

EDUCATION FOR PEACE

Joseph I. Fernando
Assumption University of Thailand

Abstract

Education for peace has become extremely urgent for the world today. For the first time in human history both humans and other living beings in the world face the threat of obliteration. We live in a world where violence has almost become a way of life. We are not only increasingly violent towards each other but also towards nature. We seem to be living in a dark age. The crucial question is: can we save the planet and ourselves? We can if we are willing to re-discover ourselves. Rediscovering ourselves is through reeducating ourselves. Reeducating ourselves means rediscovering a peace that comes ultimately from within.

I

Education for peace has three dimensions: how to live in peace with oneself, with others and with nature. Education for peace is not merely a part of individual ethics but also of social and global ethics. Education for peace includes both formal and non-formal kinds of education. Formal education is through our institutions, our schools, colleges and universities. Non-formal education including adult education takes place outside the curricula of these institutions. Living in peace does not happen to us naturally. We need to learn how to live in peace

1.1. How to Live in Peace with Oneself

I think only men and women of peace can bring peace to the world since we cannot give what we do not have. Peace is first and foremost a spiritual gift. Only those who have it can share it with others. Peace is something that flows out of one's being. Is it possible for every human to attain peace? Yes, it is; but one needs to undergo years of training to acquire peace. Acquiring inner peace depends on what one wants out of life. Some important questions like the following need to be answered: Why am I here on earth? What should I do with my life? What are my

priorities in life? What could be the best goal of my life? Answers to these questions may be from both theistic and non-theistic perspectives and differ from person to person.

The genuine religious believers perceive peace as arising out of right order. Right order is found in obeying the commandments of God. To conform to the will of God is to have peace. To turn away from God's will in favour of one's own will is to lose peace. For such believers, God is the source of peace or Peace Itself. The peace of the believer is a reflection of or participating in the peace of God. In the divine scheme of things, the Creator is the source of the universe and all things will ultimately find their fulfillment in Him. Humans are on earth with a purpose: to live a life that is pleasing in the sight of God, to live a life in response to the call to holiness. Humans can never have peace apart from union with God. St. Augustine would say our hearts have been created for God and they are restless till they find their rest in Him. For Aristotle, the final goal of life is to be virtuous. For Aquinas, the final goal of life is God and a virtuous life is only a means to attain union with God. It is not enough to be morally good, one needs to be deeply spiritual to seek God.

Such a person would not be a mere pleasure-seeker. Yet, in a sense, he is pleasure seeker in that his pleasure is joy/*ananda*/beatitude which he seeks in God. He has no desire to be the wealthiest person although he does not despise wealth because life on earth is impossible without wealth. Wealth in itself is not an end but a means to seek higher things in life. He would not seek exclusively the pleasures the world offers, but only those which are legitimate and do not destroy his soul. For him, things in moderation are good, but God as the *summum bonum* is the best. Truly lasting happiness and peace are found in the Creator and not in the creatures. A devout Muslim seeks Allah, a devout Hindu Vishnu or Shiva as their final end.

In the Indian tradition, there are the *purushartas* or the four goals. They include *dharma* (morality/righteousness), *artha* (wealth), *kama* (pleasure) and *moksha* (liberation/heaven). *Dharma* is almost untranslatable into English because it means not only morality/righteousness, but also all the virtues and much more. A life of *dharma* is not incompatible with the pursuit of wealth and pleasure: but the ultimate goal is *moksha* (liberation/heaven/union with God). *Dharma*, *artha* and *kama* can be viewed too as means to attain *moksha*. In the theistic tradition, a man or woman of peace is deeply directed towards transcendence. Peace is not merely seen as a by-product of human efforts but as a divine gift, a disposition obtained in union with the

Ultimate Reality. A seeker of peace is not a materialist pursuing worldly goals for their own sake, but one committed to worldly activities which have their final reference to transcendence. Such a person is involved in the community not with a view to create an earthly paradise but a human community of fellowship seeking meaning in existence. In an increasingly secularized world of today, peace-makers with a theistic view are not many. The following characteristics may be found in a believer who lives in peace with himself/herself. The virtues listed below are not finished products but in the process. A person of peace is not considered as a paragon of virtues but someone striving after them. He is finite, fallible, keeps struggling and is not without disappointments and pitfalls.

