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Within the field of peace education and related areas, there is a general consensus about the nature of peace and although there are numerous references and mentions of justice, there are no clear descriptions or systematic study of what justice is, in relation to peace. Among peace educators, Betty Reardon's numerous writings articulate, implicitly, a coherent theory of justice. Reardon's approach to peace education inquires into the nature of peace. Reardon asks what peace is, and the question that follows is, “What comprises peace?” From Reardon's perspective, justice is required for peace. As found in the literature, Reardon's peace education writing illustrates consistency and similarity with capabilities. Reardon's perspective of justice, I would assert, is a capabilities approach. Capabilities are a species of human rights that represent substantive opportunities and freedoms that allows individuals to do and be as they choose (and required by human dignity). Reardon’s conception of justice is similar to the prominent capabilities perspectives of Nobel laureate Amartya Sen and University of Chicago philosopher Martha Nussbaum. A clear understanding of what justice is, in relation to peace and peace education, is a useful tool for learning, scholarship and practice. Knowing what justice is informs peace.
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Chapter One

Introduction and Overview

Introduction

This dissertation argues that Betty Reardon’s perspective of peace education expresses a conception of justice that is consistent with a capabilities approach. Betty Reardon is a globally known peace educator who founded the International Institute on Peace Education (IIPE) and the Peace Education Center at Teachers College Columbia University. She has written numerous books and articles about peace education. This conception comes from the ethical assumptions from her work in peace education. A capability is a substantive freedom and opportunity that allows one to do and be as they choose. The capabilities approach is synonymous with human development. The capabilities approach is concerned with the development of capacities and conditions so that persons have opportunities to do and be as they choose. Human development is the comparative assessment of justice (and injustice) or qualities of lives to determine adequate levels of human functioning as a matter of justice. It is an approach utilized for measurements by the United Nations Development Program and Agencies. Reardon's conception and the basic structure and ideas of the capabilities or human development approach have many commonalities. Reardon’s capabilities perspective offers a view of justice that informs us about the relationship between peace and justice. Reardon’s conception of justice is distinct, and while some might categorize it as a kind of capabilities approach, it offers a distinctive approach to the emerging and important discourse on capabilities. Reardon’s conception contributes to the discourse on

---

1 Nobel Laureate Amartya Sen developed this particular approach in economics, and the philosophical development of the capabilities approach was championed and developed by renowned philosopher Martha Nussbaum.
capabilities in three key ways: explicit inclusion of peace in the justice framework, incorporation of the root causes of war and violence and how they form obstacles to peace, and a unique feminist approach to the resolution of inequality in the peace process. Capabilities (and justice in general) might be understood more through a feminist analysis that speaks to the inequities addressed by justice. Feminism, as a political philosophy and approach used by Betty Reardon, involves the equitable treatment of women and men and the importance of women’s ways of knowing (caring and cooperation). Gender illustrates the outcome and roles of men and women that are social and culturally constructed. Feminism and gender play an important role in Reardon’s (capabilities) view of justice. Conversely, the capabilities approach offers an explicit articulation of a view of justice that is consistent with and incorporates the concept of peace and the perspectives of peace education.

**Philosophical Problem**

The philosophical problem addressed in this dissertation is concerned with the definitional problem of peace: how do we define peace? What place does justice have within this conception?

This problem is one of historical, philosophical, and contemporary importance for peace workers, scholars, and all of humanity (Cox, 1984; Galtung, 1981; Ginsberg, 1984; Kende, 1989; Kirkpatrick; 1984; Reardon, 1988). Reardon explores the challenge of defining the concepts of peace and peace education without restricting future discourse on the subject. She asks, “What constitutes peace and how do we define it without closing it off?” According to Reardon (1988):
Practitioners of peace education must begin to define and delimit the field: We need to reach some general agreement on its central concepts, educational goals, and preferred instructional approaches. The intent here is not to impose restricted boundaries to the subject matter, nor to issue “definitive” descriptions of the field, its concepts and its methods. Rather, I hope that a systematic discourse about definitions will lead us to a broader but clearer notion of authentic purposes and methods and the conceptual tools needed to refine them. The definitional problem seems to be one of achieving conceptual clarity without closing off a continued open inquiry into what constitutes peace, how it can be achieved, and how we can educate students to work for it and to live in it as the normal state of human society. (p. 11)

The importance of the definitional problem has to do with the necessity for clarity about the concept of peace and the fields of peace research, studies and education, as well as related social justice and conflict areas. Reardon articulates a concept of peace that is not static, but open and dialogical. The definitional problem has two sides 1) the need for a working definition so that the discussion (and actions, etc.) can move forward, but 2) the need to leave room for growth and alternative, localized and individual approaches to peace and peace education. That is why having a dynamic definition of peace and peace education is important to Reardon.

The definition informs the way that we view and go about achieving peace. Since
peace is often defined by how it is achieved, the methodology of how peace is achieved is important. For instance, Ian Harris (1998) describes how some articulate “peace” that is a result of a military force securing the end of a violent conflict as “peace through strength.” Education belongs to those activities that are part of achieving peace. The slogan for the Global Campaign for Peace Education embodies the relationship between peace and education. It states, “No peace without peace education” (Larson and Gex, 2000). In this sense, peace is not possible without education for and about it. Peace education educates individuals for critically thinking, reflective, responsible and caring citizenship. The role of inquiry and reflection in peace education is attuned to this learning. Inquiry and reflection is part of the dynamic nature of understanding what peace is and is part of the learning required to understand how to achieve it. If we believe there can be no peace without justice, then how might we understand the meaning of justice in the context of peace?

**Personal Subjectivity and Validity**

I do not approach this study from the position of a disinterested researcher, but from my own subjective experience, learning and interests. I came to peace education as a black man frustrated and angered by my experiences working in the financial services industry. In my interest to channel this frustration meaningfully, I began studying at Teachers College, Columbia University, in the Peace Education Concentration, where Betty Reardon was teaching and directing the Peace Education Center. Working with Reardon, I came to see my own frustrations in a broader social context, and learned that they were manifestations of deep structural issues that, like any sources of injustice and
violence, are obstacles to peace. I began to seek peace both inwardly and outwardly. Unlike other approaches, peace education was concerned with my interests, for example, understanding racism and colonialism, and how they are related to other global issues, such as abuses of human rights, sexism, and violence against women and children. Peace education’s normative analysis based on human rights, world order model values, and visions of alternatives to the war system offered hope, because it provided learning toward outcomes that result from community and creative thinking.

Peace education did not claim to be neutral, but it was based on the normative standards of human rights and related international law, such as treaties, covenants, declarations and conventions. The peace educative process strives for objectivity through the subjective stance of normative values. It does not attempt to indoctrinate but asks students to reflect on important global issues and uncover possible values from the classroom to the international arena. The normative approach refers to incorporating legal framework for achieving the goals of peace education (e.g. ideas of how treaties should/can be structured to safeguard human rights), or to drawing on existing international agreements, such as the Declaration of the Rights of the Child. The purpose of this approach is to empower learners with the realities of the world and show examples of possibilities for peace and justice, as expressed in these documents.

At the same time, peace education offers a rigorous study, grounded in peace research as a foundation, along with conflict theory, international educational development, comparative education, qualitative and participatory action research and philosophy of education. I was drawn to this approach to learning because it was based on strong research, reason, and logic, as well as care, responsibility, and concern. Peace
education posits an imperative need for social transformation that seeks to transform human thinking based on the value of human dignity, so that we view each other as moral equals. I believe my own *habitus* or positionality allowed me to be open to learning about the realities of injustice and violence and to reflect, inquire and act in the world according to these normative standards. From my study and experience in peace education, I began to articulate my response to global issues, political thought, and actions in terms of peace and justice related values.

One semester, I took a course entitled *Human and Social Dimensions of Gender*. It was one of the most educationally moving and deep learning experiences I have had to date. We studied the literature on gender, sexism, peace, and violence, and explored their interconnections. We learned from each other, and shared personal experiences connected with the subject matter, and explored the material in ways that I had never experienced. I saw how the pedagogies of peace education offered a way to explore and understand this shame and helped my friend and the other students understand the negative impact social structures can impose on individuals. People were also willing to share their feelings, experiences and thoughts because of the comfortable learning environment. This was environment was intentional: peace education seeks to dismantle structures of violence and injustice and offer alternative possibilities that result in people’s well-being, on both a global and an immediate level. In peace education classes offered by Reardon and others, we learned as a community, collaborating, helping, and listening to each other.

I was also a student in Dr. Reardon’s *Fundamentals of Peace Education* course when the 9/11 attacks occurred. In this and other courses, we had been learning about the
dimensions of peace. Among our cohort, we decided to start the Peace Education Network student organization, which was dedicated to educating, providing resources, and engaging in dialogue and advocacy around the concerns of peace education. Additionally, my master’s thesis, *Education for peace in a post 9/11 environment* focused directly on the relationship between the 9/11 attacks and what this nation’s educational system’s response should be. The background of my thesis study consisted of curriculum planning in an after-school program, where I co-facilitated lessons and teacher training that was rooted in a peace education approach.

After finishing the M.A. program, I co-taught a course at Washington University exploring the range of analysis from the varying perspectives related to 9/11. In this course, we learned that many people, including members of the military, preferred a more peaceful, diplomatic, or nuanced response to the attacks. Dr. Eugene Schultz and I published an article about this experience, arguing that democratic and critical pedagogies are the best techniques for teaching difficult issues. I learned several things from this experience: the importance of peace education in the classroom; the need to actively elicit interaction in the learning process; and that the values (human rights and dignity as well as associated values) of peace education are not only useful in the international realm, but are also valuable and applicable on a small scale if there is space for open and honest discourse.

Studying with Dr. Reardon was the beginning of my first real and authentic learning experience and inquiry into the alternatives to war and the problems I perceived to be obstacles to human well-being. Until this time, I had almost always focused on the negative, and never the positive. Peace education offered an alternative future global
narrative that students often asked about. This journey helped me probe deeper into the ways in which my own prejudices affected my treatment of women and earlier exclusionary practices in which I participated. What was my role in working toward elimination of the violence of exclusion? I kept going back to a conversation with my advisor Dr. Snauwaert, where he described a lecture by Cornell West, during which West said he had an inner racist. If he had held such prejudice, West argued, then what discriminatory thoughts did those in the audience hold?2 I became more aware of my thinking and behavior. My inquiry into peace education helped me learn the skills to cope in a world in which I feel, at times, unwelcome. It offered me a practical approach to dealing with the feeling of paralysis and inability to work within and change the deep structures and systems of inequality.

I began to engage in discussion of these issues with family and friends, realizing that my role was to deeply engage those I encountered with concerns facing people from all walks of life. This active view of peace education harkens back to the early view of education and philosophy – that it is not enough to talk about what is good, but to live a good life is the goal of peace educators. At the 2003 IIPE in Istanbul, Betty noted to me that my interactions with some women could be viewed as sexist. This and other similar observations by others helped me to begin thinking deeply about my own behavior and some of their underlying meanings. As a result, I found myself in reflection about my thoughts and actions. Inquiring deeply into Reardon’s work, experiences and peace actions while I worked on her archive, my continued studies with Dr. Snauwaert, experience teaching college level courses, engaging in personal and collegial relationships and writing about her work has been part of a challenging, transformative

2 Personal communication from Dale Snauwaert 4/2011
journey of learning and growth.

This study is informed by my personal experience working with Dr. Reardon, as well as studying her work, while reflecting on what she has written and how it has influenced me. The normative philosophic inquiry into peace education, which often delves into the nature of peace, justice, and human rights, is also part of my own subjective approach to this study. This study has some *emic*³ dimensions, because of Dr. Reardon’s explicit inclusion of the community’s perspectives and experience into her scholarship. She posits importance in the experience, interests and needs of learners as opposed to quantitative or more objective data. Working alongside other students, activists, scholars and educators, I participated in the development of learning communities and peace inquiry.

Although lauded with much praise for her work and commitment to the field, Reardon has resisted efforts to focus on her as a star educator in the field, as opposed to her work. At times, the actual work is often obscured in the attention paid to personalities. Reardon’s commitment to the inclusion of people’s inquiries and learning is authentic, as the IIPE does not focus on experts’ presentations, but the learning experiences of everyday people. Validity, her work argues, although subjective and contextual, results from the experience gathered from the everyday activities of individuals. This represents a form of local expertise that is part of the participatory action research process and the qualitative approach⁴.

From this perspective, my interpretation of Reardon’s learning and reflections are

³ See Denzin and Lincoln, 2000 p. 10.
mediated by my own learning, challenges, experiences and reflections. My learning
involves reflection of and challenging the sexist attitudes that I held and the racism I
experienced. The study of Reardon’s work is personally significant and important to
others I have met and worked with over the years. Colleagues, friends and fellow
learners from Teachers College, IIPE, the University of Toledo, Vassar College, my own
students and I have experienced and influenced the transformative learning resulting from
Reardon’s work, contributing our own perspectives and inquiries. The validity of this
subjective study is limited to the extent of my own learning and experience to this point,
which remain in process. Since there is no neutral education or learning – understanding
is always mediated through social context, experience, historical context, and the
response of others – this study is a result of that contingency. This does not suggest that
studies of peace issues cannot be objective, but that learning is mediated by reason,
openness of discussion and availability of various approaches and literature. If my
experiences and those of other learners are valid, as multicultural, democratic, peaceful
and postmodern contexts suggest, the choice of Reardon as a subject of study, as an
“expert” and learner in peace education (although she would disagree with notion of
expertise) is significant and merits study.

Significance of this study

Since Reardon is one of the most well-known peace educators, as well as a leader
and architect of the field of peace education, her perspective is important. Some consider
Reardon to be one of the founders of peace education. Cora Weiss, president of the
Hague Appeal for Peace and former president of the International Peace Bureau counts
Reardon as “a pioneer and founder of peace education” (Weiss, 2007), because of her co-founding of IIPE, the Global Campaign for Peace Education, the Peace Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, and the many important books and articles she has authored that have shaped the field of peace education⁵. In addition to her role as a founder in the field of peace education (Harris, 2008a), many scholars, activists and educators in peace-related fields recognize Reardon’s continuing contributions to the development of the field as significant (Ardizzone, 2002; Bajaj, 2008; Harris, 2008a; Noddings, 2008; Snauwaert, 2009; Snauwaert, 2010; Stomfey-Stitz, 1990; Brock-Utne, 2000). Loreto Navarro-Castro and Jasmine Nario-Galace (2008), directors of the Peace Education Center at Miriam College in the Philippines agree when they write that Reardon is “a peace educator who has made significant contributions to the field” (p. 16).

Reardon’s (2001) definition of violence is useful in understanding the purposes of peace education. Reardon (2001) writes, “violence is considered to be avoidable, intentional harm, inflicted for a purpose or perceived advantage of the perpetrator or of those who, while not direct perpetrators, are, however, advantaged by the harm” (p. 35). This definition has been used by numerous peace education scholars in their descriptions of violence and the role and purposes of peace education (Ardizzone, 2007; Jenkins, 2007; Navarro-Castro and Nario-Galace, 2008, Snauwaert, 2009).

Reardon has made a significant impact and contribution to the field and our understanding of peace, globally.

One would be hard pressed to find literature on peace education that does not

⁵ See Cora Weiss open letter to Betty at http://www.networkforpeace.com/Who/People/ReardonBet.html and the profile of Reardon on the World People’s Blog that describe attribute the founding of peace education to Reardon http://word.world-citizenship.org/wp-archive/883
make mention of, draw on, or include references to her groundbreaking work. John Synott (2005), in an editorial essay reviewing the expansion of the field of peace education, describes how Reardon’s work, among that of other peace educators from the Peace Education Commission (PEC) and International Peace Research Association (IPRA), provides the “literature base of peace education theory and pedagogical principles” (p. 8). Navarro-Castro and Nario-Galace (2008), in their book, *Pathways to Peace*, describe how their conception of violence is based on Reardon’s view that it is human-inflicted harm. Opotow, Gerson and Woodside (2005), in describing moral exclusion theory as important to teaching peace, acknowledge that their work, in part, relies upon Reardon’s conception of peace and her view of pedagogical perspectives and the social purposes of peace education (pp. 303-306). Ardizzone (2002) describes how Reardon helped to deepen the understanding of democratic ideas and processes by providing a global lens through which the role of violence and other obstacles to peace can be explored. She points out the positive values of human security, “global citizenship, planetary stewardship and human relationship[s]” illuminated by Reardon (p. 16). Claire McGlynn (2009) reports that some utilized Reardon’s perspective of peace education as part of a framework for understanding the “needs of children in [the] Palestinian environment” (p. 108). Mayton (2009), in *Nonviolence and Peace Psychology*, notes Reardon’s utilization of peace education in curriculum development for teacher education as an important part of violence prevention and conflict resolution in learning to develop healthy, cooperative, and humane relationships (pp. 113-115). Brantmeier (2007) also notes Reardon’s work integrating peace education into teacher education.
Burns and Aspelaugh (1983) point out how there was little attention paid to the relationship between male aggression and war until Reardon, whose work explicitly acknowledged the links between militarism, male aggression, and the high value awarded to these concepts in our culture (p. 319). For example, Brock-Utne (2009) points out that while many paid little attention to the connection between masculinity and war, Reardon was among those investigating this relationship. Bajaj (2010) points out another aspect of Reardon’s contribution to peace education- offering a way to end violence and war and making connections between “sexism and militarism as manifestations of violence” (p. 48). Moylan (2003) writes about the strong emotion, unexpected learning and rare and important teaching moments aroused when using Reardon’s *Sexism and the War System*. Bryzzheva (2009) describes how Reardon’s work informs her own understanding of the language of peace through an articulation of silence and contemplation in critical reflection (p. 75).

