



DOI: 10.31891/2308-4081/2022-12(1)-3

Doctor of Sciences in Pedagogy, Full Professor, **ELENA ZHIZHKO**
Autonomous University of Zacatecas, Mexico,
Address: Torre de Posgrados II, Av. Preparatoria, s/n,
Fracc. Progreso, Zacatecas, Zac., 98000, Mexico,
e-mail: eanatoli@yahoo.com
ORCID 0000-0001-9680-8247

Doctor of Philosophy in Pedagogy, Associate Professor,
GALI-ALEKSANDRA BELTRÁN
Technologic University of Durango, Mexico,
Address: 1000 Poniente, esquina Zaragoza, Durango, 34000, Dgo., México,
e-mail: gali.beltranzh@gmail.com
ORCID 0000-0001-7186-332X

EDUCATION FOR PEACE: LATIN AMERICAN CONTEXT

ABSTRACT

This article presents the results of a pedagogical research, which objective was to find out through a documentary-bibliographic study how education for peace in Latin American research space is currently conceptualized. The authors found that there exist two main lines in the approach to peace education: realist-pragmatic-positivist and idealist-critical. The representatives of the first line (Vera-Poseck, Carbelo-Baquero, Vecina-Jiménez, 2006; Landazábal-Cuervo, Cardona, Ruiz-Manzanares, 2009; Cajigal-Molina, 2017; Caldera-Montes, Aceves, Reynoso-González, 2016, among others) choose to promote the peace culture through different academic and cultural events (courses, workshops, forums, conferences, colloquiums, seminars, festivals, exhibitions, cultural weeks, talks, etc.), which purpose is basically to explain to the population the negative effects of conflict, violence and the benefits of “living in peace and harmony”. They conceptualize peace education from the positivist position, pragmatic pedagogy, educational technology, resilience pedagogy, among others.

Educational researchers who are supporters of the second line (Freire, 2012, Jares, 2001, Pérez-Viramontes, 2018, Quiroga-Trigo, 2012, Savater, 1997, among others) operate from the categories of dialectical philosophy and neo-Marxism, the historical-cultural approach, the critical theory, the radical or critical pedagogy and theories of cultural reproduction, the resistance pedagogy, the pedagogy of the oppressed, the border pedagogy, the complex thinking and pedagogy in complexities, the intercultural pedagogy and cultural relativism. They seek for man to build his own systems of ideas, knowledge, theories, to be a subject from his real perspective, a concrete and contextualized ecosocial minimum (microsystem) related to the whole through intercultural communication and logical pluralism. They consider that the conflict is natural, it is not negative in itself and it has an enormous possibility for development; that violence is not an evil phenomenon but an element of the human condition that needs to be reasonably attenuated by the use of no less natural impulses of cooperation, harmony and peaceful order; that insubordination is a sign of vitality and intelligence, which should be channeled towards social creativity and not towards violence.

Keywords: *education for peace and peace education, Latin American pedagogical space, realist-pragmatic-positivist and idealist-critical approaches to peace education.*



ОСВІТА ЗАРАДИ МИРУ: ЛАТИНОАМЕРИКАНСЬКИЙ КОНТЕКСТ

АНОТАЦІЯ

У статті представлені результати науково-педагогічного дослідження, метою якого було виявити теоретико-методологічні засади, на яких ґрунтується освіта для миру в латиноамериканському дослідницькому просторі. Шляхом документально-бібліографічного дослідження і аналізу іспаномовних наукових джерел автори з'ясували, що у процесі розбудови освіти для миру науковці Латинської Америки спираються на такі підходи як реалістично-прагматичний та ідеалістично-критичний. Представники реалістично-прагматичного бачення освіти для миру (Вера-Посек, Карбело-Вакеро, Весіна-Хіменес, 2006; Ландазабаль-Куерво, Кардона, Руїс-Манцанарес, 2009; Кахігаль-Моліна, 2017; Кальдера-Монтес, Асевес, Рейносо-Гонсалес, 2016 та ін.) розглядають освіту з позицій педагогіки прагматизму, позитивізму, освітніх технологій та вважають, що культура миру усвідомлюється через активну участь у різноманітних освітніх й культурних заходах (спеціальних курсах, майстер-класах, форумах, тематичних конференціях, колоквиумах, семінарах, фестивалях, виставках, тижнях культури, бесідах тощо), мета яких полягає в тому, щоб пояснити учасникам негативні наслідки конфліктів, насильства та переваги «життя в мирі та злагоді».

Прихильники ідеалістично-критичного напрямку в освіті для миру (Фрейре, 2012, Харес, 2001, Перес-Вірамонтес, 2018, Кірога-Тріго, 2012, Саватер, 1997 та ін.) оперують категоріями діалектичної філософії та неомарксизму, спираються на історико-культурний підхід, критичну теорію, радикальну чи критичну педагогіку, теорії відтворення культури, педагогіку опору, педагогіку пригноблених, комплексне мислення, міжкультурну педагогіку і культурний релятивізм. Вони вважають важливим в освітньому процесі, щоб людина навчилася будувати власні системи ідей, знань, теорій, щоб була суб'єктом (а не об'єктом) освіти зі своєю реальною перспективою, конкретним й контекстуалізованим екосоціальним мінімумом (мікросистемою), пов'язаним із цілим через міжкультурну комунікацію та логічний плюралізм. У ідеалістично-критичній освіті для миру конфлікти вважаються природним явищем, яке саме по собі не є негативним, а навпаки дає людині великі можливості для розвитку. Щодо насильства, то воно є компонентом людської психіки, тож завданням освіти для миру є спрямовувати негативні імпульси на виконання позитивних дій за допомогою не менш природних навичок співпраці, гармонії та порядку. Що стосується непокірності деяких учнів, то вона є ознакою життєвої сили та інтелекту, тому її слід орієнтувати на соціальну творчість, а не на насильство.

Ключові слова: освіта для миру, латиноамериканський педагогічний простір, реалістично-прагматичний та ідеалістично-критичний підходи до освіти для миру, виховання через міжкультурну комунікацію та логічний плюралізм.

INTRODUCTION

Today, education for peace is not another option but a need that the school must assume, just as it has to be promoted from different contexts. This topic has been addressed since the works of Jan Amos Comenius and the New School. Also, in the late 20th century – second decade of the 21st century, this issue continues to arouse the interest of researchers at international and national levels and presents a significant theoretical development as well as practical action.



THE AIM OF THE STUDY

In this work, we set out to analyze through a documentary-bibliographic method (or sophisticated literature review), how education for peace in Latin American research space is currently conceptualized. It is important to note that the results of the documentary-bibliographic study (or sophisticated literature review) that are presented in this article, are part of a research project called “The construction of a culture for peace from education” registered under the key UAZ-2019-37944 at the Autonomous University of Zacatecas, Mexico.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH METHODS

The documentary-bibliographic method (or sophisticated literature review) is an obligatory part of any scientific research that is explained by the fact that the integrity of science consists in the point that it always starts not only from the knowledge of reality, but also from the existing scientific knowledge; it is the product of earlier scientific activity and the method of later scientific activity (Volkov, 1980).