1. Profound faith in God/Transcendence
2. Obedience to the will of God/Ultimate Reality
3. Belief in love as the greatest force in the universe
4. A life of simplicity and service
5. Freedom from anger, hatred and arrogance
6. Calmness, serenity and gentleness
7. Acceptance of peace as God's gift
8. Forgiveness, compassion and generosity
9. Spirit of sacrifice, fellowship and labour
10. Joyful acceptance of all humans as brothers and sisters
11. The belief that the world does not belong to us but we belong to it.
12. The belief that the world is not for sale but to be used prudently to support life.
13. Greed replaced by creed.
14. A man or woman for all seasons
15. The firm belief that building peace is possible although not without suffering and hardship.

This list is not exhaustive, and many of these characteristics may be found in a person with a non-theistic perspective of peace as well.

A non-theistic understanding of peace stems from morality. Scores of people have difficulty in believing in God for several reasons. Some of them cannot reconcile the existence of evil, the undeserved suffering of the innocent with a loving God. If

there is a loving God, how do we account for the holocaust, genocides, rapes, murders, starvation, accidents, killer tsunamis, earthquakes and so on? There are others without belief in God for several reasons; but hardly anyone would deny human is a moral being. Based on our moral understanding, we differentiate between good and bad, right and wrong, true and false. One's moral sense is a guide to live in peace with oneself, with others and with nature. It would not make sense to be at war with oneself, others and nature. Common sense dictates that peace is desirable and social life is unthinkable without peace. Therefore, we need to seek peace at all times.

1.1.2. How to Live in Peace with Others

It seems living in peace with others is more difficult for us than landing on the moon or the Mars. Why do we find it so difficult to live in peace with others? There may be several reasons for this. There is a tendency in humans to distinguish people in terms of 'us' and 'them'. 'Us' may be the homogeneous groups like the family, clan and community of the same race, language and religion. 'Us' also refers to a nation as distinct from another nation. 'Them' refers to another group which is within itself homogeneous. One homogeneous group considers itself as 'us' and treats another as 'them'. The difference between 'us' and 'them' is often a source of conflict.

We are born into communities which have their own distinct linguistic, racial, and cultural identities which we must celebrate. But at the same time, we need to form solidarity with all humans. If it is wonderful to be human, it is even more wonderful to celebrate our humanity transcending tribal sentiments and parochial perspectives. There may not be a clash of civilizations, if we are ready for dialogue among civilizations. Dialogue is a vital component of establishing peace. We can solve several problems if we are committed to dialogue. Dialogue has no place for finding fault with others or accusing others. Dialogue does not mean imposing one's viewpoints on others or converting them to one's way of life. Nor does it mean defeating others through clever arguments. Dialogue does not claim victory over others but seeks truth, peace and fellowship.

Dialogue presupposes humility. It is not that some have everything to teach others, but all of us need to learn from each other in humility. Dialogue means listening to the voice of truth. In dialogue, we are guided by the subject-matter. As Gadamer says, in dialogue, both the parties have their own horizons of understanding

and when both the horizons merge, the result is a fusion of horizons. Understanding takes place in the fusion of horizons. Thus understanding is an event of truth. Understanding is not a mental act which we produce, but it is the revelation of truth. It is truth that sets us free. The refusal to dialogue is to block the emergence of truth. Dialogue takes place in an atmosphere of openness and mutual trust. Dialogue is possible when people prefer wisdom to arrogance and force. Dialogue happens among reasonable people.

