IN FACTIS PAX
IN KNOWLEDGE (THERE IS) PEACE
journal of peace education and social justice

Volume 20 Number 2 (2026): 160-174
https://openjournals.utoledo.edu/index.php/infactispax
ISSN 2578-6857

# Peace and Peace education on Whose Terms?

# Envisioning Peace Education in a World Community of Separate but Interdependent States

By

Gilbert Tarugarira

## Abstract

Peace education seems to have assumed and nourished an illusion of universality where there is a selective application of universal norms and democracy yet it has to adequately grapple with the realities of militarism, statelessness and forced displacement, colonial legacies, crises of democracy and global imperialism that challenge the very foundations of citizenship, justice and peace. Any education which purports to be neutral in the face of structural violence and oppression is inimical to the real interests of democracy. An argument is sustained that, for relevance, peace education has to confront paradoxes featuring universalization of democratic space amidst exclusion. Peace education programmes should seek to produce learners who are not only aware of global injustices but actively committed to dismantling them, challenging unjust norms and institutionalized exclusions. This article advocates for the revitalisation of intellectual thought and social action beyond

the contemporary approaches and challenges within peace education scholarship and practice. It compels peace educators, policy-makers and civil society actors to rethink what peace means, who has access to it, and what it demands of us in a fractured world. The article contributes to the re-imagining of a futuristic peace education that builds on its foundational values while responding more directly to the prevailing socio-economic, political and ethical challenges.

## Keywords

Peace education, democracy, violence, colonialism, global imperialism, justice

## Introduction

The world has become a global village because of the interconnectedness and interdependence of countries' modern communication systems and trade links and yet, it is yawning for an authentic peace. The moment the world totters under power structures which celebrate political violence but go unchallenged, peace ceases to be consequential. Global fragility epitomised by violent conflicts, political intolerance, increasing structural inequalities continues to challenge human dignity and self-determination. Despite being antedated in the broader paragons of the United Nations Charter, the conditions necessary to foster both positive and negative peace remain insufficiently realized. With peace embedded into its founding vision, the United Nations (UN) emerged as a beacon of hope with both a normative guide and an institutional framework through which humanity could resist the recurrence of violence and affirm human rights as the moral and political foundation of international order. However, the UN itself has admitted that the world is bedevilled by unparalleled peace and security challenges emanating from the inability to avert abuse of human rights.

All human beings have conflicts because they have different personalities, values and goals.

This article leverages the potential of integrating postcolonial and decolonial perspectives in peace education as a way of challenging dominant narratives and foregrounding the lived experiences of marginalized communities. The decolonial approach confronts the Eurocentric heritage of peace education for purposes of creating new social, epistemic and political structures that advance peace, social justice and human rights (Bajaj, 2015). The diffusion of European values and institutions under colonialism surmises that

peace education has to directly engage with historical injustices and systemic marginalisation that continue to undermine human dignity and democratic life.

The unfolding discussions on colonial legacies, global imperialism, crises of democracy, human rights issues and the digital divide, provide insights on the proposed packaging of peace education which speaks to the challenges, discourses and possibilities of peace and justice and also informs the theory, practice and research in a fragmented world. In its conventional form, peace education has yet to adequately grapple with the realities of global injustices which have to be dismantled.

For an appreciation of the ongoing attempt to respond to the complexities of a diverse and conflict-ridden world, the article starts by outlining the evolution of peace education in order to shed light on its foundational values and principles.

## Reflections on Peace and the Evolution of Peace Education

Defining peace solely as the absence of war and armed conflict overlooks its complexity when we consider the range of psycho-social and socio-political orientations attached to it. In the light of increasing tensions , pressures and possibilities of globalisation, the concept of peace assumes varying degrees of explicitness and theoretical development. According to Groff defining peace is not the most straightforward undertaking due to how wide the concept is and how it varies according to the context and within different cultures (Groff, 2002). Rather than advancing a singular or universal definition of peace, it suffices to acknowledge that any nuanced understanding of the plurality of peace recognizes it as a dynamic and relational process shaped by cultural, historical, and ecological contexts. While moral conceptualizations of peace are mostly connected to war and conflict, some cultures emphasize the distinction between inner and outer peace and use spiritual capacities to experience connections between the inner and the outer world (Harris, 2004). This perspective broadens the scope of peace beyond the mere absence of violence to encompass the presence of justice, ethical responsibility, and the transformation of structural and cultural injustices. Peace therefore is a shifting amoeba and any meaningful discourse on holistic peace must deconstruct systemic, structural, epistemic, cultural and discursive violences that hide behind the label of 'peaceful'. While peace entails creating structures that facilitate building a just, equitable and peaceful world, it is now necessary to reexamine the assumption that there is a 'real' world of peace out there, a world of established and flourishing democracies which other countries can learn from. It is therefore justifiable to argue that peace is contextual and justifiable

(Zembylas and Bekerman, 2013).The confusion over what peace is has translated into confusion over what to do to promote peace.

