Agnieszka Piejka (Christian Theological Academy in Warsaw)♦

THE ROLE OF PEDAGOGY IN PEACE RESEARCH

Abstract. The article consists of two parts. The first part presents the most important stages of scientific discipline shaping defined nowadays as peace research. In the second part, the focus is on the specificity of pedagogic thinking about peace, in order to illustrate its consonance with the trends developing in peace research, for several decades, and to emphasize the sense of education as one of the ways to create and strengthen peace. According to that perspective every human being, and not only political decision makers, should feel responsible for the existence of the peaceful ordering of the world.

Key–words: pedagogy, peace education, peace, peace research.

Introduction

The significance of pedagogy for the research area has not always has been appreciated; a scientific reflection on the international peace order building and strengthening for a long period of time was considered to be an issue for political analysts, representatives engaged in international relations, historians, and philosophers. In the meantime, pedagogy due to its scientific focusing on the education process constitutes a very important source of knowledge for those who look for ways to build peace. Education is thus a special *tool* which allows us to effect considerable social changes, including changes that lead to the strengthening of peace, both on the local as well as global scales. One of the most prominent pedagogues of 20th century, John Dewey, wrote:

> *I believe that all education proceeds by the parti-*
> *cipation of the individual in the social consciousness*
> *of the race. This process begins unconsciously almost*
> *at birth, and is continually shaping the individual's*
> *powers, saturating his consciousness, forming his*
> *habits, training his ideas, and arousing his feelings*
> *and emotions. Through this unconscious education*

♦ Address for correspondence: Chrześcijańska Akademia Teologiczna, Miodowa 21c, 00–246 Warszawa, Poland. Email: a.piejka@chat.edu.pl.

> *the individual gradually comes to share in the*
> *intellectual and moral resources which humanity has*
> *succeeded in getting together. He becomes an*
> *inheritor of the funded capital of civilization.*[1]

Education is thus a special *tool* which allows us to effect considerable social changes, including changes that lead to the strengthening of peace, both on the local as well as global scales.

My paper consists of two parts. First, I shall present the most important stages of scientific discipline shaping what is defined nowadays as peace research. In the second part, I shall focus on the specificity of pedagogic thinking about peace in order to illustrate its consonance with the development of the trends of peace research over several decades, and to emphasize the perception of education as one of the ways to create and strengthen peace. It is due to the concept of education for peace that pedagogy contributes an important perspective to peace research. According to that perspective every human being, and not only political decision makers, should feel responsible for the existence of the peaceful world order.

1. Peace research – a short characterization

Questions referring to war and peace belong to the oldest questions ever asked by mankind; the tradition of asking such questions dates back to ancient times. This tradition should be related to philosophical reflection on the human condition and in particular to reflection – upon the political reality – in which a man lives. Questions about war and peace have been coded into philosophy, constituting one of the fields of its enquiries. They were asked, among others, by Plato, Aristotle, Seneca, Cicero, and in subsequent centuries by Saint Augustine and Saint Thomas Aquinas, Machiavelli, Moore, Montesquieu, Kant, Bentham, Fichte, Hegel and many others, that are impossible to list in full here. Additionally, the historical reasons for undertaking the specified research over peace reach far into the past. They are traced in striving for the cessation of religious wars in Europe in the 17th and 18th centuries, and then in various peace movements that occurred in the 19th century.

A particularly important moment on the path of peace research emerging as a separate scientific discipline was the establishment of international relations science in the first decades of the 20th century. The nightmare of First World War triggered reflections and motivation to build a better world, a world without wars. The establishment of a new discipline – international relations science – constituted an intellectual response to events related to the First World War; inquiry into peace guarantees, international regulations and forms of the organization of relations between countries constituted a starting point for the shaping of a new, scientific discipline, with its own rights and methodology[2]. The first university chair dealing with international relations was established in 1919 at the University College of Wales in Aberystwyth in

---

[1] J. Dewey, *My Pedagogic Creed*, p. 75.

