

# **WEAVING SOLIDARITY TOWARD A CULTURE OF PEACE**

**Opening Plenary Presentations  
of the  
International Institute on Peace Education  
2002**

**Presenters:  
Lourdes R. Quisumbing  
Toh Swee-hin  
Betty A. Reardon**

**IIPE 2002 hosted by:  
Center for Peace Education, Miriam College, Quezon City, Philippines**

**Co-organized in cooperation with:  
The Peace Education Center, Teachers College, Columbia University**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Foreword</b> <i>Loreta N. Castro</i>	<b>3</b>
<b>Values Education for Human Solidarity</b> <i>Lourdes R. Quisumbing</i>	<b>5</b>
<b>Weaving Solidarity toward a Culture of Peace</b> <i>Toh Swee-Hin</i>	<b>9</b>
<b>Solidarity, Democracy, Diversity and Dissent: Essentials for a Culture of Peace</b> <i>Betty A. Reardon</i>	<b>16</b>

## FOREWORD

The articles that are featured in this volume are written by three people who are passionately committed to building a culture of peace. They are Lourdes R. Quisumbing, President of the Asia-Pacific Network for International Education and Values Education (APNIEVE) and a former Secretary of Education of the Philippines; Toh Swee-hin, the UNESCO Peace Education Prize Laureate for the year 2000 and currently the Director of the Multifaith Centre in Griffith University in Australia; and Betty A. Reardon, the Founding Director of the Peace Education Center of Teachers College, Columbia University in New York and the recipient of the UNESCO Peace Education Honorable Mention Prize for the year 2001.

The articles all address the theme of “Weaving Solidarity Towards a Culture of Peace” and are essentially the text of the authors’ presentations during the Opening Plenary of the International Institute on Peace Education (IPE) that was held at Miriam College in Quezon City, Philippines from August 19 to 25, 2002.

In her article, Lourdes Quisumbing discusses the role of values education in fostering human solidarity. She highlights the strengthening of the ties that should bind people together: our shared human nature and human condition as well as our common Earth home/habitat and destiny. She explains that despite advancements in science and technology, we continue to experience various threats to human life and other life forms, the erosion of values and the deepening poverty of the human spirit. Hence, she calls for an active commitment to weave together a spirit of solidarity towards a preferred future – that of a culture of peace and non-violence, where people resolve conflicts not through force, where people respect each other’s identity and uniqueness, as well as care for each other as members of one human family. She also proposes a more holistic education which does not stop at acquiring knowledge and skills, but proceeds to educating the heart and the emotions, and developing the ability “to choose freely and to value, to make decisions and to translate knowledge and values into action.”

Swee-hin focuses on the theme of solidarity between North and South societies, communities, institutions, peoples and individuals. He shares his very rich experiences in educating for a culture of peace in the Philippines and worldwide, indicating his efforts to cultivate solidarity with multiple institutions, groups and movements, including a constructive and critical engagement with government. Reflecting on his many years of collaboration and solidarity with other peace educators and advocates, he outlines some of the key issues and principles that deserve to be highlighted to ensure the effectiveness and fruitful results of solidarity efforts. The article then proceeds to a discussion of the widening and deepening collaboration of movements and peoples between the North and South in promoting globalization from below (GFB). Through his presentation of exemplars Swee-hin demonstrates the gains that can be made when there is solidarity across various sectors and levels of society.

Betty Reardon posits that there are two fundamental concepts that are at the center of the culture of peace: human solidarity and democracy. To her democracy is a political order which acknowledges that its authority comes from the people for whose well-being it is responsible. Betty points out that because of the so-called “war on terrorism” democracy is in great peril and that human solidarity in defense of democracy is essential to human well-being. Drawing valuable insights from her experiences as an educator, she reminds us to enable students to learn a culture of peace by living it in the classroom. She highlights two elements crucial to democracy in the learning community: diversity and dissent. At the heart of democracy is the equal human value of every person and so she challenges us to undertake two essential acts of solidarity with and on behalf of those who are culturally, religiously and politically different. The first is sharing in the sense of the Spanish word “compartir” which connotes mutuality and the second is being part of a common struggle against injustice.

All of the articles in this volume share the vision of moving from a culture of violence to a culture of peace. It is a movement, a journey, that is not easy, but all are one in saying that the answer to the many challenges is not despair or fear, but a sense of hope and moral courage, as well as the understanding that gains can be made if we join our minds and hearts, our spirit and will towards action.

***Loreta N. Castro***

*Director, Center for Peace Education  
Chair, Local Organizing Committee  
for the IIPE 2002*

## VALUES EDUCATION FOR HUMAN SOLIDARITY

*Lourdes R. Quisumbing*

*President, Asia-Pacific Network for International Education and Values Education  
Former Secretary of Education, Philippines*

First and foremost, human solidarity is founded on mutual respect of each other's uniqueness, and a deep sense of appreciation of our common humanity - that we are individuals with intrinsic self-worth, and that we are sisters and brothers within one human family inhabiting planet EARTH, our home and our heritage.