A Cameroonian proverb says: "If you pick a cola nut in the forest, look for the tree from which it fell." In this context, any meaningful discussion on peace education requires that we briefly trace global trends in its evolution. Between 1945-1955, the drive for peace education emanated from the experiences of the Second World War. Soon after the war, the United Nations Organisation (UNO) sought ways of promoting international cooperation and peace. The initial emphasis in peace research tended to be directed on violence by one person on another, as well as organized violence between states. Hopes of developing Education for World Citizenship into peace education were scuttled by the emergence of the Cold War. From 1955 to 1965, peace education was not popular as education against Communism dominated the international political education. Between 1965-1975 the Vietnam War and anti-colonial struggles in the Third World brought a new phase to peace education. The major focus of peace education during this period was on the ethical aspects of war, as people explored the just war theory, and the humane and inhumane ways of conducting warfare. Researchers' attention was shifting from direct to structural violence, that is the ways in which people also suffered as a result of socio-economic and political systems. This expanded vision to inquire into issues of freedom and justice precipitated interest in coining broader definitions of peace. The anti-colonial struggles and the war protest during the United States of America's involvement in Vietnam afforded educators an opportunity to articulate issues of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Wars were interpreted as attempts by industrial countries to maintain their domination over the colonies for economic gains. The New International Economic Order (NIEO) became a central concept of the peace and justice approach. The document issued by the 1974 session of the General Conference of UNESCO—The Recommendation on Education for International Understanding, Cooperation, and Peace and Education Regarding Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms became the basis for the need to create a secure world community.

Since 1975 peace educators turned their attention to disarmament as a means of achieving the abolition of war. Reversing the arms race and the outlawing of nuclear weapons became rallying cries for this stage of the peace movement. The focus of the peace movement on disarmament stimulated a phase of peace education which came to be called "Disarmament Education".

The 1978 United Nations Special Session on Disarmament (SSD-I) recognized the education for peace as the fundamental step toward peace and

security. Disarmament education had to widen focus from controlling or reducing arms to deal with issues embracing the lives and concerns of the learners and the political realities within which disarmament sought to address aspects of justice and solidarity. Disarmament education also needed to address the root causes of individual and collective violence and the objective and subjective causes of tensions, crises, disputes, and conflicts which characterized the prevailing national and international structures. The totality of human experience relating to issues of social justice, social change, ecological balance, economic welfare needed to be viewed from global perspectives. As a result, matters which related to war and peace, for example, human rights education, development education, conflict resolution education, among others, had to be identified and debated across the entire spectrum of the fields of education. Ultimately, peace education became the synthesis of the separate fields to deal with the circumstances of violence and the search for peace.

Peace education, therefore, has had an embattled history, struggling to survive in an invariably ambivalent environment wherein global processes continued to affect its prospects. In as much as it seeks to promote, according to Reardon (1988), the development of an authentic planetary consciousness that will enable people to function as global citizens, there are underlying impediments to the envisaged transformation of the present human condition and social system so prone to violence and injustice. The transformative process requires the elimination of Western hegemony in the construction of international systems and matters of human rights, the rejection of all forms of violence: direct, structural and cultural and the abolition of war to achieve total disarmament. A transformational peace education for future generations of peace builders must usher a new mode of thinking that expresses a belief that life is worthwhile for all inhabitants of planet earth. This requires undoing internalized inferiority of the marginalized, challenging the universality of Western science, history and philosophy as the only valid truths by embarking on decolonisation projects.