[2] See M. Banks, *The Inter–Paradigm Debate*, p. 10.

the United Kingdom. Subsequently, such chairs were established in Paris (Carnegie Endowment, 1925) and Berlin (Hochschule für Politik, 1927). In 1926, forty American universities and colleges offered international relations introductory courses, while eighty universities offered advanced courses in that field. The new scientific discipline was developing fast, and with strong support of the League of Nations and private foundations. A considerable role with regard to the shaping of its self–awareness was played by references to international law, the history of diplomacy, and a long tradition of political philosophy. For these considerations, it is particularly important that it was established as a response to the First World War, which to a considerable extent decided its profile and purposes. The initial symbiosis between international relations science and peace research stemmed, first of all, from the fact that the science of international relations was based on the intention of examining mutual relations between countries through scientific methods (while the issue of war and peace portrays itself as a main focus) as well as the intention to find, with scientific cognitive tools, effective manners for strengthening and securing the peaceful coexistence of countries.

A crucial moment in the history of research on the essence of war and peace relates to the first years after the Second World War. In 1945 in Paris, the Polemological Institute was established by the French sociologist and economist, Gaston Bouthol. The main task of the Institute was to conduct polemological research (from Greek *polemos* – war, battle) focusing on the conditions and mechanisms of wars. Bouthol was convinced that an in–depth acquisition of those facts is very important to strengthen and maintain peace in the world.

Simultaneously, during the post–war period, the notion of a Peace Research Movement appeared in the American literature. The idea of that movement was born in the minds of scientists as a response to the tragedy of war, and first of all to the engagement of science into armament, which was expressed by the production of nuclear weapons and their use. It was considered that the building and strengthening of international peace cannot be executed exclusively by political solutions (congresses, appeals, pacts); science too should be engaged with that difficult process. Thus, special institutes as well as science and research societies should be established to deal with widely understood peace research. The effect of those proposals led to the establishment of this type of institution in the United States and subsequently in Canada and Europe. The first of these included: the Center of Research on Conflict Resolution (Ann Arbor, 1959), which was created on the basis of a research team under the name of Research Exchange on the Prevention of War (established in 1952) and the Peace Research Society (Philadelphia, 1964). In 1961, the Canadian Peace Research Institute was established in Toronto. The best known institutions established on the European mainland within the discussed period include: Peace Research Institute PRIO (Oslo, 1959), The International Peace Research Association IPRA (London, 1964), Stockholm International Peace Research Institute SIPRI (1966), and the Institute for Peace and Conflict Research (Hellerup, 1969).

The fifties and sixties of 20th century were a period of institutionalization of peace research, and simultaneously they constitute the beginning of a specialized discipline. The first decade of research is characterized by focusing on a search for answers to questions about the reasons for wars and similar conflicts. Moreover, there were questions about the arms race and the possibility of bringing it to a halt. The following decades would bring subsequent institutes, associations and foundations, which currently operate in the number of several hundred. Each of these establishments has its specificity and a special profile of research; however, we may specify a superior, common goal which they serve. The elaboration of objective and subjective indicators for the elimination of wars from social life as well as establishing a basis for lasting peace[1].

At the end of the sixties, the first conclusions on the preliminary decades of research were drawn. In that debate, statements of the founder and chairman of the PRIO, Johan Galtung, constituted an important contribution. He pointed out the various, basic weaknesses of peace research, and the lack of a commonly recognized answer to the question: *what is peace?*[2] That Norwegian scientist emphasized that it should be defined rather as a process and not the condition, with the process covering numerous stages – from war elimination, through the elimination of personal–indirect violence and structural–indirect violence from social relations, in order to fully meet human needs and ensure conditions for development[3].

