

VICENT MARTÍNEZ GUZMÁN

(Jaume I University, Castellón, Spain)

FATUMA AHMED ALI

(United States International University, Nairobi, Kenya)

Education for a Human Right to Peace from the Perspective of a Philosophy for Making Peace(s) ¹

From our perspective of a *Philosophy for Making Peace(s)*, it is important to integrate key aspects of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights into Peace Education. The Human Right to Peace is both an *individual* and a *collective* right, as well as a right of *synthesis* and *solidarity*. Let us take a closer look.

To educate for peace as a right requires us to examine the very *notion of rights* from a pedagogical and communicative dimension.

In the academic philosophy of Kant there is already a relationship between freedom, rights and peace in which we ought to be educated. ² Rights appear in the academic or scholastic part of Kant's philosophy, not in relation with laws of nature, but with the laws of freedom, directed towards «that which ought to be». «Right is the sum total of those conditions within which the will of one person can be reconciled with the will of another in accordance with a universal law of freedom». ³ In addition: it can be said that the universal and lasting establishment of peace, does not constitute only one part, but the totality of the final end of the doctrine of rights within the limits of pure reason. ⁴

In order to make the relationship between freedom, rights and peace more communicative, we can examine the notion of rights, not only from this academic

¹ This article synthesizes some of the topics we are working (and re-working) on within the framework of the UNESCO Chair of Philosophy for Peace at the Jaume I University in Castellón.

We would like to enormously thank and acknowledge Jennifer Murphy for her contribution in translating this text from the original Spanish version to English.

² Vicent Martínez Guzmán: *Filosofía para hacer las paces*, Icaria, Barcelona, 2001, p. 38.

³ Hans Reiss (ed.): *Kant's Political Writings*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1970, p. 133.

⁴ Hans Reiss (ed.): *Kant's Political Writings*, cit., p. 174.

perspective, but also from what Kant calls «worldly or cosmical philosophy»: that which all human beings ask ourselves, what is the destiny of humanity. In this context, we highlight the idea that «right» has to do with directing, with directions, and with directives that we give to one another in order to «right ourselves», when we act in crooked and twisted ways.⁵

This notion of right as one of the human forms to correct the crooked roads that we can take, also teaches us about a certain *conception of the human being*. This conception can be found in Kant when he refers to the *unsocial sociability*. Kant utilizes this term to capture human relationships and to suggest that, like timber, human beings easily become tangled, but are difficult to be straightened out.⁶ Today we say that *conflicts* are an inevitable part of human relationships and that what is important is how to regulate them or solve them by peaceful means. For this reason peace, as the final end of the doctrine of rights, acts as a buttress that helps us to correct our crooked tendencies in both our personal and institutional relationships. Peace education from the perspective of a Human Right to Peace recognizes this complex relationship between the good and evil that we can do to each other and the function of right as a guide to peace.

Moreover, and again from a Kantian interpretation, the creation passage of Genesis is the place where we can realize our capabilities for good and evil. In the heritage that we share with the three monotheistic cultures, human beings have *dignity* because «we were made in the image and likeness of God». Awareness of this similarity is based precisely on the discovery of reason and the possibility of choice. *Being conscious of freedom and the possibilities of reason leads us, paradoxically, to being aware of the good and evil that we can do in function of this freedom*. Nevertheless, the demand for responsibility immediately arises: «Why did you eat the forbidden fruit? Why do you hide?», asks God to Adam and Eve.⁷ From here peace education has to be an education for freedom, in relation to right and the diverse forms for making peace(s). As the myth goes, human beings feel «naked» and «are afraid». This is the risk of freedom and why we need to teach and learn the right to peace. That is, we need to learn to exercise our freedom in peaceful ways and in solidarity with one another. Notice how education in the right to peace as a right of synthesis, connects this right of solidarity, to the rights of freedom that appeared in the first formulation of the Human Rights of Man in the 18th century. *There is, then, a relationship between the rights to freedom and those of solidarity*.

On the other hand this freedom as responsibility of what we can do to each other, tied to the right to peace from solidarity, is also related to *positive peace as a way of confronting inequalities, marginalization, exclusion and poverty*. In Kofi Annan's

⁵ Vicent Martínez Guzmán: *Filosofía para hacer las paces*, cit., p. 294.