What shall we do when some people refuse to take part in dialogue? They may reject dialogue for several reasons which may vary from group to group. For instance, it is said the Buddhists in Thailand do not prefer dialogue with the Catholics because the former suspect the latter of the hidden agenda of conversion. In some cases, animosity is so deep-seated between two groups that they are not ready for dialogue. In such cases we need pre-dialogue efforts to make dialogue gradually possible. In some other cases, persuasion and third party mediation may be required. Ultimately what matters is a friendly attitude towards the fellow humans. A friendly attitude is possible if we understand what is to be human.

To be human is to be born naked and helpless.

To be human (in the words of Heidegger) is to be old enough to die as soon as one is born.

To be human is to be in the world.

To be human is to be finite.

To be human is to have dignity and worth

To be human is to need food, clothes and shelter.

To be human is to love and be loved.

To be human is to make mistakes.

To be human is to be in need of forgiveness and acceptance.

To be human is to have dreams, desires and aspirations.

To be human is to labour.

To be human is to be social.

To be human is to be creative.

To be human is to be linguistic.

To be human is to belong to a community and culture.

To be human is to be historical.

To be human is to understand the purpose of life.

To be human is to live a life of decency.

To be human is to die with dignity.

This is not an exhaustive list. But the basic human condition is the same though the circumstances vary.

Finite as we are, we are not omnipotent beings. The possession of science knowledge and technologies, or living in countries with large powerful economies, do not make us almighty. Mortal as we are, we need to explore the avenues of being fully human during our lifetime before we vanish from the planet forever. It is unwise to seek military solutions instead of resolving conflicts practically through dialogue. The confrontation between the Muslim extremists and the West has resulted in death and destruction, hatred and agony. What prevents the leaders of the West and the Muslim extremists from dialogue? Is not the armed confrontation between the two a failure of reason and sensibility?

Nations are caught up in fear psychosis; they mistrust each other. The result is arms build-up on which enormous sums are spent. If we can resolve our problems through peaceful dialogue, what a staggering amount of money will be saved since we will not require weapons any more! This amount could be spent on education, health care and welfare of citizens. Fear psychosis is the reason for the possession of nuclear weapons. Is it possible to eliminate nuclear weapons? Can nations eventually disarm themselves in favor of dialogue and nonviolence? Can the United Nations be made a more democratically structured world body in such a way that it takes the lead in nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament? Nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament are not immediately possible but highly desirable in the near future. Can we have a world without the Big Brother? Citizens, especially the students, have to be taught about the non-military ways of resolving conflicts. That is why we need education for peace.

1.1.3. How to Live in Peace with Nature

Since the dawn of the Industrial Revolution In Britain in late 18th century and early 19th century, humans have been violent towards nature. Francis Bacon developed inductive logic with a view to controlling and using nature for human comfort. René Descartes advocated the philosophy of rationalism which enthrones

human as lord of the universe because of the power of reason. For the human subject, everything else is an object. Science and technology have not only strengthened capitalism but also have been instrumental for humans to manipulate, rearrange and reorganize nature to suit human purposes. Schopenhauer laments that science is at the service of the body and its will. Technology prompted the unbridled exploitation of nature for the purpose of earning huge profits. The end result today is environmental decay and disaster. We have failed to perceive ourselves as part of the world. We have been imagining that the world belongs to us, to be treated as we wish rather than seeing ourselves as belonging to the world. The ruthless exploitation and poisoning of nature finally threatens our own existence. We need to rediscover the primordial harmony our ancestors had discovered in the universe and to reestablish peace with nature. We have to save the world so that we can save ourselves. We are no longer the lords of the universe, but as Heidegger puts it, we are shepherds of Being. We must become custodians, caretakers and stewards of the world. We are called upon to live in peace with nature. Education for peace is indispensable in this regard.

II

Education for peace should provide the students with the following three objectives: information, formation and transformation.