The doubts reported by Galtung and other scientists led researchers to elaborate and systematize the concepts related to two definitions of peace – a narrow one and a broad one. According to the first, peace is identified as no wars or organized collective violence – it is so called *negative* peace. This definition appeals first of all to polemologists including, among others, the above mentioned Gaston Bouthol. According to the second broad definition, (which has been adopted in the field of peace research), peace is considered as a constructive principle defining both international relations as well as, intra–country and interpersonal relations, which is related to the realization of defined, concrete values. As yet we have not managed to define explicitly what those values should be, we deal with a considerable diversity of opinions and proposals. However, there is unanimity about the inadequacy of the *negative* definition of peace. Immanuel Kant emphasized the insufficiency of that definition in 1795, in the treatiste *Zum ewigen Frieden. Ein philosophischer Entwurf*[4]. Contemporary peace researchers are attracted by the tradition of perceiving peace – in a broad perspective, within which one looks not only for the precondition, leading to achieving peaceful coexistence, but additionally for basic, definitive conditions, intended to maintain peace already achieved and to make it lasting. In other words: in order to establish

---

[1] See J. Kukułka (ed.), *Leksykon pokoju*, p. 26.

[2] See J. Galtung, *Peace Research: Science or Politics in Disguise?*

[3] See J. Galtung, *Peace: Research – Education – Action. Essays in Peace Research*.

[4] See I. Kant, *To Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*.

peace, the dual approach is needed: establishing peaceful order in the world as well as shaping a peaceful order in people. As a consequence, a subsequent important stage of peace research has come into being. It is characterized by the dominance of the so–called critical or radical trend.

Scientists have focused on sociological analyses assessing various social phenomena from the perspective of their influence on the individual or collective manifestations of aggression. They became interested, among others things, in structural violence – social and economic violence, various types of dependencies intra– and international, issues of inequality, and social injustice[1].

Subsequent decades of peace research, starting from the turn of the seventies and eighties, are related to an increasing interest of researchers in the individual – both in the context of oppressions, to which that person may be exposed, as well as from the perspective of individual responsibility for the peaceful coexistence of people[2]. Numerous analyses paid attention to issues of basic human rights violations, limitation of individual freedoms, and various forms of discrimination as well as sources of aggressive conducts and conflicts occurring in the relation to them. Moreover, there are peace–related studies undertaken (among others, under the initiative of UNESCO, The Club of Rome and Max Planck Institute in Starnberg) and they are significant for reflection on peace in the future. Such studies show various paths of humankind's developments and their consequences. Depicting the future through the lens of potential alternatives has underlined the importance of human decisions, which may constitute the beginning of long–lasting, comprehensive processes determining the direction of the development of our civilization. This issue was pointed out by, among others, Aurelio Peccei, the founder and first president of the Club of Rome, in his book entitled *Cento pagine per l'avvenire*, which appeared in 1981[3]. Big World – as he wrote – refers not only to threats but also to complicated processes. This is also the world of our human responsibility. The moral responsibility of citizens does not expire beyond the territory of the country where they live. The more the world's states are linked and co–dependent, the scope of responsibility of the individual is greater.

However, the fact is that people are not aware to a sufficient extent of those dependencies. Moreover, they are not sufficiently engaged in thinking about the future, focusing exclusively on the aspects that occur here and now. As an economist and manager, Peccei appreciated the significance of planning and activities undertaken by big corporations and organizations. He understood their considerable role in building the future of the world. He emphasized, however, that finally decisions are undertaken by concrete people: *In this analysis, I shall always take* the human being as the touchstone

---

[1] See W. Kostecki, *Współczesne badania nad pokojem*, pp. 32–33.

[2] See W. Kostecki, *Współczesne badania nad pokojem*, p. 34.

