

PEACE EDUCATION FOR THE SOCIALIZATION OF THE CULTURE OF PEACE

Ikechukwu Anthony Kanu, PhD

Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies

Tansian University, Anambra State

ikee_mario@yahoo.com

ORCID iD: 0000-0003-1977-202X

&

Philip Osarobu ISANBOR, PhD

Department of Philosophy, Seminary of All Saints, Ekpoma, Nigeria

Email: osarobuisanbor@gmail.com

OCHID No: 0000_0002_9128_6467

Abstract

Contemporarily, the issues of vibrant educational consciousness for meaningful human and societal developments have been indispensably linked with the advocacies for the Culture of Peace. Its conditions projected always the elimination of the currencies of conflict-driven socialization. Hence, with this paper and many other researches on peace education and development, we greatly observed that many communities are still in the mucky waters of violence and conflicts, and these conditions are demanding heavily on the human persons to re-address the contents of their lived experiences in order to well position the developmental contents of their present and future socialization. Such concern owes that, it is only when the human persons are adequately and holistically educated that integral humanism duly obtained. The paper focuses on the pedagogical reorientation of the human persons who are subjects of lived experiences, especially on the demands of the Culture of Peace as against the Culture of War. This paper suggests the adoption of principles of integral humanism which considers the wholeness of the human person in every development policy or initiative for the elimination of the Culture of War and other forms of violent conflicts in our societies, and which indispensably presupposes the adequate and integral educational formation of the human persons.

Keywords: Human Person, Peace Education, Lived Experiences, *Culture of Peace*, Socialization, Society, *Culture of War*.

Preamble: Some Basic Understanding of Human Development Conditions

With the contemporary upsurge of materialistic, nihilistic and hedonistic values associated with the imposing nature of scientific and technological humanism and unwavering embraces of industrialization and modernization, there are been a troubling development of conflict-driven socialization of human society, that is, the *Culture of War*. In other ways, the issues for the realization of integral humanism are necessarily presupposed on the issues for the possibilities of peaceful development, that is, the *Culture of Peace* (See, Francis 2022: no. 2; Isanbor 2021^a: 43, Isanbor 2021^b: 210). Such possibilities are: sincerity of purposes, unity of values, principles of common good and

solidarity, the practicality of truth, trust and justice. These possibilities are developmental elements against the *Crisis of Truth* that occasioned the *Culture of War* and they remain the concerns of many social and civil organizations, especially through the initiations and implementations of developmental policies and programmes, directed to promotion of the *Culture of Peace*.

As contemporarily recognised, we discuss the issues of peace and its associated linkages for integral humanism because the trending *Culture of War*. For development is about the projection of proper educational formation of the minds to embrace the institutionalization of social order and justice, and to be taken as the foundational duty and engagement of all socialization. According to Pope Francis, in his social encyclical, *Fratelli tutti*, no. 30:

In today's world, the sense of belonging to a single human family is fading, and the dream of working together for justice and peace seems an outdated utopia. What reigns instead is a cool, comfortable and globalized indifference, born of deep disillusionment concealed behind a deceptive illusion: thinking that we are all-powerful, while failing to realize that we are all in the same boat. This illusion, unmindful of the great fraternal values, leads to "a sort of cynicism... Isolation and withdrawal into one's own interests are never the way to restore hope and bring about renewal. Rather, it is closeness; it is the culture of encounter. Isolation, no; closeness, yes. Culture clash, no; culture of encounter, yes."

It is on the ideological basis for the realization of authentic development that many idealistic and humanistic thinking scholars or researchers will agree that without the *Culture of Peace*, no meaningful socialization is possible, and then, without the same *Culture of Peace*, no human person can think of achieving the organizational goals in a conflict-laden environment (See, Francis 2022: no. 2; Isanbor 2021^a: 43, Isanbor 2021^b: 210). Such institutions should do first by positively socialising the human person on the pact of social order. However, there are obvious convictions that there cannot be integral humanism where there are deep-seated lacks of the *Culture of Peace*. With these convictions above, the objectives of the paper are to reposition the minds of the human persons that:

1. there are indispensable needs to value the human person in relation to human activities, trusting on the social reformation of the minds by teaching and learning: sincerity, love and trust, continence and integrity of purposes and interests, in order to our current world of conflicting values that are basically directed by the sociological and economical waves of consumerism, sectionalism and individualism, misguided patriotism.
2. It is sociologically recognised that the human person is a product of what he or she produces, and the realization of social order is possible, especially at global level, if the human person properly understand that he or she has the power to shape the world and eliminate all forms of conflicts and violence, even at all levels of human sociological development.