This method allows elaborating new understandings and interpretations that theorists and researchers have built; it gives rise to a recreation of existing developments in an area, topic or problem of knowledge; favors the identification of trends and gaps in knowledge; encourages the approach of perspectives and lines of work in the field under study (Londoño-Palacio, Maldonado-Granados, Calderón-Villafañez, 2016, p. 27). According to Ladrón-de-Guevara, “[...] each investigation takes into account previously constructed knowledge. Therefore, each investigation is part of the already existing theoretical structure” (Ladrón-de-Guevara, 1978).

Moreover, in words of D. Boote and P. Beile in their article “Scholars Before Researchers: On the Centrality of the Dissertation Literature Review in Research Preparation” (2005), “[...] sophisticated literature review is the foundation and inspiration for substantial, useful research. The complex nature of education research demands such thorough, sophisticated reviews”.

Hence, it is pertinent to carry out the analysis of existing research, confront the results and opinions, classify the works by stages, approaches and theories used to deal with the same topic, generalize and extract the data that support the investigation. The limitations of this method are related to the time and space of the research and hence, a strict organization and work discipline of the research group. There were also some difficulties in acquiring the necessary bibliographic material.

The choice of bibliography for the analysis traced the following steps. In the first place, the heuristic phase: the greatest possible and pertinent information on the subject of education for peace in the Latin American region was collected. The search criteria were expressed in keywords, the proper combination of which allowed the identification of the sources. This information was recorded in files, which allowed to study and interpret the selected bibliography; select the fundamental points and systematize the information (classify the types of text, the authors, the frames of reference, the concepts, establish convergences and divergences).

The next phase was exploratory and consisted of analytical and comprehensive reading of the texts. The information was sought in high-impact journals such as *Espacio público*, *Cuadernos de pedagogía*, *Revista Historia de la Educación Latinoamericana*, *Revista de Paz y Conflictos*, *Thémata: Revista de filosofía*, *Universitas. Revista de Filosofía*, *Derecho y Política*, *Revista del Colegio de Estudios de Posgrado de la Ciudad de México*, *La Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, among others. In addition, we analyzed the books of prominent researchers such as P. Freire, F. Savater, Z. Bauman, S. Herrero-



Rico, A. Ocejó, V. Hernández, G. Pérez-Viramontes, E. Blanco-Bosco, G. Dietz, among others, and government documents, those of NGOs, educational materials and manuals, presentations at conferences and seminars. The third phase was descriptive, which presupposed extracting the units of analysis from the documentary material, the pertinent data, and submitting them to a review, review, and description process. Finally, the formulation or generation of basic ideas and indicators was carried out from the information found.

The original thesis or argument of this work is that the authors consider that in the educational field of Latin American two main positions about peace education exist: realist-pragmatic-positivist and idealist-critical.

The article is made up of the introduction, three sections (“Conceptualization of peace in contemporary studies”, “Education for peace in Latin America” and “Latin American researchers about the notion of peace education”), conclusions and the list of bibliography. The first section (or preparatory/foundation section) served to analyze different theoretical positions regarding the concept of “peace” and to understand the complexity of this phenomenon.

The second section explores the actions of the Latin American governments (and in more detail the Mexican government as an illustration of the efforts undertaken that concern the entire region) and the NGOs relating to the implementation of the peace culture in Latin America. The results obtained from this analysis allow to visualize important actions in favor of peace. However, these actions did not reduce the violence in the region, the high rates of insecurity, armed conflicts, homicides, etc. which prevail in these countries. Given such situation, Latin American researchers try to find alternatives to the “traditional” solutions to the problems of violence. Many of them conceptualize education for peace from the idealist-critical point of view. Therefore, in the 21st century Latin American scientific pedagogical space, two positions are maintained regarding education for peace: official (realist-pragmatic-positivist) and alternative (idealist-critical).

RESULTS

The revision of peace education literature allows us to maintain that the phenomenon of peace has been analyzed by thinkers since antiquity. Thus, Aristotle speaks about moderate peaceful and *jus ad bellum*; the Roman *pax* was around the stability of the Roman Empire and its maximum territorial expansion at the cost of other nations. Peace in Christianity supposed “the love to others”, austere life and delivered to others. In the 17th century, the Father of Pedagogy Comenius considered that peace can be achieved through the moral, political and Christian renewal of humanity, he called for a harmonious human with himself, with others and with the surrounding world. In the 18th century, the great French philosopher Rousseau acclaimed peaceful coexistence, respect of free citizens. In the same century, the eminent German philosopher Kant discerns peace as a legal prevention of violence and injustice. In the 19th century, Mexican President Benito Juárez proclaims that peace is respect for foreign law. In the 20th century, as of the First and Second World Wars, peace was considered as opposed to the conflict, the war. In the 1960s, Johan Galtung develops his theory about structural violence. In the 1990s, international organizations suggest that peace culture presupposes the compliance of human rights, democracy, disarmament, human development. In the 21st century, there persists the approach of the peace culture as opposed to the conflict, the war. At the same time it arises a new conceptualization of the culture for peace. This perspective is based on complex thought, intercultural communication and logical pluralism.



In contemporary studies on peace, the following versions of this phenomenon are visualized: direct peace, which is the non-violent resolution of conflicts; cultural peace, which refers to the existence of minimum values that are shared; the structural peace that is the one concerning the profile structure to achieve a minimum level of violence and the maximum social justice; and intercultural peace conceived from the complex thinking and the cultural relativism approach. Likewise, the concepts of positive peace, negative peace, imperfect peace and impossible peace are built.

The positive peace is the most genuine, since it is not only opposed to the absence of war or any kind of armed confrontation, but it contrasts segregation, violence or dictatorship that frees the development worthy of individuals. Ideally, it is established in all orders and existential realities. Negative peace, on the other hand, was coined in early 20th century and refers to non-aggression between states. The peace is substantially negative when determined as the absence of warlike conflict. Imperfect peace is one that brings together all the practices and places where problems are regularized peacefully (Salazar-Mastache, 2009).

Impossible peace was built by the most Latin American states with a desire to exclude the ethnic and cultural diversity of the country, and thus erect an analogous nation where multiplicity was only part of tradition. Therefore, impossible peace has been extremely segregational with indigenous people, because it has denied them their fundamental rights as: the right to territory, self-government, to possess legal and regulatory systems, to have their own education, language and culture, and above all, the right to be part of a pluricultural society (Salazar-Mastache, 2009).

In the late 20th century, the concept of interculturality and intercultural peace was created. This happened due to the problems of multiple global context, with Europe where multi-ethnic populations coexist because of migration and America where survive autochthonous, aloctonous (those who have come from another part) and mestizas groups. This concept arises to interlace bridges of mutual consensus with a pretension to generate respect, acceptance and empathy between different groups, which is of vital importance, since the acts of racism and xenophobia continue to be present in the populations.