⁶ Isaiah Berlin & Henry Hardy: *The Crooked Timber of Humanity: Chapters in the History of Ideas*, Pimlico, London, 2003.

⁷ Vicent Martínez Guzmán: *Filosofía para hacer las paces*, cit., p. 256f.

report about freedom, the enlargement of the concept of freedom leads to a freedom to live without poverty, without fear and in dignity.⁸ In this way, Peace Education from a Human Right to Peace would complete Annan's proposed triangle of development, human rights and security, which we prefer to call *peace*.

Furthermore, we have been working⁹ on the relationship between development and freedom as proposed by Amartya Sen¹⁰ which in some ways has received attention in the latest UNDP Reports: freedom depends upon the *capacities* that we recognize in one another as well as the *opportunities* that open up for us. We consider freedom as the name of a dimension in which actions are assessed, based on the possibility of holding ourselves accountable for what we do. In certain ways, we judge freedom by the greater or lesser extent of the *capacities* of people to carry out the type of life that they value and that they have reason to value. In our interpretation of Peace Education from the Human Right to Peace, we are not imposing any type of development, but rather, a development that has an intercultural dimension and that allows people to exercise their freedoms from their own values, beliefs and cultures. Otherwise in the name of development we continue colonizing and this would not be the type of development triangle that is necessary to promote the Human Right to Peace.

In the Western Christian culture, the processes of secularization led us to replace the notion of «dignity» based on the belief that human beings are the image and likeness of God. In Kantian terms, for example, human beings recognize dignity in each other. We do not have a price because we are not «means» to other ends. On the contrary, each one of us, «in his/her humanity», is an end in himself/herself.¹¹ *Peace Education from the Human Right to Peace must be open to intercultural dialogue, for a plural understanding of the notion of human dignity.*

Precisely in the relationship of the notion of right to human dignity, Seyla Benhabib¹² recuperates the notion of the right to have rights, of Hannah Arendt.¹³ This concept proves useful for Peace Education of the Human Right to Peace. According to Arendt, when the State passes from being the guarantor of rights, by means of «rule of law», to becoming a «totalitarian» State (like that of Hitler), that makes arbitrary use of rights, generating a large quantity of people «excluded» from rights, we must become aware of the «right to have rights». Applying this, as Benhabib does, to the current situation, refugees, minorities, people without

⁸ Kofi Annan: *In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All. Report of the Secretary-General, A/59/2005*, United Nations, New York, 2005 (available online at www.un.org/spanish/largerfreedom/). Accessed on 01.10.2010).

⁹ Vicent Martínez Guzmán: *Filosofía para hacer las paces*, cit., p. 301.

¹⁰ Amartya Kumar Sen: *Development as Freedom*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999.

¹¹ Immanuel Kant: *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*, Harper&Row, New York, 1964.

¹² Seyla Benhabib: *The Rights of Others. Aliens, Residents, and Citizens*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York, 2004.

¹³ Hannah Arendt: *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Schocken Books, New York, 2004.

states, displaced people, and immigrants, make us aware of the fact that there are human beings that are deprived of their «right to have rights». It is as if we lived in a world of «totalitarian globalization». ¹⁴ According to Benhabib –again, taking inspiration in Arendt–, the «right to have rights» is a right that all human beings have for the very fact of belonging to Humanity. Arendt, who is more «republican» or «communitarian», considers that this may be impossible. Benhabib uses this concept to update the Kantian approach and says that in the first part of the phrase, «the right to have rights», «right» means the right as «members of humanity» and in a second sense as the right to be understood as «members of human groups»: that is, civil and political in its juridical-civil use. That notion of dignity by which every human should be treated as an end and not as a means by «reason of his/her humanity» imposes «negative duties», that is, responsibilities that obligate us not to act in ways that would violate the right of humanity in every person. *We propose to rethink the Human Right to Peace, as a right of synthesis, as a right of humanity, as a right that we have as members of humanity to be recognized as members of human groups which are guaranteed by our juridical-civil rights –in sum, a right to have rights.*

To accomplish this, we propose to update the Kantian notion of the cosmopolitan right or the public right of humanity. ¹⁵ The Human Right to Peace would form part of this public right of humanity for the following Kantian reasons: 1) a violation of rights in one part of the world is felt everywhere, and 2) no one has more right than another to be in a place on earth because we jointly belong to it.

