**The Moral and Spiritual Foundations of Peace Education**

Dale T. Snauwaert
The University of Toledo

## INTRODUCTION

Does the use of military force require moral justification, or is political necessity sufficient? Can the use of force ever be morally justified?  If yes, what principles justify and govern its use?  Are there certain things that never should be done to another human being?  Are there things that must be provided to every human being?  Is peace a basic right? Does peace not only involve the absence of direct violence (negative peace) but include the absence of structural violence – injustice—(positive peace) as well?  Should citizens of a democracy be educated in order to participate in ethical and political discourse concerning these questions?

## MORALITY, POLITICS, AND PEACE EDUCATION

Political Realism, arguably the leading theory of international relations, denies the existence of morality in relations between nations and peoples.  It maintains that these relations are *purely political,* in the sense that they exclusively concern national-interests and power, not what is right or good *per se* (Doyle, 1997; Mapel, 1996; McMahan, 1996; Smith, 1986). Realism does posit the existence of a moral community existing within the boundaries of the nation-state.  There exists a national interest, a common good, which state agents are obligated to enhance.  There is also a moral imperative to provide an umbrella of security for the people of the nation.  Officials of the state are morally obligated to pursue the national interest and the security of the people through the prudent exercise of power, including the deployment of military force. This view, however, is morally exclusionary – it posits that human beings existing outside one's nation are not members of the moral community and thus do not require moral consideration.  Ethics stop at the border.  In contrast, Peace Education is premised upon the cosmopolitan belief that the moral community includes all human beings, that all human beings have moral standing, and thus war and peace, justice and injustice, are global moral considerations. It is not merely a philosophical ideal -- There is an *"actually existing cosmopolitanism,"* a transnational, global moral community based in widespread agreement (Bobbio, [1990] 1996; Bok, 1995; Boulding, 1988; Brown, 1992; Buergentahl, 1995; Cooper, 1999; Corcoran, 2005; Dalai-Lama, 1999; R. Falk, 1989; R. A. Falk, 2000; Finnis, 1980; Glover, 2000; Hayden, 2001; Held, 1995; Kant, [1795]1983; H. Kung, 1993a; H. a. K.-J. K. Kung, 1993b; Maritain, 1958; Nussbaum, 1996; Perry, 1998).

At its core morality concerns the question:  *How should we live?* This is a question concerning the good life, and it constitutes a *eudaimoniac* perspective (Aristotle, 1965)*.*  The Greek word *eudaimonia* is often translated as happiness, but a more accurate translation is human fulfillment, well-being, and/or flourishing.  The fundamental presupposition of this ethical perspective is that human beings seek fulfillment in terms of the enjoyment of an integrated set of basic goods (health, knowledge, friendship, aesthetic experience, play, work, sustainable environment, etc.) that together constitute human flourishing. From this perspective, individuals have a "human right" to these basic goods (Finnis, 1980). As Henry Shue (1980) suggests: "A moral right provides (1) the rational basis for a justified demand and (2) that the actual enjoyment of a substance be (3) socially guaranteed against standard threats (p. 13)." From this perspective, rights are justified demands for the enjoyment of goods, which are guaranteed by the society. Rights thus define what the individual is due, is justified in demanding, and/or is protected from.  In this way rights are moral and legal devices, which define the moral and, when codified in law, the legal boundaries of human relationship.  Rights define what choices can never be made or those that must be made.  Human rights to basic goods in turn evoke correlative duties, which are basic moral obligations required for basic rights:
> a. positive duties of mutual care and support (duty to aid)
> b. negative duties of no harm to others (duty to avoid harm)

      c.  norms of rudimentary fairness (duty to protect) (Bok, 1995; Shue, 1980)

The moral equation is not merely about what the individual is due but also, and fundamentally, it involves what individuals are obligated to provide or refrain from in relation to others. The duty to *avoid* harm entails restraint:  the obligation to refrain from destructive action.  The duty to *protect* entails the responsibility for establishment of norms, social practices, and institutions that enforce the duty to avoid deprivation.  The duty to *aid* is positive in the sense that it is on obligation to *provide* for those in need. If individuals have a right to pursue happiness, to pursue human fulfillment, then this set of duties, *and* their institutionalization, is morally imperative on the social level. These correlative duties are necessary for the minimal level of social cooperation necessary for human flourishing.

Does this imperative apply on the level of foreign relations? This question can be rephrased in terms of moral duty. There is an important distinction between "positional" duty and "natural" duty.  Positional duty constitutes obligations that are entailed by a particular position or role in the society.  Positional duties relate to special relationships connected to specific roles.  Natural duty refers to obligations that are owed to all human beings regardless of position or specialized relationships.  Natural duties speak to obligations that human beings possess and owe each other *as* human beings. Are the basic duties, the common values above, positional or natural?  Do they apply to relations between societies and peoples?  The claim that human beings have a right to pursue happiness, including rights to all goods necessary for human flourishing, is based upon the presupposition that human beings possess intrinsic value, that they are ends.  It is an ethic that proclaims the sovereignty, not of any temporal governmental power, but that of human dignity.  Human dignity is not defined by political borders but establishes a global, cosmopolitan moral community.  The proposition here is that membership in the moral community is based upon the recognition of the intrinsic value of innate human characteristics and capacities.  Peace, therefore, can be defined as a cosmopolitan moral order that secures human rights and duties necessary for human flourishing.