The interculturality is defined as the interrelation and impartial interaction between numerous approaches and social, political, economic and cultural experiences. Interculturality involves a profound renewal of the dominant structure to build a truly equitable nation. Likewise, it seeks articulate ethnic, class, gender, regional option and sexual preference contrasts, among others, without a hegemonic center that is constituted as a point of universality. To prosper in the formation of an intercultural society it is inescapable to begin by recovering minimum values of coexistence such as respect, cordiality and tolerance. Similarly, the construction of interculturality involves enormous challenges, such as the improvement of a type of citizen that exceeds the conception of parity of the individuals before the law, because equality does not exist, since society is established on a basis of inequality (Quiroga-Trigo, 2012).

Another challenge is the recognition of the differences between human beings in its broadest sense, because it is not only about observing expressions of adjective nature. For this to be carried out, first the human will have to have a full encounter with the Other so that “[...] an experience of admiration or amazement that makes discovering the alterity of nature and the intersubjective presence of other human beings. This discovery of land belonging can be a symptom of fragility that is afraid” (Martínez-Guzmán, 2015).

The way to react to fear that causes that collision is through the acts of coercion, for example, the knowledge sealed by the white, Western, adult and masculine race



becomes the only valid. In this sense, that Other that is perceived as a stranger, a foreigner, thus, there emerges the differentiation and symbolic construction of the enemy. Therefore, fear of alterity causes violence. Another way to respond to fear is that people assume their humility, fragility and the relational and intersubjective nature of human relations, and promote policies based on that relational nature.

In early 21st century, investigations for peace resume the “interculturality” concept and make up intercultural peace, which is used to help understand multicultural and intercultural discourse. Interculturality represents an opportunity to respond to the challenge of establishing links between cultures with respect to them to coexist and enrich each other. Thus, “[...] peace and interculturality are related, complements and feedback at the same time, so we intend from different peace (negative, positive and neutral) lead the interculturality to school” (Jiménez-Baulista, 2016).

From this tenor, intercultural peace is conceptualized as an active involvement to reduce cultural and symbolic violence, based on a new redefinition of economic policy imposed by capitalism, of education, so that it contributes to the school that teaches individuals to think critically and particularly, constructing and reconstructing the way of thinking: their epistemological, axiological, ontological, anthropological and sociopolitical beliefs (Jiménez-Bautista, 2016).

Then intercultural peace constitutes, apparently, an effective project to abate the contexts of violence and generate a solidary citizenship, because it focuses on social reorganization that sponsors the disappearance of votes of power and articulates pluricultural and multiethnic societies so that they can coexist in peace. For the case of Latin America, it represents an opportunity to travel towards authentic coexistence and understanding not only between cultures and ethnic groups, but also between classes, races, collectives, etc.

In relation to the foregoing, it is worth mentioning that the challenge of the construction of intercultural peace in Latin America is quite complicated, since, according to the Canadian philosopher Will Kymlicka, currently in the region prevails multiculturalism (or multisociety relationships), which accepts diversity only to the extent that it does not affect the pre-eminence of particularism from the hegemonic sectors presented as universalism. It does not propose a transformation of the power relations and leaves the situation of poverty and exclusion of marginalized populations (indigenous, poor, women, etc.) (Tapia, 2002).

It is necessary to specify that multiculturalism, which is characterized by the existence of several groups with different cultural codes that do not necessarily interact with each other, or interact partially, not equitably, is one of the most elementary levels of modern social organization. It follows the second level, the pluriculturalism or recognition of the heterogeneous nature of society, in which different actors have different cultural codes; it is based on the principle of respecting differences, but criticizing the inequalities and violation of human rights. Likewise, the interculturality is at the summit of human relations.

In the words of the Bolivian sociologist María-Soledad Quiroga-Trigo (2012), interculturality is not a current reality, but a project to develop that implies a deep transformation of power, the domination system, and the formation of a genuinely equitable and fair society. It supposes development of a different type of citizenship: intercultural citizenship that should ensure that the individual is not subsumed in the collective and that the collective is not subordinated to the individual, but both are articulated and complemented. It also provides for the recovery of minimum values of coexistence, such as



tolerance, respect, trust between different groups and sectors of society and the acceptance of dissent (Quiroga-Trigo, 2012).

Therefore, in the analyzed literature, the conceptualization of peace (key concept) as something contrary to conflict and violence predominates. Nevertheless, several researchers consider conflict and violence as a natural human condition and call for “directing” this energy towards peace (not fighting it, not “preventing it”). It is where the open debates between the representatives of one and another position begins. So, different methodologies (realist-pragmatic-positivist and idealist-critical) led to different theses about the concept “peace” in the existing literature.

The idea of this section is to show the scope of the Latin American governments in the task of reducing violence and building a peace culture in the region based on the example of Mexico in order to support the thesis that all the efforts undertaken so far, have, unfortunately, not reduced the conflict.

The issue of education for peace in Latin American countries, is still in the process of growth. Only some joint efforts with organizations from other regions can be mentioned. Thus, in 2004, the *Eurosocial* movement invited 21 representatives of the Latin American education institutions to Malaga, Spain, for training them in peace formation. Following this action, the governments of some Latin American countries began to incorporate the elements of the peace culture into their educational programs. For example, the *Secretariat of Public Education* of Mexico, added the following aspects:

1) themes on human rights and non-violent resolution of problems, intended to develop schoolchildren’s skills and moral action capabilities through the reflection and critical analysis of their personalities and surroundings;

2) formation of capabilities that allow students to develop their personal potential, so that it is satisfactory and responsible;

3) fortifying a democratic political culture in childhood, with its active concentration on matters of social interest for the formation of equitable, intercultural and solidarity forms of life (Ábrego, 2010).

Also, in 2000, the program against violence called *Educate for peace for me, for you and all over the world*, was created. From 2000 to 2006, this project was promoted up by the *Secretariat of Public Education* of Mexico and the *United Nations Fund for Children* (UNICEF) to the schools of the marginalized zone of Mexico-city (Ábrego, 2010).

On the other hand, it is important to note that the institutionalization of peace education in Latin American countries has promoted the emergence of civil societies in support of peace. Thus, in Mexico as a response to the failure of local and federal authorities to restrain violence and organized crime, national marches emerged in 2008 and 2011, from which, with the support of various civil organizations, the *Peace with Justice and Dignity* movement was created. As a result, the participating organizations announced, in Ciudad-Juárez, Chihuahua, a *National Citizen Pact against Insecurity* and organized the *Dialogues for Peace* with the Federal Government. Likewise, in 2013 the *General Law on Victims* came into force and the *Executive Commission for Attention to Victims* began its operation, provided for in this Law (Red Nacional de Organizaciones Civiles de Derechos Humanos, 2017).

In 2013, a group of professionals interested in contributing to the construction of peace in Mexico, moved by the situation of violence in the country, created the *Center for Research and Social Action* (CIAS) “Jesuits for Peace”. Among its activities stands out the *Forum for analysis and reflection “Educational approaches, a social perspective”*, organized in



2018 in coordination with the *National Confederation of Private Schools* (CNEP), the *Mexico University Center* (CUM), the *Federation of Private Schools of the Federal District*, the *Latin American Institute of Educational Communication*, the *Mexican Institute of Christian Social Doctrine*, *La Salle University* and the *Ibero-American University*.

