lesson (“Dragons as the Symbol of Power”) two of our students, rather than focusing their attention on the content of the lesson, began, at one point, to focus on a laptop computer on which we were displaying the material for the lesson of the day. The facilitator (Sun) records in her fieldnotes from that day, “L listened to me attentively and nodded her head; the boys attempted to touch my laptop, but Carl helped to stop them”. This incident illustrated for us a difference in the way our respective cultures viewed the objects of economics and thus the conflict (i.e. the lack of attention on the lesson and the undue attention given to the laptop itself) was actually a conflict of cultural ideas about what the laptop represents. To us educators, coming from White culture and Chinese culture respectively, the laptop represented a common tool with the purpose of storing and displaying information. To the students, coming from the culture of an impoverished mostly African-American neighborhood, we theorized that the laptop represented an economically valuable object with the purpose of empowering and conferring status upon the owner. This was the topic of a short discussion that took place between us educators after this lesson. Sun goes on to write in her notes,

Carl noticed that the kids paid much attention on [sic] my laptop and they might easily get appeal to valuable things. That may be because their family culture that values things concerning money, which may lead them to work for them. We should help them to realize that money is not that powerful and each of them has their inner power that can help them fulfill their dreams and make an impact on others.

It was this insight that inspired the use of a new relational strategy for teaching about peace. A history of slavery, disenfranchisement, and a struggle for civil rights as well as the fact that money is scarce in this particular neighborhood all serve to inform the cultural attitude towards economics that we witnessed during our research. Therefore, in
order to more effectively engage the students it became apparent that what was required was a lesson that would speak to their culture directly.

Exactly two weeks after the occurrence of the incident described above, we returned to The Center and I (Templin) was to facilitate in the teaching of a lesson of my own designed entitled “Peace Dollars”. Using the insights gained from the lesson of the previously described session, I designed this lesson specifically to relate to the culture form which our students come while at the same time presenting them with a culturally different idea about the purpose of money, and by extension economy, as being an instrument for conveying a message of peace to the people of this country and possibly to the people of other countries. The lesson involves examining the symbols that appear on both American coins as well as coins from other countries from various points in history. For, example, the olive branch, a commonly used symbol for peace, appears on many coins and other monetary units in this country. The fact that money is constantly changing hands means that such symbols are seen by many different people and are meant to remind them of the peaceful values of their country. By using money as the medium by which to transmit the point about peace, we were able to create an environment that was much more conducive to learning not only a lesson about peace but also a new and culturally different conception of the purpose of money. Sun records in her fieldnotes from this day, “K and M responded actively and K offered her answer that famous people could appear on coins and those figures made people to [sic] remember them…”. Here we can see the positive results of this educational strategy. Whereas in the previous session different cultural ideas of economic objects led to conflict and disengagement from the lesson, in this session students became actively engaged –
feeling as though they could express their ideas and apparently taking something away from the experience.

On a broader level, the effective execution of this relational strategy confirms the validity of Harris’s (1988) suggestion that peace in best learned by experiencing it as a worldly reality and not first and foremost by authoritarian instruction. “An irony of peace education is that an educator need not necessarily teach the topics of peace education in order to conduct a peaceable classroom” (Harris, 1988, p. 122). In our case, the “Peace Dollars” activity served the purpose of creating a peaceful classroom twice over. In the short term the students were more responsive to a lesson that took their own cultural background into consideration while simultaneously allowing them access to the knowledge of another culture. While the long term effect is beyond our capability to experience directly, our hope and intent was that the students would leave with a new understanding of and appreciation for their own ability to learn from other cultures that can have a positive impact on the culture of which they are a part. Through the attainment of a newfound efficacy students will be able to take what they learn from this experience and use it to effect positive change in the classrooms at the school or schools to which they return.

Conclusion

The research we have carried out implies that culture differences can be either a barrier or an advantage to learning peaceful principles and actions depending on how they are approached by educators. Explicit comparison of cultural conceptions allows students to see that the same ideas, objects, and entities have different applications and
meanings depending on context – cultural or otherwise. Diversity in perspective allows students to recognize that they have a choice in how to act and react in certain situations as well as providing them with a sense of the options open to them. Just as important, there must be a feasible plan in place for educators to relate the information being taught to students in a manner that they find culturally affirming and relevant. Therefore, it is our finding that both approaches – i.e. comparative and relational – have advantages that prove very effective at cross-cultural communication under the right circumstances. In any case, the cultural identity of students cannot simply be ignored; rather it must be addressed in an appropriate way. Generally speaking, the strategies outlined in this essay and develop throughout our research indicates what these appropriate ways of addressing culture might be. Comparison promotes an explicit understanding that there are differences between cultures by offering concrete examples of such differences in pointing out how the same objects or situations can mean different things to different people. Relation allows educators to actively engage students in the incorporative process by examining a familiar object or situation from the point of view of another culture. Each of the strategies takes cultural difference into consideration and each is designed to encourage a dialogical encounter rather than a conflict between cultures. Furthermore, the use of such strategies demands that the educator be aware of his or her own cultural identity and recognize that his or her own viewpoint is not necessarily the only one. That is, the educator has to have formed the project of imagining other viewpoints as being able to be other than they seem to himself or herself before he or she is able to teach others the same skill. Failure to do so risks devaluing students as fellow human beings and encourages dismissal of the information offered as irrelevant and devoid of
practicality. As peace educators it is our duty to do everything within our power to keep such a state of affairs from becoming reality.
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