II.1. Information

We live in an age of information technology. The mass of information available today is infinite. Therefore we have to select what is relevant to us. Education for peace must impart to the students the necessary information about peace. This would include the following: why it is of paramount importance to be at peace with oneself, others and nature, the steps required for this three-fold peace, the terrible consequences of armed confrontation and how it can be avoided, exploring the possibilities of dialogue and nonviolence, individual and community efforts to foster peace, nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and disarmament, local, national and international movements committed to peace, how to remove the obstacles to peace, how to work for the cause of justice which is a prerequisite for peace, networking of peace activists and groups, positive steps to foster peace and so on. Since the topic nonviolence is a very important component of peace education, the

students need an exposure to nonviolence. I would like to discuss the relevance of nonviolence as exemplified by Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr.

II.1.1. Experiments with Nonviolence

There is too much of violence in the world today. Our salvation shall hopefully come from nonviolence. Despite severe attacks from some critics, nonviolence has not lost its meaning, value and efficacy. Space does not permit an exposition of criticism of nonviolence and responses to the critics. But a discussion on nonviolence is pertinent to education for peace. Although it is hard to practise nonviolence, it is possible for humans to be nonviolent. What are the characteristics of nonviolence? Nonviolence means abstaining from harming oneself and others. It is essentially a moral quality. There are three ways of being nonviolent. The first is nonviolence in thought. We must not entertain violent thoughts about harming others. Violence of heart means our heart is filled with anger, hatred and desire for retaliation and destruction. A nonviolent person is free from the violence of the heart. He is incapable of anger and hatred and is calm, gentle and kind. Nonviolence is a soul-force. The second is nonviolence in speech or nonviolence of the tongue. A nonviolent person avoids hurting others by violent and abusive utterances like “I will hit you.” “I will kill you” and so on. One who is violent in thought cannot be nonviolent in speech. Only he who is nonviolent in thought can be nonviolent in speech because the mouth utters what the heart thinks. The third is nonviolence in deed. This means avoiding violence of the fist. A nonviolent person does not attack others physically.

Gandhi would say if one cannot be nonviolent it is better to be violent because violence is preferable to cowardice. When someone strikes a nonviolent person, he does not strike back. It is easier to hit back but it requires enormous courage not to hit back. Nonviolence demands great moral strength. One who is violent in thought and speech cannot be nonviolent in action. One needs to be consistently nonviolent in thought, speech and action. Practice of nonviolence does not happen naturally. We need to train ourselves to be nonviolent and the training takes time. Nonviolent action produces lasting results.

Gandhi calls nonviolent resistance '*satyagraha*' which means adherence to or holding onto truth (*satya*=truth; *graha*=holding onto). Nonviolence or *ahimsa* is part of one's commitment to truth. Nonviolent resistance can be demonstrated by civil disobedience and non-cooperation. People have the right to civil disobedience and non-cooperation. We cannot obey an unjust law because an unjust law is not a law. We can obey only just laws and it is our duty not to obey unjust laws. Similarly, we cannot cooperate with an unjust system or government. If we do, it means we cooperate with evil. Nonviolent resistance through civil disobedience and non-cooperation is a moral duty performed by a *satyagrahi* (one committed to truth). Gandhi challenged the mighty British Empire in India with his nonviolent resistance. He was able to silence the guns of the British by his *satyagraha*. Some critics say it was not because of his nonviolent resistance that India won freedom from the British rule, but because the British had a conscience and decided to leave India. As an Indian I am aware of the atrocities the British committed in India. If they had a conscience, they would not have done the terrible things unfortunately they did in India. I do not wish to give a list of those terrible things. Gandhi exposed the British atrocities to the world, when the British attacked the unarmed, innocent nonviolent resisters. Some critics reject nonviolence as impractical. It is impractical if one is not trained in nonviolence. It is easy to grab a gun to shoot somebody. But to undergo spiritual and moral purification is hard and takes time. Nonviolence is more than a strategy; it is a way of life.