Ardizzone (2007) points out that Reardon’s approach to reflection is part of the process of developing understanding, awareness and the ability to care and empower oneself through the establishment of connections between issues and the development of relationships with others (p. 7). Bajaj (2009) notes that Reardon was among the early peace educators who saw education about the natural world and sustainable development as an integral part of a comprehensive peace education, as well as the connections Reardon made between ecological security and peace. Reardon has written widely about the various and interrelated aspects of peace education, which have been utilized by many.

According to Google Scholar, Reardon’s works have been cited numerous times:
Sexism in the War System (1985) over 280 times; Comprehensive Peace Education (1998) 193 times; Education for Peace from a Gender Perspective (2001) 65 times; Educating for Human Dignity (1995) 60 times; Women and Peace (1993) 119 times; Human Rights as Education for Peace (1997), 60 times. All of these citations of Reardon’s works have been utilized as support in various published works; many scholars, students, educators and activist have learned from Reardon’s perspectives on peace education.

Reardon’s teaching, development of networks and communities of educators committed to the dissemination of peace knowledge, and establishment of the International Institute on Peace Education (Jenkins, 2005, 2008), as well as her prolific writing about peace education, have made an important contribution to our understanding of peace and the development of the field of peace education. Reardon’s work is foundational in the goal of moving toward the shared peaceful and just future.

A major assumption of this thesis is that the philosophical and theoretical foundation of peace education would benefit from a systematic study of its underlying conception of justice. The intention of this study is inform peace education, and contribute to the philosophy of peace. Development of a comprehensive philosophy of peace and a theory of peace education is needed (Page, 2008; Webel and Galtung, 2007; Webel, 2007).

As a new field, peace education suffers from some criticism, some deserved and some not. Many of the critiques emerge from the definitional problem (Reardon, 1988, 2011): some critics argue that peace education indoctrinates students and has an impulse toward universalism or western-liberal bias and lacks explicit theoretical grounding
(Burns and Aspelaugh, 2003 citing Cox and Scruton, 1984; Gur-Ze’ev, 2001; Horowitz and Laskin, 2009; Page, 2008). While these are important concerns, they will be addressed.

In terms of theoretical grounding, peace education, peace studies, and peace research have deep intellectual histories and constitute a vigorous discourse based in a multiplicity of disciplines and human experience (Reardon, 1988). Reardon (1988) and Reardon and Cabezudo (2002) respond to the critique of bias, citing Freire, who argues that “there is no neutral education.” In other words, inherent in all forms of education are values that reflect a particular subjective view, a point that many critiques and approaches to education fail to admit. The importance of this failure to address subjectivity and, at times, ideology, paints current educational structures, such as high stakes testing, as the norm and not to be challenged. The ideological stance of many educational approaches harm students and results in systemic obstacles that prevent them from obtaining their conception of a good life. However, peace education offers an examination of its value orientation within an open, reflective and critical framework that actively works to avoid banking and other didactic forms through participation of students. Reardon (2001) further addresses such critiques when she writes:

Education is the systematically planned, guided learning that develops the potential talents and capacities of learners and opens them to reflective thinking, responsible action and lifelong learning. Indoctrination is direct and specific instruction in one mode of thinking, communicating to learners that there is only one good way to learn, to be human and to achieve
social purposes. Education is pursued by democracy, and indoctrination by authoritarianism. The former may lead to tolerance and respect for human rights, the latter to intolerance and moral exclusion. (Reardon, 2001, pp.149-150)

Peace education provides a space where learners develop the capacity to think for themselves, free from indoctrination. Reardon (2010b) articulates a pedagogy that is reflective and self-critical, and encourages the same for the wider public discourse. Reardon’s integration of critical frameworks has been important to the development of the pedagogy and theory of peace, and yet, as Charles Webel (2007) notes in the preface of the *Handbook of Peace and Conflict*, the philosophy of peace is still in its infancy and in need of development.

Gur-Ze’ev (2001) and Burns and Aspelaugh (2003) acknowledge critiques that peace education is idealistic and “negatively utopianistic,” among other things, from “neo-conservative politicians and educational scientists,” as well as those from “post modern philosophers of the 1980’s,” while simultaneously pointing to peace education’s scholars (including Reardon) as dreaming, but making substantially practical contributions (pp. 391- 393). Peace education from this perspective is practical, based on an underlying theoretical perspective incorporating tools and ideas from various disciplines. It is this idealistic perspective noted by Burns and Aspelaugh (2003) that must be paid attention to in order to counter these criticisms and fully articulate the utility and importance of the field. From this perspective, there is need to explicitly ground the philosophy of the field in the work of its foremost thinkers.

As one of the most widely read, and recognizable figures in the development of
peace education, Betty A. Reardon articulates an approach to peace education that is distinctly feminist, democratic, critical and holistic (Reardon 1973a, 1988, 1995, 2001). For Reardon, peace education is also grounded in the notion that planetary justice, where the extension of justice to all humans and the natural environment is a necessary condition of peace. Within peace education, this extension of justice to all humans and the natural world is a moral imperative. Reardon’s approach is one that stresses the adoption of global, ethical and democratic values, and that illustrates and is compatible and connected with a “capabilities-based perspective of justice” as articulated in this dissertation. Reardon's (1988, 1994) articulation of a theory of justice is interrelated with peace.

Justice, in Reardon’s thought, is implicit within the concept of peace. The primary subject of justice is human dignity and ‘reverence towards’ as well as ‘responsibility for’ all humans, the natural environment and its ecological balance. Consequently, Reardon’s approach to peace education is consistent with the capabilities approach to justice, because of its attention to matters of human dignity and deep interest in human development and flourishing. The capabilities perspective is an approach developed by Amartya Sen (2009) and Martha Nussbaum (2006, 2011) that focus on human dignity as the basis for the fulfillment of rights, goods, and the articulation of claims as an urgent matter of justice. For most scholars of peace education, justice tends to be assumed to be related and necessary for peace; as a result, the relationship between peace and justice remains tacit.

The purpose of this dissertation is to articulate, extend, and elaborate Reardon's conception of justice implicit within her philosophy of peace education. Clarifying this
relationship through the exploration of Reardon's work, as well as the works of others about justice and peace, will allow for further scrutiny and deeper understanding of peace, justice and peace education. There are, I argue, wider implications to peace, since Reardon’s philosophy of peace education is, in part, a result of a socio-historical context of peace-thinking.

Reardon (1988) writes that she “regards justice as an essential requirement for peace” (p.11). Thus, articulating a systematic theory of justice implicit in Reardon’s concept of peace is needed to inform the practice of peace activists, educators, and scholars by:

1. Further clarifying the definition of peace by describing the essential requirement of justice;
2. Articulating a coherent theory of justice, in terms of its relationship to peace;
3. Providing a conceptual tool for peace workers to assess and evaluate justice and discern injustice, as well as violence;
4. Developing a conception of justice that will inform the pedagogy and practice of peace education;
5. Furthering the overall development of the philosophy of peace.

The project of articulating justice as constitutive of peace is similar to the goal of Reardon (1988) when she writes:

It soon became clear that not only did the word peace bear many definitions and connotations, but peace education itself meant many different things, even to those who identified themselves as peace educators. I also felt that it would be both presumptuous
and premature to specifically define and delimit a field that is, I believe, only at the beginning stage of what it might become. However, it was clear that for the purposes of my own work and that of at least those of my colleagues in the field with whom I have shared some of these reflections, it was time to become much more self-conscious about both the pedagogical purposes and the political goals of peace education. (pp. ix-x)

The importance of developing “conceptual clarity” regarding the meaning of peace is necessary for peace educators formulating the purposes and goals of their practice. We have gained much understanding about the nature of negative peace, yet what constitutes positive peace, (i.e. justice) remains murky. Generally, negative peace is defined as the absence of war and reduction of violence, but positive peace is the presence of justice and the removal of injustice and violence. As Reardon (1988) writes, “we seem to know far more about what is not peace than about what is” (p.13), leading to the focus of peace education on the absence of peace.

Peace education is deeply concerned with justice (Ardizzone, 2002, 2007; Bajaj, 2008; Berlowitz, 2009; Christensen, 2010; Ezozo, 2009; Galtung, 1981; Gay, 1999; Harris, 1988; McElwain, 2008; McNiff, 2006, Opotow, Gerson and Woodside, 2005; Page, 2009; Reardon, 1973a/1976/1988/2000; Snauwaert, 2010; Synott, 2005). However, while many peace educators mention justice, they give very little description or systematic exploration of its nature. For example, in the Encyclopedia of Peace Education, Bajaj (2008, pp1-2), Tibbits, (pp. 104-105), Howlett (p. 30), and Haavelsrud (p. 60) all mention social justice, but do not describe what it means or how it is related to
peace. Bajaj (2008) writes that an important aspect of peace education involves “skills and values needed for peace and social justice” (p. 2). In this passage and in the sum of this work, Bajaj's documentation acknowledges that justice is an active part of peace discourse, yet does not define the term fully. Based on the lack of description, the notion of justice is situated as a supplementary component or as a consequence of peace.

In a later argument, Bajaj (2009) describes how the field of peace education is constructed in terms of human rights, disarmament, development, and ecological and conflict resolution education. She writes, “while there are different approaches to educating about and achieving peace, there nonetheless exists the unifying concept that peace education seeks to achieve human rights for all by transforming students into agents of change for greater equity and social justice” (Bajaj, 2009, p. 443). In this case, is justice a separate field of study, or is it the result or goal of student transformation? Bajaj (2009) further argues that protection against various forms of harm and injustice is an essential part of the work of “peace and justice.” Is justice synonymous with peace? Besides the reference, “a just society for present and future generations” (Bajaj citing UNESCO for Sustainable development, 2009, p. 449), justice is loosely conceived as attention to injustice and violence, without specifics on justice itself, or how it is related to peace. Similarly, the references to social justice go without systematic description. From this position, it is difficult to conclude more than the assumption that peace is somehow connected to justice.

In other peace-related literature, DeBie (2007) and Algers (1989) suggest that justice is related to positive peace. Alger (1989) writes that positive peace refers to “overcoming social injustice” (p. 117). For the most part, “social injustice” is the extent
of this particular reference to justice. DeBie (2007) argues, “positive peace (global justice) is what peace educators strive for” (p. 28). This is the only direct mention, albeit short and in parentheses, to justice.

Others scholars have written about how peace addresses injustice. Berlowitz (2009) describes justice in the context of peace-building as exploration of “policy alternatives designed to ameliorate structural violence grounded in social injustice,” as well as connecting justice to positive peace (p. 565). Briefly, in describing positive peace, he writes:

The construct of “positive peace”, grounded in recognition of the dialectical relationship between peace and justice, has recently gained ideological hegemony. This transformation is evident in the history of peace organizations, which began with the founding of the Peace Studies Association (PSA) in the 1980s, followed by the formation of the Consortium of Peace Research Education, and Development (COPRED). The recent merger of PSA and COPRED into the Peace and Justice Association (PJSA) is a symbolic manifestation of ideological hegemony of “positive peace”, since the new title demonstrates the predominance of the issue of social justice as a factor of peace. (Berlowitz, 2009, p. 565)

What does Berlowitz mean here by the dialectical relationship of justice and peace? Is the understanding of justice assumed because of the organizational distinction of PJSA? Berlowitz suggests that the relationship between peace and justice has become a popular
notion. It is also one that has taken on an ideological stance since people might accept this relationship without critical examination. From this view, the merger of two institutions reflects their “ideological” acceptance of positive peace. Berlowitz (2009) acknowledges the lack of definition and description of this relationship and then continues without explaining exactly what (social) justice means, beyond its assumed and ideological relationship with peace.

Harris (1988) perfunctorily describes the role of justice in peace education in dealing with and educating about injustice, noting the problem with the perception of justice. Harris (1988) writes, “the banner of peace through justice is carried by many combatants, each side claiming that it stands for justice while the opposition stands for tyranny and oppression” (p.11). Harris importantly notes that justice is misused. Inherent in Harris’ writing is that justice is connected to peace, not violence. Harris does not elaborate or explain the nature of peace through justice in any systematic way. What Harris’ view realizes is that justice is misused and understood differently among different groups.

In her book *Peace Education in America, 1828-1990*, Stomfey-Stitz (1993) compiles the history and background of peace education in the US, yet mentions justice only fleetingly. Instead of describing or defining the term, in the section on social justice, she lists the social and political events of the 1960’s.

While it is clear that peace educators view justice as a key component of peace and peace education, its exact role is not clear. The descriptions (or lack thereof) of justice listed above in the previous survey are mostly concerned with and defined in terms of injustice. Problematic in this approach is the possibility that justice is defined by
what it is not or what it is opposed to, which is what Cox (1984) describes (informally) as a logical fallacy.

While the aforementioned scholars make mention of social, economic, and/or global justice in multiple places, there is little to no discussion of what particular concept of justice is related to and reasonably consistent with peace. This is surprising in light of the frequency with which social justice is mentioned; many of these works devote entire sections or chapters to social justice. One might argue that the use of the term is intuitive and implicit. The terms “justice” and “social justice” are used in many contexts as related to positive peace, yet it is unclear if the use of these terms in the literature is synonymous.

Ardizzone (2007) includes social justice as an area of concern for positive peace education, or the elimination and establishment of conditions for peace. While she offers some description about the removal of structures of injustice as a requirement for positive peace, there is no clarification in terms of the distinction between social justice and justice. Bajaj and Chiu (2009) write, “peace education involves methods and learning processes that include inquiry, critical thinking, and dialogue toward greater equity and social justice” (p. 441). They continue that education for peace is directed toward students who are transformed to become agents for “greater equity and social justice” (p. 443). In this essay, when Bajaj and Chiu (2009) speak of justice, they do so in terms of “social justice.”

Stomfey-Stitz (2008), on the other hand, includes social justice as a focus of peace education that is connected with economic justice in particular. In Stomfey-Stitz

---

6 See later in this paper Cox (1984) discussion of Aristotle’s conception of a definition – that it cannot be defined by what it is not.
(2008) and Bajaj and Chiu (2009), the mention of justice seems to be described in most references as social justice. Other peace educators similarly use the term social justice (Burns, 2008; Davies, 2008; Haavelsrud, 2008; Howlett, 2008; Mische, 2008). There is an implicit view that justice, in the context of peace education is synonymous, for the most part, with social justice and connected with positive peace. This seems to be the prominent view throughout much of current peace education literature.

The term “injustice” is widely used to describe war and other forms of violence. The terms still go, for the most part, unexplained. Reardon (1973a, 1974, 1988, 1995), Kenneth Boulding (1978) and Snauwaert (2009, 2010) are the exceptions (in peace education), although I may have overlooked other work on peace education, describing peace as constituted by justice. Even so, Reardon’s conception of justice is implicit, and Boulding’s view needs further development. The identification of the shortcomings of peace educators and scholars in terms of their discussion of justice is important. If justice is closely related to peace, it is necessary to describe how it is related to peace and what approach or concept of justice is being discussed. Reardon discusses justice as it relates to peace, thus providing a more explicit account of a conception of justice, which is necessary to further define peace and the implications on peace education.

Other identifications of this problem

For many, defining peace is problematic, because, as previously listed, there are multiple concepts and perspectives attempting to describe peace. Magnus Haavelsrud (1983) warns that the terminology of peace is, at times, used to give legitimacy to

---

7The term “global justice” is also used periodically by peace educators and is discussed in more detail in chapter 3.
policies and actions that are not peaceful. Peter Wallensteen (1988) describes the general difficulty of defining and agreeing on a definition of peace. He suggests that this is a large part of the goal of peace research. Johan Galtung (1969) is credited with coining the terms “negative peace,” “positive peace” and “structural violence” in the context of peace research. Negative peace is achieved through the reduction and ultimate elimination of physical and armed violence and war, while positive peace results from the reduction of structural or “indirect” violence, including racism, sexism and other forms of cultural violence. Cultural violence is a distinct form of structural violence as it is focused on violence arising from traditions.

This terminology has been widely accepted and used by peace, activists, educators and researchers (Berlowitz, 2009; Cohrs and Boehnke, 2008; Galtung, 1969; Gawerc, 2006; Harris, 1988; Johnson and Johnson, 2006). In the fields of peace research, peace studies and peace education, the conception of peace is both positive and negative, although not all scholars accept this particular definition of the negative and positive peace distinction. Nastase (1983), who became Foreign Minister and later Prime Minister of Romania, argues that:

Peace must no longer be defined as the absence of war (negative peace) but rather as the gradual process of organizing multi-value international interdependencies as well as resolving any disputes which may appear, by means that exclude the use

---

8 Prominent social scientist and founding member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) Johan Galtung, who is often credited as a founder of the field of peace research, established the Peace Research Institute in Oslo (PRIO), and later in 1964 the *Journal of Peace Research* (Bajaj, 2008, p. 159). Although Galtung is widely credited with development of the terms positive and negative peace, Martin Luther King was the first to use them in his *Letter from Birmingham Jail* (4/16/1963). He initially described the framework and conditions of structural violence, without using the term structural violence.
of force [and] that emphasize the findings of adequate forms of cooperation (positive peace). (p. 395)

Similar to the perspective that peace is a process and more than the “absence of war,” Reardon (1988) suggests peace educators read Cox (1984), who views the negative definition as problematic. Noting his own objections and those of peace researcher Juergen Dedring, on its explicit grounding in “the absence of war,” Cox (1984) describes his view of the negative distinction of peace. For Cox (1984), writes that the term “violates Aristotle’s criterion for a good definition which requires that it tell us what a thing is rather than simply what it is not” (p. 104). Many concrete and abstract concepts are not defined by what they are not. Cox’s (1984) dynamic view of peace as the removal of war is comparable to the Gandhian Satyagraha or nonviolent truth force-peace transcends violence through powerful and active peace-making.