While new trends, particularly globalization, link cultures ever more closely and enrich the interaction among them, they may also be detrimental to our cultural diversity and cultural pluralism. Thus, the need for mutual respect becomes all the more imperative. Dialogue between cultures appears to be one of the fundamental cultural and political challenges for the world today. It is an essential condition of peaceful co-existence. (International Conference on Cultural Policies for Development, Stockholm, Sweden, 1998).

Thus, "To learn how to avoid cultural diversity resulting to the clash of cultures but rather to intercultural harmony and peace," is a challenge to us, peace educators (Our Creative Diversity, de Cuellar's World Commission on Culture and Development Report to UNESCO, 1995).

One cannot underestimate the role of education for international and intercultural understanding, which consists not merely in knowing more about different peoples and their cultures - their geography, history, economy, government, value-systems - but more in understanding and gaining insight into the factors and motivations underlying their behavior and appreciating their cultural patterns, traditions, customs, values and beliefs.

Human solidarity is likewise fostered by the realization and strengthening of the ties that bind us together in our common humanity: our human nature and the human condition, our common habitat and destiny, our universally-shared values.

Indeed, there are VALUES which transcend the barriers of culture, race, gender and creed; of social class, economic status, or political persuasions, because such values are rooted in our common humanity. They are our common treasures, our "birthright". (They could form the core of a new global ethics.)

The articulation of human rights has set for the modern world a “common standard of morality,” and an appreciation of individual moral claims that are regarded as “universal, inviolable and inalienable.” (Antonio J. Ledesma, S.J. “Forging a Culture of Peace: Hope for Coming Generations, 1998). They are our basic human rights and fundamental freedoms: the worth and dignity of the human person, our innate human goodness, our capacity for love and compassion, the sacredness of our person and identity; the right to truth and justice, the freedom to choose and decide for oneself, to believe, to love and to act freely according to one’s values and convictions; freedom from ignorance, fear, prejudices poverty, cruelty and abuses; the right to peace, happiness and development.

Young people across cultures are in search for the deeper meanings of their existence and for enduring values and roots that provide them with stability and strength, security and hope, happiness and peace to their lives, in these rapidly-changing and confusing times. They look up to their leaders and they feel lost. A crisis of confidence is spreading throughout the world.

“We have but one world, or none at all;” words from Jerry and Pat Mische, founders of GEA, Global Education Associates, when they came in the early 80’s and founded the PCGE, Phil. Council for Global Education. I can hear them now and feel their presence among many of us. Their messages of global solidarity, global spirituality and our common humanity, our interconnectedness (and interrelationships) with each other and with our planet Earth and beyond, reaching the future generations, shall remain with us forever. “We either work together to build the EARTH or perish together with it.” We have only one home, one body of waters, one atmosphere, one environment. We live under one sky. What happens in one place, affects all the rest.

Nowadays, one is apprehensive to turn on the TV/radio, or glance at newspaper headlines, lest we suffer more shock and disillusionment at the sad state of our human relationships, the immense sufferings of peoples all over the globe, the never-ending cycle of violence; religious fanaticism, terrorism, kidnappings, the deterioration of our ecosystems, the disasters of proportions unheard of before: devastating floods, forest fires, haze (brown sky), landslides, pollution. Instead of the Culture of Peace and Non-Violence, that we all hoped, waited and worked for (2000 was declared by the UN as the International Year of the Culture of Peace, 2001-2010 the International Decade of the Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World), an Age of Terror and a Culture of Greed have set in.

Despite the dramatic breakthroughs in science and technology, which have brought benefits and progress to our lives, we continue to experience the daily occurrence of human cruelty, misery and tragedy, torture, genocide, violence, displacement and abuse of peoples, mostly the marginalized, women and children; the destruction of the ecosystem and biodiversity; the threat to human life and all other life forms; moral bankruptcy in the wealthiest of nations, the erosion of our human, cultural, ethical and spiritual values; the deepening poverty of the human spirit.

Indeed, it can be said, that humankind stands at the brink of total disaster. We face a crisis of our own making, a result of our irresponsible and selfish lifestyles, our abusive patterns of production and consumption, the insatiable greed for profit, the drive to satisfy the whims and wants of a few at the expense of the needs of the majority.

Is it not an irony and a tragedy that in these times when instant messages crisscross the globe every second of every day, even reaching outer space, peoples of the world instead of becoming closer and more united, have become more divided and polarized, torn apart by deep-seated animosities and hatreds, prejudices, discrimination and intolerance? That some are still isolated and marginalized? That despite peace talks, negotiations and coalitions, the cycle of bloodshed and violence continues, that despite world summits and conferences - on globalization, free trade, the open market, liberalization policies, environment, - eradication of poverty, development, human security and human solidarity remain elusive?

This is not the time for despair, but of active faith and resolve, not the time for vacillation or procrastination, but of collective effort and commitment to weave together our spirit of solidarity and towards the vision of our preferred future – that of a culture of peace and non-violence, where people resolve conflicts not through force, but through dialogue and negotiation, where people learn to know and to understand each other, to respect and appreciate each other’s identity and uniqueness, to care and to embrace each other as members of one human family.