## The Decolonisation Projects

The section on postcolonial and decolonisation projects, unravels how without the erasure of the greatest evils of imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism any meaningful discourse on peace is rendered futile. The legacies of colonialism and the on-going neocolonialism perpetuate cultural hegemony and neocolonial intrigues which encapsulate varied forms of structural and cultural violence. The new global imperialism championed by the world's military and

economic powerhouses has invented new ways of retaining and restoring socio-economic and political influence in former colonies which are a threat to peace. Global relations of domination and exploitation , rooted in the era of colonialism that assigned the developing world the role of primary product producer, have had a bearing on human rights and peace education programmes. Decolonisation of the mind which entails the intellectual and psychological process of unlearning the Eurocentric beliefs , values and cultural norms internalised during and after colonial rule remains paramount. While political independence may have been won, true liberation remains impossible as long as the 'colonised' continue to see themselves and the world through the eyes of their former colonisers. Undoing internalised inferiority is necessary because colonial education often taught that indigenous cultures were 'primitive', 'barbaric' or 'backward'. Decolonisation of peace education requires a fundamental shift in how knowledge is produced, validated, and disseminated. Eurocentric foundations of traditional research paradigms have to be challenged so that alternative methodologies that prioritize social justice and transformative change are developed. Such a mental shift toward self-affirmation and pride in one's own heritage also involves choosing indigenous languages over colonial ones to express authentic identity and history. This questions the idea that Western science , history and philosophy are the only valid forms of truths.

Thus, peace education is challenged to equip peace educators, community leaders and policy makers with the conceptual and pedagogical tools necessary to deconstruct systemic and discursive violences and empower the oppressed population to challenge the systems that marginalise them. Peace education as an emancipatory practice has to empower marginalised groups to critically examine and challenge unjust socio-cultural systems. Values and indigenous knowledge systems have to be integrated into education to facilitate structural changes in universities, legal systems and government policies. A decolonial approach enables students, peace educators, the next generation of peacebuilding educational researchers and policy makers to understand their history and escape from destructive emotions, opinions, and hopes for the future. Empowering those vulnerable to violence develops their capacity to devise solutions and act as agents of transformative change. The global concern over the indispensability of peace education comes in the wake of realising that designing, developing and promoting an integrated decolonised peace education curriculum can combat selfishness, greed, marginalization and advance the rule of law, promote good governance and peace processes that respect of human rights (UNESCO, 1996).

The efforts by the Decolonising Education for Peace in Africa (DEPA) to develop a network of projects aimed at reshaping peace education from a Global South perspective have realised a commendable measure of success. Projects in Algeria, Ghana, Sierra Leone, Liberia, among others have tried to address the historical, epistemic and structural legacies by elevating indigenous epistemologies. The power of masquerade and carnival arts has been explored in Ghana to find out how arts can be used to address contemporary issues of peace and conflict. Algeria has also resorted to story-telling , poetry and traditional melodies by the elderly to educate and transmit peace values. In sub-Saharan Africa, the philosophy of *Ubuntu/Unhu*, which is an approach to morality, provides a unitary foundation for a variety of normative and empirical conclusions that are serious alternatives to dominant Western views (Metz & Gaie 2010). A deduction from these illustrations is that the decolonised peace education curricula has to be pivoted on localised philosophies and frameworks if peace, conflict and reconciliation have to be understood.

## The Human Rights Issue

Human rights are the essence and arbiter of peace , the antithesis of violence, touching on multiple and complex aspects of the human experience. The potential of human rights as the means to cultivate transformational thinking lies in viewing all human rights norms and standards as a whole integrated ethical system (Reardon, 2009). States' tendency to selectively apply human rights norms has created a persistent gap between aspirational standards and realities on the ground (Özler, 2018).

According to Hopgood (2013), the globalized superstructure of the human rights system often fails to align with diverse political and socioeconomic realities on the ground. While the human rights discourse advances dignity and freedom, Moyn (2018) argues that it does so within neoliberal political-economic frameworks that tolerate, and in practice coexist with inequality. In this reasoning, promoting dignity amid entrenched disparities is inherently contradictory. There has been a tendency of the West to claim universality of values that are particular to western history and culture. Tandon (1995) criticizes the way the concept of human rights has come to mean civil rights embedded in Western liberal and individual expression. Tandon (1995) argues that the West has committed the classic error of transposing its values on weaker people who pretend to share those values for the sake of aid or development assistance.