The realization of these objectives will be based on the contemporary understanding of the human person in relation to the sociological quest for development and advancement, away from the traditional sustainability of integral humanism (See, Aghamelu 2019: 93). The human person remains a social subject of societal interests and desires, and this defines him or her from time to time. The process of socialising human actions for integral humanism is a sociological engagement that centred in the reformation of the minds. It is about the changing of individuals' orientation and reshaping the individuals' social interests, and for the proper adaption of personal and group rights and interests for communal integration. With constant educational socialisation of the human person, the tenet of

sociology is inferred, that is, understanding the social ethical integrity of the individual's growth and development.

In sociology, the human person remains "who he or she is"; dependent of his or her propelling tendency to initiate the trends of development. The human person cannot but seeks the opportunities to develop. For the possibility of integral humanism is situated on the realisation of some abstractive and pragmatic elements of the *Culture of Peace*. It behoves on the human person as a subject of lived experiences, who must constantly learn about the importance of the *Culture of Peace*, to ensure that social order and development in our world of conflicting purposes, policies, innovations and interests are fully realised. Hence, the paper is aimed at suggesting the relevance of education for peace as most reliable and accommodating mode of socialising the human persons. It recognises that every act of sociological engineering, reformation and restructuring is the product of human minds and consciences. Then, it projects that we must be socialised to embrace the *Culture of Peace* as against the *Culture of War*.

Existential Educational Story of Character Reformation for the *Culture of Peace*

To put this discourse into context, especially within an experienced existential analogical representation, let us adopt the "War Game" story. Thereby, a story is told of a group of children who engaged in playing a "War Game" in a remote part of Omolua-Igbanke, Orhionmwon Local Government Area of Edo State, Nigeria. Customarily, a "war game" is played with fashioned toy guns, spears, and machetes and other like weapons. The players whistled sounds associated with weapons of war and forms of violence. One day, an elderly man met with these children at play, at the peak of action, actively enmeshed in it. Then, he asked them why were they playing "war game" and not "peace game"? The children, astonished by the question, asked the elder in return: what is "peace game"? They certainly did not know what "peace game" is, and since it could be claimed that they had not been taught. As a matter of fact, the "peace game" had been taught to them, otherwise, consciously or unconsciously. The social and ethical ultimate fact remained that the children had grown so accustomed to societal violence and conflicts that they had no qualms playing them out. This is their inherited culture, and it would take some act or task of learning the contents of peace is to unlearn war and other forms of violent conflicts and to embrace the most wanted *Culture of Peace*. Of course, there are other similar stories of this kind that indicate the level of which humanity has been accustomed with violence.

From the point of précised directedness of interests, the objective of this paper is not on the analysis of any violent stories. It is rather about the right educational formation of the human mind towards the embrace of the *Culture of Peace*. The thrust of this paper is hinged on the altercation for the possible realization of peace-making, peace-building and peace-keeping as against the prevailing *Culture of War*. It aims at suggesting the relevance of the education of peace as most realistic and accommodating mode of socialising the human person. It is certain that peace is possible, just as the *Culture of War* has been possible. In its projection, the education for the *Culture of Peace* should be the ardent duty and engagement of every institution and organization in order to positively socialise the human person on the path of social order.

To understand the human person in terms of his or her pursuance of the *Culture of Peace* is to exact the weighty relevance and influence of human histories in terms of his exercises of freedom, personality and intelligibility. Arguably, the pursuance of peace has not been outside war and other forms of violent conflicts and it contemporarily appeal to the existentiality of truth that humanities are more inclined to the cultures of violence than to peaceful resolution. It is simply due to the factors of

advancement that forms the cooperative interests for social order and harmony. For this, many thinkers over the ages have believed that the “atom of war” are parts of human development, and that, when seeking the *Culture of Peace*, the human persons remain in the fate of social actuality that is dependent on their actions and choices (cf, Isanbor 2021^a: 45, Isanbor 2021^b: 213). And, in most cases, they make less effort to establish the *Culture of War*, and it has escalated, they make more efforts to fight the same *Culture of War* rather than to seek for the avenue to establish the *Culture of Peace*, but we easily know the dangerous effects of conflicts than the effectual comfort of peace-making, peace-building and peace-keeping.