The theme of the Forum focused on the reflection of an education that is capable of integrating the individual and social dimensions in an articulated way, in order to become a training process that impacts the harmonious development of people and that permeates the construction of a more just, equitable, inclusive and co-responsible society with its community and the environment. The Forum participants stated that in the face of violence in Mexico, [...] the school has become an important space for the construction of peace, since it can summon a diversity of actors in order to create processes to strengthen coexistence, and begin to spread the skills of problems' resolution for the family, neighbors, work agencies, the government and also the churches, thus creating circuits of inclusive relationships that allow good coexistence (Centro virtual de la pedagogía ignaciana, 2019). Similarly, the speakers expressed the need to create innovative pedagogical strategies to strengthen the construction and exercise of citizenship from the perspective of sensitive education or education through art, in order to promote culture and the collective construction of coexistence agreements.

In 2014, as a result of the disappearance of 43 students from the *Rural Normal School* of Ayotzinapa, Guerrero, again thousands of people in Mexico mobilized to demand the resolution of the case. This event prompted the publication in 2017 of the *General Law on Forced Disappearance of Persons, Disappearance by Individuals* and the *National System for the Persons' Search*.

Currently, the *Federal Register of Civil Organizations* (CSOs) of Mexico includes 2,500 active civil organizations that carry out actions promoting the strengthening of the social and citizen security; about 5,500 CSOs refer to the culture of peace or the issue of violence as part of their corporate purpose, and 160 CSOs carry these concepts (peace against violence) in their names (Red Nacional de Organizaciones Civiles de Derechos Humanos, 2017).

Thus, the activity of the aforementioned civil organizations was one of the triggers that outlined the new national policy. Therefore, the *National Development Plan 2019-2024* of the new Mexican Government (2018–2024), defines great objectives and goals related to the coverage and quality of Mexican education: "Review the plans and programs in all types and levels of the national education system, promoting sustainable, artistic, scientific, technological, financial, environmental, sexual, indigenous, intercultural and community education, which guarantee the right to equality gender, non-discrimination and elimination of violence" (Poder Ejecutivo Federal, 2019).

Likewise, derived from the *National Development Plan 2019–2024*, the *Sectorial Education Program 2020–2024*, education for peace is mentioned among priorities of Mexican educational system, as well as six specific objectives that will guide the Government's efforts in order to achieve an equitable, inclusive, intercultural and comprehensive education are revealed: education must be excellent, pertinent and relevant, focused on learning, with teaching-learning process of different types, with social inclusion and the promotion of healthy lifestyles. It is intended at "[...] promoting different support programs to promote access and the permanence of students from low-income families, for example, with basic, superior and upper medium scholarships, such as a strategy to not leave anyone behind, not leave nobody outside [...] guaranteeing a compulsory education of



quality with relevance, universally, inclusive, public, free and secular as a fundamental human right” (SEP, 2020). It is also noted that education must respond to the needs of the new national and global context, especially at the level of human development.

It is worth mentioning that the document is based on human rights (in particular, quality education) embodied in different international instruments: *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948), *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* (1966), *Convention on the Child’s Rights* (1989), *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women* (1979), *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* (2006), *Agenda 2030 for the Sustainable Development of the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization* (2015). It is also grounded on the rights that recognizes the *Political Constitution of the United Mexican States*: the right to non-discrimination (Article 1); the right to education and the right to enjoy the benefits of the development of science and technological innovation (Article 3); the right to access culture and the right to physical culture and the practice of sport (Article 4); the right to access information and communication technologies (Article 6); the right to freedom of ethical convictions, of conscience and religion (Article 24) (SEP, 2020).

Therefore, according to the example of Mexico, peace education is disseminated by the Government. Likewise, it is necessary to recognize that academic activities related to this objective organized by the Mexican Government are offered free of charge. However, the multiple national and international NGOs that operate in Mexico and Latin America promoting the culture of peace, organize their academic events (courses, seminars, certifications, etc.) to “train peace educators”, charging excessive sums. Among these, the following NGOs can be enlisted: *Pax Humana & EPP Ibero-America*, *COMNAPAZ Mexico*, *Foundation La Paz begins with children AC*, *Education for Peace*, *International Institute Education for Peace*, *Carlos Slim Foundation* among others. The question arises: to learn to live in peace and treat conflicts in a non-violent way, do we have to reimburse the significant amounts of our income? Apart from that, will not this organization be manipulating us at their convenience? Will there be another way of instructing us so that we stop being violent?

In addition, in these academic events, the construction of a “common good” is addressed. For whom will this “common good” be constructed? Is it possible to speak of a “common good”, truth or justice in a world without justice for most and with the only truth of a few (those who are in power), in a world where corruption, inequality, xenophobia prevail?

It is important to note that in spite of all these steps that Latin American governments as well as NGOs undertake, no positive changes are visualized in educational practice, nothing seriously has been specified regarding education for peace: projects and programs simply continue in the inkwell. To contribute to the construction of a pacific future, the Latin American educational researchers handle different proposals. Let’s discuss some of these.

What concerns peace education, *Associated Schools Project* of the United Nations and UNESCO as its modern antecedent, which incorporated education for human rights and disarmament in the 40s of the 20th century (after the World War II), should be mentioned. Later, in the 60s of the 20th century, peace education is enriched with the contributions of Paulo Freire who links education with the nations’ development and overcoming social inequalities, as well as with proposals and social-pedagogical practices of Mahatma Gandhi based on teachings of truth and non-violent action and the development of personal autonomy and disobedience to unfair structures (Zhizhko, 2019).



In the 80s of the 20th century, the peace education turns to practical approaches and emphasizes coexistence within the nearby community (the classroom, school, neighborhood, etc.). Thus, it's perceived as an alternative to violent, excluding and intolerant human behaviors in peaceful relations (Grasa, 2000). In the 90s of the 20th century, the peace education is related to intercultural education. Thanks to new information and communication technologies, contacts are made between different nations and people with diverse experience and access to materials, centers and people working in peace education in very different contexts and situations of conflict and violence. In 1995, the UNESCO General Conference proclaimed the *Declaration and the Integrated Action Plan on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy*, which in its Article 8 states: "education must develop the ability to recognize and accept the values that exist in the diversity of individuals, genders, nations and cultures, and develop the ability to communicate, share and cooperate with others. The citizens of a pluralistic society and a multicultural world must be able to admit that their interpretation of situations and problems follows from their own lives, from the history of their society and from their cultural traditions and that, consequently, there isn't a single individual or group that has the only answer to the problems, and there may be more than one solution for each problem. Therefore, people should understand and respect each other and negotiate on an equal footing with a view to finding common ground. Thus, education should strengthen personal identity and favor the convergence of ideas and solutions that reinforce peace, friendship and fraternity between individuals and nations" (UNESCO, 1995).