“Humankind has for the first time, the sophistication to build its future, not on the illusion of a one-sided, ill-conceived ideology, but on a set of universal values which we all share, even if their optimal balance differs from people to people, from religion to religion and from individual to individual, and when there is great respect for such differences. (de Cuellar, Creative Diversity, World Commission on Culture and Development Report to UNESCO, 1995.)

We need a new revolution, a massive radical attitudinal and behavioral change, if we wish to halt the race towards catastrophe and save the world for the future generations. We need no less than a “re-education of humankind.” (Paul Kennedy, in Communicating for Development, Colin Fraser and Sonia Restrepo-Estrada, 1998.)

This calls for a paradigm shift in our educational philosophy and practice. Instead of a rigid and compartmentalized knowledge-based curriculum, we should adopt a more holistic view of education which aims at the development of the faculties and powers of the whole person – cognitive, affective, emotional, aesthetic, volitional, behavioral; a teaching-learning approach which does not stop at knowledge and information at developing skills and competence, but proceeds to understanding and gaining insights, that educates the heart and the emotions and develops the ability to choose freely and to value, to make decisions and to translate knowledge and values into action. The heart of education is the education of the heart.

Modern day education must espouse Scientific Humanism, a new Science with a Conscience, and a new Technology with a heart. Valuing our common humanity, as well as our local cultural traditions, provides challenges and guides for designing civic education curricula towards responsible citizenship for our fast-changing world. (Kenny J. Kennedy, "Searching for Values in a Globalized World" in Values in Education, Susan Pascoe ed. Yearbook 2002 –Australian College of Educators, 2002)

But by values education we do not mean merely teaching about values but rather learning how to value, how to bring knowledge into the deeper level of understandings and insights; into the affective realm of our feelings and emotions, our cherished choices and priorities into loving and appreciating, and how to internalize and translate them into our behavior. Truly, values education is a holistic process and a total learning experience.

In closing, I wish to quote Jacques Delors speaking at the UN Conference on Environment, Rio de Janeiro, 1992:

"The world is our village: if one house catches fire, the roofs over all our heads are immediately at risk. If anyone of us tries to start rebuilding, his efforts will be purely symbolic. Solidarity has to be the order of the day: each of us must bear his own share of the general responsibility. He continues to say: We need a global ethics to guide us in solving global issues, in strengthening our global interdependence and solidarity."

The issues have been raised and the challenges presented in many a forum, but our answers and our plans have yet to galvanize into a determined and collective action. In the last analysis, it is not in knowing alone, but in valuing and caring deeply; not in merely planning but in willing strongly TOGETHER that we can make things happen.



- Principles to form the core of a new global ethics:
1. human rights and responsibilities
  2. democracy based on H.R. and fundamental freedoms
  3. protection of minorities (respect for diversity)
  4. commitment to peaceful conflict-resolution and fair negotiation
  5. equity within and between generations  
(de Cuellar, op cit)

## WEAVING SOLIDARITY TOWARDS A CULTURE OF PEACE

*Toh Swee-Hin*

*Professor & Director, Multifaith Centre*

*Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia*

*Laureate, UNESCO Prize for Peace Education 2000*

### *Introduction*

In my reflections as part of this panel, I will focus on the theme of solidarity between North and South societies, communities, institutions, peoples, and individuals. “North” and “South” here does not mean only the distinction between advanced industrialized and the economically poorer nations of the world. We are also mindful of the “global South” and the “global North,” which reflect the existence of a marginalized minority within North societies and an affluent and powerful elite within the South.

My reflections are drawn from my personal and social experiences in educating for a culture of peace, as well as my awareness of and contact with widening and emergent networks of communities that span national and regional boundaries. Two questions are salient in this paper: Are there some key principles, themes, and practices that may guide effective and authentic solidarity towards a culture of peace? What may be some of the problems, obstacles, and barrier to such solidarity?

Before sharing my experiences and exemplars, however, a comment on the word “solidarity” is necessary. Within a culture of peace framework, “solidarity” cannot be pity or charity, even if the personal motivation to help others in need is sincere and altruistic. Rather, I am reminded of a poster I once saw by an Aboriginal activist which said: “If you have come to help me, you’re wasting your time. But if you are here because your liberation is bound with mine, then let us work together.” Hence solidarity for peace educators challenges us to weave our own personal and social transformation into the process of collaboration or partnership to fulfill a shared vision and mission.

### *Solidarity for Peace Education in the Philippines*

May I begin with the Philippine context in which I have had meaningful and sustained opportunities to be involved since the late 80s. Initially, from Australia and then from Canada, I joined Filipino educators in Mindanao to develop the first graduate program in peace and development education at Notre Dame University (NDU) in Cotabato City. Eventually, with support from NDU administrators, a core course in peace education was designed to be taken by all undergraduate students.