Unlike Nastase (1983), Cox (1984), Boulding (1976, 1978), Reardon (1988, 2011), and Snauwaert (2009a, 2010, 2011), many scholars happily define peace, often referring to Galtung’s (1969) description, as positive and negative (Algers, 1987; Bajaj, 2008; Brantmeier, 2007; Berlowitz, 2009; Cohrs and Boehnke, 2008; DeBie, 2007 Harris, 2008b). The terms negative and positive peace assist many in peace-related fields in their understanding of the dimensions of peace, but there are questions as to whether these categorizations have outlived their usefulness.

Negative peace, in times of war, diminishes the social stability that is present. But, since our lives are (or should be) connected to others, if there is war and violence anywhere, our inquiry must be, what is my role in helping to end those violent conflicts? Also, does negative peace often focus our efforts solely on the nature of war and
Once we have dealt with violence, what is the next step? Is the peace-making process linear? Does it move from negative to positive peace, or is the work of positive peace part of the transition toward alternative futures, thus working in tandem with negative peace? Since positive peace is concerned with structural violence – which can lead to direct violence – should we reconsider the label “positive peace” and move to a term Reardon articulates as “organic” (peace that grows out of just conditions) peace? Despite these questions, the vast numbers of perspectives in the literature suggest there is some agreement about negative and positive peace terminology. So in this agreement, does the definitional problem still exist? The issue of terminology is both definitional and conceptual. Concepts are informed by definitions, so conceptual and definitional clarity is important. Thus, the problem does still exist, in the sense that there is disagreement on the distinctions of peace as negative and positive.

As stated earlier, agreement on peace as a closed concept in terms of negative and positive is problematic. Agreement on definitions might close further discussions, as opposed to offering a conceptual framework or starting point, from which learners, both individuals and groups, might continue discussion.

Reardon (1988, 2010a, 2011) posits a dialogic openness in the definition of peace. In this sense, peace is not closed; it is an evolving conception. Reardon (1988) interprets what is understood as negative peace as “foundational peace” involving the creation of institutional and living conditions that make (organic) positive peace possible. This institutional aspect of negative peace is concerned with abolishment of war and transformation of the institutions that contribute to a culture of violence. In this sense, ways of living (peacefully) and the relationships and values within the community
reinforce institutions that support individual behavioral norms and just and peaceful societies. War, in this sense, (and the culture surrounding it) is “the problem.” It extends to other forms of physical violence, creating a culture of violence. Peace is considered negative if it involves the elimination of war and physical violence.

Positive peace comprises the areas of the doing, struggling, creating institutions and conditions that abolish those oriented toward war and all forms of violence (Reardon, Fall 2001, Class discussion). Positive peace emerges from the reduction and removal of structural violence. Structural violence is:

…used to identify the consequences of social, political, and economic structures, institutions, and processes that systematically violate rights and lower the material quality of life of particular groups or classes of people – the same structures that maintain (and are maintained by) the attitudes and values inherent in racism, sexism, and colonialism.

(Reardon, 1988, p. 7)

In a state of positive peace, the possibility for further aggression (organized violence, especially state-sanctioned violence) is significantly reduced because the conditions causing violence are eliminated, or there is movement toward its elimination. Reardon (2011) suggests that it may be impossible to eliminate all violence, but this does not mean that we should not work to try to do so.

Boulding (1977, 1978) offers an alternative conception to the negative and positive dualism of peace in his articulation of stable peace. Boulding (1977) suggests that Galtung's positivist and dualistic articulation of (negative) peace diminishes its
positive nature, as well as the necessary focus on a peaceful future. For Boulding, the categories of negative and positive peace are too dichotomous, oversimplifying the concept of peace. Boulding (1977) writes:

I would certainly not call Galtung a strict determinist, but there does seem to be a certain underlying tendency for a structuralist to think in rather deterministic terms….Galtung seems to me to have a certain carelessness in the definition of positive and negative terms. The expression “negative peace” of which he is very fond seems to me a complete misnomer…. Peace is a phase of a system of warring groups. It is not just “not-war” any more than water is “not ice.” Both peace and war are complex phases of the system, each with its own characteristics. The term “positive peace,” by which Galtung seems to mean any state of affairs, which gets high marks on his scale of goodness, is also most unfortunate. It is not in any sense the opposite of negative peace. In fact it may have very little to do with peace. (p. 78)

Boulding (1977) argues that Galtung’s dualistic categorization of peace as negative and positive is structuralist, hierarchical and rigid, where it should be evolutionary. In this sense, Reardon’s view of peace is closer to Boulding’s than Galtung’s.

Because of the wide acceptance of the terms negative and positive peace, their inclusion was useful to people in the peace-related fields (Reardon, 2011). Reardon

---

9 See further detail on evolutionary perspective in K. Boulding’s (1977) *Twelve friendly quarrels with Galtung*, not to be confused with Darwinian evolutionary perspective
(2011) argues that those terms are dualistic, but that the usage of the terms is necessary, in part, because they reflect language in the field of peace research, studies, and education that were familiar to most (Reardon, 2011, personal communication). The terms negative and positive peace for Reardon and others, although problematic, were useful in articulating the complexities and challenges of the conception of peace.

Reardon (2011) suggests the terms negative and positive peace have outlived their utility. Reardon (1988) writes:

My own view is that the two concepts [of] negative and positive peace [are] complementary and inseparable. Like Boulding, I see what has been labeled “negative peace” as a desirable and, in many ways, positive condition. His notion of “stable peace” I would term fundamental or foundational peace, out of which might grow those conditions of justice and equity connoted by positive peace, which, as a living, evolving condition, I would call organic peace. However, for the sake of clarity, throughout this book I will use the terms negative and positive as they are employed in the wider field of peace research. Peace education practices derive primarily from the concepts of peace held by the practitioners. Most of the concepts used in peace education today fall within the domain of negative peace, but a significant set of concepts within the domain of positive peace is also reflected in contemporary peace education. (pp.12-13)
It should be acknowledged that currently, most concepts with peace education do fall within the realm of negative peace. There is significant focus on positive aspects of peace. Negative peace is the colloquial understanding of what peace is, i.e. ending all forms of violence, general and complete disarmament, and dismantling institutions that support a culture of violence (Reardon, 1988). In relation to disarmament, Reardon (1988) writes:

This approach, more than any of the other negative peace general and complete disarmament approaches, comes closest to confronting the issue of war as an institution. It is a fairly global approach, bringing into consideration the notion of general and complete disarmament (GCD), the achievement of which would require all nations to renounce war. Disarmament education falls more into what I would categorize as a reconstructionist approach to peace education, because of the institutional requirements of GCD. (p.19)

GCD is an essential part of negative peace that is concerned with disrupting and dismantling the violent institutions of war. Reardon (2009a) argues that the work of disarmament education, education for GCD, is instrumental in the realization of our humanity.

The institution of war is dehumanizing. In her acceptance address for the MacBride Peace Prize at Georgetown University, Reardon (2009a) describes how:

…the core pursuits of the realization of our common humanity, the repudiation of violence and the realization of universal
human dignity, the convergence of the human rights and peace movements, manifested as gender equality and general and complete disarmament, [are] respectively the social and structural transformations from which can emerge the practical possibilities for a culture of peace. (p. 3)

Discussing the work of 1905 Nobel Peace Prize laureate Bertha von Sutner, Reardon (2009a) describes Lay Down Your Arms as a “major call to peace,” calling it a “peace education lesson that instructs on disarmament as the fundamental, essential condition of peace” (p. 4).

Negative peace includes education about disarmament as a fundamental component of peace and education for it, whereas positive peace includes negative peace, but transcends its goals, describing a condition where there is human flourishing. Where peace is stable\(^{10}\), there is building and movement toward conditions where individuals develop more humanely.

Positive peace, as it is traditionally defined, is concerned only with justice (Reardon, 1988; Snauwaert, 2010). Snauwaert (2010) argues that because negative peace seeks an end to war and all forms of violence, it is also concerned with justice.

Often, it is argued that the use of violence is justified as a mechanism to achieve justice. According to Reardon (2001):

In peace education violence is considered to be avoidable,

\(^{10}\)There is great importance in the notion of stable or organic peace, as it has virtually disappeared from the discussion of peace education. As Reardon (2011) and Snauwaert (2011) note, the negative/positive distinction is dualistic, false and ultimately problematic, thus some in the field of peace define the concept as dualistic and mechanical.
intentional harm, inflicted for a purpose or perceived advantage of the perpetrator or of those who, while not direct perpetrators, are, however, advantaged by the harm. The structural violence of unequal access to social benefits and resources is one example of such harm. To most forms of violence there are usually alternative non-violent means to achieve the ends sought by the perpetrators. Violence is not an inevitable or immutable element in human life and society, as has been asserted by scientists in the Seville Statement on Violence. (p. 37)

In this sense, violence is a calculated act that often benefits those who carry it out, and violence is alternative that can be avoided.

According to Reardon and Cabezudo (2002) “the relationship of human dignity to the abolition of war [is] the integral link between justice and peace … the institution of war is totally inconsistent with the value of human dignity” (p.49). Violence is intentional, avoidable harm and, as a violation of human dignity, it is unjust (Reardon, 2000, 2001; Snauwaert, 2010).

**Intellectual-Historical Context of Peace**

Because the concept of peace has been with us throughout recorded history, it is important to ground it in its intellectual history. Galtung (1981) attempts to describe the development of peace in terms of what he refers to as “Occidental” and “Oriental”
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11The term oriental is problematic- see Edward Said (1978) *Orientalism*
The western concept of peace, based on Greek and Roman formulations, has its geographic center emanating outward towards others. The Greek concept of peace, narrow as it was, emerged in a city-state whose thinkers believed peace was only possible for Greeks. Others (non-Greeks) were considered barbarians and thus unable to benefit from peace. Galtung (1981) suggests this idea was based on the Greeks’ view of themselves as the master race, and was diffused by Hegel, who, in *Will to Power*, described the view that the Greeks held such an idea. The Romans considered peace as *Pax Romana*, or order made by the empire. Power and prosperity, in this sense, were gained through the domination of others. Galtung (1981) describes how the monotheistic faiths of Judaism and Christianity contributed to this western concept. Peace, in these religious concepts, was derived from a comprehensive, natural order and a hierarchical view of the world.

The “Oriental” or Asian and Indian development of peace was based on an inward concept of peace whereby, despite raging war, individuals could have a measure of (inner) peace resulting from their spiritual beliefs and cultural positionality. Galtung (1981) notes that the Asian and Indian perspectives were not concerned with domination of others, but were founded within the spiritual traditions of Jainism, Buddhism, Taoism and Confucianism. Jainism strictly rejects violence and the harm of any creature, so much so that the ultimate goal of those in the faith is to welcome death to avoid doing harm to any living creature.

The concept of *ahimsa*, a tenet shared among Hinduism, Jainism and Buddhism, was initially understood by outsiders as passive power. Later, Gandhi interpreted ahimsa as a nonviolent peace (truth) force (Galtung, 1981, pp. 191-192). This concept of peace
is a dynamic, people-centered approach that informs many contemporary perspectives on nonviolent action and peace (Cox, 1984). The Asian concepts of peace, such as those found in Confucianism, were concerned with social harmony (Hayden, 2001). This approach to harmony focuses on inner peace, duty in one’s community, respect for elders and ancestors, and familial responsibility. One’s comportment in the outside world, such as displaying humility, obedience and reverence toward those of higher rank plays an important role in that order.

Galtung’s (1981) descriptions are concerned with the orientation of peace from the Asian and Indian perspectives as “inward.” The “outward” European perspective was initially based on peace through domination, or what Harris (1988) describes as peace through strength. This outward flowing concept of peace, as well as the view of inner peace, is connected to a comprehensive view of the world based on specific developments from within cultures over time.

The dualistic distinction between inward and outward perspective are often overly simplistic, offering categorizations that do not accurately reflect the deepness of cultural perspectives. The Western view of Eastern thought in this historical approach is viewed as violent in its essentialism. Sen (2006) makes a similar observation of Western intellectual attempts to explain various aspects of culture, suggesting that a surface and cursory view of other cultural perspectives can be violent. This view of historical development is affirmed, partly, but articulated differently by Istvan Kende (1989), who describes the development of the concepts of peace (from a Western or European perspective) as attached to the changing modality of war.

Beginning with the Middle Ages, Kende (1989) describes the proposals for peace
as shaped by thinkers’ religious views, which at that time were Catholic-centric, and considered universal. The view was that peace was only possible among Christian nations (pp. 234-235). Kende (1989) describes thinkers from this period such as Erasmus, who was anti-war on the grounds that war was willed by kings, not people. Initially, the concept of peace and war as the concern of people, as opposed to leaders, did not take hold.

Later, the ideas of the renaissance and humanism led to the proliferation of education and social reformation, allowing more people to become aware of their world and political issues (Kende, 1989, pp. 235-236). The invention of the printing press was instrumental in the dissemination of such knowledge.

Thinkers who developed plans for peace during this period include the German preacher Sebastian Franck, who focused on global communities, the human cost of war, and war as a crime, and the French political writer Emeric Cruce de Lacroix who developed a plan for all religions and nations beyond Europe, such as Ethiopia and China. De Lacroix believed that the reconciliation of the world’s major religions would bring peace. Kende (1989) notes how other proposals and considerations for peace from princes in this era used the word peace, but meant war.

The end of the humanistic age brought plans emanating from the English, proposing peace through economic development. Beginning with the age of the industrial revolution, thinkers believed trade would end the need for war, since maximization of utility deemed it unprofitable. Many English thinkers argued that, “the reason for peace … is … profit” (Kende, 1989, p. 237). Rooted in the ideas of Rousseau and Voltaire, the later revolutionary period brought the cause for peace as human
equality. Later, Saint-Pierre de Abbe and Kant developed proposals for peace that encouraged the creation of federations. Kant proposed the reduction of standing armies, while Abbe encouraged reliance on “strong alliances” since “wars could not be avoided,” a claim that was critiqued as being conservative and bleak (Kende citing Saint-Pierre de Abbe, 1989, p. 238). In this age, the idea of economic and social justice was part of peace. According to Kende (1989), Bentham and Mill were concerned with peace, with Bentham arguing for the reduction of armies and gradual disarmament and the relinquishing of colonies because “a country which had no dependent territory would have no cause for being attacked,” and because the cost of war could be used for other goods. In this view, peace is linked to disarmament and ending colonisation.

In this period of class struggle, the example of the French revolution led many to believe that justice required violent liberation. There are questions about whether violence in historical quests for freedom has ever brought about authentic freedom and peace (Arendt, 1991). Freire (1993, 1970) argues that violence is a tool of the oppressor, thus using this tool to become free negates that freedom and damages one’s humanity. In the era before the 1850’s, both princes and those working in movements believed, or at least argued, that war was necessary to settle injustices and thus to bring about peace.

Kende (1989) argues that war was always connected to peace, because throughout each historical period, at each stage wars became more horrific. The depravity of each war led to promises that there would not be a next one, promises that were repeatedly broken. The modern age following both world wars saw numerous proposals for peace, but nuclear weapons offered the choice of “total annihilation of our globe and humanity – or peace” (p. 245). Despite finality of the threat of such weapons, war has not been
eliminated.

Reardon (2001) also describes the longing for and visions of peace that have been with us throughout human history. The religious philosophies that included peace within their worldviews often regarded peace as the reward that the virtuous would receive in paradise. Reardon (2001) describes Thomas More’s *Utopia*, a “perfect” society on Earth, as a complementary alternative. She argues that this concept of perfection on Earth and in the afterlife led to a view of peace as outside of human reach, unrealistic or undesirable, saying that “while the great majority longed for peace, they did not believe it was truly possible” (Reardon, 2001, p. 55). Beyond the critique of being unrealistic, utopias are used in the envisioning of alternate realities, upon which reflection and planning can occur.

The powerful often view peace as an extension of their power through violent force (Harris, 1988). The historical views from proposals like Kant’s *Toward Perpetual Peace* often held the view that peace was only possible among European nations, a concept which can be compared with the Pax Romana, civilization and peace under the cultural and political domain of the Romans. Peace, as viewed by many princes, required the universal adoption of their own worldviews. Reardon (2001) describes the continuation of this approach to peace through the twentieth century, which saw violent conflict after violent conflict.

Reardon points to the development of the International Court of Justice in 1899, the publication of Grotius’ *On the Law of War and Peace*, Kant’s moral imperatives and *Perpetual Peace*, Abbe’ Saint Peirre’s proposals for peace, The Hague’s International Court of Justice (circa 1899) designed to deal with international conflicts and disputes,
and the Geneva Conventions (circa 1922), as steps toward the establishment of normative precepts and international law to prevent war and reduce its devastating effects (pp. 55-56).

Reardon (2001) continues with her description of the rise of and developments in global civil society, such as the League of Nations, the United Nations, World Order Models and other important conferences and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), including women’s groups, that advocated and created declarations that provided the moral grounding for many international and domestic laws (pp. 56-58). While many leaders viewed peace as the domain of the powerful (men), groups in civil society struggled for peace that encompassed the rights and opportunities for well-being of all individuals.