Therefore, the conceptualization of peace education has gone from the vision of an instruction in human rights, disarmament, and global responsibility. It involves the understanding of the need for teaching dialogue and attention to the student's integral development; contemplates the improvement of positive, analytical, transformative, conciliatory, tolerant attitudes; the ability to forgive and reconcile, respect the Other, handle aggression, anger, hate. It provides for the acquisition of knowledge for the critical analysis of reality, creativity in the search for solutions, the development of skills to think critically (to know how to process existing information, understand the conflict and prevent it, deal with it, resolve it, know how to mediate, reconcile and generate peaceful solutions to conflicts, know how to empathize with the different divided parts and build peaceful coexistence environments). It calls to form values (freedom, equity, justice, solidarity, cooperation, autonomy, critical reflection, creativity, decision making). It aims to transform society, motivate and create new conceptions of the world.

In the late 20th century – second decade of the 21st century, the Latin American researchers, who study the problems of peace education, traced its main features:

- based on a human rights issue (Nastae, 1986; Tuvilla, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2004; Alba, 1998; Jares, 2002; Blanco, *et al.*, 2007; among others);
- implies educating for global responsibility (Reardon, 1988, 1999; among others);
- achieved by teaching dialogue according to Montessori method (Duckworth, 2006; among others);
- achieved by means of complying with the pedagogical framework of Vigotsky's sociocognitivist model (Vidanes-Diez, 2007; among others)'
- based on philosophy of making peace (Herrero-Rico, 2012; among others);
- presupposes an ethical-political proposal of democratic emancipation carried out on the basis of Freire's popular pedagogy (non-violent popular resistance) (Ospina, 2010, 2015; Ribotta, 2011; Walsh, 2015; among others);



–attained through conflict controlling teachings (Cascón, 2004; Smith, 2011; Hernández-Arteaga, Luna-Hernández and Cadena-Chala, 2017; among others);

–is a way of teaching values (Hernández-Arteaga, Luna-Hernández and Cadena-Chala, 2017; among others).

Since the early 21st century, in Latin American educational thinking, basically two large trends regarding the perception of education for peace are observed. One of them can be called “officialist”. It is the approach in which the key components of an effective peace education are the following: it considers peace as opposed to conflict, violence; it aims to “[...] change violent, exclusive and intolerant human behaviors in peaceful relationships, participate actively and responsibly in the construction of a peace culture acting from one’s own community with non-violent conflict treatment programs” (Grasa, 2000).

This “officialist” tendency about peace education arose in early 20th century, in the context of the World War I, when the need to work for an international understanding that would allow tensions and hostilities between states to be overcome was underlined. At the end of the conflict, an educational movement was produced characterized by the idea of avoiding war, as well as by its strong internationalist component. Likewise, it initiates the mission of “instructing the masses in peace” (or so-called peace education).

Its primordial part is developing of resilience capacity. It is important to note that resilience, the key category of this instructive paradigm, is the capacity of a system, a community or a society exposed to a threat, to resist, absorb, adapt, transform and recover from its effects in a timely and efficient manner, in particular, by preserving and restoring their basic structures and functions through risk management (Vera-Poseck, Carbelo-Baquero, Vecina-Jiménez, 2006; UNISDR, 2017).

The resilience pedagogy epistemologically ascends to system theory, pragmatic pedagogy, active pedagogies, and educational technology and foresees planned and organized teaching in the form of an algorithm and the active use of technological resources (Cajigal-Molina, 2017; Caldera-Montes, Aceves, Reynoso-González, 2016). It is the ideal approach to serve the vigilante capitalism of the early 21st century, since it “cultivates” the “ideal man” according to their needs: a “good citizen”, an “honest and virtuous father of a family” and a follower of the consumerism culture (who does not usually question the actions of governments or people in power).

Thus, the “officialist” tendency about peace education appeared in early 20th century, with international policies on the culture of peace and institutional studies on peace taking their rise in the 1940s. Consequently, we are talking about more than a hundred years of intensive real work and joint efforts (both intellectual and financial investment) of various countries for the sake of building a peace culture in the world, preventing wars and violence. However, the wars continue, the suppressions are more cruel and massive, the weapons are increasingly sophisticated and destructive, the family disintegrates, it is even at risk of disappearing as a social institute, bullying in schools is already common, suicides of young people and adolescents increase, the world, in general, becomes more cruel and ruthless.

In short, the current context is far from being defined as an environment of peace. We must recognize that we continue to live in a world permeated by violence, cruelty, crime, fanaticism, terror, intimidation. Henceforth, in late 20th century – early 21st century, debates arise among scholars who address the issue of the peace education, and the new “alternative” tendency in the conceptualization of peace education appears. It is based on the idealist-critical philosophical vision.

So, understanding the dynamic, non-linear, multidisciplinary, heterogeneous, multiform and transversal nature of the task of peace culture building from the educational



field (that definitely implies a diversity of challenges), many Latin American educational researchers acquire a different position regarding this phenomenon. This position can be called “alternative”.

The key components of an effective peace education according to this “alternative” position are the following: scholars believe that in order to educate young generations to live in peace, it will be necessary to reconstruct the conceptions of the State and the nation that the Western tradition has erected, as well as review the relations between the State and contemporary societies, analyze the intercultural processes of integration and differentiation that occur in them. Education will only have significance, impact and value when it is critically assumed as a pedagogical-political-social-epistemic-ethical act and as a decolonial pedagogy that seeks to intervene in the “re-founding of society”, as Paulo Freire said (2004). It is about “rethinking its structures that racialize, inferiorize and dehumanize and trace out paths for a different praxis” (Walsh, 2015).

In the opinion of Pérez-Viramontes (2018), to build an authentic and effective education for peace, a cultural disarmament is necessary, which will be done through a global criticism that makes it possible to renounce the embankments in which modern Western culture has entrenched itself, which principles are based on acquired and unalterable values such as freedom, progress, technology, science, the world economic market, etc. Therefore, transcending evolutionary thinking that conceives the evolution of history as a linear process requires deep analysis to deconstruct the myth of the totality of scientific knowledge and thus introduce new levels of values in which the other is recognized with all its cultural, philosophical and experiential universe (Pérez-Viramontes, 2018).

Hence, the mission of education for peace is to originate a true anti-belligerent school idiosyncrasy to form leading, reflective and critically committed citizens in the reconstruction of a world civilization. It is a social practice that arouses values, that tries to raise positive emotions such as empathy, affection, care and respect and encourages the deconstruction of words and concepts related to the subjects (Pérez-Viramontes, 2018).

Likewise, in the proposal by Hernández-Arteaga, Luna-Hernández, Cadena-Chala (2017), education for peace is built on the basis of the possibility of exploring the conflict by channeling it to meet educational objectives, since, following Savater (1997), violence is not an evil phenomenon but an element of the human condition that needs to be reasonably attenuated by the use of no less natural impulses of cooperation, harmony and peaceful ordering (Savater, 1997).