However, consistent with a holistic paradigm of educating for a culture of peace, it was necessary to cultivate solidarity with multiple institutions and movements outside the university. Hence, we worked closely with schools and teachers to encourage them to integrate issues and strategies of peace education into the school system, including

curricula, pedagogy, administration, and community outreach. The formation of a Center of Peace Education at NDU also provided a vehicle for nurturing solidarity through peace education workshops with non-government organizations (NGOs), community groups and other civil society organizations, barangay officials, and inter-religious dialogue forums.

It was also deemed crucial and constructive to engage critically with the government sector. For example, conflict resolution workshops within a holistic framework for peace education were conducted with civil servants in the region. On a few occasions, workshops with soldiers of the AFP gave us an insight on their perspectives on issues of peace and problems of conflict. While they have been directly involved in wars and other manifestations of armed conflicts, the soldiers participated as human beings, capable of understanding the root causes of the conflicts in which they serve on the “frontline.” I would also like to acknowledge that, over the years, the Office of the Presidential Adviser on the Peace Process (OPAPP) has been willing to support and fund many peace education activities in Mindanao, activities which consistently maintained a critical and independent assessment of the contribution (positive or negative) of Government policies toward building a culture of peace in Mindanao and in the Philippines.

By the second half of the 90s, catalyzed by the signing of the Peace Accord between the Government and the MNLF (Moro National Liberation Front) in September 1996, peace education began to expand in the higher education community of Mindanao. Together with NDU peace educators, I became involved in the Mindanao Advanced Education program (MAEP) of the Commission on Higher Education (CHED). With NDU serving as the lead institution, a number of other universities across Mindanao (notably Ateneo de Zamboanga, Xavier University, Ateneo de Davao, and Mindanao State University, Marawi) developed and expanded their interest in peace education. I co-facilitated orientation workshops for senior administrators from the consortium universities, and conducted courses for the enrolled M.A and Ph.D. candidates. Over 1997-2002, nearly 40 MAs and 20 PhDs focusing on peace research and education have graduated from the program, and returned to establish peace education programs in their Mindanao institutions. Thus, an initiative which began with very limited resources (albeit with much voluntary energies and time) in one university (NDU) has eventually expanded to diverse regions of Mindanao, demonstrating the value of patience and long-term commitment.

Another significant moment in the story is that, over time, the interest in other regions and islands of the Philippines in educating for a culture of peace has been awakened. Thus, specific congregational systems, such as the Assumption schools, and national or regional networks like the Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines (CEAP) and the Notre Dame Educational Association (NDEA), have also adapted the holistic peace education framework pioneered at NDU to their schools and classrooms. Equally important and inspirational has been a growth of education for a culture of peace in community contexts, involving NGOs, peoples’ organizations, church and other faith institutions, inter-faith dialogue movements (e.g. PAZ-SALAAM, Silsilah), civil servants and internationally assisted projects such as the CIDA-Local Government Support Program (LGSP) and the UNDP volunteers training program.

Furthermore, I believe it is most relevant to facilitate links between Philippine peace educators with international and global communities, organizations, and networks. Exemplars of such networks include the International Institute on Peace Education (IIPE), the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction (WCCI) and the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA). More recently, there has been an expanding and fruitful solidarity between Filipino peace educators with the UNESCO-affiliated Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding (APCEIU) based in South Korea. Through such contacts, both Filipino peace educators and colleagues from other movements or region have shown the value of promoting international solidarity via mutual learning and sharing of ideas and lessons.

In reflecting on these fifteen years of collaboration and solidarity with Philippine peace educators, some key issues, principles, or themes deserve to be highlighted:

- (a) First, there is a crucial need to be willing to dialogue and to listen and learn from each other. Most specifically, coming from the “North,” I always stressed that “North” representatives should not position themselves or be perceived by South partners as “experts,” dispensing knowledge and ‘truth’ to the South. The flow of knowledge needs to be horizontal and reciprocal, rather than vertical and one-way (from North to South). It is only through mutually and critically respectful learnings that we help to enrich and deepen each other’s capacities and wisdoms. This principle also helps to avoid the possible “dependency” of South on North. It was therefore encouraging and affirming to hear and later see that our Mindanao partners were undertaking their own culture of peace activities and initiatives.
- (b) Second, the framework of education for a culture of peace that we drafted must have deep relevance, in this case, to Philippine realities. This requires, on the part of North peace educators, including myself, a preparedness to take time and energies to ground ourselves in understanding, as fully as possible, the complex historical, social, economic, political, and cultural realities of the Philippines. I recall the occasion when we first presented the first draft of our holistic framework that included the themes of militarization, structural violence, human rights, environmental care, cultural solidarity, and personal peace. It was at the opening of the Peace Center of Xavier University, and at the end of our presentation, we immediately asked the participants for their assessment on the relevance of the framework. The first response was an emphatic “Yes – the framework is very relevant to Mindanao!” We discovered later that the response came from Bishop Capalla, now Archbishop of Davao City and a long-standing advocate for peace and justice in the region and country. In my view, there can be no excuse for North participants working in South contexts not to ground their perspectives in the local context, even while bringing in a global understanding.
- (c) A further principle for weaving solidarity in my Philippine experiences rests on the necessity of building trust and mutual respect. This is attained in part through sharing similar circumstances of living and working. For example, if a North participant expects “luxury” accommodation and elite international organization’s benefits well

beyond local standards, then an immediate barrier is set up between “North” and “South” partners. Likewise, it also means a willingness to engage in parallel risk-taking. I remember that beginning in the late 80s, the Cotabato region in which NDU is situated, was already well-known for kidnapping for ransom activities. Since, by outward physical appearance, I may be mistaken for a “kidnap-able” Asian investor or tourist, my Mindanao friends and I thought of a creative prevention strategy. Word would be passed around that should I be kidnapped, all I could offer would not be money, but rather a library of peace books and a free peace education workshop in the mountains! This message seemed to work, at least over those years.