Providing a history of the concept of peace is a difficult prospect, since it is often understood from a Western perspective. This view often obscures or ignores the historical influence of the rest of the world on human history and the concept of peace. For instance, parts of Northern Africa, the Middle East and Asia were all part of Rome, and both adopted and influenced many of Roman cultural practices, although currently, these regions are generally not associated with “Western Civilization.” A history of peace is, in general, problematic and this description represents only a brief overview. Further work is necessary to develop and understand peace based on its rich history.

Reardon (2001), Galtung (1981) and Kende (1989) describe the development of peace as evolving from comprehensive, religious and secular worldviews that are concerned with justice. However, Galtung and Kende fail to offer a detailed analysis, limiting themselves to a cursory treatment of the concept of justice. Reardon’s (2001)
articulation of the history of peace focuses on the importance of values through the establishment of institutions, the development of laws to provide just outcomes to conflicts and disputes, and the inclusion of all people as subjects of justice. The proposals that emerged from civil society in late 20th and early 21st centuries were more attuned to peace through justice, which became possible with the establishment of equitable laws and a focus on the excluded.

It seems that the historical emergence and development of the concept of peace gained more traction with the increase of literacy, where more people became aware of what their leaders were doing. Simultaneously, history has seen the emergence of a global civil society, often including traditionally excluded groups and advocating on their behalf, a growing capability to deliver complete devastation through the development of new weapons, and the emergence of international law as a framework for peace and justice.

This study of Reardon’s approach and perspectives in peace education reveals much about the nature of justice, and how it relates to peace. Understanding Reardon’s concept of peace and determining the meaning of justice in peace education is an attempt to begin to fill the gap in understanding about the nature of justice in much of the peace-related literature.

Thus, my central research questions are: What is the nature of justice that constitutes peace? What is Reardon’s concept of justice that informs her concept of peace?

Philosophical Framework and Methodology
To interpret a theory of justice from Reardon’s philosophy of peace education, I propose a theoretical exegesis of Reardon’s implicit (not fully articulated) conception of justice. Such a project will be carried out through a close textual analysis of Reardon’s major (and less known justice-related) work. The exegetical process is defined by what Michael Walzer (1983, 1985, 1987) describes as “interpretation.” Interpretation, as opposed to discovery and invention, is hermeneutic (Snauwaert, 2011). Discovery, as found in natural rights and natural law, is grounded in a metaphysical approach and a result of revelation through a transcendental experience or divine inspiration (Walzer, 1985, pp. 2-8). In terms of discovery, Walzer (1985) writes:

Consider Professor Nagel’s discovery of an objective moral principle, the only one specified and defended in his lectures: that we should not be indifferent to the suffering of other people. I acknowledge the principle but miss the excitement of revelation. I knew that already. What is involved in discoveries of this sort is something like a dis-incorporation of moral principles, so that we can see them, not for the first time but freshly, stripped of encrusted interests and prejudices. (p.7)

Walzer critiques Nagel’s notion of objective discovery because it assumes the unveiling of a new concept or knowledge devoid of the human context.

In discovery, the revelation of moral laws guiding behavior, once accepted, is no longer representative of a new declaration. Discovery, in this sense, is subject to rediscovery, which Walzer (1987) argues lacks the same clarity of the initial discovery. Invention, on the other hand, is to “construct an entirely new moral world” (pp. 9-10).
Walzer describes this approach as based on a view of the inadequacy of a moral universe, the absence or death of God, and Descartes’ reflection on knowledge. Rawls and other social contract philosophers use invention. Invention is concerned with a development of perfect ideals that are often out of context with reality. It involves intuitions based on “pre-reflective and pre-philosophic knowledge” because it draws on familiar abstractions. Walzer asks why a society, which includes a conception of justice based on principles derived from a representative situation where beliefs are suspended, would have any desire to accept “what God and nature don’t provide, a universal corrective for all the different social moralities” (Walzer, 1985, p.13). To do so is to permanently put aside one’s own moral beliefs, publicly. If one filters out their worldview to make a plan for the good, as does the representatives of Rawls original position, they are in “epistemic denial” (Walzer, 1985, p. 16). Walzer (1987) argues that to do so would be to create a “God” of one’s own making. Even in this case, what of enforcement? Discovery does not posit enforcement, but leads to it. Invention similarly has representatives, in the Rawlsian case, and legislators, in the minimalist version. The legislators interpret laws and/or constitutions, while in discovery, an executive interprets divine texts (p.19). For Walzer (1987), all paths lead to some sort of interpretation. Walzer (1985) argues for interpretation, stating that:

The idealized morality is in origin a social morality; it is neither divine nor natural, except insofar as we believe that “the voice

---

12 The purpose of Descartes’ (1998, 1641) reflections in Meditations on First Philosophy was to ratify the existence of God and Science – inventing a new distinction between the mind and body.
13 Nussbaum (2006) and Sen (2009) critique Rawlsian social contract theory for invention of perfect institutions and the little attention given to human lives (see chapter two of this dissertation).
15 Rawls (2003) responds to this criticism in Justice as Fairness: a Restatement
of the people is the voice of God” or that human nature requires us to live in society — and neither of these views commits us to approve of everything the people say or of every social arrangement. The project of modeling or idealizing an existing morality does depend, however, upon some prior acknowledgment of the value of that morality. Perhaps its value is simply this: that there is no other starting point for moral speculation. We have to start from where we are. (p. 16)

Interpretation is rooted in human perceptions and thought. It asks what is present and considers it valuable to interpret the meaning of existing morality.

Critiques of interpretation are that it “binds us irrevocably to the status quo – since we can only interpret what already exists – and so undercuts the very possibility of social criticism” (Walzer, 1987, p. 3). Walzer (1987) counters in his description of interpretation of social values, culture and what is already present as “created by conversation, argument, and political negotiation in circumstances we might best call social, over long periods of time” (p.13). These negotiations, conversations and arguments are never settled. Walzer (1987) suggests that they might rest for a while. In this sense, interpretation is far from static. “Our categories, relationships, commitments, aspirations are all shaped by, expressed in terms of, the existing morality. Discovery and invention are efforts at escape in the hope of finding some external and universal standard with which to judge moral existence” (p. 21). This escape, for Walzer, is unnecessary because in the work of invention and discovery, the critique is already present. This approach is Aristotelian, in that ethics are immanent in human activity, developing as
humans develop and emerging from our lived experience. It also relies on “critical reflection,” or the critique of an (inside) outsider, on the most “confident intuitions” (Walzer, p. 17). Walzer (1983) utilizes an interpretive approach in his explication of justice. He argues that justice is understood by the complex plurality in which it emerges. In other words, justice cannot be understood outside or apart from a social context. Contextual understanding of peace is just as important as it is for justice. Since Reardon is more explicit about peace, the context of justice, in terms of this dissertation, is based on Reardon’s conception of peace and approach to peace education.

**Interpretation and Concepts of Peace and Justice**

Is interpretation, discovery or invention most appropriate in articulating a theory of justice based on Reardon’s approach to peace education? This project – understanding Reardon’s conception of peace to articulate her conception of justice – is necessarily interpretive. Interpretation can help to answer the definitional question, “How do we define peace?” The discovery approach to understanding peace might consist of a Platonic inquiry that would posit peace as a form or a metaphysical conception, as some peace scholars suggest (Page, 2008; Webel, 2007). Yet discovery would be problematic, because peace would only be visible to a few. In this sense, peace becomes elite and only the few enlightened can leave the cave, while the rest remain enslaved. It would be closer to the religious perfection that many, according to Reardon (2001), view as “other-worldly” and unattainable. In utopian perspectives of peace, the perfect society is invented. The concept of utopia is often critiqued for its idealism as not grounded in reality. Reardon (2009a) draws a distinction between envisioning pure utopianism and

---

16 See Plato’s cave allegory.
what she describes as pragmatic utopianism, which is based on educating learners to think about alternatives to the war system. This thinking is grounded in the reality of everyday activities, practices, thinking and behavior that move incrementally toward preferred possibilities. This approach is interpretive because it is organic, querying into social conditions to determine, actions, and approaches to the problematic of violence. Peace education and the application of justice must be based on an interpretive approach, since violence and war result from the social context and everyday conditions of unjust systems, processes and policies. The comprehensive views typical in discovery and invention approaches are inappropriate foundations for a political conception of justice or peace. If we are solely inventive in our quest for a philosophy of peace, we risk alienating or excluding the lives and experiences of individuals and groups. Invention and discovery can be problematic in a world of moral equality because there can be infinite discovery and invention, and any accepted discoveries and inventions lead to further questions about their meaning, which is interpretive.

One can find peace through their religion or personal worldview. One may even imagine or invent a conception of peace in the world. Unfortunately, such approaches remain too abstract and politically untenable, especially if we are concerned with everyday human needs. Human needs are not imagined, but are the reality of lives and must therefore be interpreted. Interpretation can draw on intuitive conceptions of peace based on various worldviews, insofar as they interpret what we know, from culture to culture, of what is needed for peace. This approach is narrower than a general philosophy of peace, since the goal of this work is to articulate a theory of justice based on Reardon’s conception and her writings on peace education. It may not be definitive
for all those interested in a philosophy of peace. It is not intended to be definitive. I argue that because an interpretive approach is rooted in human realities, it is more relevant to human security or the basis of actual security, well-being and peace. Peace, in this sense, is not a whimsical idea; it is practical, based on ideas that have been envisioned from the examples of history and those from the lived experience (Boulding, 1978; Reardon and Cabezudo, 2002, Reardon, 2009a).

Questions and Description of Chapters

Therefore, this dissertation will interpret Reardon’s concept of peace through its conceptual evolution. Part of this inquiry is the identification of aspects of her conception of peace that contribute to her theory of justice. The following research questions will guide the inquiry Reardon’s conception of peace and justice:

- What is the nature of justice that constitutes peace?
- What is Reardon’s conception of justice that shapes her definition of peace and, in turn, peace education?
- If justice constitutes peace (within Reardon’s conception of justice) then what is her conception of peace from the perspective of the capabilities approach to justice?

Sub-questions:

- What is Reardon’s conception of peace?
- From Reardon’s perspective, what role does justice play in peace?
- From Reardon’s perspective, what is the role of justice as a dimension of peace?
In what ways does Reardon’s conception of peace influence her pedagogy and practice of peace education?

The following parts of the dissertation will explore the previous research questions.

Chapter 2 describes the evolution of Reardon’s perspective of peace education. Since, for Reardon, there is no peace without education (for and about peace), the exploration of the development of Reardon’s understanding of peace education illustrates her conception of peace, and emerging thinking about the role of justice as a dimension of peace.

Chapter 3 explores three theories of justice: utilitarianism from the view of Mill (2002), Kymlicka (2003) and Singer (2004); Rawl’s (2003) version of contractarianism or social contract theory; and Nussbaum (2006, 2011) and Sen’s (2009) approaches, as the social context of theories of justice. Further, this chapter utilizes Snauwaert’s (2010) dimensions of justice to compare and isolate various aspects of these approaches to justice as a framework to later contextualize Reardon’s conception of justice in peace education.

Chapter 4 employs the dimensions of justice (Snauwaert, 2010), which serve as a philosophical framework to explore and articulate an explicit theory of justice in Reardon’s philosophy of peace education. By interpreting all of the ten dimensions of justice, this dissertation will fully explicate Reardon’s conception of justice. Each of the dimensions works to isolate a particular aspect of Reardon’s notions of justice through textual analysis, situating her perspective firmly within a capabilities framework, and providing clarity about the nature of justice as constitutional in and related to peace.
Chapter 5 concludes with Reardon’s conception of justice, in terms of implications in each dimension, to her practical, pedagogical and policy approaches of peace education, activism questions that emerge from this research.

**The Dimensions of Justice: A Framework of Inquiry**

Snauwaert (2010) identifies and employs dimensions of justice to organize the complex, interrelated and overlapping aspects of justice. The dimensions are useful in education about theories of justice. For instance, the dimensions offer the ability to easily compare and contrast various theories of justice, explaining similarities and differences. Chapter 3 will compare and contrast utility, contract and capabilities theories of justice and chapter four will describe Reardon’s conception of justice, within the context of Reardon’s perspective of peace education in Chapter 2 and the theories of justice in Chapter 3. The dimensions have a basic logical order, with one dimension flowing to the next. There may be other ways to organize theories of justice, but they have not been identified. According to Snauwart (2011), the dimensions are:

- **Foundation** – What qualifies one as a subject of justice? What is the source of moral consideration? What determines standing as a member of the moral community?

- **Orientation** – What should we be seeking in the pursuit of justice? What is of such value and importance that it ethically constitutes a great and urgent matter of justice? What should be the end, aim, or focus of justice?

- **Domain (space)** – What should be the content of justice? What goods should justice be concerned with? What is of such primary importance to a life worthy of human dignity that it becomes an urgent matter of justice? What defines what one must do
or can never do to another human being? Equality of what?

- **Structure** – How are the claims and duties of justice expressed?
- **Distribution** – What constitutes a fair/equitable distribution of social goods, rights and obligations?
- **Form** – Should justice be based upon a metaphysically grounded, comprehensive doctrine of the good life, or should it be constructed as a political conception compatible with a plurality of comprehensive doctrines?
- **Scope** – How far should justice reach? How inclusive should the moral community be?
- **Process** – On what grounds is the validity of a conception of justice based? What constitutes the process of political justification for a conception of justice?
- **Moral Resources** – What moral capacities are required to justly respond to others?
- **Social Conditions** – What material and social conditions are necessary for the achievement of justice (including the educational development of the supportive moral resources)? (Snauwaert, 2011)

This formulation of the dimensions of justice constitutes a framework for (1) inquiry into the nature of justice, (2) the comparative assessment of justice, and (3) the teaching of justice.

1) The **foundation** refers to the subject and moral source of justice. The determination of moral standing is the essence of the foundation of justice. Once the foundation is determined, it is possible understand how that foundation is grounded.

2) The **form** describes the moral grounding of justice. The question of whether justice is defined and rooted in transcendental theories or political perspectives constitutes the form
of justice. The form is part of the basic foundation of any theory of justice. In part, the form determines other dimensions. The form, whether justice is political or comprehensive, informs the orientation, which is concerned with the focus of justice as institutional or aimed at individual lives. The nature of the construction of justice informs its focus. 3) The orientation describes whether “just institutions or the comparative realization of good lives” should be sought (Snauwaert, 2011, p.317). The orientation describes the focus or aim of justice. The orientation explains how justice is pursued, which also informs the domain or content of justice. 4) The domain or space is concerned with the content, i.e. goods, of justice. Pertinent to the domain of justice is the question of why human life and its inherent dignity is a chief focus of justice. The possession of dignity necessitates certain behavior by all individuals toward all others and their environment. Related to this line of inquiry is “equality of what:” rights, welfares, primary goods, or capabilities? 5) The structure of justice explains the manner in which the demands of justice are to be articulated and expressed. Claims and duties of this dimension influence distribution, as the preceding step. For instance, claims are expressed, and, based on that expression, are distributed according the structure of the claim. 6) The distribution, referring to impartial allocation of goods, welfares and resources, tends to be one of the most commonly referenced dimensions of justice. Often distribution is the extent to which many understand justice. The scope is related, since once the distribution is known (i.e. is it fair and equitable?), the question of whom goods are distributed to can be answered. 7) The extent, composition and determination of who should be the moral beneficiaries, i.e., local, national, or global majority, religion, etc., comprise the scope of justice. The question of whom justice is extended to and whom
goods are allocated to informs the validity process dimension. 8) In exploring the roots and whether a conception is valid, the process of justice is articulated. Is it transparent, democratic or reasonable? The process informs moral resources. In a democratic process, capacities that allow persons to participate and articulate their perspectives are required. 9) Moral resources are a developmental and relational aspect of justice. They elucidate what moral powers are needed in human relations. The moral resources that are available to individuals are based on the social context of that society. Therefore, education, political structures and history inform the social conditions as well as what moral resources are needed. 10) The social conditions of justice amount to the physical context required to move toward a just society (Snauwaert, 2011, p. 318).

These dimensions of justice are the starting point for the inquiry into theories of justice and have a significant bearing on my interpretation of Reardon’s conception of justice. Although presented in a linear fashion, these dimensions are organic and might be ordered differently based on the particular perspective or approach. There might also be more dimensions. In general, the dimensions will be organized in chapter four as follows:

1. What are the defining questions of the dimension?
2. What are the prominent approaches to justice?
3. What is Reardon’s proposition or position, in summary?
4. What is the textual evidence for Reardon’s position?
5. What is the interpretation of the textual evidence as indicative of Reardon’s position?

As a result of the interpretive and dimensional approach of this study, further sub-
questions are posed, which correspond with the preceding dimensions, as they are included in Reardon’s conception of peace:

- What is the source or what determines moral standing?
- Is Reardon’s conception of justice (and peace) comprehensive or political?
- What is the aim or focus of justice?
- What is the space or content of justice?
- How should the demands of justice be articulated?
- How are goods allocated?
- What is the extent of justice?
- How should the principles of justice be validated?
- What moral powers are needed to relate to others?
- What are the material conditions?

This study will explore all of the dimensions of justice as identified by Snauwaert (2011) in Reardon’s conception of peace.