Undoubtedly, a culture without violence will be condemned to suffer from apathy, since every act of change will be promoted through violent mobilization. However, to what level is it adequate if the scenario in Latin American countries is drawn as the epicenter of street and domestic brutality? They are considered as countries where bullying inside schools has escalated to shootings by minors. In this framework, it is essential to educate or re-educate for peace and to learn acts of harmony, empathy, compassion, love and dialogue.

In the opinion of Hernández-Arteaga, Luna-Hernández, Cadena-Chala (2017), it is necessary to use mediation and diplomacy in the face of a conflict, since traditionally in the educational context the conflict has been stigmatized and denied. This is because it is seen as synonymous with mismanagement and the student or teacher is perceived as a troublesome person. In this way, the conflict is presented as an inconvenience that must be prevented. In this situation, it is believed that healthy coexistence is the one that is free of conflicts. However, according to Jares (2001), the conflict is natural, it is not negative in itself, and it has enormous educational potential (Jares, 2001).



Consequently, we must break with archaic ideologies in which the school system is held responsible for the deterioration of social coexistence, since the school is not guilty of evils nor should it be seen as a panacea. Its real challenge is the configuration of spaces for coexistence, which requires a global approach in which different elements of the curriculum are affected. From these assumptions, the following challenges must be addressed to build convivial educational centers: cultivation of intercultural relationships, democratic discipline and democratic school management, introduction of affective education and education for human rights, learning of resolution strategies and skills (Hernández-Arteaga, Luna-Hernández, Cadena-Chala, 2017).

For this educational model to be possible in the Latin American countries, it is important to initiate a deep metamorphosis of what is taught in school, that is, we must rethink the values of the masculine over the feminine and of the victors over the defeated, demystify the history of bronze and the history of the victors. For the first, the Manichean vision of national heroes and villains will have to be demolished. For the second purpose, it is necessary to stop telling the story through “winners and losers” orientations.

In this new model, in the groups of students, teachers and administrators, peaceful relations, mutual understanding and the collective interest over their own must prevail; affective education must occupy a preponderant place, since it is an object with educational value as a development to achieve a respectful and peaceful coexistence. What concerns discipline, it also constitutes an essential part in any educational process, however, it is not a traditional discipline, but one based on self-discipline and mutual respect. Likewise, non-violent conflict resolution is internalized by learning negotiation strategies.

On the other hand, for Blanco (2007) and Herrero-Rico (2012), education for peace must ensure the full exercise of democratic rights and social affinity through participation; the basic competencies for an educated and responsible citizenry; the construction of a scientific culture for all and the cultivation of affective values and attitudes. Equally, it is a process based on a holistic vision of the human being and the world, on equality and non-discrimination, the purpose of which is not the transfer of knowledge, but the collective foundation of the same, from the affirmation and respect for diversity guided by the search for real and potential solutions to the problems that societies must respond to (Herrero-Rico, 2012).

In the same way, Arboleda, Herrera and Prada (2017) define education for peace as a compendium of attitudes, traditions, values and behaviors based on respect for life and the practice of non-violence through education, dialogue and collaboration. For this reason, education for peace is conceived not only as the absence of war or conflict, but as an authentic, dynamic and participatory process in which dialogue and the resolution of controversies originate, in a spirit of understanding and mutual participation (Arboleda, Herrera, Prada, 2017).

Thus, the pedagogy that is based on the construction of a culture of peace encourages changes in the way people and societies relate to each other through social justice practices that circumscribe harmonious relationships of inclusion, tolerance, and respect for the human rights, conciliation, interpersonal and intercultural encounters, among others. Also, it integrates one's own experience with reality, inspires the evolution and overcoming of generational violence and fosters peaceful and creative routes to transform conflicts, examine them, dialogue, debate, help, mediate, recognize individual and collective interests and needs.

Educating for peace represents providing individuals and social groups with sufficient autonomy to be able to discern and reason about reality and freely decide to



defend their own rights and those of others; the approval of discrepancies and divergences in a non-violent way, where the diversity and particularities of different groups that make up the nations are also recognized and valued (Arboleda, Herrera, Prada, 2017).

Likewise, following Ospina (2010), education for peace must be an ethical-political proposal of democratic emancipation carried out from the popular pedagogy. It must be the result of a progressive reform movement determined by the pluralism of institutions and pedagogical projects. Equally, in the words of Freire (2007), their duty is to develop in society the ability to govern and propose a true alternative to capitalism and despotic socialism. In this space, the teacher must assimilate that the insubordination of the student is a sign of vitality and intelligence, which must be channeled to direct it towards social creativity and not towards violence (Freire, 2007).

Following Freire (2012), the ultimate goal of education will be to free oneself from oppressive reality and injustice, its objective will be the radical metamorphosis of reality to modernize it, to make it more human. Education must allow a critical look at the world, the unfinished world. To transform hostile situations of oppression, education must take root in the popular culture. But it is not about encouraging the population to rebel, it is about challenging popular groups so that while working specifically on each one they discover, in critical terms, the violence and deep iniquity that characterizes their specific environment (Freire, 2012).

For his part, Dietz (2012) points out that education for intercultural peace through complex learning aims to educate society as a whole and not only minorities. Similarly, the author makes a rescue of the notion of empowerment. At the same time, he recovers the school space as a focus of action. Regarding the specifically pedagogical task, he points out that this “[...] will consist not only in thematization of the existing heterogeneity in the classroom, but even in taking advantage of it to generate intragroup mechanisms of formulation, negotiation and conflict resolution among the students” (Dietz, 2012).

Concerning intercultural competences, these are mutually acquired through group interaction and will be used to develop cooperative learning. However, this model, focused on generating experiences of interculturality lived jointly by schoolchildren, calls for profound reforms, because “preparing for an intercultural society also requires carrying out profound transformations in the process of construction of knowledge and the norms that define school culture: giving the student a more active role in this construction, teaching to recognize the positive nature of the doubts and conflicts as engines of growth, helping to face high levels of uncertainty and providing experiences that allow living heterogeneity as a source of development and progress. And for education to achieve these reasons, it is necessary to change the traditional method, excessively focused on the activity of the teacher, and give students more power and more responsibility in their own learning” (Dietz, 2012).

CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS OF FURTHER RESEARCH

Thus, the study carried out allows us to maintain that in the Latin American pedagogical space, the peace education phenomenon is analyzed from different epistemological and theoretical positions: rationalism, empiricism, positivism and neopositivism, pragmatism, idealism, and radicalism. However, the specific contribution of this article is that basing on this research we can distinguish two main trends in the approach to peace education: realist-pragmatic-positivist (or “officialist”) and idealist-critical (or “alternative”, “progressive”). The representatives of the first trend visualize peace education from the rational-practical point of view, implementing pragmatic



solutions (sometimes superficial) in conditions of the given current socioeconomic situation. They choose to promote the peace culture through different academic and cultural events (courses, workshops, forums, conferences, colloquia, seminars, festivals, exhibitions, cultural weeks, talks, etc.), the purpose of which is basically to explain to the population the negative effects of conflict, violence and the benefits of “living in peace and harmony”. They conceptualize peace education from the positivist position, pragmatic pedagogy, educational technology, resilience pedagogy, mindfulness pedagogy, among others.