- (d) Fourth, I found it not just essential but fruitful in terms of critical empowerment, to always volunteer or reveal a self-critical presentation of my own North society in relation to the South context in which I am working. Thus, I always forthrightly clarify and critique the role of the North in creating and fostering global inequities and injustices that also link with structural violence within the Philippines. Furthermore, it is a valuable pedagogical tool in raising and challenging the internal contradictions within the North, whether they pertain to social/economic injustices, gender inequities, and/or cultural discrimination. For example, during a workshop with Filipino soldiers, it was moving to see some of them express compassion for Aboriginal or indigenous peoples in North nations like Australia or Canada, who under European colonization, had suffered enormously from subjugating, repressive and assimilation policies. It was then easier to build a bridge between those North-based injustices and parallel injustices towards the Philippines’ own indigenous peoples.
- (e) A fifth theme of my Philippine experiences in solidarity is the need to continually ask: what are the root causes of conflict and marginalization? Unless this question is continually posed, the proposed solutions may well be limiting and partial. In so asking, North participants avoid the tendency to serve as “technocrats” who often “resolve” problems at a superficial or less than holistic level. It is, in turn, inevitable that a critical analysis of root causes of conflict often surfaces “unpopular” or “controversial” issues, at least in the eyes of certain sectors of South society. For instance, at a talk I was giving to a Chinese high school in Negros, one faculty member was very upset that I had raised the challenge of effective agrarian reform, and implied that this view “echoes” the ideology of the Marxist NDF-NPA movement. But how can the pervasive and continuing problem of rural poverty be fully understood unless we recognize the structural violence of landlessness and landholding inequities, which are root causes of the insurgency in the first place.
- (f) Last but not least, in practicing solidarity for peace education in the Philippines, my Filipino partners and I unequivocally link education and critical empowerment with transformation, both of selves and of society and the world. This means that, as we were educating for a culture of peace in the academic programs, we constantly challenged learners and ourselves to engage in advocacy for change. For example, at the outset of the Mt. Apo geothermal project, we showed our solidarity with the *Lumads* or indigenous peoples whose lives and wider social/cultural/economic fabric

would be undermined or fragmented. Thus the peace education classes in NDU organized petitions to send to Government and civic leaders to support the initially unified *Lumad* opposition to the project. During a drought, when poor local farmers suffering from hunger were arrested when they distributed rice available in a locked government warehouse, the NDU peace education classes lobbied the President to intervene to free the farmers without charge, and instead distribute badly needed food to their families. Finally, even while away from the Philippines, authentic solidarity means efforts on my part to organize and mobilize ordinary Canadians to support movements and efforts for nonviolent peace and justice. (e.g., sending petitions and statements to the Philippine Government and Congressional representatives to return to the peace talks with the MILF, instead of waging the “all out war” policy by the President against the MILF camps; supporting the campaign of the people of Marinduque for just compensation and redress from the Marcopper mining disaster that has destroyed their environment and economic sustainability, and causing long-term ill-health).

Practising solidarity is, of course, a journey where some obstacles or barriers are encountered along the way. There are, for example, the presence of institutional and sectoral politics such as changes of local leadership who may not be as supportive of educating for a culture of peace. In the case of one institution, peace advocacy was regrettably deemed more important than peace education, even though the holistic framework does not separate the educational process from action for transformation. In addition, over the years, my own institutional environment in the North has seen varying levels of understanding and support for peace education from administrators.

Another barrier that has surfaced, especially when more resources become available as official endorsement of peace education increases, is sometimes the tendency for groups and institutions to compete aggressively for those resources. This invariably undermines the possibilities and necessity for collaboration and sharing of ideas and strategies. New programs or projects can then be superficially conceptualized and hastily put together without the benefit of long-term praxis and development.

Finally, educating for a culture of peace, as it seeks to transform prevailing relationships and structures, has to contend with systemic barriers such as the excessive competition and examination-centered schooling systems and the heavy workload of educators faced with the daily pressures of “banking” curriculum and pedagogies.

To be mindful of these barriers and obstacles is not however to feel despair or helplessness. Embedded within the very framework of educating for a culture of peace is the value of hope, inspiring us to find creative and patient ways of overcoming the barriers and transforming the conflicts. In the Philippines, as I have engaged in weaving solidarity with Filipino peace educators, hopefulness has always been in abundant supply, a force for courageous and committed transformation, no matter how slow the journey forward.