Essence of Human Sociological Development

In all civilisations, education is the taste of social and societal empowerment and development of the masses. This greatly translates their sociological internalisation of interests, purposes and inventions. Put directly, it is about the socialisation processes that take place in society in relation to human behavioural development. It is closely linked with the material societal development and on the value of human interests. This dimension of development emphasises that the modes of production should be determined by the socialisation processes of the people within a particular human structuring of interests (Nneji 2009, 100). The improvement of lives necessarily depends on the values invested on human rights, justice and peace that must be properly socialised and internalised. For Douglas Roche (2006: 11):

The human society is met to enjoy adequate peace and justice in fine-tuning its affairs toward development and progress. Of-course, the past few decades have seen positive gains for humanity. The world economy has soared. Science has blossomed. Medical advances are stunning. Knowledge can be instantly transmitted by electronic means. However, the persons who enjoy these gains, for the most part, are already well off, and the gap between them and the dispossessed continues to grow. Despite all the advances in science and technology, injustice prevails.

We understand that all men are social by nature. They must naturally need to live together and consult each other's interests in order to develop meaningfully and integrally. These interests situate the fact of essential living that men should recognize and perform their respective rights and duties are imperative to a well ordered and just society in order to attain peaceful development therein. As sociologically and cosmologically situated, society defines the individual as a subject of lived experiences, just as the individual as a member of human community, helps the same community to shape the society. But, such society that the avenues for the individual to develop himself or herself along the values of lived experiences recognises that the individual has the ontological responsibility to shape his or her present and future existentialities with proper internality of the products of the past experiences. But, the result will be that the human person as an agent of development will make his or her whole-hearted contribution to the creation of a civic order in which rights and duties are ever more diligently and more effectively observed.

Many of the models of development seem to centre about the social consciousness of the people. Humanity longs for development adequately, and requires the conditions favourable for it, and human sociological development is not an exception. Human sociological development is the progressive change and growth that is associated with interrelatedness and interconnectedness of human beings of a particular society, even, in the world at large. These relationships are developmental in nature, because, it is in human's nature to live with others, not in isolation. Sociological development is about the network of persons, about the society of persons. It is about social interaction and communion: that is, the unity of community. We exist as individual only if we are in relation to and with others.

As a person, it applies the association and relation with others. Only with person is one's personality becomes ever enlivened with meaning and purpose of which it is created. It may be our family, peer groups and friends, or community; much of our uniqueness comes from being with and learning from others in groups.

We necessarily understand that all contents of human and societal developments occur in group contexts or social groupings, following the indispensability of the roles of ethical consciousness and principles in guiding or directing socialization and civilisation. Developmentally, our first group is the family and extended family. Much of our way of thinking about self and how we relate in other groups can be traced back to our family history. The human person can only survive and flourish in the network of healthy human relationships. Then, any society with the multiplicity of ethnic, racial and religious groupings needs to understanding the relevance of sociological development of the individual and the society are inevitable. This is because; it is about the integration of collective oneness and togetherness of communal interests.

On the relevance of communitarian ethics in societal development, there is a wide expression of the socialisation of the individual and the society, and since the community of persons control the individual, it takes the same community of persons to form an integral society in the *Culture of Peace*. So, the individual development is that of the community which he or she belongs. One is talking about sociological development, especially in modern society which we belong, because many factors have initiated against achievement and actualisation of proper human conscientious formation. Human personality has been facing things contrary to his or her socialisation. From these points of view, proper human socialisation remains hinged on the values of the human person and his growth processes, and projects that one has to advance above primitiveness and cultural limitedness, to welcome the trend of togetherness which nature has put in place. Certain factors like the valuations of justice and peace will always help in the actualisation of proper human formation.