Educational researchers, who are supporters of the second trend, operate the categories of dialectical philosophy and neo-Marxism, the historical-cultural approach, the critical theory, the institutional analysis, the critical curricular approach, the radical or critical pedagogy and theories of cultural reproduction, the resistance pedagogy, the pedagogy of the oppressed, the border pedagogy, the complex thinking and pedagogy in complexities, the intercultural pedagogy and cultural relativism.

The representatives of the idealist-critical position intended to build the new educational ideal: a free, innovative, reflective and self-reflective human being (the one that understands the Other through self-understanding), critical, plural, capable of self-training, self-organization, living in a multicultural environment, knowing how to listen, understand, be sensitive to the experience and condition of the Other, be perceptive with the environment. They seek to build education based on complex thinking that tries to understand the world and form the ability to establish different dimensions with reality; grounded on the ideas of interculturality, which are embodied in a non-discriminatory integrative system; supported by cultural relativism that admits as valid any practice for the sole fact of being the production of a social group; the one that considers the conflict as an indispensable part of the human being and knows how to channel it to create good, initiate dialogue and negotiation; the one that involves the family and society in the educational process.

It is about the new school model where peaceful subjects will be educated, away from the homogeneous idea of culture and ideological hegemony; where humans aware that thought is complex, non-linear, horizontal, will be trained; with individuals who value the dialectical units of the simple and the complex, chance, uncertainty, chaos, disorder, indeterminacy and emergence, who build their own systems of ideas, knowledge, theories, who are subjects from their real perspective, concrete and contextualized related to the totality through intercultural communication and logical pluralism acting when necessary in a non-traditional way and finding alternative steps to fulfill daily or professional tasks, who are citizens capable of critically exercising their citizenship and building a life project.

This new education aims to lead human to “overcome the limits”, transgress the borders to know the Other in their own sense, create “an area on the fringes of the border”, generate the intercultural mechanisms for the formation of their socio-cultural experience; it leads them to the equitable articulation of a different without a hegemonic center.

Our future research should focus on finding out the specific features of education for peace, in particular, through a detailed comparative analysis of the characteristics of the peace education and education for peace in the Latin American educational space.

REFERENCES

1. Ábrego, F. M. (2010). La situación de la educación para la paz en México en la actualidad [The situation of education for peace in Mexico today]. *Espacio público*, Vol, 13, No. 27, México, UAEM. (in Spanish)



2. Arboleda, Z., Herrera, M., Prada, M. (2017). Qué es educar y formar para la paz y cómo hacerlo? [What is educating and training for peace and how to do it?]. *Educación y Pedagogía para la Paz. Material para la práctica*, Bogotá (Colombia), PNUD, OIM. (in Spanish)
3. Bauman, Z. (2013). *Sobre la educación en un mundo líquido [On education in a liquid world]*. Barcelona, Paidós. (in Spanish)
4. Blanco Bosco, E. (2011). *Los límites de la escuela. Educación, desigualdad y aprendizaje en México [School boundaries. Education, inequality and learning in Mexico]*. México, COLMEX. (in Spanish)
5. Blanco, R. (2007). *Educación de calidad para todos. Un asunto de derechos humanos [Quality education for all. A matter of human rights]*. Documento de discusión para políticas educativas en el marco de la II Reunión Intergubernamental del Proyecto Regional de Educación para América Latina y el Caribe [Discussion document for educational policies in the framework of the II Intergovernmental Meeting of the Regional Education Project for Latin America and the Caribbean]. Buenos Aires, Argentina, 29 y 30 de marzo de 2007, Buenos Aires, EPT/PRELAC. (in Spanish)
6. Boote, D., Beile, P. (2005). Scholars Before Researchers: On the Centrality of the Dissertation Literature Review in Research Preparation. *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 34, No. 6, 3-15. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X034006003>.
7. Cajigal Molina, Erick, Maldonado González, Ana Lucía, González Gaudiano, Edgar (2017). Resiliencia en docentes: una vía para mejorar capacidades de las poblaciones ante inundaciones agravadas por el cambio climático [Resilience in teachers: a way to improve the capacities of populations in the face of floods aggravated by climate change]. *Revista Diálogo Educativo*, Vol.17 (55), 1445–1464. Retrieved from <https://periodicos.pucpr.br/index.php/dialogoeducacional/article/view/22305/22536> (in Spanish)
8. Caldera, J., Aceves, B., Reynoso, O. (2016). Resiliencia en estudiantes universitarios. Un estudio comparado entre carreras [Resilience in university students. A comparative study between races]. *Psicogente*, Vol. 19(36), 227–239. Retrieved from <http://doi.org/10.17081/psico.19.36.1294> (in Spanish)
9. Centro virtual de la pedagogía ignaciana, Selecciones de Diciembre 2018-Enero 2019 [Virtual Center for Ignatian Pedagogy, December 2018-January 2019 Selections] (2019). *Pedro Arrupe y su apuesta por la educación [Pedro Arrupe and his bet on education]*. Conferencia de Provinciales en América Latina – CPAL. Retrieved from www.pedagogiaignaciana.com. (in Spanish)
10. Dietz, G. (2012). *Multiculturalismo, interculturalidad y diversidad en educación: una aproximación antropológica [Multiculturalism, interculturalism and diversity in education: an anthropological approach]*. México, FCE. (in Spanish)
11. Freire, P. (2007). *La educación como práctica de la libertad [Education as a practice of freedom]*. Santiago de Chile, Siglo XXI. (in Spanish)
12. Freire, P. (2012). *Pedagogía de la indignación. Cartas pedagógicas en un mundo revuelto [Pedagogy of outrage. Pedagogical letters in a troubled world]*. Buenos Aires, Siglo XXI. (in Spanish)
13. Garnica J. (2015). *La educación para la paz en situaciones de conflicto armado. Construyendo un nuevo enfoque desde el caso de los Territorios Palestinos Ocupados [Education for peace in situations of armed conflict. Building a new approach from the case of the Occupied Palestinian Territories]*. Tesis doctoral, Instituto de derechos humanos “Bartolomé de las Casas”, Getafe. (in Spanish)



14. Grasa, R. (2000). Evolución de la Educación para la Paz. La centralidad del conflicto para la agenda del siglo XXI [Evolution of Education for Peace. The centrality of conflict for the 21st century agenda]. *Cuadernos de pedagogía*, No. 287, 52–56. (in Spanish)

15. Hernández Arteaga, I., Luna Hernández, J., Cadena Chala, M. (2017). Cultura de Paz: Una Construcción educativa. Aporte teórico [Culture of Peace: An Educational Construction. Theoretical contribution]. *Revista Historia de la Educación Latinoamericana*, Vol. 19, No. 28, enero-junio, 149–172. (in Spanish)

16. Herrero Rico, S. (2012). *La educación para la paz desde la filosofía para hacer las paces: el enfoque REM (reconstructivo-empoderador) [Education for peace from the philosophy of making peace: the REM (reconstructive-empowering) approach]*. Tesis Doctoral, Instituto Interuniversitario de Desarrollo Social y Paz, Doctorado Internacional de Estudios de Paz, Conflicto y Desarrollo, Universitat Jaume-I, Castellón. (in Spanish)