### *Solidarity through Globalization from Below*

A second source of exemplars in the task of weaving solidarity towards a culture of peace is in the widening and deepening collaboration of movements and peoples between North and South, joining hands, minds, hearts and spirit in promoting globalization from below (GFB). The solidarity of GFB challenges the dominant power of globalization from above (GFA) or corporate-led globalization that is based on structural violence, unjust world economic systems, monocultures, values of consumerism, commodification, greed, and unsustainable “development.”

I will cite a few key exemplars of such GFB solidarity.

Over the past decade, the peoples’ summits (e.g., Seattle, Quebec, Prague, Genoa, Washington, Cancun) that regularly challenge meetings and forums of the powerful elites and elite institutions/organizations promoting GFA (e.g., WTO, APEC, IMF, World Bank, World Economic Forum) have demonstrated the will and capacity of civil society organizations to raise awareness of global and local injustices. Such GFB mobilization has also helped to disrupt the smooth functioning of GFA mechanisms.

Increasingly too, North and South citizens, communities and NGOs have collaborated to promote fair trade campaigns, whereby products made in the South are bought in ways and on terms that give equitable income to South producers. These campaigns reflect the willingness of North citizens to consume South products with a spirit of responsibility and accountability to the human rights of South workers, sustainable use and production of resources;

GFB is also being implemented through campaigns for the ethical conduct of transnational corporations, whether in free trade zones, in mining, logging and dam construction, etc. Notable examples include boycotts against clothing or shoes with certain well-known brand names that have led the TNCs marketing those brands to improve the human rights of workers producing the products in sweatshop factories in South countries. The ethical labeling of some products (e.g., carpets) has also helped to improve the rights of South workers, including children.

Movements for freedom from debt, such as the Jubilee campaign initiated by many church and other civil society coalitions, have put considerable pressure on wealthy G8 nations to forgive or cancel the crippling debts owed by poor countries to the IMF, international banks or other rich countries.

At grassroots levels, GFB is being manifested in people-centred equitable development projects in South contexts instead of technocratic, elite-centred modernization schemes that promote GFA. Specific examples of such alternative development include sustainable farming and fishing cooperatives; peasants movements to challenge agribusiness control over food production and distribution; nonviolent agrarian reform advocacy; urban poor organizing for adequate housing and fair working conditions, etc.

There has also been the solidarity of women worldwide to challenge gender inequities and violence against women. This is clearly a crucial dimension of GFB given the vital role women play in all levels of economic and social production and reproduction, as well as in environmental care.

Equally inspirational too has been the movements that join indigenous peoples across mother earth to promote their rights for cultural survival now being destroyed by GFA activities and what has been aptly termed “development aggression.”

In a world still steeped in wars and armed conflicts, GFB is being demonstrated in the numerous campaigns for demilitarization, such as the historic treaty to ban land mines, nuclear arms abolition, and the ending of the deadly arms trade which diverts scarce planetary resources away from basic social needs.

Last but not least, GFB is expanding through projects and programs for sustainability, that include the willingness of North peoples and the non-poor of the South, to lighten their ecological footprints, consume in moderation, and adopt voluntary simplicity so that others may simply live.

The list can go on, but these exemplars of GFB solidarity, so inspiringly demonstrated at such gatherings as the Hague Appeal for Peace, the global justice protests and the World Social Forum at Porto Alegre in Brazil, give us hope and courage that the forces of GFA are not invincible. The global resistance to policies, structures and relationship based on injustice, unsustainability and other dimensions of a culture of violence can only deepen and expand in all the four directions. But it means that as educators for a culture of peace, we need to be as concerned with the critical empowerment of the marginalized, coming to know their realities and seeking their own transformation for justice and peace; as well as with the critical education of the non-poor, so that they are able to integrate within their very lives and being the values of compassion, justice and sustainability.

Last but not least, in the post-September 11<sup>th</sup> globalized environment of militarization and unilateralist projection of power by the dominant states of the world, we need to include in our tasks a deconstruction of the security and fear-mongering that is being used by the powerful to gain support from their citizens for militarized “solutions” to conflicts and “international terrorism”.

In sum, a journey towards a culture of peace that needs critical and empowering education is necessarily a slow and patient process. But hopefully, I have been able to show through my exemplars that weaving solidarity is an indispensable project in which we all need to join in minds, heart and spirit.

**SOLIDARITY, DEMOCRACY, DIVERSITY AND DISSENT:  
ESSENTIALS FOR A CULTURE OF PEACE**

***Betty A. Reardon***

*Founding Director, Peace Education Center  
Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City  
Honorable Mention, UNESCO Prize for Peace Education 2001*

I wish to express my thanks to all at Miriam College and my joy at once again being in the Philippines!

If one were to try to envision the aspect of a culture of peace that I would call "the human encounter," one need only remember or hear about how guests are encountered in the Philippines and how the guests encounter the Filipinos. It is a kind of welcome that one doesn't experience (although one experiences wonderful things in all parts of the world) anywhere else in the world. This is something very special and peace-inspiring about this country.