Despite the seeming universality of human rights, there are divergences in the philosophical conceptions, individual traditions, and in the treatment of the problem of the international protection of human rights and even the ranking of particular human rights. In the ranking of rights, Western states have put more emphasis on civil and political rights, while the developing nations see social and economic rights as areas where intervention is most needed. The absence of absolute consensus affects the efficacy of human rights instruments. The international community is seen as the norm sender and yet human rights should develop their meaning from within societies. Thus from a methodological perspective, the peace education curriculum and teaching materials lack cultural sensitivity because they are being influenced by Western biases that promote universal values (Bajaj, 2015, 2019). Peace education has failed to overcome the legacy of Eurocentric values (Hajir &Kester, 2020). Both the universal, liberal and Western binary values of classical peace education are criticised for contributing to the reproduction of Western historical discourses. Countries that have historically championed the global mission of peace and human rights in the aftermath of the Second World War are posing a grave threat to the fragile normative order that underpins international cooperation (Destradi & Vüllers, 2024). Their capacity to project peace and uphold universal values is profoundly compromised.

## American Globalism as Imperialism

Of late, globalization has come to be closely equated with Americanization. America's rise to globalism, and achievement of worldwide influence seems to have been the essential precondition of contemporary globalization. This development has also marked the first phase of post-colonial globalization in which global influence has been achieved without formal empire. The end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union and the demise of communism across Eastern Europe left the United States as the sole superpower with no contender.

This development has tended to confirm projections by Luce (1941) that America would be the "Good Samaritan" of the world with the burden to feed the hungry, help the destitute, determine whether a "system of free economic enterprise' would prevail globally and also act as the main source and trainer of skilled labour. These projections were echoed by Reynolds who advanced that the US would serve as a "sanctuary" for the ideals of freedom and justice in an era of war and 'the powerhouse' from which those ideals spread throughout the world ( Reynolds, 2002). In as much as official rhetoric paints

the US as devoted to world benefaction, and as the champion of human rights, democracy and the raising of living standards all over the world; the US policies , and actions conversely create and sustain dictatorships that practice torture, assassination, mass murder and mass impoverishment on the people they rule.

As Israel continues to execute military forays in Lebanon and Iran, and a genocide in Gaza, the US continues to supply her with weapons, diplomatic cover and veto protection at the United Nations. Bombardments by Israeli forces across Gaza, have witnessed the destruction of hospitals, displacement of families and deaths of people underneath the rubble of collapsed buildings. The genocide in Gaza has largely been mourned by the Palestinians only and yet a tragedy of this magnitude should have been viewed as a calamity for the entire world. The US-Israeli onslaught against Iran has served to legitimate warfare and use of the military in the interest of 'security'. The war is threatening to rage on until the ego of the perpetrator is satisfied. It goes without saying that militarism, like its close siblings capitalism and colonialism, is deeply imbricated with suffering and social injustice.

Genocides and military interventions can never be good because they are an endorsement of the right of the perpetrator to inflict violence on a human group. The respect and selective enforcement of international law now depends on who breaks it. With considerable violence and non-compliance with international law, the US policy has sought to destroy human rights and prevent democratization. By so doing, the US is drifting away from a principled foreign policy of championing universal liberal values such as democracy, justice, human rights and the rule of law.

While violence has been invariably defended by the perpetrators in the name of security; emotional and populist historical, and religious arguments have also been put forward to defend such crude actions. Tragically enough, the acts of violence are defended in the name of peace , justice and divine punishment. Worse still, the utter failure of the UN system, the global governance system, and world public opinion to protect vulnerable communities leave no deterrent options for other countries to observe. The Russo-Ukraine war which started in 2022 has negatively affected people's lives through belligerent thinking, policing, and daily life, at local, national and international levels. The aggressiveness of the mass media, coupled with the robust mechanism for mobilizing collective fears and hatreds, normalizes, naturalizes and legitimizes the highly militarized infrastructures and rationalities. Ultimately, the culture of war impacts negatively on peace education policy, implementation and practice.

US President Donald Trump's punitive action against immigrants smacks of anti-global citizenship. The rising prominence of extremist ideas, such as white supremacy, Trumpism and neo-Nazi movements in North America has intensified apprehensions over social polarisation and radicalisation. The rise in anti-migrant sentiment, and its validation and promotion by those in positions of power has without any perceptible limits, pervaded the entire world and every aspect of social life in some way. Anti-migrant politics has turned out to be a global tool of governance. Xenophobia, for example, has been on the rise outside the Western world. Countries like Colombia, Peru, Chile and Ecuador have put in place policies to curtail the influx of Venezuelan migrants. Xenophobic rows, tensions and anti-immigration protests have been a constant feature of life and politics in post-apartheid South Africa. Discrimination has been institutionalised as states fail to uphold responsibilities towards non-citizen populations. People are being categorized through binary constructions -citizens versus non-citizens, autochthons versus strangers. These binary categories influence public attitudes and everyday interactions, often intensifying conflict among people living in the same neighbourhood. Such distinctions deeply shape access to rights, socio-economic opportunities, recognition, acceptance, and human dignity.