Culture of Peace and its Developmental Placement in Conflict-Driven Socialization

Sociologically, the human minds are conditioned to accepting what they are accustomed to in a long time, especially in a repeated modelling of learning and socialising. Both the conditioning for peace and war are the same processes of development (See, Isanbor 2021^a: 46, Isanbor 2021^b: 215). They are learnt over time. But the human society encourages we learn and socialise those elements of development that promote positive human togetherness based on the valuation of human life, rights and dignity. These investments, whether social or political, must be directed towards social order. The global consideration of development is hinged on the fact that no particular culture or race can claim monopolistic possession of peaceful development. It remains indispensably un-debatable, and its social placement is unquestionable. In this, we talk about the protection, promotion and respect for human rights, that which differentiate him or her from other animals. The understanding of this advocacy will depend solely on the recent consideration of human rights, whether as an authority or as a subject of lived experiences. But the whole affairs of the human person are governed especially for a good consideration and maintenance of human rights and his or her quest for integral development.

Emphasizing the phased relevance of peace in relation the existential commitment in safeguarding the human ecology in the *Culture of War*, Paul VI in his 1978 *Message of the World Day of Peace* recognises the communal cooperativeness for *Culture of Peace*, that;

Violence is antisocial by reason of the very methods that allow it to be organized into group complicity, in which a conspiracy of silence forms the binding cement and the protective shield. A

dishonouring sense of honour gives it a palliative of conscience. And this is one of the distortions, widespread today, of the true social sense, a distortion which clothes with secrecy and with the threat of pitiless revenge certain associated forms of collective selfishness.

According to Douglas Roche (2006: 6) in his work: *Human Right to Peace* comments that “the world faces no greater challenge today than the challenge to end its relentless march to war” (p. 6). It is the social conditioning where contemporary humanity is becoming at home with the *Culture of War* which is associated with materialism and imperialism, and even forced patriotism. We recognized that “war caused starvation, deepens poverty, ruins environments, forces migration of people, wrecks the rule of law, multiplies the gap between rich and poor, and causes prolonged misery for the most vulnerable” (Roche, p. 6). With this culture of development, the world is becoming fractionized and disintegrating to the formation of greed economic and diplomatic blocs and industrialist grouping and franchisers who want to commercialize and monopolize the commonwealths in global fronts of development.

In our contemporary society, the *Culture of War* is mostly engineered by the reign of religious insecurity and conflicts. From it, the reign of insecurity and conflicts has remained very visible and factual. Sociologically, one does not need to be told by any prophet about the extent of damages and wastages on nations which these situations of violent conflicts have caused and have been causing. The phenomenon of violent conflicts has a paradoxical character in the society, that while many people see it as undesirable in itself, while some believe that it is desirable as a means of achieving social ends. Some even hold that social progress cannot be recorded without violence. Despite the level of education majority of the human persons have obtained, the rise of these insecurities and conflicts is heightened and very compelling. In all, education is a tool that forms the human conscience, in making right decision amongst conflicting and enslaving ones. Nevertheless, one can easily conclude that this objective of education has been detected by the happenings amongst educated citizenry. So, there is need to assess the nature of educational formation of minds we receive in order to possess the consciousness for the *Culture of Peace*.

With the reigns of wars and other of violent conflicts that have been associated with contemporary human society for fames, power and wealth, there are calls for the needs and adoption of peace-building, peace-making and peace-keeping through the educational formation of the minds towards the values of the *Culture of Peace*. This is due to the objective conviction that contemporary human persons are easily convinced to embrace any model of development when the factors of such claims are appealing and promising to meet their yearnings and aspirations. As they are easily convinced to embrace violence and conflicts especially by political and religious motivated agencies, they can also embrace the *Culture of Peace*, when they are formally taught about the values and meaning of integral humanism.

Peace Education and the Demands for Human Character Formation and Reformation

It should be recognised that education involves the training of individuals in order to acquire a particular skill(s). It also involves the formation and development of moral character and mental power (Agulana 2011: 87). On the whole, education is centred towards the formation of the human person in order to make such person or persons capable of utilizing their entire resources for the good of the society to which they belong (Fasuyi and Adeleye 2013: 140). It is about a recognised procedure of transmission of knowledge for individual and societal advancements, from the regulatory

bodies have put in place that is called ‘curriculum’. Hence, it is readily understood by many sociological thinkers on the realization of social order, that education has remain a tool of character reformation which help to guarantee societal peace and harmony.