[3] It is worth to mention that both the German as well as Polish editions of the book were issued under the telling title, *The future is in our hands*: A. Peccei, *Die Zukunft in unserer Hand*, [no transl. given], Wien – München – Zürich – New York 1981, A. Peccei, *Przyszłość jest w naszych rękach*, transl. I. Wojnar, Warszawa 1987.

and point of reference. *For this reason, I shall come back to the individual time and again – for, in the end, everything depends on the human quality.*[1] Such perspective emphasizing the significance of responsibility of the individual for the world and its future has been of significance with regard to thinking about peace, while studies of the future, even if they are not carried out directly in the context of their peace aspects, should be perceived as a valuable source of knowledge for those who deal with issues of building and strengthening international peace[2].

The second and the third stage of peace research development were related to a considerable widening of research areas within the scope of the analyzed discipline of the science. Simultaneously, global peace research to an increasing degree assumed a multi– and interdisciplinary character, obliging researchers to take into consideration theoretical reflections as well as the results of studies in various scientific disciplines. Thus, not only international relations, from which peace research emerged but also political economy, natural science, psychology, sociology and pedagogy had to be recognized as important sources of knowledge[3].

The example of such an interdisciplinary research approach refers, among others, to the activity of the Norwegian PRIO. Individual projects have been executed in an interdisciplinary manner, by international research groups. Relatively frequent scientific meetings, conferences and symposia have facilitated both scientific communication between peace research experts, as well as the exchange of views between representatives of various fields of science, politicians, journalists and officers of the state administration[4]. A similar interdisciplinary research strategy was adopted by IPRA and by UNESCO.

While IPRA set up the Peace Education Commission (PEC), a body devoted to pedagogical and personal aspects of peace knowledge, the PEC inquired into the relationship of peace education and peace studies and the impact of the former on the latter. Moreover, members of the Commission from around the world promoted the recognition of the significant role of pedagogy in shaping the field of peace studies[5]. UNESCO considers as one of the basic goals of its activity

> *to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without*

---

[1] A. Peccei, *One Hundred Pages for the Future ...* , pp. 26–27.

[2] While referring to Aurelio Peccei we shall mention as scientists meritorious for the discussed period of research over the future, among others, C. F. von Weizsäcker, G. Picht, R. Jungk, H. Kahn.

[3] See W. Kostecki, *Współczesne badania nad pokojem*, p. 36

[4] See J. Galtung, *The Next Twenty–five Years of Peace Research: Tasks and Prospects*.

[5] See M. A. Percival, *An intellectual history ...* .

distinction of race, sex, language or religion[1].

The Preamble to the constitution of UNESCO reads: *That since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed*[2]. This concept points out not only the necessity to examine reasons and conditions for the c o l l e c t i v e use of force, but it additionally emphasizes the need to ask questions about human nature and the i n d i v i d u a l responsibility for what is going on in the world. The individual shall be perceived not only as an entity c r e a t e d by various external conditions, but also as the c r e a t o r a n d a u t h o r. Decisions of people have always been and are one of the most significant sources of the processes and mechanisms occurring in the world.

The identification and analysis of such relations has become a part of the peace research field, the symbol of which may refer to the introduction of the notion of peace culture, defined in 1995 by UNESCO as culture of coexistence and sharing with others based on principles of freedom, justice and democracy, tolerance and solidarity; culture that rejects violence, demonstrates a tendency to prevent conflicts at their sources and to solve problems by the dialogue and negotiations; culture that ensures everybody full rights and the possibility of a full participation in the endogenous society development[3].

This definition points to a person's attitudes as well as interpersonal relations as the basic component of the social world. Moreover, it notes that all the people, and not only selected individuals, for example political decision makers and owners of huge corporations, may and shall have an influence on the development of society, as conscientious creators of bottom–up, single changes. The possibility for such perceived participation refers not only to the question of political interdependencies and arrangements, but also the effect of the appropriate preparation of individuals. Thus, questions about peace also demand questions about education, which is examined and depicted by pedagogy. Scientific circles dealing with conditions of the peaceful coexistence of people are aware of the significance of reflection and pedagogical studies. They have been recognized as important factors almost at the very beginning of peace research, appearing parallel to the departure of that field of science from its initial symbiosis with international relations and the broadening of its scientific perspective; the awareness of that significance was growing. Already in the 1960s pedagogical reflection was considered as an important field of peace research. During subsequent decades, as the scope of such studies was expanded and their multi– and interdisciplinary character was emphasized, more and more often the idea of education for peace was referred to. Alongside political and economic activities, intended to prevent wars, pro–peace education is currently recognized as equally important in building international peace order. Thus, questions about peace constitute a

---

[1] *Preamble to the Constitution of* UNESCO.