Hypothesis

Justice, from Reardon’s perspective, is constitutive of peace. Peace is freedom from violence. Direct and indirect violence are unjust, thus urgent matters of peace and justice. I argue that Reardon’s philosophy of peace education contains a conception of justice that is capabilities based, and thus concerned with human and ecological dignity, well-being, and freedom from all forms of injustice and violence. The capabilities approach maintains that the ability to choose to function in various core areas of human
life and to do and to be as one chooses, in accordance with the dignity of human, non-human animals and their environment is the aim of justice (Nussbaum, 2001, 2005, 2011). In general, I argue that Reardon’s philosophy of peace education has implicit within it a conception of justice that is capabilities based, and, among other commonalities, is consistent with the capabilities to which all humans are entitled. The capabilities approach informs peace education about the kind of justice that comprises and is associated with peace. Reardon’s perspective of peace education offers to capabilities what I argue is essential and missing from its perspectives: an explicit understanding of peace, and a lens that takes violence as a core problem into account.

**Conclusion**

Inquiry into the Reardon’s conception of peace education can provide deeper understanding about the relationship between peace and justice, and what justice means to peace educators and those in peace related fields. The aim is not to resolve the definitional problem, but offer an interpretation of one significant approach to peace. Reardon’s approach to peace education continues to impact to the work of many in the field including my own research and approach to analyzing global issues and the determination of my global responsibility. Couching Reardon’s approach in the capabilities approach offers a context of theories of justice that has implications on peace and peace theory itself, activism, and pedagogies and educational practices. In this dissertation, I hope that such analysis and interpretation will bring clarity about the nature of peace, the kinds of justice, and how, at a conceptual (and practical) level, the two inform each other.
Chapter Two

The Evolution of Reardon’s Conception of Peace Education

The evolution of Reardon’s conception of peace education offers insight into the development of Reardon’s conception of peace. This section describes the historical and contextual development of the emergence of concepts related to and constituting her conception of peace education and the conceptual emergence of justice as integral to peace. It is important to note how education for and about peace is inseparable from Reardon’s conception of peace. Similarly, justice is central in Reardon's conception of peace. Reardon (2009a) describes the relationship between peace and peace education in the Global Campaign for Peace Education statement, “No peace without peace education” (p. 1). There is some agreement with this perspective (Brenes, 2003; Freire, 2006; Larson and Coppock, 2000; Reardon and Cabezudo, 2002). This framework is composed of Reardon’s subjective recollection of the evolution of her own learning, laid out in an informal talk to a non-academic audience at the Foreign Policy Discussion Group at Morningside Gardens in New York City. In recent talks, Reardon (2009b, 2011) described her evolving understanding of peace education in terms of six periods that shaped her learning experiences and the socio-political climate. This framework begins to address the questions posed in the previous section about Reardon’s philosophy of peace education, as well as its relationship with justice and its pedagogical approaches and implications. Because Reardon’s conception of justice is implicit, it is expressed in her conception of peace. The evolution of her conception of peace is important in the articulation of her view of justice. The content of each phase is
constituted by the documents and publications from each phase as well as her major works, which refer to specific reflections about concepts and learning from those phases. Each period is characterized as organic and “lived,” with each flowing to the next. In this sense, peace, like history, for Reardon, is organic. Reardon’s evolution of peace consists of the following phases:

- 1955-1963: International understanding
- 1963-1976: War prevention
- 1976-1983: Global justice
- 1995-2003: A culture of peace
- 2003-present: The gender imperative

Each range of these dates is a period in the development of Reardon’s philosophy and methods for peace. The inquiries of the questions in the philosophical framework are, to some extent, clarified in this section.

**International Understanding**

This first period, encompassing the years 1954 to 1963, included Reardon’s experience teaching social studies at the secondary level. Since, in this phase, Reardon has no published work, this section relies primarily on her reflections from more recent lectures and those from *Comprehensive Peace Education* (1988) and *Peace Education: Review and Projection* (2000). Reardon (2011) describes the political context, which influenced her and others’ thinking, as “international.” According to Reardon (2011), at the Foreign Policy Discussion Group at Morningside Gardens in New York City, “Joseph McCarthy, the Hungarian revolution, Sputnik, [and] the Cold war … were among the
events and conditions that produced the political climate at that time, which were on our minds as we went into our classrooms each day”¹⁷. During this period, there were a number of international students studying in the US, with whom Reardon, her colleagues and students interacted. Reardon (2012) describes her conception of peace as international cooperation, mediated by the United Nations. During this phase, peace was perceived as international cooperation. Around this time, Reardon also began developing her concept of globalism as related to peace. Globalism is a state of where policies and practices are “fully inclusive of the earth’s human diversity” (Reardon, 1991, p. 28). Underlying this concept is the equality or equal value of all people. Justice is rooted in the equal moral worth of all humans. In this stage, the emergence of the concept of globalism suggests her attention to the central role of justice within peace.

This early period was also characterized by the peace learning in her teaching experience. The privileged background of her students affected their outlook and how Reardon approached them. She worked to include alternate perspectives in her pedagogy and curriculum. By engaging students in the larger world outside of their insular communities, Reardon worked to open their minds to global thinking and authentic exchanges with different people. Such engagement depended upon comfortable learning environments for Reardon’s students, so they would be open to sustained interactions and she worked to develop individual learning plans to draw out students’ potential. Reardon saw the links among a comfortable learning environment, personal relationships, and deeper learning. The interrelationships of the aforementioned aspects articulate a peaceful process, which is central in peacemaking and peace education:

¹⁷ This quote is from a talk at Morningside Gardens in New York, from January, 2011; the speech is in Reardon's Collected Papers at the University of Toledo Libraries.
Once you get to know the learner, you can work in a way to withdraw their learning capacity. I also began to understand that that … has something to do with peace. That element of engagement and trying to understand how the other person is thinking and what their motivations are and not necessarily assume, no matter how abhorrent some of the things that come out of their mouths, that its [sic] all bad. The political opinions they were bringing from home were not exactly the ones I wanted to hear. (Reardon, NYC Lecture, 2011)

In this sense, learning was empowerment for students. Reardon formulated her teaching around engagement, paying serious attention to students’ interests, perspectives and experiences. Reardon’s pedagogy embodied development of student-centered classroom practices arranged around international and global engagement and exchanges. The student-centered focus and interest in other people from around the world reflect globalism and a concern for justice. Reardon’s approach to students treated them as ends in themselves. The international curricular content reflected an interest in students learning about the realities of the world so that they would have the tools to encounter others, recognizing the full humanity of other learners.

Reardon saw peace within the context of international institutions developed for the express purpose of abolishing war. These institutions offered models for students to learn about the processes of peacemaking. Reardon (2000) points out that international education is historically significant in her understanding of the development of peace education and for the achievement of peace. According to Reardon (2000) in Peace
"Education: Review and Projection:"

The major educational goal of global or international education is imparting knowledge and skills about the international system and global issues. The apparent assumption underlying this goal is that a well-informed public is essential to citizens’ calling for and supporting policies, which are more likely to lead to peace. Some thought of this approach as education for world citizenship. They saw that citizenship as participation in or expressing opinions on the international policy making of the citizens’ respective national governments, supporting the United Nations and exercising overall responsible national citizenship within a framework of global responsibility. Much of this education was thus devoted to cultivating understanding of foreign policy and developing a global perspective, but not all of it cultivated the critical stance traditional peace educators assumed to be necessary to the purposes of achieving peace. (p. 6)

International education embodies the transmission of capacities to encounter others for the purpose of global cooperation. This learning posits the understanding that if students and citizens are aware of various policies related to global conflict, they can develop the skills needed to make peace. The United Nations system, in this sense, provides the space and mechanisms to facilitate this collaboration to democratically decide on policies with a peaceful outcome. The role of the UN as a space for learning
collaboration and interactions with others was essential to the development of global
citizenship, where individuals saw their role to engage with their own governments to
prevent war and encourage global peace. International education, in this light, is
important for understanding various cultural perspectives. Inherent in international
education and understanding is a plural and multicultural global polity. According to
Reardon (1988):

*Education for international understanding* was probably the
earliest form of education for positive peace. … Some of the
early efforts in education for international understanding may
have lacked real substance. A few probably even contributed to
reinforcing old stereotypes or creating new ones, such as the
problematic and negative view of the developing world.
However, the basic purpose was to learn to understand others,
in order to bring about a new and more positive system of
international relations, with increased cooperation and reduced
international conflict. The fundamental assumption was that
although nations and groups differed widely, all people were
equally human, and that if we got to know others, we would
recognize this fact and act accordingly. What was missing was
the substance of “acting accordingly,” as well as study of the
systems and process that would make such action possible.
Education for international understanding and its companion,
*international education*, instruction about other nations that
was designed to provide knowledge suitable for the newly acquired international responsibilities of the United States, was the most popular approach in the 1940s and 1950s. (p. 28)

Education for international understanding complemented international education as a part of the goal of orienting students to different perspectives. This approach to education was viewed as a requirement of and essential step toward positive peace. Often, our initial interactions with other cultures lack sophistication, but they can lead, with further learning, to more substantive understandings and relationships. Reardon (1988, 2000) describes how international education provided a cultural or multicultural context for understanding global problems. Specifically, the study of other countries and their cultures would help to remove insular perspectives many in the US held of various cultures. Instead of stereotypes of different cultures, citizens engaged and were presented with knowledge and would come to better understand them. Multicultural education grew out of international education (Reardon, 1988, 2000). Peace, then, was the result of structuring empowering, comfortable learning communities that utilized global institutions as facilitators and supported international engagement with other cultures, which would in turn lead to a deeper understanding and greater participation in development of national and foreign policy that would support an end to war. In this stage, Reardon understood peace to be a result of a development of global responsibility among citizens resulting from multicultural learning and international understanding. Reardon also saw the inseparability of peace with the process, content, and space involved in learning, connecting the classroom to the international stage. International and global forms of education posited a kind of pedagogy of respect for human dignity in
students and people who were the subject of the learning. Valuing students and people from diverse backgrounds is a matter of justice.

**War Prevention Years**

The war prevention years (1963-1976) included historical events such as the Cuban Missile Crisis and JFK’s assassination, and began with Reardon’s departure from teaching to direct the Schools program for the Institute for World Order (Reardon, 2011). During this period, Reardon’s understanding of peace education, as influenced by international education and understanding was enriched by the approach of world order studies, which also was concerned with education and global understanding. The world order approach not only analyzed the international system, but also offered values in order to judge policy and action in the international arena. Reardon’s perspective of peace education came to acknowledge and draw on JFK’s definition of peace, which, in part, inspired and became integrated with disarmament as an essential component of education for war prevention and peace.

Reardon (1967) describes the world law model, within the world order perspective, as a vehicle toward global peace that went beyond the approach of international education and understanding since, “truly understand[ing] another culture may emphasize conflicting values and interests rather than resolve them. … International education must come to deal with the many complex aspects of conflict and its resolution” (p. 455). Reardon and others recognized that much of global war and violence emanated from socio-cultural and economic competitive conflict that escalated to violence. From this perspective, world law emphasized the importance of law “as a
rational method for achieving order and even justice” (p. 457). Within this perspective, the reduction of harm could be achieved by adherence to laws based on values. The World Order Project identified values such as diminishing war, economic welfare, social justice, democratic participation of minorities and ecological balance. If the world order values, which were also goals adhered to, there might be more peaceful and just resolution of conflicts, as well as increased justice and peace. An understanding of importance of international moral norms emerged, which illustrated the need for the rule of law, as well as being a condition of a just global society. World law, in this sense, was equally concerned with justice. World law, as a model of approaches to world order, was focused on institutional authority that encompassed a collective approach to security and disarmament (Reardon, 1968, p. 168). Reardon’s work in this area produced academic programs, training and curricular development for teachers and their students at multiple levels. Education about matters of war and peace posited a belief in global democratic citizenship through learning and “extensive and responsible study” by policy makers and students at all levels (Griffith and Reardon, 1968). Posited in the world order approach was the belief that deep understanding of international institutions and laws should be the focus of educational initiatives, which would impact and educate the broader citizenship so that they could be aware and become active in efforts to achieve peace and justice.

In “Let us examine our attitude toward peace,” Reardon and Priscilla Griffith (1968) compile a number of speeches and statements by global leaders, using a world order lens, to delve into the political and psychological nature of international conflict for the purpose of learning how peace could be achieved. One in particular, John F. Kennedy’s speech at American University, deeply influenced Reardon’s definition of
peace. In the speech, Kennedy defined peace as a process. According to Kennedy (1963):

Let us focus instead on a more practical, more attainable peace, based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions – on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements, which are in the interest of all concerned. There is no single, simple key to this peace; no grand or magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each new generation. For peace is a process – a way of solving problems. (American University Commencement Address)

Kennedy’s pragmatic and historical approach hinges upon the diplomacy and other work of many people within various nations who were engaged in gradual but concrete actions that evolve into peace over time. It should be noted that this speech also included an implicit call for disarmament. Kennedy (1963) questioned the purpose of military expenditures toward the stockpiling of weapons that “can only destroy and never create” (Griffith and Reardon, 1968, p.7). Peace was conceived as an inclusive, dynamic, but gradual process that always changes as it responds to each generation’s issues. Reardon (2011) describes the importance of JFK’s speech:

In that speech [was] a definition of peace I still find … the most cogent because its [sic] not closed, in that sense a closing, but
an opening definition. JFK said peace is a process, a way of solving problems. (Morningside Gardens Talk, NYC)

This conception of peace is open and based on solving the problems of war and violence. As a dynamic process, peace includes authentic dialogue and listening to others. Prior to and during the negotiation, one must remain open to learning and the possibility of a different outcome. Such openness may lead to better than expected possibilities. In this sense, war is an institution that involves patriarchal domination. The war process is characterized by dualistic and linear thinking. The hierarchical nature of patriarchy excludes diverse voices (Reardon, 1985). It does not listen to others, as patriarchy is directive and hierarchical. Reardon’s teaching and embracement of JFK’s definition of peace came to comprise a view that involved the development of learning communities in a process of open and authentic dialogue and negotiation. Dialogue or negotiation involves listening to learn what motivates and is needed by the “other.”

Attending to the concerns of others is a matter of justice. Authentic learning is, in this sense, a negotiation between teacher and learner. Peace and authentic learning are both open and dialogic processes. Peace requires learning from the other. The process of education, in this context, consists of the developing personal relationships between teacher and learner, if the learner’s capacity is to emerge. It is evident that Reardon's thinking about peace became more dynamic and open, including a notion of justice related to interpersonal relations.

Reardon moves beyond JFK’s definition of peace toward a conception of peace education that moves from negotiation and dialogue between nations to individuals. Peace education, in this sense, is composed of individuals learning and listening to each
other, engaging and understanding their conflicts and concerns. Peace, in this view, situates persons and their needs as the primary concern. Inherent in this approach is an orientation toward the needs of human dignity. An attempt to impose a plan for peace is unjust and not peaceful unless a democratic and participatory process is utilized.

Reardon’s approach for peace relies on person-centered dialogue and attention to human dignity and needs. Because of this attention, Reardon’s conception of peace involves justice. Here, we see the beginnings of Reardon’s conception of peace in her view of peace and education as open, dialogic, overlapping and inseparable processes. The actual process of peace education, which includes participatory learning, reflection and dialogue, is premised on justice, in that teachers and learners are moral equals. Their dignity is attended to because they are equal partners in learning and discussion. Also, the content of learning is focused on matters of justice, such as war and peace. This perspective of peace, as part of the educational tools, emphasized the imperative to learn about the obstacles to peace for human survival. General and complete disarmament was among the cadre of issues with which the world order approach and JFK’s conception of peace through negotiation was concerned.

Disarmament education was concerned with systems change through arms reduction and GCD, while envisioning and working toward a weapons free world. Disarmament, in addition to collective security, was the basis of the world law alternative to the approaches offered in international education and other international theories concerned with preventing war (Reardon and Mendlovitz, 1968, p. 167). According to Reardon (2011), she and colleagues:

…were formulating materials and thinking about how
disarmament offered one particularly significant approach to peace and what became evident was that disarmament is not possible in the present system; that’s why do negotiations for disarmament always fail? [sic] Because we don’t have the alternative structures in place. ... We had at that time the international court but their [sic] weren’t political structures for resolving conflict. They didn’t have compulsory jurisdiction. What I was beginning to understand was the fundamental premise of the group that I was working with was [that] we had to have a system change. (Morningside Gardens Talk, NYC)

Disarmament, as a goal, was important but improbable because of the lack of institutional structures and processes to effect systemic change. Study of the current system was important, but it also required thinking about alternates and transformation of systems and individuals through education. Reardon saw this transformation as possible through education about the system in place. Transformation also involves envisioning futures different from those in our competitive order. Reardon (1969) describes the need to shift from the competition underlying the arms race toward global cooperation (p. 33). Utilizing various methods toward the end of envisioning an alternate future and educating about the need for disarmament, Reardon describes how games can be used as a “tool for social learning and reconstruction” through “disciplined imagination applied through roles [assumed] in play and games" (Thorpe and Reardon, 1971, p. 57). The testing of alternatives for the proper selection of a preferred model and the use of games for testing purposes were considered the most productive instructional devices for the study of world
order (Thorpe and Reardon, 1971). Reardon and colleagues focused on futures education as an instructional method for educating students about global problems through participation in games and simulations toward a more preferable resolution of conflict. In this sense, disarmament was more possible if there was education about current structures and visions of alternate systems using value-oriented decision-making.