Thereby, for the achievement of certain qualities or dispositions: sincerity, love, justice and equity, there is an indispensable need to respect human rights and dignity. The course of social and societal restructuring or re-engineering is an indispensable pointer for conflict resolution and peace development (Fasuyi and Adeleye 2013: 140). It also considers an integrated modality for peace initiative based on the social contact theories associated with some socio-political and economic philosophers- Thomas Hobbes, J. J. Rousseau and John Locke. For them, the human communities should be brought together in the same school setting in order to overcome their attitudinal differences. Education is an instrument of achieving social change by identifying sources of conflicts and resolving them. It is on this classification and consideration that we relate the institutionalisation of education to the possibility of the realisation of peace-making, peace-building and peace-keeping, just as we consider the development of peace education in all stages of education.

From all indications, the story above has shown some level which humanity has been acculturated, accustomed or indoctrinated with the *Culture of War* and other forms of dehumanization. Many thinkers believe that human nature is indispensably known for violence and conflicts. Almost everything we do, we will try to showcase the promotion and valuation of conflicts, even to the level of video gaming and sports. From the ethical perspectives, it is impossible for human beings today, who have seen what people can do to themselves and to one another, hesitating not to be involved (Wiese in McKenna 2002: 171), on the quests for harmonious living. It is generally accustomed that these cultures of violence are making the society very hostile and intolerable. They are seen in every human organisation or institution.

Historically put, we reiterate the thoughts of the classical minds of the enlightenment period including Immanuel Kant and Georg Hegel. The Kantian–Hegelian theory emphasized the shift from spiritual agency to humans as the agents of historical change. Karl Marx and Frederick Engel stepped in and gave economic interpretations to the Kantian – Hegelian theory of change. As mostly noted by Karl Marx, any change in society is propelled by the conflict between different classes in society, and the most essential factor of this conflict is group economic interest (Thingan 1981: 83). So particularly, through education, there is need to reflect on the central objective of every institution of socialization. But, in them, it has been observed that wars have been a common market of agitations. We either fight for power, wealth, rights or freedom. These are parts of human growth process and development. War is physical or mental, cold or hot. Any of it, has been for the exercise of subjugation, domination. Ultimately, in every quest for peace, the questions that are mostly asked by philosophers and social thinkers in line with Thomistic philosophy of war or “Just War Theory” have been that; can humanity attains peaceful co-existence and meaningful or sustainable development through the exercises of war? Can the negativities associated with the reality of wars bring the goodness associated with the culture of war? These questions sometimes remain without meaningful, convinced and sustainable answers, when in most cases, the establishment of peace is indispensably linked with wars and other forms of conflict- humanities believing that without war, no peace is possible.

Hence, there is an indispensable link between education and religion. In understanding education, the religious aspects of integral humanism is estimated and undertaken, when the issues of contemporary societal conflicts and violence are considered for analysis. Benedict XVI, in his message of the 2012 *World Day of Peace*, greatly emphasised the need to educate the youth in the society. Such education needs to start from their home formation and their socialisation processes by and within the human

family. Such arrangements should serve as the bedrock for proper conscience formation towards peaceful and just living, before the extended responsibility is given to other agents of socialisation (see, Benedict XVI 2012: no. 2). As a matter of fact, religion is the body of rules derived from acceptance of a faith and adoration of deity specified by the particular religious community. For instance, the metaphor: “religion with dirty hands” means going beyond the pulpit in search for godly and integral humanism (See, Francis 2022: no. 2; Isanbor 2021^a: 43, Isanbor 2021^b: 210). Its prescriptive rules sometimes form the basis of other normative prescriptions such as law, ethics and morals. At such, the analysis of human social institutions in relation to the quest for peace always exemplifies the involvement of the religious communities in the politics of human and global interests that always needs the practicality of laws and morals.

Educating the *Culture of Peace* in Conflict-Driven Socialization

Education is not limited to what is mainly done in an academic institution or a formal gathering. It also involves the whole process of transmission of intellectual, cultural, moral, religious and social values from an individual to another or a group of individuals for continuity and proper ordering of the society. It also involves the training of individuals in order to acquire a particular skill or skills and also the formation and development of moral character and mental power. This demands the institutionalization of peace education in all level of human socialization. The whole aspect of education is centred on the formations of the human persons in order to make them capable of utilizing their entire resources around and about him or her for the good of the society to which they belong. According to Cora Weiss;

Peace Education is a holistic approach to preparing young people for active participation in democracy by teaching for and about human rights, gender equality, sustainable development, disarmament, international law, social and economic justice, human security and traditional peace practices. It is a fairly new discipline with limited measurable results.