When human rights are threatened or violated on a mass scale, such as aggressive war and genocide, the Just War tradition maintains that the aggrieved party has a right to protect itself and to restore a just peace and others, friends and allies, are justified in intervening to protect or restore that peace.  This intervention can entail a justified use of force.  The obligation to act for the protection of a just peace is founded upon a right of self-defense and an obligation to help others in need. In its efforts to defend a just peace, Just War Theory has developed two sets of principled considerations that define the standards for moral decision making concerning both the decision to go to war and the right conduct of war:  *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello* respectively.  In this moral tradition there exists a *prima facie* presumption against violence, and thus the use of force requires moral justification.  The moral justifiability of using force is contingent upon meeting all of the following criteria:  just cause, right authority, right intention, proportionality, reasonable hope of success, and last resort.  *Jus in bello* pertains to the right conduct of force.  From this perspective, the use of force must be proportional and consistent with noncombatant immunity – the principles of proportionality and discrimination respectively. The use of force may be morally justified to restore a just peace, but it can never fall into total war, for then it contradicts its own justification, the protection of human dignity (Allen, [1991] 2001; Bishops, [1983] 1992; Boyle, 1996; Cady, 1989; Finnis, 1996; Ford, 1970; Hoffman, 1981; Holmes, 1989, [1989] 1992; Nardin, 1996; Ramsborth, 1996; Ramsey, 1961, [1968] 1983; Turner Johnson, 1981, 1999; Walzer, 1970, 1997; Wasserstrom, 1970; Yoder, 1984).

Peace, as a cosmopolitan moral order, is in turn contingent upon the capacity of individual persons to respond to the inherent dignity, the intrinsic value of others.  Principles of rights and duties are essential but they remain powerless without the internal moral resources that equip one to morally respond to others.

There are two basic moral sensibilities that form our moral capacity:  "I can't" and "I must" (Fromm, 1947; Glover, 2000).  "I can't" constitutes the capacity to refrain from doing harm – a capacity of restraint.  It is grounded in the capacity of internal reflection and self-awareness of what is consistent

with one's own integrity (Arendt, 1971, 1992, 1994; Arendt & Kohn, 2003; Dalai-Lama, 1999; Hanh, 1987). It is based upon the moral perspective that it is "better to suffer wrong than to do wrong." In Plato's *Gorgias* Socrates states metaphorically: "it would be better for me that my lyre or a chorus I direct were out of tune and loud with discord, and that most men should not agree with me and contradict me, rather than that I, being one, should be out of tune with myself and contradict myself (482b-c)." If I harm others, then I will not be able to live with my self. The potential internal discord stops me. It is an internal, spiritual mechanism of restraint.

"I must" constitutes the capacity to positively respond, with care and compassion, to the needs of others. This response requires the capacity to meet the other as a subject, as an end. It is based in the recognition of the intrinsic value of the other person (Buber, 1970). It also involves the awareness of the interdependence and interconnection between human beings. It also entails the capacity of equanimity, the ability to remain impartial while being able to take the perspective of the other (Dalai-Lama, 1999).

## CONCLUSION

From this perspective, morality and thereby peace are structured in the overall quality of our hearts and minds (Dalai-Lama, 1999). As Betty Reardon maintains, peace education should aim at the transformation of both the structures of society *and* the structures of consciousness (Reardon, 1988). These points suggest that peace education has interrelated moral *and* spiritual foundation.

## REFERENCES & FURTHER READING

Allen, J. L. ([1991] 2001). *War: A primer for Christians*. Dallas: First Maguire Center/Southern Methodist University Press.

Arendt, H. (1971). *The life of the mind* (Vol. one volume edition). New York: Harcourt.

Arendt, H. (1992). Lectures on Kant's political philosophy. In R. Beiner (Ed.), *Hannah Arendt lectures on Kant's political philosophy* (pp. 3-88). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Arendt, H. (1994). *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the banality of evil*. New York: Penguin Books.

Arendt, H., & Kohn, J. (2003). *Responsibility and judgment* (1st ed.). New York: Schocken Books.

Aristotle. (1965). *Nicomachean ethics* (J. A. K. Thomson, Trans.). Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Bishops, U. S. C. ([1983] 1992). The challenge of peace: God's promise and our response. In J. B. Elshtain (Ed.), *Just war theory* (pp. pp. 77-168). New York: New York University Press.