If I were really grateful, what I would do right now is say, "Dr. Lee, Dr. Quisumbing and Dr. Toh have said it all, and you do not have to listen to me." However, Loreta did not mention that in my background is a formation acquired in ten years as a junior high school classroom teacher. So, you know I have some things to say. But I want you to keep my junior high school teaching background in mind, because whatever I say, I always have the caution in my mind that "You cannot say that to an audience of educators if you cannot transform it into curriculum." And by curriculum, I don't mean texts and such learning material. I mean all intentionally planned learning experiences. If you cannot transform an idea or assertion into a relevant learning experience for the learners who are put into your care, then you cannot propose it as relevant to the educational task.

I am convinced that a culture of peace will come about through our forming into curricula two fundamental concepts that I think are at the center of a culture of peace, human solidarity and democracy. Dr. Quisumbing gave us a wonderful description of a culture of peace rooted in the acknowledgement of human unity. Let us contemplate that notion and the ways by which we realize and arrange human unity. We do it, I believe, through solidarity and democracy, that is, living by the principle of one humanity and constructing our social and political institutions on the basis of that principle. By democracy, I do not mean any specific form of government, neither parliamentary nor republican, but rather a political order which acknowledges that its authority comes from the people for whose well-being it is responsible. In a democracy, government is responsible to the people. Above all, democratic governments are accountable for the way in which they use their power and resources. I fear that given the kind of circumstances that we live in today, so well illustrated in the overview that Professor Lee gave us of the nature of the current, so-called "war on terrorism" that democracy is in great peril. Now more than ever, human solidarity in defense of democracy is essential to

human well-being, even to human survival. If we continue to behave as though world society comprised separate peoples, some more worthy of well-being than others, human survival remains in peril. Without the democratic process to bring about the essential changes, solidarity can not be cultivated.

There are two elements of democracy that we should focus on as we think about the classroom experience and how we plan and facilitate it; diversity and dissent. I believe that we should conceive of the classroom experience as the enablement our students to achieve and live a culture of peace, to learn a culture of peace by living it in the classroom. Indeed, we all learn our cultures by living them. We do not so much receive specific cultural instruction, as we learn what is important who we are in a cultural context by being in that context and interacting with the others who have been formed by that culture. So, as educators what we must be striving for is creating cultures of peace in our classrooms by providing experiences which enable students to fully understand what democracy is and when possible to experience solidarity. Within the classroom community there must be certain democratic agreements and principles governing our relationships so as to assure common well-being, allow for freedom of thought and expression and a respect for and appreciation of the advantages offered by human differences. Because we speak about a culture of peace as embedded in peaceful relationships, behaviors and institutions, we want to create in our classrooms, relationships among our students, and between our students and ourselves that manifest these characteristics of a culture of peace. Relationships in a culture of peace are built on the principles of mutual responsibility that are essential to a sustainable democracy and inspire human solidarity. Thus in a learning community committed to educate for a culture of peace, members are responsible not only for their own learning, but also for contributing to the learning of others. Democracy in the classroom cultivates such mutual responsibility. Acknowledging diversity as a learning resource contributes to the breadth and richness of the learning. Allowing and respecting reasonable disagreement and responsible dissent encourages reasoning and integrity. Without responsible dissent, democracy cannot be sustained in the face of xenophobia and simplistic political reasoning.

These are the very qualities of democracy we lose when we wage war, any kind of war, including and especially the war on terrorism. War is clearly the enemy of democracy. We in American society, supposedly a society that cherishes diversity and makes it possible for people from various cultural traditions to come together in one national community, that assures the right to dissenting political opinions, now suffer a malady that has devalued diversity in cultural identity and political thought, cultivating suspicions of members of particular ethnic and religious groups and discouraging, even suppressing opposition to military responses to terrorism. We have succumbed to a kind of political fundamentalism that represses difference and dissent, mirroring that which we purport to be struggling against. I am afraid many of our students do not fully understand the requisites of democracy.

I was shocked to hear that one of my students thought of democracy as nothing more than majority rule asking, "What happens to the minority?" That's the central point about democracy; it is intended to protect the rights of all minorities, political as well as ethnic and religious. Majorities and minorities have mutual responsibilities for the well-being of their communities. As Dr. Quisumbing and the other speakers have told us this morning, human rights are universal. They belong to us all. A culture of peace is one in which we believe in universal entitlement. As Dr. Quisumbing says, it is our birthright. We are entitled to the benefits of Earth, so long as we cherish and replenish the Earth. And we are responsible to see that fulfilling our entitlement does not deplete the Earth or deprive others of its benefits.

We cannot deprive others of a fair share of Earth's benefits, nor can we deprive them of their right to speak the truth when the authority proclaims a truth that some of us cannot see. So, we have to respect truth in our classrooms, to make room for dissent, and learn how to deal with it constructively. We have to learn ourselves how to be instructors in the skills of non-violent resistance-- a dissent or resistance which allows always full respect to the humanity and rights of the opposition. One of the most significant principles that upholds this imperative of respect comes from the 1963 papal encyclical, "*Pacem in Terris*" in which the very wise Pope John XXIII tells us that although human beings may be in error, they are still human beings and entitled to all their rights.