Education for disarmament enquires into militarism, war systems, and the structures and processes that perpetuate social violence and harm, disrupting and preventing human well-being and a decent quality of life. The importance of disarmament results from the devastating capacity of weapons and their use in war and other forms of armed conflict. With the vast amount of resources being used toward preparation and execution of wars instead of social and economic well-being, individual lives are insecure. Even with this high level of insecurity from lack of social spending, intervening in systems that created this fear and harm proved difficult. Because of the secretive nature of policymaking, national security agencies, Cold War political posturing, the relinquishing of armaments, weapons development, and related expenditures information, criticism and education about these systems was unwelcome (Reardon, 2000). Inquiry into disarmament included studying the nuclear issue, the conventional military arms race and expenditures, which Reardon and others argued, on moral and ethical grounds, could be used for the fulfillment of vast human needs and welfare\(^\text{18}\). Reardon and Mendlovitz (1968) write that the world law model is concerned with the “achievement of economic welfare and social justice – a world development authority based on the desirability of a more equitable system of distribution of the

\(^{18}\text{See Reardon’s (1991) Women and Peace discussion of Ruth Sivard’s annual analysis of global military spending, pp. 95-97.}\)
earth’s material goods” (p. 169). This approach embodies a conception of peace concerned with justice through a more ethical distribution of good. They also connect military spending with poverty and injustice, since economic and material resources are used for “the destruction of other human beings, their institutions and property” (p. 169). Resources directed toward war and its preparation were an important focus of education for disarmament and alternative futures because it directs the learner’s attention to possibilities for increasing human well-being. The roots of Reardon’s work in disarmament education is deeply rooted in the understanding and learning from the realizations of futures education, which describes the just distribution of resources that would actually increase human well-being. As opposed to the injustice people endure because of war, Reardon's understanding of alternative futures offered hope for a just and peaceful world.

During this phase, Reardon became active with the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), which dealt primarily with issues concerning war prevention, arms races and international relations. Within IPRA, Reardon and other peace educators founded the Peace Education Commission (PEC) in 1972. Reardon (2011) describes the attitude of researchers in IPRA toward peace educators:

Many of them thought many thought [sic] our (peace educators) job was to miniaturize their work for the schools … but they finally came to realize that education itself was an area of research and creativity. … We used their research. Yes it was useful, but it took … a lot more work to get it in forms that could be used not only in classrooms, but by ordinary people in
church basements etc. … One of the really important contributions that we as educators made to the field of peace research … was the whole idea of teaching about alternative systems. (Reardon, Morningside Gardens Talk, NYC, 2011)

The work in *Perspectives in World Order* (1971, 1973b) contributed to learning for alternate possibilities, offering scenarios detailing international crises and conflicts. This series of perspectives details creative ways to engage in inquiry using a world order value analysis, with historical information as background, so that learners can think about and imagine possibilities utilizing non-violent methods (Reardon, et al., 1971; Fraenkel, Carter, Reardon; 1973b).

The contribution to peace from IPRA/PEC was part of the development and dissemination of materials for classroom and everyday use. The values orientation of the Institute for World Order and peace knowledge from IPRA both contribute to Reardon’s understanding of and teaching toward possibilities of alternative security systems.

Alternate systems thinking comprises futurism, which Reardon and others integrated into social education curriculum through simulations and envisioning. This went beyond a utopian vision of a world without war and provided a space to engage students’ imaginative capacities in thinking through alternative resolutions and developing decision-making skills through multi-disciplinary models (Reardon, 1971; Thorpe and Reardon, 1971; Thorpe and Reardon, 1972). Reardon (1973b) writes that world order studies uses the concept of utopia as a heuristic tool for consideration of the present situations based on the discovered possibilities. Preferred futures are grounded in normative analysis conceived in world order studies (pp. 145-146). In addition to the
skill development for peace in the simulations and futures discourse, Reardon’s early “feminist” thinking is framed in terms of possibilities for human equality and flourishing (Reardon, 1975). This encompasses a view emphasizing the importance of the need for equality in relationships between women and men to reduce systemic violence suffered by the oppressed. These feminist analyses highlighted the importance of perceiving connections between violence and male-female relations. This understanding is the beginning of global transformation.

In her article *Women’s Movement and Human Futures*, Reardon (1975) describes the use of Freirian methods that serve as a pedagogical approach encouraging development through helping individuals uncover social structures and become literate to become informed about problems and possibilities for change (Reardon, 1973b, 1975). Despite the feminist critiques of Freire (Weiler, 1991), Reardon suggests that, at some basic level, the Freirian pedagogical approach, combined with the feminist conception of peace, offers the perspective of the excluded women and men in the global south. The importance of the role of gender in issues of justice, as a result of the exclusion and privation of women, became evident in the critical consciousness-raising of the Freirian approach.

This second phase marked the development of Reardon’s understanding of how peace is achieved in terms of being intricately connected and composed of the dimensions of disarmament (and education for it), values formation and education, and alternative systems through futures education. These aspects of peace, and education for it, evolved through Reardon’s work with the IWO, and organic collaborations between IPRA and networks of educators doing peace education. Reardon began to formulate her
views on ecological issues, which are seen in the IWO values. This is also present in later feminist thinking, in terms of Reardon’s view of women’s futures. Toward the end of this period and at the beginning of the next phase, Freirian liberatory education became an essential part of peace education. This critical addition to peace education came to offer a new view of development, by removal of gender injustice through women’s education, participation and development (Reardon, 1974). The inclusion of women’s voices and participation is necessary for equality and dignity, and thus is an urgent matter for justice. This addition and view was possible because of the impact women’s education had on the development of entire communities. During this phase, the focus on world order values, particularly the value of economic and social justice, emerged as connected to peace. Since world order values offer an alternative to the violence and injustice of the war system, I argue that Reardon saw justice as a necessarily nonviolent component of peace.

**Global Justice**

Phase three, the years 1976-1982, consist of what Reardon (2011) describes as the “global justice period,” focusing on structural violence as the underlying cause of injustice and the political development of peace education for human action toward the alleviation of all forms of violence. Reardon and others concerned with peace began to move beyond negative aspects of peace to recognize injustices within global social and economic structures:

Positive peace is changing the structures that they saw as the cause of structural violence. … Certain structures have built
into them, such disadvantages that people are harmed. So that also becomes part of the problematic. How do we change these kinds of structures and what do we have to learn to do it? But mainly we understood that it was a question of changing perceptions of how people look at other cultures because underlying those structures was the notion that the domination of the west buttressed by the notion of superior western culture and politics, so we had to have people begin to reflect on the actual justice of it. (Reardon, 2011, Morningside Gardens Foreign Policy Discussion Group Talk)

Positive peace, during this period, came to be associated with concerns of injustices perpetuated by (global) institutions. Perceptions the injustices borne by the Global South (and minorities in the west) were understood as the root of the problematic. These same perceptions, based on worldviews from the West, influenced humanitarian and development aid to the global south. Reardon (1991) describes how exploitative and ecologically damaging resource extraction and Western farming methods that diminished traditional approaches to sustainability continued even after colonial powers officially withdrew. This exploitive relationship between the global south and Western nations was manifested further in the trade practices benefiting the elite of those countries and the West. Understanding how the removal of economic and social injustices was integral to the positive dimension of peace (and justice) represents a fundamental shift in the thinking of those in peace-related fields.

During this period, peace educators and researchers began to examine how the
Western perceptions were forms of structural violence present in some peace knowledge and educational practice (Reardon, 2011). Peace educators, researchers and world order scholars perpetuated some injustices and violence, in the form of exclusionary and prejudiced practices. Reardon (1976) points out how those in world law often failed to address structural violence because of their focus on war prevention and peacekeeping (pp. 104-105). The focus on what peace researchers described as negative peace was important, but many causes of war and armed conflict are rooted in structural violence, such as racism, sexism and other forms of exclusion and discrimination. The world order model values and peace research provided perspectives important to peace education, but excluded women’s voices, values and experiences. Reardon (1985) describes how women’s perspectives have a normative orientation because they give voice to a silent half of the human population and offer ways of relating to others that focus on cooperation and community, rather than competition and autonomy from the community. Carol Gilligan’s (1982) work on women’s voices supports the claim of feminine ways of relating to others. Reardon’s consideration of this perspective was a departure from what many peace researchers claimed was valid. Peace research excluded “women's issues” and failed to “include sexism as a problem for research and analysis” (Reardon, 1985, p. 72). As a result, PEC began to work on these concerns by reflecting on their own conditioning by the (patriarchal) systems that dominated the global south and caused inequality externally and among Reardon and her colleagues. For years, many in IPRA were reluctant to accept sexism as a relevant issue for the obstacles to peace. Through the use of a feminist analysis, these revelations brought up and highlighted the exclusion of disenfranchised voices, which were embedded in the political and normative social
Reardon (2011) suggests that consciousness-raising, during this period, provided a way to teach values without imposing them. Part of the reconsideration of institutional domination required new ways to work and relate to those from the global south and as well as among peace researchers and educators in the West. Reardon describes her and colleagues’ concern with the imposition of values and power differentials among those with whom they were working in solidarity. Freirian critical consciousness and dialogic pedagogical approaches provided a way to become aware and avoid imposition while engaging with the values and experiences of others. Reardon (1974, 2011) saw this as a methodology that reflected and embodied a kind of cultural competence and provided a voice for those who had been traditionally excluded. Reardon (2009a) described the 1980’s as a period where the feminist pedagogy and analysis began to take hold in peace education. The feminist perspective answered the question, “How does it (the world/global problems/solutions) look from the perspective of the excluded?” (Author’s notes, Reardon Lecture, Toledo, OH, 2009). Reardon (1979) connects disarmament issues with structural violence when she illustrates the concerns of children and their caregivers in her essay describing the possible effects on the unborn from radiation emitted in the wake of the Three Mile Island nuclear power plant incident. The use of such dangerous nuclear technology is justified in terms of economic benefit, but it can also be directed toward weapons production. The same technology can and has been inadvertently turned against those whose human well-being, was meant to be increased
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19 My personal notes on Betty Reardon Lecture at University of Toledo Libraries, Canady Center for Special Collections, Reardon Archive Opening, November 2009.
by it. Reardon (1979) describes how economic resources are squandered on “nuclear systems of power and weaponry while hopeful young boys and girls struggle for self-worth in inadequate schools” (p. 2). Reardon (1979) notes the need for world order studies to focus on protection of children, since they are most vulnerable in cases of intentional avoidable harm. Reardon (1979) points out that women and children suffer most in violent conflict, and from the structural violence of poverty, environmental degradation, lack of participation and economic injustice (pp. 3-6). The feminist perspective is embodied in this view and became an important way to analyze the war system and understand structural violence and injustice. War prevention was the foundation because, once the direct violence ended, it became possible to focus on structural violence and “positive-organic peace – the growing and the dynamic peace” (Reardon, 2011). In this sense, the possibility for the creation of a society with basic human dignity emerges once the various forms of structural violence are addressed (Reardon, 2011). Out of their efforts toward war prevention, Reardon and others saw how the same violence was manifested against the citizens, through exposure to nuclear energy failures and other injustices. Similar to militarized security and the war system, nuclear energy is described as a means governments utilize to provide for human well-being, but does not actually do so. They only make populations more vulnerable.

War prevention in this phase evolved toward political participation through the re-evaluation of learning that went beyond the focus on understanding, toward critical capacities of analyzing structures to learn what actions might be taken to make changes. Reardon (1978) describes the reluctance of curriculum developers to include issues of
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20Recent news describes the nuclear catastrophes in Japan; as a result, many nations are re-evaluating the safety and potential risk of their own nuclear programs, as well as their inability to safely store nuclear waste. NYTimes, June 20, 2011
disarmament in education because of the political climate. Such a climate was fostered by structures preferring that citizenship education be oriented toward nationalism, without critical analysis or agency to act. Reardon (1978) writes:

> The failure to provide full analytic education for all students is a political failure of democracy, because it effectively denies those who miss it full rights of participation in policy-making. Further, it debases both the pragmatic and the ethical quality of politic by limiting not only the numbers but also the capacities of those who do not participate. (pp. 400-401)

In this passage, Reardon suggests that structural violence was inherent in domestic policy that refuses the acknowledgement and development of capacities for citizens to become aware and act in ways that are consistent with their freedoms. These rights to education, transparency of information, and participation are those that should be guaranteed in a democracy. Reardon (1979) argues that the political obstacles to disarmament education are also manifest in the international system because of the ideological views of sovereignty that actually protects economic interests and power, and prevents citizens from interfering and participating in public discourse that might halt the development of weapons. Reardon (1979) identifies the influence of militarism in public policy that permeates the perceptions of complexity of issues that ordinary citizens cannot comprehend and the fear of “economic consequences of disarmament” (p. 356). As a result, Reardon (1978, 1979, 1980) advocated the inclusion of disarmament education in curricula at all developmental levels, so that students would have the capacities to evaluate structural conditions, policy and creatively think about and imagine
alternatives. These capacities would enable students to understand the reality without feeling hopeless. Attention to the obstacles and possibilities for disarmament education posited the value of human dignity for global citizens, in that critical education about these issues were matters of individuals rights to participation and knowledge for agency in life choices. Such acknowledgement is a matter of justice, since it requires authentic education and access to information and the capacity for expression that impacts human freedom to determine the choices people make (Sen, 2009).

The global justice years revealed the nature of the basic relationship between peace and justice in Reardon’s philosophy. This section provides a space to begin responding to earlier questions about Reardon’s conception of peace as it is related to justice, those questions are raised again here. Why do Reardon and others use the term *global justice* and not *justice*? From Reardon’s perspective, what role does justice play in peace? In Reardon’s philosophy of peace, what is the place of justice in the definition of peace? From Reardon’s perspective, what is the role of justice as a dimension of peace? The term global justice is used in the context of and closely related to positive peace (Berlowitz, 2009; Debie, 2007; Reardon, 1988). In *Peace Education: Review and Projection*, Reardon (2000), writes:

Pope Paul [IV]’s axiom, “If you want peace, work for justice” was translated into the terrain of peace education under the assertion that teaching about or for peace, necessitates teaching about and for economic and social justice. Here was another instance in which human rights, economic and social structures were linked inextricably to essential peace education, as the
structural, institutional and values dimensions of peace education were clarified and systematized in the world order approach which like the ethical issues of low intensity conflict and neocolonialism became a distinct approach to essential peace education (p.12).

*Global justice* is distinguished from *justice* as education, economic fulfillment and removal (or the process of removal and reduction) of all injustice and forms of harm throughout the world. It is a global value, indicating the extension of justice to all peoples. So “global” refers to the *scope* (dimension) of justice. Global justice and the imperative of “working for justice” situate justice as constitutive of peace. Justice, inter alia, is a dimension of peace. In Reardon’s conception of peace, justice more fully articulates the dynamic nature of peace as an active process moving toward the fulfillment of human flourishing. Reardon (1976) suggests that her view of the relationship between peace and justice is similar to that of others who argue, “peace is a high level of justice and a low level of violence” (p. 30). In this sense, measuring levels of violence expresses whether a society is just. This also reaffirms the view that justice is nonviolent. The term global justice suggests a cosmopolitan positionality of peace and what is required by it. Global justice (and peace) demands moral equality to end inequity resulting from patriarchal-neocolonial structures. These demands of justice, which are necessary for peace, require attention to human dignity. Global justice adds planetary-normative claims for rights and goods as a necessary condition for peace. In this global sense, justice is a moral dimension of peace that addresses claims and duties related to flourishing. It extends to all of the planet’s inhabitants. Critical reflection on structures
through a feminist lens, along with dialogic and liberatory pedagogies to teach and learn, suggest the importance of justice in peace-related work. The presence of justice can be seen in the attention to injustice, the reflection of relations between scholars of the global south and the West, as well as the inclusion of the voices and experience of women, minorities, and indigenous groups. The Freirian dialogic processes have been used to elicit the voice and participation of the excluded. The global justice interval proceeds into the comprehensive peace education phase, expanding Reardon’s and others’ conception of peace education.

**Comprehensive Peace Education**

The years Reardon identifies as her comprehensive peace education period were 1982 to 1995, a time in which she found other ways to view, understand and teach the various interrelated aspects of peace using a feminist analysis and pedagogy. The focus was on content knowledge of the interrelated aspects of peace so that learners could understand problems, possibilities and obstacles on deeper levels. Reardon posits a transformational approach in this comprehensive phase so that learner’s thinking could be open to understanding that would impact their actions. Important to this phase was the understanding of various interrelations between these multiple aspects and obstacles to peace. Reardon became engaged in providing clarity about ways to educate for and about the multiplicity of issues connected to peace, as evidenced in her essay *Pedagogical Approaches to Peace Studies* (1989). Those ways included learning more through collaborations, teaching and curricular development at all levels, the founding of the PEC and the IIPE, and assisting in the development of the United Nations Mandated
University for Peace in Costa Rica. Reardon (2011) saw the United Nations as a “learning laboratory for nations and people and there was something called civil society and they could become part of it” (Morningside gardens talk). Teaching and learning about the interrelated dimensions of peace through these learning communities posits a relationship-oriented aspect to the conception of peace.

The structure of Comprehensive Peace Education interrelates various topics and foci of peace education, and can be seen in the dimensions, values and capacities upon which it is constructed. The dimensions are holistic and educational in terms of the whole person, human context or what makes humans connected, ecological and planetary and organic and developmental (Reardon, 1988, pp. 74-75). Ways of knowing that value the ways in which people, their issues and others are interconnected derives from women’s or feminine ways of knowing or feminist thinking. The feminine values inform the world order values of “planetary stewardship, global citizenship, and human relationships” (Reardon, 1988, p.76). These values are suffused in the normative analysis of the world order model. The IWO developed values for an alternative system and utilized peace education to transform thinking and behavior. A transformed society would be based on these five values: war prevention, economic welfare, social justice, political participation, and economic balance (Reardon citing Reardon, 1988, p. 4).