More straightforwardly, the societal valuation of peace education which is “education for peace” at a general level of human development comes to mean the general enlightenment of the human society on the value of establishing and maintaining the avenue of social order and harmony. This demands the elements of the aesthetic value of creation; the education for ecological responsibility; the culture of simplicity, moderation and spirit of sacrifice; respect for humans and non-humans, the promotion of human rights and dignity; elimination of wars; and avoidance of all sorts of poisonous and deadly pollutants. Such social conditioning recognises that the society is the product of the people. It is the people who, utilizing the power of the intellect and their freedom, determine the nature and the direction of societal affairs and welfares. The human society is meant to enjoy adequate peace and justice in fine-tuning its affairs toward meaningful and sustainable development and progress.

In recent times, the value for peaceful living is highly diminishing. This is because, individuals and nations refuse to understand the proper trend in which developments have to be championed by United Nations Organization (UNO) though its objectives in the commissioning of United Nations Education, Scientific Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Humanity needs to be more educated in valuing social order and harmony. Without the consciousness for social order, man is worse than an animal, because even animals love and work for developments that are homing to them. The UNO’s reason for contemporary emphasis on the education of the masses has been assessed to be more importantly for the attainment of peace and justice, than for the elimination of illiteracy. From this conviction, it should be agreed that the underlying ideologies and practical applications of some social institutions have been so caustic, and that they are capable of destabilising the nation’s social

formation. By ideology is meant the underlying principles behind any chosen course or action. Many things need to be unlearned and the good that have phased out need to be re-learned.

Understandably put, the problems of development are widespread and demand speedy responses to alleviate humanity from extinction. Never has the human race enjoyed such an abundance of wealth, resources and economic power, and yet a huge proportion of the world's citizens are still tormented by hunger and poverty, while countless numbers suffer from total illiteracy. For the sake of common integral humanism, we must be with those who have suffered. We must also be with those who strive to prevent others from suffering. Such community does not deny the differences, but rather embraces and transcends them (Wiesel 2002). Never before has humanity had so keen an understanding of freedom, yet at the same time new forms of social and psychological slavery make their appearance. It is in the light of this that the UNO will emphasise that;

Education for human rights in a changing world is the thrust of this Plan of Action. It should be participatory and operational, creative, innovative and empowering at all levels of civil society. The rise of nationalism and intolerance... calls for special and anticipatory educational strategies aimed at preventing the outbreak of violent conflicts and the related human rights violations. Incremental changes can no longer be considered satisfactory. Education should aim to nurture democratic values, sustain impulses for democratization and promote societal transformation based upon human rights and democracy (UNESCO 1990).

It is reasonably positioned that the Plan of Action of UNO on the development of the human society is necessarily centred on the possible realization of the *Culture of Peace* and sustainable development through the provision of Universal Basic Education (UBE) and the policies of Education for All (EFA). With them, UNO encourages world nations and governments to respect the Right to Education which every individual as a person has. The relying efforts and thrusts on the world governments in the name of the UNO have been the major earthly hope for the realisation of peace and justice through the proper education of common cultural, social and religious heritages and values that the human person as an end not a means. Nevertheless, the achievement of social order remains the earthly hope of the authentic or integral living and for the growth of world solidarity. Knowing that, social order is only possible when world policies advance the whole nature of the human person, and at such, monitors the account of his or her actions. This culture of social order advances the transvaluation of values that are already traversed.

Owing to the social concerns for cultural, social and political developments of any constitutionalised society, we recall the extensive Programme of Actions by the UNO in its 2000 International Year of the *Culture of Peace*. They situate the possibility of national building and development on the common understanding of our common existential living, and translated in 50 languages, and they act as a guideline for practical actions and public awareness campaigns, and they are follows: a. Respect for the values of all life; b. Rejection of violence and all avenues of conflicts; c. Sharing with others in the sense of universal distributions of goods; d. Listening to others in order to affect common understanding of existence. e. Preserving the planet and allowing to sustain our living; and f. Rediscovering the power of human solidarity for otherness of development.