Violence is a shortcut. A violent act leads to retaliation and the chain of hatred remains unbroken. 'An eye for an eye' policy will produce a nation of blind citizens. The Civil Rights Movement spearheaded by Martin Luther King, Jr. in the US in the 1960s was inspired by Gandhi's nonviolent struggle. King was in search of a method to usher in a just American society. The American society was unjust because it did not treat the African-Americans with respect and dignity. It denied them equal opportunities in education, employment, housing and so on. It practised segregation of races and King knew that segregation was an evil and laboured for integration.

King was deeply fascinated by Gandhi's campaigns of nonviolent resistance and profoundly impressed by the idea of *satyagraha* or truth-force. He realized for the first time the potency of nonviolent love in the area of social reform. He came to believe that Gandhi was probably the first person in history to transform the interpersonal love ethics of Jesus Christ into a powerful social force on a large scale.

King says, “Love for Gandhi was a potent instrument for social change and collective transformation. It was in this Gandhian emphasis on love and nonviolence that I discovered the method for social reform which I had been seeking for so many months.”¹ King did not borrow nonviolence from Gandhi, but the field tactics he learnt from Gandhi.

Why did he choose nonviolence as a weapon in his battle against the powerful white oppressors? Was it because the African-Americans were economically so weak that they could not afford to arm themselves against their oppressors and that nonviolence was inevitably the only available weapon to attack the whites? Or was there something more to the story? King was not driven to choose nonviolence due to the non-availability of other means. He deliberately chose it because of his perception of nonviolence for what it is. He described his entire life as a ‘pilgrimage of nonviolence’. In his prolonged struggle against organized, immoral, oppressive measures King was convinced of the saving power of nonviolence. He knew too well it is possible for human to gather enormous moral strength to rise nonviolently against oppression. The painful reality of liberation can be achieved with dignity and tenderness of heart together with firmness of purpose and a basic affirmation of faith in people. Gandhi had demonstrated that nonviolence is active, not a passive form of resistance. Active resistance is governed by a higher law and not by lower principles such as immediate gains. Active resistance eschews violence. In active resistance one suffers in one’s own person for the conquest of opponents. Active resistance is a nonviolent method of conversion. King accepted Gandhi’s approach. Gandhi did not promise that nonviolent resistance would produce change immediately. India became free after forty years of nonviolent struggle. King realized that it would take many years for the African-American struggle to bear fruits.

Nonviolence does not seek to defeat the opponent but to win his friendship. Though the nonviolent resister shows his protest through boycotts, he realizes that these are not ends but merely means to awaken a sense of moral shame in the opponent. The end is reconciliation. The aftermath of nonviolence is the beloved community, while the aftermath of violence is hatred and bitterness. In nonviolent resistance the attack is directed against forces of evil than against persons who happen to be doing evil. King said to the people in Montgomery. “The tension in this city is not between white people and Negro people (read African-Americans). The tension is, at bottom between justice and injustice, between the forces of light and the forces of

darkness. And if there is a victory, it will be a victory not merely for ...Negroes (read African-Americans) but a victory for justice and the forces of light. We are out to defeat injustice and not white persons who may be unjust.”²

King summed up the Gandhian approach to nonviolence as follows when he told his opponents: “We shall match your capacity to inflict suffering by our capacity to endure suffering. We shall meet your physical force with soul force. Do to us what you will, and we shall continue to love you. We cannot in all good conscience obey your unjust laws, because non-cooperation with evil is as much a moral obligation as is cooperation with the good... We will wear you down by our capacity to suffer. One day we shall win freedom, but not only for ourselves. We shall appeal to your heart and conscience that we shall win you in the process, and our victory will be a double victory”³