Reardon (1976) describes the development of these values through the deliberations of a “transnational community of scholars sponsored by the Institute of World Order Studies, each of whom was concerned about the stresses of current world problems on his own region as well as the world system” (p. 32). All of the aforementioned world values were accepted, while political participation was rejected, because some considered it to be
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21See Carol Gilligan (1982), Another voice, for description of feminine values.
classified within social justice. Reardon (1976) suggests, “Persons who work in abstract research related to social reform tend to put a lesser priority on participation in public policy-making … than do practitioners” (p. 33). The values, for Reardon, were only important if they were sufficiently grounded in the reality of situations they described. One aspect of Reardon’s critique is the same problem of Western approaches to development in the global south - the communities which development was to benefit were never asked. If there is no participation, the question that arises then is, “Whom do the values (development) benefit?” Public participation, in this sense, is a matter of validity, authentic justice, and the possibility of opening the discourse to those who have been traditionally excluded, such as women and children.

Reardon (1988) describes how these values were useful in the analysis of global problems and curriculum development for teacher and general education. The world order values approached global conflict analysis for 1) clarification and realization; 2) The focus is on prescription as the goal of problem analysis. 3) Time is not linear but focused on the present past and future. 4) Problems are interrelated and the focus is on individuals and institutions – not only governments. 5) Global interests are the focus of policy. 5) Soft power is a viable alternative to coercion; 6) Violence cannot be tolerated. 7) Human survival is not assured (Reardon, 1988 citing Weston et al., 1978, pp. 7-8.) This value orientation is in stark contradiction to the current approach to global affairs. Reardon (1985, 1988) points out that, although useful in terms of its ability to help students analyze structures (based on values) and envision alternative systems, the world order model and much of peace research excluded women’s voices and perspectives. According to Reardon (1988), in her analysis of militarism and sexist repression:
It is unrefutably evident that women’s concerns, feminine modes and perspectives and feminist values have little or no role in the formulation of public policy in general and in security and military policy in particular. They are most notably absent in the military regimes. But less obviously and more potentially detrimental to its very purpose, they are sorely lacking in peace research. Most inquiries are carried out entirely by men, but also in masculine modes. Women’s concerns and feminist perspectives are only considered at women’s insistence. (pp. 13-14)

It is especially problematic that women’s voices were excluded in peace research, possibly undermining the goals of the field, since women comprise half of the population subject to violence. In addition to values, a feminist analysis as found in Ruth Leger Sivard’s World Priorities provided a “distinctly feminine perspective of the human impact and concern for human welfare to a review of the basic data on how the world uses its resources” (Reardon, 1985, p.1). This analysis pointed out the expenditures on weapons and military development as opposed to human needs. Such values and analysis offer a feminist lens to identify and illustrate the interrelations of obstacles and possibilities to comprehensive peace education. These interrelations inform and draw on the feminine capacities such as care and concern. The use of resources for weapons and potential violence, as opposed to human well-being, illustrates a failure of the state to provide for the basic needs of society. Actual security is reduced in this sense. Human well-being is an urgent matter of justice. The analysis that Reardon describes has a
normative dimension that perceives state preparation for war as unjust, especially when its citizens have basic need that must be met.

Reardon (1988) also describes human capacities of care, concern and commitment, as required in the transformational aspect of peace education. Capacities are abilities that have normative implications. They are realized through skills and are the basis of the transformative potential of education. For instance, the capacity to care might involve person’s protection of the natural world. Individuals, in terms of the value of planetary stewardship, have a responsibility and interdependent relationship with the natural world. The capacity to care for the natural world suggests that the person acts in a way that does not cause harm. Care (as well as concern and commitment), in Reardon’s thoughts, is a reason to extend justice to others. Care is a way of relating to other that posits engrossment in the others' well-being. Stewardship, which also involves care, suggests a duty to prevent harm of the ecological balance (Reardon, 1988). This balance can also be achieved by “making peace with the Earth,” instead of war, which is a metaphor for the destructive processes humans engage in toward the planet (Reardon, 1990, p. 57). Reardon identifies the value of care as a reason for the extension of justice to the natural world. Care is also a way of relating to others and framing human actions toward others. Care, because it embodies concern and commitment to the needs of others, is attuned to the needs of human dignity, which, in Reardon’s perspective, include a sustainable environment. Viewing the world, its problems and potentiality through a lens that asks what we care for is part of Reardon's holistic feminist approach that emerges in this stage. It is a way that gets at the core of what is required for just and

---

22 Martha Nussbaum (2006), in *Frontiers of Justice*, suggests that care is a starting point or reason for the extension of justice.
peaceful relationships.

Holism, as described earlier, focuses on individual and ecological relationships, rather than institutions, as the center of the (peace) educational process. It places value on face-to-face interactions and authentic relationships and communication. The ecological and planetary dimension points to the human connection to and dependence on this planet. Since Earth is our home and all humans share it, it behooves us to protect the natural world for the sake of human survival. This dimension also asks humans to cooperate out of necessity stemming from the scarcity of resources. The hope that humans will move away from an anthropocentric perception (instrumental) to live in harmony with the environment is necessary for human and planetary survival (Reardon, 1988). This view is consistent with the claim that the anthropocentric perspective views the living environment as a means to human good only (Lynn, 2004; Snauwaert, 1996). It has resulted in degradation of the natural world and destruction of thousands of species that place human flourishing in peril. The values and dimensions of peace education inform the capacities needed to develop an ecological view. Values, dimensions and capacities are interrelated. All the values inform the dimensions and capacities, while the dimensions are the basis of the values. The dimensions of peace are the human foundation that requires values if people are to live with dignity and as moral equals. The feminist dimensions of peace are rooted in the dignity that requires “equality between women and men as the foundation for equality among all peoples” (Reardon, 1990, p. 138). In this sense, Reardon views the equal status of women to men as a fundamental concern and metaphor for human strivings toward full equality. Gender inequality is an obstacle to women's full inclusion and status as moral subjects worthy of the same
protections and rights as men. The socio-cultural distinctions of gender contribute to the social perception and political exclusions of women as “less human.” Reardon addresses this fundamental inequality between women and men as dualistic and one of the most basic distinctions (although not the only one) in which discrimination is rooted. Gender is also a continuum, whereby those closest to women are more subject to violence and injustice. Although the subservient status of women, as seen in lack of economic opportunities, abuse, and exclusion, is obvious to many, it is difficult for many to see because this inequality has been normalized. Reardon employs, in her holistic peace educative process, reflection on experiences, policies, human behavior and possibilities to help learners uncover and make the connections about what is often obscured in broad daylight. The capacities of reflection and critical-holistic thinking are to inform and facilitate the transformation of human relationships, connections with the natural world and our understanding of how we can affect the policies and structures that are obstacles to peace. Reflection and other capacities, in this sense, are required to help us see what is just and unjust, as well as what is required for peace.

In part, capacities, dimensions and values were the basis of the learning in various peace education university and college courses and IIEEs. The UN is a vehicle for peace education because of its function as a participatory, democratic, and public space. As a subject matter, the UN was the focus of graduate courses in peace education programs. The hope of the establishment of the University for Peace was that it would be a vehicle for the “achievement of a just and peaceful planetary social order and lead to an improved quality of life for all members of the human family” (Reardon, 1984, p. 7). Reardon (1984) was instrumental in the development and establishment of the United
Nations Mandated University of Peace, as she served as the coordinator for the curriculum committee. She and others proposed curricula that focused on educating students for global citizenship and responsibility by focusing on the core “problematique” of militarization, economic exploitation, social discrimination, ecological irresponsibility and authoritarianism (Reardon, 1985, pp. 1-2). In addition, the proposed curricula had an open component with the ability to respond to global problems as they emerged (Reardon, 1984). This openness is consistent with the organic, open and dynamic descriptions of peace that Reardon and others advocate. This approach to learning and curricula development embodied a transformational approach that posited demilitarizing or disarming the mind as a step toward the same demilitarization of the world (Reardon, 1984).

The learning in comprehensive peace education draws on Freirian critical approaches to learning and Metcalf’s “reflective thinking” as an essential mode of this approach to social education, as well as the Deweyan students-centered approach and general social reconstructionist perspectives of progressive (developmental democracy) educational perspectives (Reardon, 1987, p. 20; Reardon, 2000, 2011; TCPEC Website, 2008). These progressive and transformational educational approaches helped to facilitate the kind of learning with students, scholars and activists from around the world that incorporated their experience as a significant part of the discourse. For Reardon (2011), the peace education courses and IIPE provided a space for systematic participation in progressive and emancipatory forms of education.

This era adds the holistic and feminist analysis of values that opens learning for individuals and institutions to understand interrelationships that play key roles in the
development and fostering of human capacities and behaviors necessary for transformation toward peace. The connective aspect of the values, dimensions and capacities are based on a holistic feminist framework, as an analysis that views the interrelated aspects of global issues. This informs pedagogy, various teaching methods, curricula and thinking needed to transition toward a transformed world. Reardon views comprehensive peace education as not only about education for peace, but as a shift in thought about education, whereby it is seen as lifelong and related to all human inquiry. As follows, the dimensions and values in peace education should reflect the learning in which humankind must engage in order to mature and survive (Reardon, 1987). The comprehensive peace education era of Reardon’s learning was a complex convergence of holistic education and reflection that was oriented toward action and social transformation, which made it profoundly political. The notion of social transformation, in Reardon's thought, is related to justice in terms of the underlying basis of such change, rooted in the reconstruction of society based on principles that value human dignity, as opposed to violence. Reardon began to evaluate all of her learning through lenses that were based on emerging understandings about the world and the human condition. Reardon’s openness to possibilities in curriculum development, insistence upon participation of all people (if possible) in the development of values, and belief in the possibility for transformation in the face of such violence speaks to her belief in human progress. Not in the abstract, Reardon’s engagement with people and their commitment to continue learning and working toward peace may have inspired her work. It is the ground level work with teachers, organizers, community members and activists around the world that in part, that constitutes the basis of culture and leads us to the next phase.
Culture of Peace

The years 1995-2003 comprise the culture of peace phase, which centered on understanding and transformation of human values and attitudes (rooted in patriarchy) that were obstacles to peace through various efforts, such as the Global Campaign for Peace Education. Reardon (2011) describes this phase in her understanding as (human) flourishing. Flourishing is an appropriate designation, because this period saw the coalescence of various groups, movement and emerging ways of analysis around issues of peace as a result of critical learning, reflection and the understanding of a shared humanity. Flourishing also represents the hope for human equality arising from equal treatment, women’s values and ways of knowing, and the demand for opportunities and freedoms for women, along with an understanding that various cultural traditions, with possibly conflicting values, possess a shared humanity as expressed in their dignity and goals for safety and security. There was organizing for global solidarity between the UN system, individuals in civil society, NGO’s and organizations committed to dealing with injustice and ending violence. Underlying the culture of peace era was the sense that greater solidarity through the dissemination of peace knowledge allowed people to access their own cultural perspectives and some shared global values. According to Reardon (2011):

When you talk about culture we are talking about what people value, how they relate, some very deep roots of human attitudes. …We can talk about institutions until we are blue in the face, we can talk about reform, we can talk about changing
economic policy, but if we don’t have a fundamental change from within, seeing ourselves as human beings first, flawed but interconnected. We have to begin to reflect on why we value what we value and how did we get that way. … A culture of peace would be out of an organic peace, a way of life in which violence would be abhorrent, just as we say now human sacrifice in most cultures is abhorrent, that would be a culture of peace. (Morningside Gardens Foreign Policy Talk)

This stage in the evolution of Reardon’s thinking about peace was based upon an inquiry into the closely held cultural beliefs that contributed to or became obstacles to peace. How might this understanding of beliefs illuminate peace? Beliefs point to values that indicate how people will behave in their daily lives, communities and toward the “other.”

Education, as defined by Reardon23, becomes extremely important because it informs people about important practices that may often reduce uninformed parochialism.

One such parochialism is a result of a general mis-education about weapons. Reardon (1996) describes the symbolism of weapons as emblematic of security and associated with freedoms. Reardon suggest that society has become “addicted to weapons.” On every level of society, from international to local, amassing weapons constitute gaining power. Reardon (1996) writes, “Addiction slowly undermines well-being, providing immediate harm to the addicts and preventing them from understanding

23 “Education is the process whereby we learn what the realities of the human experience are, how they operate, and how we fit into them … [and] also the process which purports to prepare us for participation in the public order” (Reardon, 1976, p 30).
authentic human security. Addictions fill a void, real or perceived, in the sources of well-being” (p. 320). This addiction to weapons (and violence) pervades human culture in games, language, music, national celebrations and other every aspect, because of the competitive nature of society. Reardon (1996) continues, “armed conflict inevitably results from serious conflicts when weapons are at hand” (p. 320). Weapons have contributed to a culture of violence that provides a false sense of security. This false sense of security is the basis of national security and militarism; we are less secure. Reardon (1997) articulates the interrelationship between women’s issues and a culture of violence when she suggests that “violence against women is both a consequence and indicator of militarism and preparation of war” (p.6). Violence in one sphere often prepares individuals for more violence in other realms. The purveyance of violence across spheres, to people unrelated to the particular military conflict indicates the addictive nature of violence and its level of purveyance in culture.

To follow Reardon’s (1996, 1997) logic in the articles Women or Weapons and The Role of Women, the addiction to violence and violence itself will continue to increase in this culture because of the nature of dependency, which is to fill the emptiness resulting from a lack of authentic human security, and a false security perceived from the presence of weapons, and the threat of real violence. Thus, Reardon (1996) points out that women’s voices have advocated for authentic human security through well-being that protects us from all forms of harm and respects human dignity and rights. Authentic human security, is when “basic needs are needs are met, when we experience human dignity and human rights, and when we have a healthy natural environment capable of sustaining life” (Reardon, 1996, p. 318). Security, in this sense, would be general
complete disarmament and full equality for women and racial and sexual minorities, constituting a culture of peace. As it stands, the needs of women are unfulfilled even as they are often required to carry out the day-to-day fulfillment of human security in caring for children and elderly, cultivating land and providing the basic needs of community without inclusion in decision-making (Reardon, 1991, 1998). Our learning is insufficient because much of these connections between violence, women and their exclusion, as well as the relationship of violence to other forms of oppression are obscured. As a result, learning and reflection for a culture of peace requires learning about weapons, military expenditures, and the war systems, as well as alternatives, tolerance, cooperation and conflict resolution skills. This learning constitutes the transformational imperative of peace education informed by feminist thought and comprehensive peace values. It is concerned with spurring the emergence of a culture that does not tolerate violence and injustice.

Reardon (1997) documents how women’s movements, networks, NGO’s, activists and educators engaged in work toward a culture of peace through a myriad of activities leading to acknowledgement of an end to obstacles to women’s equality, participation and security as integral to peace and justice. According to Reardon (1997), the status of women (equality with men) was excluded from official UN language as a result of the organization’s role as “a creature of [the] patriarchal state system” (pp. 34-35). In 1975, the preparation for the International Women’s Year saw feminists who challenged this exclusion and “began to work for … including gender as a factor in all U.N. data gathering and policy making” (Reardon, 1997, p. 34), to lessen the effect of patriarchy in public policy. Reardon (1997) suggests that this data contributed to the policy goals
formulated in the Platform for Action developed in the Beijing Conference of 1995. The feminine principle, which complements masculinity and explores the “psychocultural roots of the subordination” (p. 33) and violence perpetuating oppressive structures, was utilized in the UN Global Social Summit (Copenhagen 1993) and was reflected in the underlying capabilities approach to the human development report and index. The feminine principle focuses on “well-being of living creatures and systems, [and] works with, rather than manipulates, the natural order in efforts to provide for quotidian human security” (p.36). The “Agenda 21” that came out of the Rio conference of 1992 reflected a similar feminine principle for sustainable development. Reardon (1997) describes how the grassroots efforts and networks brought people together in global conferences to present an agenda to increase the human security of women. The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) in 1980, the Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women in 1993, the Nairobi Forward Looking Strategies for Advancement of Women in 1985, and the Beijing Platform for Action in 1995 were all informed by the status of women, feminine principles and feminist theory. This underlying approach provided the impetus and values that the guided grassroots efforts, learning and organizing toward authentic human security that are required for a culture of peace. The notion that principles and documents are important to civil society, the U.N and international community reflects a movement toward justice focused on the living conditions of women, the poor and excluded.

Reardon’s culture of peace approach was unlike its colloquial usage within the UN and related NGO system. The term “culture of peace” became empty and rhetorical
(Reardon, 2011). Reardon’s and other peace educators' efforts toward learning for peace was part of a process of peace knowledge dissemination, collaborative learning, consulting, and work with NGO’s and UN organizations. Part of this learning was to understand how human culture connected people and informed peace. This inquiry and the learning of this phase went beyond institutional reform, and was focused on individual learning and the identification of values that could contribute toward personal and global transformation toward peace. This transformation was intended to go beyond political structures to the individuals who make up institutions. What was even more significant about this stage was its shift from institutional reform to human transformation from a bottom-up, individual and civil society orientation (Reardon & Cabezudo, 2002). Reardon and others’ approach to human values was aimed at challenging discrimination on the basis of race, gender, religion and other differences resulting from the inequality generated by most basic separation by gender in patriarchy (Reardon, 1996, 2011). The culture of peace approach to human values articulated culturally relevant approaches to peace education (Reardon & Cabezudo, 2002, p. 17).