Now, we have had many interpretations of what has transpired in the world since over the last year. Many have been declared in error, if not sinful, in their acts, but we have not been reminded that the perpetrators of the acts and all are still human beings and have to be treated accordingly. Even when they are taken as prisoners of war, the principle must hold. While I am very concerned about the current state of democracy, I also take very great hope in what I see as new sources of democracy. When Dr. Toh Swee Hin spoke about the various civil society efforts, he was speaking about, in many cases, transnational, transcultural efforts of dissent against the negative processes of globalization and the policies and values that underlie those processes. I think we would agree that they intend to dissent on behalf of humanity, especially the majority, the poor, the marginalized, the larger, percentage of whom are women. A process which privileges a few at the cost of the suffering of many is not democratic; it is not peaceful.

We ought to bring into our classrooms not only the possibility to learn how to dissent constructively, but we should introduce within the framework of teaching such skills, the imperative that the equal human value of every person is never forfeited. Crimes must be punished and harms must be redressed, but those who commit them are still human; indeed, their being human, "endowed with reason and conscience" (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 1) is what makes them accountable. We, ourselves need to learn and guide our students in learning to cherish diversity, and understand that democracy depends upon diversity. It is only when we have multiple ways of looking at the world, of seeing problems from multiple perspectives that we can begin to have a sufficient variety of ways to confront our common global problems; to work our way out of what seem to be unprecedented conditions - the conditions which sometimes keep us from not turning on the television or opening the newspaper. We must also indicate that

we cherish diversity because each culture is unique and irreplaceable as is each person. But to be unique does not mean to be the best. Often, that is the message we give to our students about our cultures and our political systems. My mother's message about being the best, basic to my ideas on human equality was, "Remember that you are not better than anybody; but also, remember no one is better than you." She believed that we are all God's children and should treat each other accordingly. I learned from her that respect for the rights of others and defense of our own rights are both important social obligations.

I think there is a wisdom in what parents tell us that we sometimes seem to forget from the ages of fifteen to thirty, the years when the generation gap tends to be as wide as some of the cultural gaps we now face. However, the older we get we see the wisdom of these lessons of the past, lessons from family and cultural traditions, our own and others in which we can find the seeds of human solidarity. Among us here at IPE are those who have cherished both their own precious uniqueness and the richness of human diversity and have been able, on the basis of a strong personal and cultural identity, to undertake acts of solidarity with and on behalf of those who are generationally, culturally, religiously and politically different. The first and most fundamental solidarity act, of course, is sharing. I mean sharing much the way that it has been mentioned by the other two speakers, thinking in particular of the Spanish word "*compartir*" which connotes mutuality. I don't share by giving you something. Together we look at what is there, and we parcel it out by need and by what we can do with it for the good of all. That's "*compartir*," the first essential act of solidarity.

A second essential act of solidarity is being part of a common struggle, a shared resistance to an injustice, such as when we in the United States boycotted grapes in support of the farm workers in California, when we engaged in the anti-Apartheid movement by divesting investment in South Africa. That was being part of those struggles as best we could from our own locations. There are also those whose acts of solidarity are in actually joining the suffering of the abused and exploited, such people as Bishop Oscar Romero of El Salvador whose solidarity with the economically deprived and politically oppressed led to his martyrdom. Most of the world knows Bishop Romero who really took the Catholic teaching about the option for the poor and the oppressed so seriously that he was murdered for his stance of solidarity. But how many of you know of three boys from my country -- Goodwin, Schwerner and Cheney, one black boy and two white boys working together in the voter registration campaign in what was called Mississippi Summer, 1964. They went into the struggle for equal rights for black Americans knowing the risk of an act of solidarity, and they, too, gave their lives in an act of solidarity. There are many such names in the histories of all of our countries that should be among those we count as national heroes memorialized in accounts, in our texts and by statues in our town squares.

Many peace educators participate at various levels in solidarity struggles and are fully committed to human solidarity based on the value of human equality. So as we practice democracy in our classrooms, affirming human unity, valuing diversity, as we create a climate of a culture of peace, we see the need to nurture courage, because there is no authentic solidarity unless there is courage to share not only benefits but also, and more urgently, the risks of actually confronting injustice. Even changing the way we live day by day in solidarity with the poor and the marginalized as Toh Swee Hin enjoined us calls for risk and courage, qualities which we should include among our learning objective in education for a culture of peace. We've already been told that we were a bit courageous because some of us disregarded travelers' warnings and so forth to come to IIPE. So, I know that in this room there are many who know how to risk for solidarity and have the courage to do so. Indeed to be a teacher of peace is in itself to risk teaching the new and the controversial. Peace education is practicing the pedagogy of the brave.

Finally, I want to say to the students in the room, I hope that many of you are thinking about being teachers. The reason for this hope is that I really believe that what we do in the classroom matters. I truly believe we can educate for solidarity and a culture of peace. We can make curriculum from everything that I've talked about today. I also know that doing it is a lot of fun. So, I hope that many of you will have that same joy.

Thank you all!