[2] *Preamble to the Constitution of* UNESCO.

[3] See F. Mayor & J. Bindé, *The World Ahead: Our Future in the Making*, p. 414.

challenge not only for historians, political scientists and representatives of peace research as a separate scientific discipline. Moreover, they have a pedagogical character, and neglecting that dimension would constitute a considerable negligence of researchers looking for means to build and strengthen peace in the world.

2. The specific nature of pedagogical reflection on peace

The subject of research, explaining the reason for the existence of pedagogy as a field of science, are widely understood educational processes. The term *education* means all the actions aiming at forming (changing, developing) human capabilities, connected with various areas of their functioning in the intellectual, emotional, interpersonal and motivational world[1]. Educational actions are intended to foster personal development, and this development is defined as a better understanding of self and ones relationship with the world, a more effective control over one's behaviour and more considerable influence on external processes. This goal in pedagogy is presented by I. Wojnar:

> *I believe that pedagogy, by nature, is a general knowledge focused on a person, his timeless 'essence', defined in the infinite variety of existence. Such pedagogy is sometimes defined as 'general', 'integral' or as the basis to shape personality. The current tendencies of this pedagogy are expressed in the complementarity of the 'macro' and 'micro' spheres. Philosophy, which earlier had been the only basis of pedagogy, now opens to novelty and variety of phenomena on the global scale, cumulated both through research experiments as well as specialized and interdisciplinary experts studies. However, it cannot overshadow sensitivity to human subjectivity and the quest for what is hidden behind something specific and perceptible. Human life situations in space and time as well as the context of everyday life – are new or rather basic existential areas of interest to pedagogy.[2]*

Education, which is studied by pedagogy, is therefore *a matter of a person in the world* and as a process it should also involve the context of individual development of personality as well as the issues related to the functioning in society and the role of the citizen.

Pedagogy, by its nature, places the person–world relationship at the centre and concentrates on its different aspects and dimensions. Its key research issues are to pose questions related to the preparation of a person to live in the world; to understand its undergoing phenomena and processes, to create, to

---

[1] See K. Rubacha, *Edukacja jako przedmiot pedagogiki i jej subdyscyplin*, p. 25.

[2] I. Wojnar, *Humanistyczna pedagogika – w nieprzyjaznym otoczeniu*, pp. 28–29.

coexist with others and bear responsibility for everything being within the person's influence. The authors of the international report *Education. The Treasure Within*, developed under the auspices of UNESCO, defined the most fundamental educational goals as *pillars of education*. Emphasizing the human–world relationship, they identified four issues that should be regarded as educational priorities in the whole world: learning to know, learning to do, learning to live together, learning to be[1]. In this way, the authors highlighted the issue of the peaceful coexistence of people on Earth. It was considered fundamental for education in general and not only for specific, narrow areas or fields of education. The authors of the report write:

> *Is it possible to provide education that would enable us to avoid conflicts or to solve them in a peaceful way, by enhancing knowledge about others, their culture and their spirituality? The idea of teaching at school not to use violence is praiseworthy, even if it is one of many instruments of fighting prejudices that lead to conflicts. [...] This is why education should take two complementary paths: on one level, a gradual discovery of others and on another, and throughout the whole life, involvement in common projects as an effective method of avoiding or resolving conflicts.[2]*

The issue of education for peace has been regarded as one of the priorities on the global scale in the 20th century. However, the first proposals of this kind have significantly longer traditions.