Europe -bound migrants in Libya face horrific levels of violence and abuse. According to Amnesty International, they are subjected to prolonged arbitrary detention, enforced disappearances, torture, rape, unlawful killings, extortion and forced labour. These abuses occur within a system effectively underwritten by European governments , which have funnelled funding, training and equipment to Libyan coastguard units tasked with intercepting migrants before they reach international waters.

Peace education and peace movements should rebut and possibly curb the recurrence of genocide, abuses and military intervention by reviewing these devastations and chatting a blueprint for future struggles. Humanity has to lament any holocaust or genocide because it eliminates an essential component of a global future every time.

As a result, there is need to interrogate the extent to which peace education can deliver new ideas and future plans that can be more effective in containing and controlling genocides and military interventions.

## The Digital Divide

In a world dominated by science and technology, global connectivity through digital transformation has brought both opportunities and challenges. The networked digital space is also characterised by violence and conflict which are difficult to confront and dismantle. The digital platforms allow cyber violence to evolve and adapt. Through cyber violence broader patterns of inequality and discrimination and new forms of expression that normalise and trivialise violence have been created.

Mainstream discourse around Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education tends to celebrate innovation and efficiency, often portraying digital tools as neutral enhancers of learning. The portrayal of the digital tools as neutral enhancers of learning and the feasibility with which algorithms can fully synopsize the complexities of human peacebuilding remain highly questionable. In as much as these Western-designed tools serve the global good, they risk eroding local autonomy and reproducing dependence. In most cases, the technologies dominating peace education are products of the Global North, built on a Western worldview that downplays and overlooks the indigenous peculiarities like languages, cultural logics, and indigenous conflict resolution traditions. In a situation where the developing countries are largely consumers of new communication technologies, the unequal knowledge production perpetuates algorithmic bias which makes AI a crafty apparatus of epistemic injustice and digital hegemony. The North holds the majority of technology and intellectual property creating a dependency for the South. The result is data colonialism which occurs when AI platforms from the Global North are utilised in the Global South with minimal to no adaptation. Thus, the growing digital divide and knowledge dependence has immense potential to extend historical patterns of exploitation into the digital sphere through data colonialism. The global power and knowledge imbalances embedded in technological innovation have affirmed the dominance of Western knowledge systems and the marginalisation of epistemologies of the Global South. The danger which emanates from such a scenario is the reproduction of colonial hierarchies of knowledge and control through the exportation of epistemologies and values by the Global North. In addition, social data appropriated from the Global South also risks being monitored or hacked into by corporations and institutions in the Global North whose values influence the algorithmic definitions of peace and conflict.

Authoritarian regimes have developed a practice of using technology to deliver misinformation and exert power by shutting down communications from political opponents. In 2021 and 2026, for example, the Ugandan authorities imposed an internet shutdown ahead of general elections, leaving many people

in socio-political and economic limbo (Gordon & Gordon, 2013). When societies are divided into informed, misinformed and uninformed populations, collective judgment is eroded. In such situations, peace activists and educators have to rise to the occasion and avoid situations where authoritarians do not deliberately misinform or distract people.

While the drive to measure peace through metrics, dashboards, or predictive scores risks the distortion of perceptions of local realities, peace education offers a necessary corrective by positioning technology within the broader struggle against structural and cultural violence. However, if biased datasets or corporate interests shape the content of adaptive learning tools, there is a danger of foiling critical thinking. The clarion call by Post-Colonial Science and Technology Studies (STS) to go for technological sovereignty, which emphasises innovation rooted in local participation, cultural sensitivity and epistemic pluralism is quite noble. AI can also support this change if it aligns with ethical, inclusive, and decolonial principles so that human dignity is not undermined. However, the controversy surrounding the efficacy of AI as a device or instrument for emancipatory or liberatory learning leading to social transformation presents a pedagogical challenge.The incorporation of AI must therefore be guided by moral values, integrity-driven goals and benevolent intentions to ensure that educational innovations remain rooted in values of fairness, empathy, and human dignity. According to Taylor (2017) issues concerning freedom, visibility and representation should be pivotal in all global discussions about digital rights. In this sense, peace education, as the provider of a moral compass for aligning digital progress with the deeper purpose of peacebuilding, has to question who has the authority to define peace and which or whose forms of education and peace learning are legitimate for dismantling hierarchies of knowledge and recognizing the primacy of epistemic justice for sustainable peace.