Hence, the argument here is this: if educating the human persons has a part to play in the cultivation of the tolerant attitude, then, the potency of being tolerant exists in human society. This tolerance for peace for integral humanism calls the communality of common interests and civilisation of love. This civilisation of love is enclosed in its depths as poverty of spirit, emptiness of conventional religion, morals, and wisdom. It is mourning for the world, for the elimination of for collective and individual

guilt, for proper distribution of commonwealths. The persecution and contempt that follow must be persecution for the sake of that new justice, free of moralism, individualism and escapism. This justice will be hated most of all by those who want to be righteous in their wealth, to be culturally and morally religious. Everyone should know that nothing good happens outside the *Culture of Peace*, and for the integral humanism should be the very reason why everyone should strive for peaceful development and be adequately realistic in their creativity and innovation. For the continuous confirmative interest of all religious bodies in the *Culture of Peace*, and it should not be seen as an elusive concept or reality. This should be the major role of all consented persons and for all, since everyone desires a world that socially ordered, and it is an arena that is dominated by many people, and remains an avenue to talk about the *Culture of Peace*, especially towards the realization of the intergenerational justice and equity.

Evaluative Conclusion

From the foregoing, we have seen that for the course of integral humanism, education must be properly taught to properly socialise the human persons, especially the youths. Since education is seen as cultivating to the process of integral humanism by fostering an orientation to moral reflection and choice, a pattern or way of dealing with moral and intellectual questions of integral humanism (Dimkpa 2013: 50). In all, it must be understood that conflict is natural, and just like peace, is also common in human experience in all relationships and interactions. It is observed that conflict does not just happen, it has roots. Humanity must create the avenues for the *Culture of Peace* to thrive and to outweigh the operation of the *Culture of War* through peace education. We create, nurture, promote and sustain conflict (Akpan 2015: 180). The human person is an interpersonal being, and without this interpersonal quality, integral humanism is impossible to be desired (Isanbor, Ayetin and Okoro 2015: 128). The same devotion and strength are required of us to institutionalise lasting *Culture of Peace* which is of greater value than the *Culture of War*.

We honestly conclude this paper on the valuation of education of minds for the institutionalization of peace-making, peace-building and peace-keeping for the realization of integral humanism. Such resolution is on the basis that lasting development is hinged on what we make up from the society we live in, by turning down the tables of hatred and greed to embrace the civilisation of love. The conception of authentic development through peace-making, peace-building and peace-keeping and their enduring adoption and adaptability will necessarily become the hallmark of integral humanism, where the wholeness of the human person is fully protected, promoted and restfully respected. Both our religious and educational developments must be for the establishment of peace-making, peace-building and peace-keeping. Fundamentally speaking, if all things being equal, there should be peace and justice in the human society as preview by the application of natural law principle, where there are full regards for the contents of social contracts and the respects for the contents of common good. As Pope Paul VI in his 1970 *Message of World Day of Peace* personified the valuations of peace by asserting that:

Peace is man, who has ceased to be a wolf to his fellow man, man in his invincible moral power. This it is that must today prevail in the world. And it does prevail. We enthusiastically greet the efforts of modern man to give affirmation, in the world and in present history, to Peace as a method, as an international institution, as sincere negotiation, as self-discipline in territorial and social disputes, as a question that is higher than the prestige of reprisal and revenge.

In all, the question whether peace is possible in truth will always have an answer(s) which cannot be fractionised. The thrust of the *Culture of Peace* always hinged on the fact that the human persons are

peace personified, and if the human persons must be redeemed from the waves of unchecked freedom that lead to the *Culture of War*, they must examine the truthfulness of its *beingness*, the reasons for the purposes why it is created. Therefore, we must reform and educate the human persons towards the valuation of peaceful development. So, contemporary human persons should live to liberate themselves from the *Culture of War* they have created for themselves through its errant demands of power and recognitions. They should learn to embrace peace-making, peace-building and peace-keeping that naturally flows from their essential quest for true freedom, common good and social justice, a culture for non-violence and conflict resolution.