The universality of the Human Right to Peace as a part of the public right of humanity would be nuanced by the difference of cosmopolitan localism. ¹⁶ It is from our commitment to the local and immediate environment that we demonstrate how to reclaim the Human Right to Peace for all human beings. The Human Right to Peace synthesizes the rights of freedom and equality because it is understood as a right of solidarity between human beings and cultures. Kant warned that there would be some state that would be tempted to convert itself into a world State. Nevertheless, Kant says, nature wills it otherwise and asserts two means in support of this, linguistic and religious differences. It is true that this diversity can lead us to war, marginalization and exclusion of some beliefs or confessions and languages by others. It all depends on the culture that we promote. *In the framework of cultures for peace(s) the Human Right to Peace encourages this diversity of beliefs and languages as a way of living in peace.* At the same time, from a gender perspective, the Human Right to Peace expressed as a

¹⁴ Ignacio Ramonet: «Regímenes globalitarios», *Le Monde Diplomatique*, vol. II, No. 15 (1997).

¹⁵ Vicent Martínez Guzmán: *Filosofía para hacer las paces*, cit., Chapter XVI.

¹⁶ Wolfgang Sachs (ed.): *The Development Dictionary. A Guide to Knowledge as Power*, Witwatersrand University Press / Zed Books, London, 1993.

right of solidarity completes the «fraternity» that was once only «solidarity between brothers» and from a patriarchal and masculine perspective with the «sorority», which includes solidarity with «our sisters» and all citizens of the world, from a commitment to the local.

In this way, the Human Right to Peace as a right to have rights, a public right of humanity and solidarity of cultures and men and women, opens up the space for a new type of Post-Westphalian citizenship. In the world order of the peace of Westphalia of 1648 and its consolidation with the French Revolution of 1789, the nation-state should provide security, governance and sovereignty within the limits of its territoriality.¹⁷ Educating ourselves in the Human Right to Peace as we are putting forth here, makes us *citizens without borders in the universal sense, and, at the same time, committed to the understanding of collective identities and of local beliefs and languages* as we have explained above. The nation-state has become quite small for the global economic problems and answers: misery and poverty, migrations, ecological problems, global terrorism and the answers of «war on terror» that increase fear and terror and prolong the spiral of violence. At the same time, it remains very large for the acknowledgment of national identities without a state, for the empowerment of the local, which as we have explored, should be carried out through a grassroots approach in order to meet the «universal» demands of the Human Right to Peace.

Therefore, we need to rethink the world order with *new forms of understanding – governance from above and below the nation-state*.¹⁸ Some examples of governance from above the nation-state are: a reform of the United Nations; the empowerment of the International Court of Justice; control mechanisms for the global economy in order to face the poverty it generates; a world parliament of religions; institutions of the dialogue of civilizations; empowerment of global civil society and networks of global social movements; and, cosmopolitan democracy and global constitutionalism. Acknowledgment of nations without states, of indigenous peoples, of the right to ones own language, beliefs, cultures and economic forms of subsistence, empowerment of local forms of justice, and attention to local social movements are forms of local governance or governance from below. *Peace Education from a Human Right to Peace should include these new forms of conceptualizing citizenship and governance.*

¹⁷ David Held: «Democracy: From City-States to a Cosmopolitan Order?» in David Held (ed.): *Prospects for Democracy. North, South, East, West*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1993, pp. 13-52; David Held: *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1995.

¹⁸ Mark R. Duffield: *Global Governance and the New Wars: The Merging of Development and Security*, Zed Books, London-New York, 2001; Robert O Keohane: «Governance in a Partially Globalized World», in David Held and Anthony McGrew (eds.): *Governing Globalization*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd., Cambridge, 2002, pp. 325-348; James N. Rosenau: «Governance in a New Global Order», in David Held and Anthony McGrew (eds.): *Governing Globalization*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd., Cambridge, 2002, pp. 70-87.