Nonviolent resistance is characterized by a willingness to accept suffering without retaliation, to accept blows without hitting back. Gandhi says “Rivers of blood may have to flow before we gain our freedom, but it must be our blood.” The nonviolent resister is willing to accept violence, but never to inflict it. One might ask how he is justified in suffering violence. The answer is that unearned suffering is redemptive. Suffering has tremendous transformational and educational possibilities. Gandhi says “Things of fundamental importance to people are not secured by reason alone, but have to be purchased with their suffering... Suffering is infinitely more powerful than the law of the jungle for converting the opponent... shut to the voice of reason.” An important ingredient of King’s nonviolence is creative or redemptive suffering which is unearned. It issues from the evil of the inflictor rather than that of the victim. It is redemptive in the sense that by suffering the pain inflicted upon by the oppressor, the victim makes an appeal to the inherent goodness of the inflictor of pain. King says “Forced to stand before the world and his God splattered with the blood of his brother, he will call an end to his self-defeating massacre... if physical death is the price that a man must pay to free his children and his white brethren from permanent death of the spirit, then nothing could be more redemptive”.⁴

Another redeeming feature of nonviolent resistance is that it avoids not only external physical violence but also internal violence of spirit. The nonviolent resister not only refuses to fire at his opponent but he also refuses to hate him. The principle of love occupies the centre of nonviolence. In their struggle for human dignity, the oppressed people must not become bitter and hateful. Retaliation of evil would only

intensify the existence of hatred in the world. “Along the way of life, someone must have sense enough and morality enough to cut off the chains of hate. This can only be done by projecting the ethic of love to the center of our lives.”⁵ King’s social ethics revolves around nonviolent love. One of the great virtues of nonviolent resistance is that it reduces hostilities to a minimum. “Nonviolence not only produces goodwill, but also offers the greatest opportunities for evolving communal harmony. It maintains moral, rational and cooperative attitudes amidst conflict and thus increases the moral forces instead of destroying them”. Another important merit of nonviolent resistance is its practicality especially for an oppressed minority group. The African-Americans could hardly depend on the ‘moral sense’ of the whites; nor could they take to violence in order to be free. Those who hated the African-Americans outnumbered them and violence would only produce more violence to the utter disadvantage of the African-Americans.

The doctrine of nonviolence does not demand an eye for an eye, but summons one to ‘open the eyes of blind prejudice’. According to King, the African-Americans rejected violence not only because he knew he could not gain freedom through physical force, ‘but also he believed that through force he could lose his soul’. Winning is not everything, but being human is. King says that from history we know instances of successful nonviolent resistance. The nonviolent resistance of the early Christians shook the Roman Empire. Nonviolent boycotts and protests in colonial America heralded the independence of the colonies. Gandhi’s *satyagraha* won India’s independence from British rule. King wanted the African-Americans to be ready to risk martyrdom in order to stir the conscience of America and to force the oppressors to commit brutality for the whole world to see.

Acceptance of nonviolence was a mark of sophistication on the part of the African-Americans because it showed that they dared to break away from the established concepts of the American society. King says “The eye-for-an-eye philosophy, the impulse to defend oneself when attacked has always been held as the highest measure of American manhood. We are a nation that worships the frontier tradition, and our heroes are those who champion justice through violent retaliation against injustice. It is not simple to adopt the credo that moral force has as much strength and virtue as the capacity to return a physical blow; or that to refrain from hitting back requires more will and bravery than the automatic reflexes of defense.”⁶

The nonviolent tactics put enormous pressure on the government and forced those in power to repeal the unjust laws and to implement the just laws of desegregation, voting rights and so on. Under the weight of nonviolent pressure the whites were forced to recognize the African-Americans as human persons, not slaves or things. The power released by the Nonviolent African-American Revolution initiated by King shook the white America, the first nation to bomb the nonwhite Japan. Mighty in weapons, white America had to yield to the unarmed African-Americans whose greatest weapon was the conviction that they were right in being nonviolent. King's nonviolent movement changed the face of America to a large extent. Nonviolence gave a measure of manhood and self-respect to the African-Americans oppressed for generations; it gave the whites the realization of decency and to both the experience of brotherhood and the possibility of peace. I am convinced that we need to rediscover nonviolence and put it into practice in our much troubled times