At the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, the New Education Movement began to emerge in pedagogy (English people use the name *Progressive Education*, in Poland this term was adopted as the translation of the French term *Education Nouvelle – Nowe Wychowanie*, whereas German people refer to it as *Reformpädagogik*). We owe revolutionary changes in thinking about a child, the process of upbringing and educational goals to the representatives of this movement (among others Georg Kerschensteiner, John Dewey, Ovide Decroly, Edward Claparède, Maria Montessori, and Adolphe Ferrière). They also showed thought–provoking sensitivity to specific situations and contradictions in social life as well as the need to reconstruct it[3].

In the context of promoting the idea of educating for peace, Maria Montessori (1870–1952), an Italian educator, holds a special place among the educators of *the great reform*. The period of particularly intensive actions of Montessori in this respect embraced the 1930s – the time of growing contradictions in the world, serious economic crisis and the escalation of nationalism. In the face of growing fascism in Italy, Montessori left her country and engaged in international activities to spread the idea of educating

---

[1] See J. Delors & al., *Learning ... .*

[2] J. Delors & al., *Learning ... ,* pp. 93–94.

[3] I. Wojnar, *Pedagogika twórczej aktywności*, p. 22.

for peace. Peace, as she proved during her numerous conferences, does not only mean lack of wars and the effect of ad hoc political negotiations, but is also the result of long–term, grass roots and educational work on its building and strengthening.

This second way towards peace should be considered equally important as the pro–peace actions of politicians. When analysing the reasons for conflicts and wars, Montessori related them mainly to the discrepancy existing between civilizational progress and the spiritual development of a person. She underlined the alienation of a person – from one's nature and from the world which leads to a feeling of internal emptiness, frailty and unhappiness. People in this situation can be easily manipulated as they are unable to show any moral resistance being prone to use the easiest ways to deal with difficulties and conflicts, ways often based on aggression. People may also forget that they may constructively and creatively influence their environment and change it. That is why childhood, when personality starts to be shaped and proper development begins in the earliest stage of life, became for Montessori the basis and the starting point for considerations about educational ways of building peace. She regarded early education as the first step for a child to develop a pro–peace attitude and such competences as: the ability of being empathetic and cooperative, a willingness to share things, solving conflicts without aggression as well as showing respect for the natural environment. In these ways a child may become *a new person* as an adult one who promote peace. Montessori believed in the real influence education had on the world, which was reflected, in her lecture delivered in 1937 during the 6th International Montessori Congress in Copenhagen, entitled symbolically: *Educate for Peace: Why can today's education have an influence on the world?*[1] The way relationships are shaped and directed as well as the attitude of a person to nature and to mankind as a species, constituted in her opinion the basis for the future, one either full of conflicts and aggression or one of peacefulness.

Montessori delivered her last lecture of the series devoted to education for peace in 1939. It could therefore be stated that the events during the Second World War, which began in that year, would scupper the educational sense of her message. However, this was not the case; in the post–war years, the issue of educating for peace was emphasized even more, as indicated by the words in the Preamble of the Constitutive Act of UNESCO which underline the significance of building peace in people's minds. At that time, different countries begin to shape the direction called *pedagogy of peace*, and the most specific suggestions were formulated in Germany. German *Friedenpädagogik*, seen as the idea and task to be implemented in the international context, was developed by Albert Schweitzer, who received the Nobel Prize in 1952, as well as Karl Jaspers, the author of critical comments on politics. One of the most prominent representatives of this movement was Herman Röhrs, the author of works on the European educational thinking in the early 20th century and insightful studies on the pedagogy of M. Montessori. He formulated his

---

[1] M. Montessori, *Educazione e pace. Perché l'educazione oggi puo avere un'influenza sul mondo?*

suggestions connected with educating for peace on the basis of philosophical ideas from the 17th century as well as his reflections on European values and traditions, which particularly foster overcoming the *combatant* tradition of commemorating military action, wars and victories and replacing them with showing the cultural achievements of mankind. In this way, tradition may become the inspiration for the arousal of creativity and respect for variety, and for building tolerance as well as respect for peaceful coexistence and unity in building[1].