## Conclusion

Summarily, peace education is conceptualised as a transformative, epistemological, moral, and political undertaking intended for nurturing individuals and societies with the power and skills to decisively challenge injustice and assiduously create societies with discursive, intersubjective and dialectical competencies essential for peace and justice. Within this framework, peace education ceases to be just a medium for the transmission of knowledge, but a channel for expressing emotions and meaningfully addressing political violence , historical injustices and systemic marginalization. In this regard, it

has to broaden its horizon and directly engage with ideologies, historical injustices and systemic marginalization that continue to undermine human dignity.

Peace cannot co-exist with political repression and even education ceases to be peace -oriented the moment it remains neutral in the face of oppression. Peace education must therefore be grounded in context-specific struggles for justice and dignity instead of maintaining an illusion of universality. There is need to confront the uncomfortable truths of our global order so that as global citizens people act in solidarity toward a more just and peaceful future. Instead of advocating tolerance, a reimagined peace education must expose and engage structural violence, support populations that are marginalized and oppressed in order to promote transformative social action. A global justice agenda has to deliberately rethink peace education as a global and transformative practice which seeks to create new ethical and political possibilities for living together in a world fractured by racialised borders, inequality and violence. While peace education is indispensable for the creation of a peaceful world, the task before peace educators, policy-makers and civil society is to revisit or reconsider what peace means, who has access to it, who has the moral integrity to dispense it and how, and what it demands of humanity in a fractured world.

## References


Bajaj, M. (2015). Pedagogies of resistance and critical peace education praxis. Journal of Peace Education, 12 (2),154-166.

Bajaj, M. (2019). Critical peace education. The Palgrave Encyclopaedia of Global Security Studies. Springer.

Destradi,S. and Vüllers, J. (2024). Populism and the liberal international order: An analysis of UN voting patterns. The Review of International Organizations, Volume 20, Issue:4,1053-1080.

Gordon, A. and Gordon, D. (2013). Trends and Prospects. In Understanding Contemporary Africa, eds. A. Gordon and D. Gordon ( Lynne Rienner Publishers: Colorado), 417-438.

Groff, L. (2002). “A holistic view of peace education,” in Peace Education for a New Century, eds. I. Harris, Ian and Synott, J. Social Alternatives, 21(1),7.

Hajir, B. and Kester, K. (2020). Toward a Decolonial Praxis in Critical Peace Education: Postcolonial Insights and Pedagogic Possibilities. Studies in Philosophy and Education. 39, 515–532

Harris, I.M. (2004): Peace education theory, Journal of Peace Education, 1:1, 5-20.

Hopgood, S. (2014). The Endtimes of Human Rights. In Debating the Endtimes of Human Rights,eds. D.Lettings, D.& Van Troot,L.) Strategic Studies Project: Netherlands.

Luce, H. (1941). The American Century. LIFE Magazine, February 17.

Metz, T and Gaie, J.B.R. (2010). The African ethic of Ubuntu/Botho: Implications for research on morality. Journal of Moral Education, Vol.39, No.3,273-290.

Moyn, S. (2018). Not Enough: Human Rights in an Unequal World. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Ozler, S.I.(2018). Universal Declaration of Human Rights at Seventy: Progress and Challenges. Ethics and International Affairs, 2018, 32 (4), 1-12.

Reardon, B. (1988). Comprehensive Peace Education: Educating for Global Responsibility. Teachers’ College Press.

Reardon, B. A. (2009). Human rights learning: Pedagogies and politics of peace. Paper presented at the UNESCO Chair for Peace Education Master Conference, Rio Piedras, April 15. Available on: http://www.pdhre. org/HRLreardon.pdf. Accessed November 25, 201

Reynolds, D. (2002). American Globalism: Mass, motion and the Multiplier effect. In Globalisation in World History, ed. A.G.Hopkins, London: Pimlico.

Tandon, Y. (1995). Norwegian South Policy for a Changing World. Development Today, Vol V.No.5, 10-11.

Taylor, L.(2017). What is data justice? The case for connecting digital rights and freedoms globally. Big Data and Society. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951717736335.

UNESCO (1996). Learning: The Treasure within: Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century. UNESCO Publishing. United Nations (2015). Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. United Nations.

Zembylas, M. and Bekerman, Z. (2013). 'Peace education in the present: Dismantling and reconstructing some fundamental theoretical premises'. In Journal of Peace Education, 10(2), 197-214.