II.2. Formation

Mere information on fostering peace is not enough. Information is knowledge. Knowledge alone is not going to change things. What is needed is commitment to action guided by knowledge. The students must be exposed to living with heterogeneous groups so that they can learn to respect and accept differences. The students must be formed in such a way that peace education will have a profound impact on them and that they become seriously involved in fostering peace wherever they are, and at all times. Formation of men and women of peace could take place in several ways. Peace begins at home. Some students may come from families which lack peace. If the members of their families are not at peace with each other, well trained and highly motivated peace educators would do well to be mediators in such families provided their mediation is not rejected. Fellow students could be of help to each other in this regard. Dialogue groups must be formed among the students of diverse background. With the help of peace educators, there must be ongoing dialogue among the students. Dialogue must be extended to interaction between students and others. Students of diverse nationality, religions, languages and so on must form not only dialogue forum but also activity groups.

Travel must be encouraged. Visits to different countries, at least to those in the region promote mutual understanding and students can participate in the life of the

local communities. Learning about other religions and visiting places of worship of other religions is an important component of peace-building. Learning foreign languages opens the window to hitherto unexplored worlds. Every student must be encouraged to learn a foreign language in addition to English. Participating in the festivities of others can be a joyful, educational and communitarian event which brings people together and fosters better understanding. Being friendly and sympathetic goes a long way in fostering peace. Above all else, we need role models for the students. Peace educators have a tremendous obligation to be role models to the young students who look up to the elders for guidance and inspiration.

The problems we have in the world today are essentially moral in nature; therefore, they need moral solutions and not merely technological, economic and military ones. If the students see the peace educators genuinely committed to peace, they will certainly be motivated by them. The students can interact with peace groups and peace activists at local, national and international levels. They can also acquaint themselves with the biographies of outstanding men and women of peace who may inspire them. The educational institutions can network with NGOs and peace groups so that the students may be in touch with real situations in life and can be trained to meet the challenges of peace. If peace education fails to have an impact on the students, then there may be serious flaws in the way it is done.

II.3. Transformation

Information and formation are meant for making the students become agents of social transformation. After graduating from the educational institutions, the young men and women, it is hoped will be involved in fostering peace at various levels. Respect for the dignity and worth of the human person and for human rights, promotion of peace through justice and so on are foundational to peace efforts. In the course of time, as the young men and women mature into responsible adults, they will have a better grasp of problems and greater confidence in addressing them. Transforming the world into a better place than it was when we were born is a noble task performed by noble souls. Nobility of heart and mind is a moral quality found in morally upright persons. Humans are primarily moral persons. If we understand what it is to be moral, we will certainly be peace-makers. But if we pursue other things than required by morality, then peace may be elusive and even a casualty. To be a peace-

maker is a choice, a commitment, an act of love and sacrifice. “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons and daughters of God.”

References

- Copleston, Frederick, *History of Philosophy*, Vol.II, Search Press, London, 1950
- Fernando, Joseph I, *Dynamics of Liberation*, Agape Publications, Madurai, 1992
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Philosophical Hermeneutics*, University of California Press, 1977
- _____, *Truth and Method*, Continuum, New York, 1989
- Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1995
- King, Jr, Martin Luther, *Stride toward Freedom*, Harper and Row, New York, 1953
- _____, *Strength to Love*, Harper and Row, New York, 1963
- _____, *Why We cannot Wait*, The New American Library of World Literature, Inc. 1964
- Krell, David (ed.), *Martin Heidegger: Basic Writings*, Harper and Row, New York, 1977
- Palmer, Richard, *Hermeneutics*, Northwestern University, 1969

Endnotes

¹ 1. Martin Luther King, Jr. *Stride toward Freedom*, Harper and Row, New York, 1958. p.97

² Ibid.p.82

³ Martin Luther King, Jr. *Strength to Love*, Harper and Row, New York, 1963. p.77

⁴ M.L.King, *Stride toward Freedom*, p.177

⁵ Ibid. p.83

⁶ Martin Luther King, Jr. *Why we Can't Wait*, The New American Library of World Literature,Inc. New York, 1964, pp.27-28