It is a significant educational strategy as it aims at overcoming destructive forces and strengthening constructive and humanistic values. Since the 1970s, the German idea of the pedagogy of peace has been translated into specific practical proposals, implemented already at the level of pre–primary education. Since the 1990s, when the notion of the *culture of peace* was introduced, this term has appeared repeatedly in various educational proposals and has directed pedagogical reflection on the pro–peace potential existing in each person. In the field of Italian pedagogy, this category (*cultura di pace*) is related to the intention of building international agreement and dialogue. Education in the spirit of the culture of peace is presented here as a multifaceted program, focused on such issues as: enhancing sensitivity to the values of local culture and its protection, strengthening the sense of cultural community over nations, shaping attitudes of world citizenship and stimul-ating creativity, which is considered particularly important in the context of breaking stereotypical thinking and quieting aggression. The works of Norberto Bobbio played a significant role in the development of this direction in Italian pedagogy[2].

In Poland in the post–war years, the pedagogical reflection concentrated on the issue of peace was often ideology–oriented. However, the proposals that went beyond this ideological and political character cannot be ignored here and the best example of this is the thought of Bogdan Suchodolski, stressing the idea of building peace as *order in the world* and *order in people*. B. Suchodolski focused on those two issues, but the subject of educating a person and shaping *internal peace* in people was of particular importance to him and was at the heart of his considerations on peace. He wrote:

> *In our difficult times of concern, the questions on people's role in the course of history are gaining in significance. How does history develop, how is it shaped, why in this way and not the other, what are the factors determining its course? What is the role of people in this course of events in which they participate? Do they have any say? Can they direct this reality that affects them in this way?*[3]

---

[1] See I. Wojnar, *Kształtowanie kultury pokoju zobowiązaniem edukacyjnym na XXI wiek*, pp. 113–115.

[2] See N. Bobbio, *Il problema della guerra e le vie della pace*.

[3] B. Suchodolski, *Wychowanie dla pokoju*, p. 12. When speaking of publications breaking ideological correctness that were created in Polish pedagogy in the first post–war decades, we should mention the book of J. Kondziela, *Badania nad pokojem. Teoria i jej zastosowanie*.

While searching for the answers to those questions, he indicated among others things the need to build the sense of having influence on things and the feeling of responsibility for the world in every person, even on the micro scale of personal attitudes and actions.

Such a perspective of thinking about peace, i.e. showing the interrelation between actions directed at the world and actions concentrated on shaping people's awareness, is visible even today in pedagogical reflection. On one hand, the problems of the contemporary world are revealed and, on the other, we look for such educational solutions as could arouse the feeling of having influence and responsibility for the world in individual people and could give them the opportunity to develop pro–peace attitudes and competences[1]. Due to more dynamic migration processes and the multicultural nature of societies, it is important to develop studies on multicultural and intercultural education as well as studies focused on educating people living in the areas rocked by national and ethnic conflicts. In the last decades, multicultural and intercultural pedagogy constitutes a rapidly developing pedagogical sub–discipline.

Pedagogical reflection concentrates mainly on building *internal peace* in people. Education is considered here an equally important tool to build peace as the pro–peace initiatives and actions of politicians. Even if it does not bring rapid results and even if it requires time and persistent day–to–day work, as M. Montessori underlined, it is necessary for peace to be strengthened and transformed into the permanent principle organizing interpersonal relations.

Pedagogy brings, therefore, an important perspective of the individual vs. world relation to the studies of peace. It looks for specific educational solutions, which in people's awareness would result in the feeling of having influence and responsibility for the world as well as the knowledge and competences necessary for active citizenship in accordance with the motto: *think globally – act locally*.