Bobbio, N. ([1990] 1996). *The age of rights*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bok, S. (1995). *Common values*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

Boulding, E. (1988). *Building a global civic culture: Education for an interdependent world*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Boyle, J. (1996). Just war thinking in catholic natural law. In T. Nardin (Ed.), *The ethics of war and peace: Religious and secular perspectives* (pp. 40-53). Princeton, NY: Princeton University Press.

Brown, C. (1992). *International relations theory: New normative approaches*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Buber, M. (1970). *I and thou* (W. Kaufman, Trans.). New York: Scribners.

Buergentahl, T. (1995). *International human rights*. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing.

Cady, D. L. (1989). *From warism to pacifism:  A moral continuum*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Cooper, B. (Ed.). (1999). *War crimes:  The legacy of Nuremberg*. New York: TV Books.

Corcoran, P. B. (Ed.). (2005). *The earth charter in action:  Toward a sustainable world*. Amsterdam: KIT Publishers, In cooperation with the Earth Charter Initiative, San Jose, Costa Rica.

Dalai-Lama. (1999). *Ethics for the new millennium*. New York: Riverhead Books.

Doyle, M. W. (1997). *Ways of war and peace*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Falk, R. (1989). *Revitalizing international law*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press.

Falk, R. A. (2000). *Human rights horizons: The pursuit of justice in a globalizing world*. New York: Routledge.

Finnis, J. (1980). *Natural law and natural rights*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press.

Finnis, J. (1996). The ethics of war and peace in the catholic natural law tradition. In T. Nardin (Ed.), *The ethics of war and peace: Religious and secular perspectives* (pp. 15-37). Princeton, NY: Princeton University Press.

Ford, J. C. (1970). The morality of obliteration bombing. In R. A. Wasserstrom (Ed.), *War and morality* (pp. 15-41). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Fromm, E. (1947). *Man for himself:  An inquiry into the psychology of ethics*. New York: Rinehart and Company.

Glover, J. (2000). *Humanity:  A moral history of the twentieth century*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hanh, T. N. (1987). *Being peace*. Berkeley, Calif.: Parallax Press.

Hayden, P. (Ed.). (2001). *The philosophy of human rights*. St. Paul: Paragon House.

Held, D. (1995). *Democracy and the global order*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hoffman, S. (1981). *Duties beyond borders:  On the limits and possibilities of ethical international politics*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Holmes, R. L. (1989). *On war and morality*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Holmes, R. L. ([1989] 1992). Can war be morally justified?  The just war theory. In J. B. Elshtain (Ed.), *Just war theory* (pp. pp. 195-233). New York: New York University Press.

Kant, I. ([1795]1983). *Perpetual peace and other essays* (T. Humphrey., Trans.). Cambridge: Hackett.

Kung, H. (1993a). *Global responsibility:  In search of a new world ethic*. New York: Continuum.

Kung, H. a. K.-J. K. (Ed.). (1993b). *A global ethic:  The declaration of the parliament of the world's religions*. New York: Continuum.

Mapel, D. R. (1996). Realism and the ethics of war and peace. In T. Nardin (Ed.), *The ethics of war and peace: Religious and secular perspectives* (pp. 54-77). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Maritain, J. (1958). *The rights of man and natural law*. London: Geoffrey Bles.

McMahan, J. (1996). Realism, morality, and war. In T. Nardin (Ed.), *The ethics of war and peace: Religious and secular perspectives* (pp. 78-92). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Nardin, T. (Ed.). (1996). *The ethics of war and peace:  Religious and secular perspectives*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Nussbaum, M. (1996). *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Perry, M. J. (1998). *The idea of rights:  Four inquiries*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ramsborth, O. a. W., Tom. (1996). *Humanitarian intervention in contemporary conflict:  A reconceptualization*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Ramsey, P. (1961). *War and the Christian conscience:  How shall modern war be conducted justly?* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ramsey, P. ([1968] 1983). *The just war:  Force and political responsibility*. New York: University Press of America.

Reardon, B. (1988). *Comprehensive peace education: Educating for global responsibility*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Shue, H. (1980). *Basic rights: Subsistence, affluence, and U.S. Foreign policy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Smith, M. J. (1986). *Realist thought from Weber to Kissinger*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.

Turner Johnson, J. (1981). *Just war tradition and the restraint of war:  A moral and historical inquiry*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Turner Johnson, J. (1999). *Morality and contemporary warfare*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Walzer, M. (1970). Moral judgment in time of war. In R. A. Wasserstrom (Ed.), *War and morality* (pp. 54-62). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Walzer, M. (1997). *Just and unjust wars: A moral argument with historical illustrations*. New York: Basic Books.

Wasserstrom, R. A. (1970). On the morality of war:  A preliminary inquiry. In R. A. Wasserstrom (Ed.), *War and morality* (pp. 78-101). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Yoder, J. H. (1984). *When war is unjust:  Being honest in just-war thinking*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House.