17. Jares, X. (2001). *Educación y conflicto como retos en la educación infantil, en Congreso europeo: Aprende a ser, aprende a vivir juntos [Education and conflict as challenges in early childhood education, in European Congress: Learn to be, learn to live together]*. Santiago de Compostela, World Association of Early Childhood Educators. Retrieved from <http://www.waece.com>. (in Spanish)

18. Jiménez Bautista, F. (2016). Paz intercultural. Europa, buscando su identidad Intercultural [Intercultural peace. Europe, looking for its Intercultural identity]. *Revista de Paz y Conflictos*, Vol. 9, N°1. (in Spanish)

19. Ladron de Guevara, L. (1978). *Metodología de investigación científica [Scientific research methodology]*. Bogotá, Universidad de Santo Tomás. (in Spanish)

20. Londoño Palacio, Olga Lucía, Maldonado Granados, Luis Facundo, Calderón Villafañez, Licy Catalina (2016). *Guía para construir el estado del arte [Guide to building the state of the art]*. Bogotá, ICONK (in Spanish)

21. Martínez Guzmán, V. (2015). Intersubjetividad, interculturalidad y política desde la filosofía para la paz [Intersubjectivity, interculturality and politics from the philosophy for peace]. *Thémata: Revista de filosofía*, No. 52, 147–158. Retrieved from <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=5318919> (20.01.2019). (in Spanish)

22. Ocejo, A., Hernández V. (2016). *Derechos humanos y educación para la paz [Human rights and education for peace]*. México, Universidad Iberoamericana. (in Spanish)

23. Ospina, J. (2010). La educación para la paz como propuesta ético-política de emancipación democrática. Origen, fundamentos y contenidos [Education for peace as an ethical-political proposal for democratic emancipation. Origin, foundations and contents]. *Universitas. Revista de Filosofía, Derecho y Política*, No. 11(1), 93–125. (in Spanish)

24. Pérez-Viramontes, G. (2018). *Construir paz y transformar conflictos. Algunas claves desde la educación, la investigación y la cultura de paz [Build peace and transform conflicts. Some keys from education, research and the culture of peace]*. Tlaquepaque, Jalisco (México), ITESO. Retrieved from <https://rei.iteso.mx/handle/11117/5417> (date of access: 03.03.20). (in Spanish)

25. Poder Ejecutivo Federal (2019). *Plan de Desarrollo Nacional 2019-2024 [National Development Plan 2019-2024]*. Retrieved from <http://www.dof.gob.mx/notadetalles.php> (date of access: 10.11.2020). (in Spanish)

26. Quiroga Trigo, M. (2012). Conceptos sobre comunicación intercultural. Comunicación y ciudadanía intercultural, en Antonio Aramayo Tejada (coord.) [Concepts on intercultural communication. Communication and intercultural citizenship, in Antonio Aramayo Tejada (coord.)] *Memorias de los Seminarios Comunicación para una ciudadanía*



integral e intercultural [Proceedings of the Seminars Communication for an integral and intercultural citizenship]. La Fundación UNIR Bolivia. (in Spanish)

27. Red Nacional de Organizaciones Civiles de Derechos Humanos (2017). *Todos los derechos para todas y todos. La esperanza no se agota: Situación de las personas defensoras de los Derechos Humanos durante la presidencia de Enrique Peña Nieto [All rights for all. Hope is not exhausted: Situation of human rights defenders during the presidency of Enrique Peña Nieto]*. Primera Edición, México. Retrieved from <https://www.comecso.com/publicaciones/la-esperanza-no-se-agota-informe-tdt> (date of access: 06.04.2020). (in Spanish)

28. Salazar Mastache, I. (2009). Paz y ciudadanía en el proceso de formación básica de los jóvenes de secundaria [Peace and citizenship in the basic training process of high school youth]. *Revista del Colegio de Estudios de Posgrado de la Ciudad de México [Journal of the College of Postgraduate Studies of Mexico City]*. México, EUMED. (in Spanish)

29. Savater, F. (1997). *El valor de educar [The value of educating]*. Barcelona, Ariel. (in Spanish)

30. SEP (2020). *Programa Sectorial de Educación 2020-2024 [Education Sector Program 2020-2024]*. México, SEP. Retrieved from https://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5596202&fecha=06/07/2020 (date of access: 16.05.2020) (in Spanish)

31. Tapia, L. (2002). *La condición multisocietal. Multiculturalidad, pluralismo, modernidad [The multisocietal condition. Multiculturalism, pluralism, modernity]*. La Paz, Bolivia, CIDES-UMSA/Muela del Diablo. Retrieved from <https://es.scribd.com/doc/124379442/La-Condicion-multisocietal-multiculturalidad-pluralismo-modernidad-Luis-Tapia-pdf> (date of access: 07.05.2020). (in Spanish)

32. Tuvilla Rayo, J. (2004). *Cultura de paz y educación. Manual de Paz y Conflictos [Culture of peace and education. Peace and Conflict Manual]*. Granada, Universidad de Granada. (in Spanish)

33. UNESCO (1995). *Declaración y el Plan de Acción Integrado sobre la Educación para la Paz, los Derechos Humanos y la Democracia [Declaration and Integrated Action Plan on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy]*. Conferencia General de la UNESCO, París, UNESCO (in Spanish)

34. Vera Poseck, Beatriz, Carbelo Baquero, Begoña, Vecina Jiménez, María Luisa (2006). The traumatic experience from positive psychology: resiliency and post-traumatic growth, *Papeles del Psicólogo*, Vol. 27(1), 40–49. Retrieved from <http://www.cop.es/papeles>.

35. Vidanes Díez, J. (2007). La educación para la paz y la no violencia [Education for peace and non-violence]. *La Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, No. 42/2, 10–30. Retrieved from <https://rieoei.org/historico/deloslectores/experiencias146.htm> (date of access: 21.01.2020). (in Spanish)

36. Volkov, G. (1980). Los métodos cualitativos y cuantitativos en el estudio de la ciencia. El futuro de la ciencia: Perspectivas. Hipótesis. Problemas no solucionados [Qualitative and quantitative methods in the study of science. The future of science: Perspectives. Hypothesis. Unresolved issues]. *Anuario internacional*, Ed. 3, Moscú, pp. 53–60. (in Spanish)

37. Walsh, C. (2015). Interculturalidad? Fantasmas, fantasías y funcionalismos [Interculturality? Ghosts, fantasies and functionalisms] in C. Montúfar, F. Balseca, *Ecuador: desafíos para el presente y el futuro [Ecuador: challenges for the present and the future]*. Quito, Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar/Ediciones La Tierra, pp. 269–288. (in Spanish)

38. Zhizhko, E. (2019). *Aproximaciones a la educación para la paz: dimensiones temporal y teórica [Approaches to education for peace: temporal and theoretical dimensions]*. Kyiv, Publisher LAT&K. (in Spanish)