In this way, education is committed to abandoning the belief that peace is solely a matter for leaders, politicians and influential representatives of a big business. It indicates the necessity of perceiving every person as responsible for the world. Pedagogical reflection on the issue of peace is reflected in the trend of peace studies, which have been on the scene for several decades, and on account of the analyses and specific proposals connected with the educational process, it should be considered particularly important in developing pro–peace solutions.

Bibliography

Banks M., *The Inter–Paradigm Debate* in: *International Relations. A Handbook of Current Theory*, (eds.) M. Light & A. J. Groom, London 1985, pp. 6–17.

Bobbio N., *Il problema della guerra e le vie della pace*, Bologna 1979.

---

[1] See G. Salomon, *Peace Education: Its Nature, Nurture and the Challenges It Faces*, p. 24.

Delors J. & al., *Learning: the Treasure Within: Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty–first Century*, Paris 1996.

Dewey J., *My Pedagogic Creed* in: *The School Journal* 54, 3/1897, pp. 75–81.

Galtung J., *Peace Research: Science or Politics in Disguise?*, PRIO Publication 1967, no 23–6.

Galtung J., *Peace: Research – Education – Action. Essays in Peace Research*, vol. 1, Copenhagen 1975.

Galtung J., *The Next Twenty–five Years of Peace Research: Tasks and Prospects* in: *Peace Research. Achievements and Challenges*, (ed.) P. Wallensteen, Boulder 1988, pp. 242–263.

Kant I., *To Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch* [*Zum ewigen Frieden. Ein philosophischer Entwurf*], transl. T. Humphrey, Cambridge MA 2003.

Kondziela J., *Badania nad pokojem. Teoria i jej zastosowanie*, Warszawa 1974.

Kostecki W., *Współczesne badania nad pokojem*, Warszawa 1990.

Kukułka J. (ed.), *Leksykon pokoju*, Warszawa 1987.

Mayor F. & Bindé J., *The World Ahead: Our Future in the Making*, London 2001.

Montessori M., *Educazione e pace. Perché l'educazione oggi puo avere un'influenza sul mondo?* in: M. Montessori, *Educazione e pace*, Roma 2004, pp. 54–63.

Peccei A., *Cento pagine per l'avvenire*, Milano 1981.

Peccei A., *One Hundred Pages for the Future. Reflections of the President of The Club of Rome*, [no transl. given], Oxford 1981.

Percival M. A., *An intellectual history of the Peace Education Commission of the International Peace Research Association, Columbia University Teachers College*, New York 1989.

Preamble to the Constitution of UNESCO [available at: http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.phpURL_ID=15244&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.htl, retrieved Jan. 30, 2015]

Rubacha K., *Edukacja jako przedmiot pedagogiki i jej subdyscyplin* in: *Pedagogika*, vol. 1, (eds.) Z. Kwieciński & B. Śliwerski, Warszawa 2003, pp. 21–29.

Salomon G., *Peace Education: Its Nature, Nurture and the Challenges It Faces* in: *Handbook on Building Cultures of Peace*, (ed.) J. de Rivera, New York 2009, pp. 3–13.

Suchodolski B., *Wychowanie dla pokoju* in: *Wychowanie dla pokoju*, (ed.) B. Suchodolski, Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków – Gdańsk – Łódź 1983, pp. 11–40.

Wojnar I., *Humanistyczna pedagogika – w nieprzyjaznym otoczeniu* in: I. Wojnar, *Humanistyczne intencje edukacji*, Warszawa 2000, pp. 27–42.

Wojnar I., *Kształtowanie kultury pokoju zobowiązaniem edukacyjnym na XXI wiek* in: I. Wojnar, *Humanistyczne intencje edukacji*, Warszawa 2000, pp. 109–122.

Wojnar I., *Pedagogika twórczej aktywności* in: *Idee edukacyjne na rozdrożach XX wieku*, (eds.) I. Wojnar, A. Piejka & M. Samoraj, Warszawa 2008, pp. 21–39.