References

- Aghamelu, F. C. (2019). The human persona and social order: a moral perspective. *Journal of African Studies and Sustainable Development*, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 91-108.
- Aghaosa, I. P. and Isanbor, P. O. (2021). Human Person and the Metaphysics of Education. *Euromentor Journal Studies about Education*, Vol. XII, No. 4, pp. 49-60.
- Agulana, C. (2011). Ethics and education. In A. F. Uduigwuomen and K. Ogbinaka (eds). *Philosophy of education: an analytical approach*. Lagos: JERP Ltd.
- Akpan, S. T. (2015). Inter-tribal conflict and alternative mean of conflict resolution: a canonical perspective. *The Aquinas Journal*, Vol. 7, pp. 163-191.
- Benedict XVI (2012). *Messages for the world day of peace*. Educating Young People in Justice and Peace. VC: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- Boyles, N. and Boyles, A. (2003). *The challenge of God; exploring morality*. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan.
- Dimkpa, A. C. (2013). Is pacem in terris possible? *West African Journal of Ecclesial Studies*, Vol. 10, pp. 47-68.
- Ekanola, A. B. (2005). Towards an enduring social peace in a violence ridden society: from a culture of war and violence to a culture of peace and non-violence. *West African Journal of Philosophical Studies*, Vol. 8, pp. 92-112.
- Fasuyi, A. O. and Adeleye, J. O. (2013). Philosophical justification of education as an instrument of conflict resolution in Nigeria. *Ikere Journal of Education*, 15(1), 135-143.
- Isanbor, P. O. (2021^a). "Environmental Sustainability and the Quest for Global Social Order in Francis' Laudato Si." In I. A. Kanu (ed). *African Eco-Philosophy: Cosmology, Consciousness and the Environment*, (pp. 42-66). USA, Maryland: Association for the Promotion of African Studies.
- Isanbor, P. O. (2021^b). "Environment in the Cultures of War and Peace." In I. A. Kanu (ed). *African Eco-Philosophy: Cosmology, Consciousness and the Environment*, (pp. 209-232). USA, Maryland: Association for the Promotion of African Studies.
- Isanbor, P. O. and Folorunso, P. O. (2021). Human Person and the Metaphysics of Social Order and Development. *Cogito: Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, Vol. XIII, No. 2, pp. 50-66.

Isanbor, P. O., Ayetin, N. A., and Okoro, A. O. (2015). An ethical tripod of human work, freedom and social justice in John Paul II's social Philosophy. *NIDCASRES: Niger Delta Journal of Religious Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 124-133.

John Paul II (2000). "Incarnation touches depths of humanity". Address to participants in the World Meeting of University Teachers for their Jubilee- The University for a New Humanism – on 9th Sept., 2000, no. 4, in *L'Osservatore Romano*, English Ed., {13th Sept, 2000}.

Kusumalayam, J. (2008). *Human rights*. Mumbai: St Paul Press.

Nneji, B. (2009). Severe poverty and human rights: a socio-philosophical critique. *West African Journal of Philosophical Studies*, Vol. 12, pp. 68-105.

Oredipe, P. (2005). Integral humanism: an ethical challenge in faith and reason. In P. Iroegbu and A. Echekwube (eds). *Kpim of morality: Ethics*. Ibadan: Heinemann.

Roche, D. (2006). *The human right to peace*. Mumbai: Better Yourself Books.

Thingan, M. L. (1981). *The economics of development planning*. New Delhi: Delhi Press.

UNESCO (1990). *World declaration on education for all and framework for action to meet basic learning needs*, Adopted by the World Conference on Education for All Meeting Basic Learning Need. Jomtien, Thailand, 5-9th March.

Weiss, C. "Integrating Peace and Disarmament Education into Curricula and community." In *Peace and disarmament Education: Changing Mindsets to Reduce Violence and Sustain the Removal of Small Arms* (pp. 7-10). Edited by Gloria Levitas. New York: The story of the partnership in Albania, Cambodia, Niger and Peru between the United Nations Department For Disarmament Affairs and the Hague Appeal For Peace

Wiesel, E. (2002). The Refugee- Elie Wiesel in sanctuary: A Resource Guide for Understanding and Participating in the Central American Refugees' Struggle. In Gary MacEoin ed., as in M. McKenna, *Prophets: Words of Fire*, Mumbai: Paulines.