Not to be confused with cultural relativism, the culture of peace approach is relevant to various cultures because there is agreement on violence and injustice as problematic and the necessity of the recognition of human dignity. In Learning to Abolish War, Reardon and Cabezudo (2002) write:

We believe that such culturally varied and community relevant forms of peace education not only better serve the learners, but greatly enrich the entire field of peace education, increasing the possibilities of its being introduced into all learning
environments throughout the world. … While we argue for the universal need for peace education, we do not advocate the universalization and standardization of approach and content. We believe that peace education in whatever forms it takes must be a fundamental part of the socialization process in which education plays a major role. (p.17)

This education for peace was aimed at the learning of general (peace, teacher and social foundations) educators so that knowledge about the war system, injustices and the possibilities of peace could be available and assessable:

All citizens need to be educated to assess and evaluate possibilities and preferences for alternative, global security systems. Demystifying the technicalities that have obscured fundamental security issues from the general citizenry is a crucial challenge to education to abolish war. (Reardon & Cabezudo, 2002, p. 18)

Mystification of the tools of war, applied through patriarchal structures committed to nontransparent actions that view ordinary people as incapable of understanding the actual doings and global relations of nation-states, is common, even in democratic countries. Knowledge and education about the war system, which had been an important part of the war prevention era, was also necessary in learning for a culture of peace. There was acknowledgement that governments, on the whole, were still not working toward peace, despite the widespread efforts of NGO’s, the UN system, peace workers and others. As a result, the Global Campaign for Peace Education, and the Learning to
Abolish War: Teaching Resource attempted to disseminate peace education by making it accessible and encouraging participation in the campaign globally. The Hague Agenda made “political and institutional recommendations to bring about the required systemic changes that could make possible a cultural transformation to sustainable peace” (Reardon & Cabazudo, 2002, p. 18-19). Individual and institutional changes, in this sense, were both necessary. Individuals make up institutions, which have the mechanisms to reach large amounts of people. Yet individual action has greater importance for what Kenneth Boulding (1978) describes as “stable peace.”

If people have the skills and capacities in their everyday life to manage conflict constructively and reflect on global issues, institutional transformation and sustainable peace becomes more possible. This kind of peace would also be organic. “Organic or ecological thinking should inform teaching for peace” (Reardon, 2001, p. 39). The organic approach was described, in Education for Peace from a Gendered Perspective, as a complementary view of masculine and feminine ways of knowing. The feminist approach to gender studied women’s ways of knowing, exclusion, and inequality based on sex as a way to understand various forms of discrimination. Women around the world suffer from different forms of discrimination, but all women suffer because of their gender (Reardon, 1985, 1991, 2001). Patriarchy’s characteristics of directive control and elitism view ordinary citizens as unable to deal with the problems that face them. As a result, a gendered approach provides a way to examine injustice experience by various groups stemming from patriarchy. A gendered approach, in this sense, is a recognition of excluded groups’ and ordinary people’s right to participate in determining their own future:
I believe that if we really want to get to a culture of peace, then I think we have to look at that the basic paradigm for all the structures of oppression patriarchy and we also have to understand that patriarchy is not just a system of male dominance over females [but] that it is a very complex hierarchical system in which there are the privileged and less privileged … in the current form of western patriarchy, which is the dominant form. (Reardon, 2011, Morningside Gardens Foreign Policy Talk)

The culture of peace required an understanding of gender in order to transform human behavior toward a more peaceful comportment. The culture of peace era ended as Reardon stopped teaching and began to refocus on clarifying her understanding for ongoing learning.

The Gender Imperative and Ongoing Learning

Not unlike other phases, this era of Reardon’s thinking, from 2000 to the present, is also concerned with gender, but focuses in on it as symbolic of the deeply entrenched nature of human inequality. Gender is not only symbolic, but also represents the pervasiveness of problematic human constructs that cause real violence. When asked about the most important issues facing us now, Reardon (2011) described the most significant issue to be gender. As a result, feminist scholarship and activism, as well as gendered approaches, has an influence on peace thinking that deals with equality as a way of examining patriarchy, which is the root of most violence and injustice. Gendered
thinking highlights historical separations and envisions ways masculine and feminine values and perspectives complement each other. It also addresses the inequality of exclusion and discrimination. This phase highlights the importance of the achievement of human security as a fulfillment of rights, the recognition of human dignity, and the actualization of gender justice and a culture of peace.

In this phase, Reardon calls attention to patriarchy as a primary obstacle to peace that creates hierarchies that separate issues needing holistic interpretation and action.

According to Reardon (2010b):

Patriarchy … valorizes men over women and arrogates to them power over the public sphere. Thus, the control of resources and their use is in the hands of men, male elites who also control the state (through legal, constitutional and other methods). As a consequence of masculinist thinking, most of the ruling male elites see resources as finite and therefore, to be acquired and defended against a distribution that might disadvantage their states as others benefit. Defense of resources, as well as the nation (to be read as the communal male identity), the elites contend, requires the capacity to apply armed force even when this may disadvantage some, or even the majority of people within the nation state. The future of the nation and its people, they assert depends upon the protection and the preservation of the state and its ability to compete with others states. In patriarchal politics as in patriarchal business
every effort is made to maintain the “competitive edge” – advantage over all others. (p. 17)

In this phase, Reardon’s understanding of patriarchy evolved to an understanding that located the hierarchical control within the separation of women from influencing the public realm, so that public values of competition and power over others determine global policies, with the constant threat of violence enforcing that control. Reardon and others suggest that masculine values need not reinforce this separation and exclusion, but operate complementarily toward a gendered and equal conception of humanity. In their essay *Gender and Peace: Toward a Gender Inclusive Holistic Perspective*, Jenkins and Reardon (2007) discuss the importance of the inclusion of masculinity, which involves research into the ways patriarchy is unjust to men and women. According to Reardon (2010b):

* Gender, as the concept is generally used in works that deal with the differences and inequalities between men and women, is [a] socially derived concept, a culturally varied construct that assigns to men and women a set of cultural roles and social functions only minimally determined by their reproductive and sexual characteristics. (pp. 12-13)

The role gender has played in society has socialized men into validating their masculinity through violence and aggression. Part of the initiation of men is often participation in the military, while women have historically resisted, attempting to preserve those men, husbands and sons, and their society. Jenkins and Reardon (2007) point out that nonviolence and resistance is not exclusively a feminine trait, but that men
have also resisted war. As Reardon has often noted, the process of socialization in the military often resulted in men’s violence toward women during war and off the battlefield. Patriarchy, in this sense, is derived from the attempt to maintain power and control over women, as well as men. The threat of violence is a tool to maintain that authority. As a result, women and men worked to establish a normative framework through which violence against women, and their participation would be legally addressed through international conventions and standards.

Jenkins and Reardon (2007) point out the importance of understanding how patriarchy was part of the historical separation of gender issues from race and political rights (pp. 28-29). They argue for inquiry into gender that cuts across the range of sexuality, as the roots of discrimination against transgendered, homosexual and other similar distinctions is one of the separating functions of patriarchy. In this view, CEDAW does not address the institutionalization of rights for the range of sexual and gender distinctions, but that it should comprise future study of gender. The importance of the application of human rights as a normative framework for uncovering injustice and making connections is possible only with a democratic framework which allows participation and encourages education and required for citizen to exercise authentic dissent or consent (Jenkins and Reardon, 2007; Reardon, 2010a). Jack Donnelly (1999) and Martha Nussbaum (2001) make similar arguments about the need to expand our understanding of human rights so that they comprehend gender distinctions. Such understanding and learning about gender bring us to a deeper understanding of patriarchy so that gender can be mainstreamed for transformation toward peace and movement toward authentic human security.
Reardon's gender imperative is the beginning of inquiry into one of the most basic dualisms of the human existence, male and female. This inquiry is not for the purpose of deepening these problematic distinctions, but understanding them to offer spaces where learning can be reciprocated, as masculine and feminine values might complement each other. This basis dichotomy is rooted in the patriarchal hierarchy that informs other discrimination and exclusions leading to violence and injustice. Gender, in terms of various distinctions and diversity of human realities, represents the most urgent issues and ways in which human rights must expand in order to be relevant so that justice corresponds to the circumstances of all people. In this section, Reardon's focus on gender is instructive because it positions this understanding as necessary for peace and justice in terms of moral equality that is often awarded on the basis of gender.

**Summary and Analysis**

To summarize the evolution of Reardon’s conception, peace is an organic and dialectic process of learning from and about the “other” toward a just world. In phase one, Reardon understands peace as a process and part of learning about the world. This learning requires the inclusion of as many perspectives as possible. International and understanding education posits a person-centered approach to peace through dialogue and emphasis on the needs of the other. Such an approach focuses on human dignity. The learning is composed of critical approaches that invite excluded voices and offer a holistic and gendered approach to global problems (Jenkins and Reardon, 2007). Peace, in this sense, is built within a community of learners who negotiate to move toward consensus. Although Reardon's experiences in this phase emerge from her experience in
the classroom and working with teachers, she sees education, in its broadest sense, as a laboratory for learning values through the educative process, consistent with peace and justice. This learning process is what Reardon suggests is necessary in terms of peace and justice in the broader and more global sense. The process of peace education is itself a just process because it posits moral equality between teacher and learner, as well as those with different cultural perspectives. The issues and possibilities to deal with the global problems are rooted in structural and cultural perspectives.

The war prevention years were focused on understanding the causes of war, particularly weapons and militaristic systems that propagated war and violence. War, and the violence it manifests, is a violation of human dignity, and education to abolish war and deal with its root causes articulates a kind of learning that prioritizes knowledge for human development. It replaces state-centered security with human-centered security, not to produce a sense of security, but to bring about a new system to provide actual and authentic human security. Authentic human security is a requirement for and a product of a just peace. Learning about war and the possibilities for human security, in Reardon's view, is not too complex for citizens, but a part of the human responsibility to participate in the decision making that affects human lives. Reardon and others regard transparency about military expenditures and activities often kept secret from citizens as necessary for all societies, especially democratic ones. This approach begs the question, how can citizens fully participate, deciding on matters of justice, if they do not have accurate information? Justice demands that citizens have full knowledge of the activities of militaries and governments, since people give states their power.

Global justice is explicitly concerned with human flourishing and attention to
structural and other forms of violence and injustice. Structural violence is an important conception in terms of justice, as it refers to systemic economic and development issues, as well as exclusionary practices at all social levels. Injustice, for peace educators, is a form of structural violence. Reardon and her colleagues focus peace education, and the world order values that inform it, directly on alleviating injustice in all of its forms. Reardon describes the critical pedagogical approaches that are useful in both understanding structural violence and working toward just conditions characterized by inclusive and democratic participation. Global justice, the concept closest to traditional “positive peace,” describes the conditions of a just peace. During the global justice phase, Reardon and her colleagues developed a nuanced understanding of the nature of and requirements for positive peace and justice. Not only does global justice require a critical inquiry into structures at all levels, but it also requires an understanding of justice as an essential component of peace emerging from such inquiry. Global justice means that everyone's human dignity is attended to. Although a notion of justice is present throughout the earlier phases, this phase represents what Nussbaum (2006) and Sen (2009) describe as the “intuition of justice.” In other words, Reardon and colleagues understood justice to begin with a realization of injustice and what human dignity requires.

The comprehensive peace education period involves the articulation of an interrelated framework that underscores the methods and approaches to holistic learning needed for global citizenship and human survival. This learning is an imperative for justice in the context of peace education because it connects people with their responsibility to others and the planet. Comprehensive peace education articulates,
through holistic education, the claims and duties for a just world. By connecting the various issues of peace with a larger picture, the ambiguities that are often obscured become visible. This different approach to viewing the problems and possibilities of peace and justice is a departure from the traditional, linear, and often dualistic views of addressing conflict. Drawing on their inquiry into the interrelated realms of the human condition, Reardon and other peace educators utilized this understanding to develop educational practices, processes and opportunities that reflected this perspective. As a result, peace education offers a holistic learning framework, within which students learn to see themselves as members of a global citizenry, with equal rights and responsibilities toward other members. Comprehensive peace education is informed by and premised on the cosmopolitan values of the world order model, constituting an ethical approach whereby learners develop, as Rawls describes, a “sense of justice.” This sense of justice, which is inherent within the values that inform comprehensive peace education, is necessary for global transformation. Because of this view, I argue that comprehensive peace education was and is a very “critical” approach to peace education.

The culture of peace phase encouraged the exploration of how various worldviews contributed to a global conception of peace, as well as the nature and causes of violence that emerges in every culture. Tolerance of plural and diverse cultures, as culture is a key way in which individuals express themselves, is an essential requirement of human dignity and justice. Yet cultural traditions should not be a reason for the suppression or exclusion of various members of the culture and or subcultures. All cultures are rich in values that contribute to ethical understandings and inquiry into the human condition. As a result, cultures contribute to human articulations of peace and
justice. The culture of peace is a result of learning about human commonalities and obstacles to dignity. The culture of peace phase represents the further development of a globally and culturally rooted approach to comprehensive peace education. This extension of comprehensive peace education values to the global public sphere is a way of deepening and opening the understanding of what constitutes peace. The UN system, through the efforts of global civil society, works to make the UN a global forum and space that is inclusive, accessible, and democratic. The Global Campaign for Peace and teacher educational efforts suggest a pragmatic and human approach to global transformation for a peaceful and just world. The significance of the idea of the culture of peace phase is rooted in the importance of the educative efforts and focus on democratic inclusion from various worldviews to establish truly global and ethical norms and practices to inform peace. As follows, a culture of peace embodies the overlapping consensus of peace values derived from cultures that attend to what human dignity requires. Overlapping consensus is one of the most basic and foundational aspects of theories of justice (Nussbaum, 200; Rawls, 2003; Sen, 2009; Snauwaert, 2011). Many “ethical” and “moral” approaches fall short of the participation and inclusiveness needed for an authentic and global conception of peace and justice.

In the gender imperative phase, Reardon recognizes the importance of thinking about patriarchal structures to resolve the deeply ingrained human inequality of gender bias and discrimination. It is this gendered analysis, Reardon argues, that offers a way to comprehend other forms of oppression. The evolution of Reardon’s conception of peace involves a willingness to learn from others, continuous critical analysis, and a focus on

24Overlapping consensus as described by Rawls (2003) and Sen (2009) is a political space where various groups with different comprehensive beliefs can dialogue for cooperation – without suspending their beliefs, but agreeing to respect each other’s dignity – will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.
education for human development. As a result, this approach to peace is firmly situated in a capabilities view of justice. An analysis of gender differences as illustrative of violence and injustice, which are a root cause of structural and direct violence, leads us to the need for a capabilities approach. Human rights, as articulated in the UDHR, represent an agreement between all humans and governments across the world, and are rooted in the Kantian-Rawlsian social contract tradition. Thus, human rights are only claims that representatives decide upon in the original position. Although reflective equilibrium is possible, there is the flaw of original exclusions, as a result of the structure of a social contract. A capabilities approach requires what individuals need according to their human dignity. Reardon's perspective of gender, rooted in her overall view of peace, similarly relies on human dignity. Thus, it is quite similar with the capabilities approach. Therefore, Reardon's view, in its similarity to the capabilities approach, reveals possibilities for how we can relate to others and transform how we interpret human difference. Reardon focuses on gender to deepen human understanding of exclusions and “blind spots” in the application and interpretation of human rights.

In each of the phases of Reardon’s learning, justice is a central, albeit implicit, concept. Yet there is attention to human dignity in peaceful learning communities and international understanding; a focus on public information and knowledge of the war prevention years; values that inform holistic, comprehensive peace education; new possibilities for historically excluded world views and values in a cultural of peace; and gender as part of the complex composition of human nature that could unite us because of our common futures, and encouragement of men to care. Justice, which corresponds with a capabilities approach, is at the core of Reardon’s dynamic understanding of peace and
peace education. The next chapter will compare and contrast the most prominent theories of justice and its similarities with the capabilities approach.
Chapter 3

What is Justice?

We now turn to political formulations of justice to understand their character before describing how they fit with Reardon’s conception of peace. Justice is complex, specifically articulated in the context of access and claim to the goods, rights and welfare needed for a quality of life. In this sense, peace and justice are connected. Justice is an integral aspect of peace. If one has peace, justice has been served. Justice embodies the meaning and actual existence of peace. If so, why is there a need for peace and not justice alone? Is the mention of peace purely semantic? The term peace is manifestly important, as it is symbolic and signifies a shift in our behavior of destructive practice to our neighbors and the living environment of humans. To describe a world that is peaceful moves beyond what some believe is justice. In this view, justice is a nonviolent concept. Justice is not always understood or interpreted in the same way. In this sense, peace is a useful concept for understanding the characteristics of justice within its relationship with peace. Justice, as an integral aspect of peace, signifies a kind of existence antithetical to violence and injustice. If one were to draw on metaphysical claims, then the possibility for authentic peace and justice could only exist in the heavens. (This approach does not draw on metaphysical claims.) The aim of this work, unlike Kant’s, is not to unite the starry heavens with the world that exists beneath it, but to interpret how peace is present, and how it can be developed in our everyday life by giving voice to those suffering from injustice and violence, and through education for peace. Therefore, articulating justice is a necessary task because it is a vehicle that makes peace possible. Justice and peace work in tandem. In response to the primary
question, not only is Reardon’s approach to peace consistent with capabilities, it is part of the capabilities tradition. Her theory of justice articulates a capabilities or human development approach. This perspective is distinct as it is holistic, meaning that it is conceptualized as feminist, global and ecological.

This section will utilize Dale Snauwaert’s (2010) identification and discussion of the dimensions of justice, as reported earlier in Chapter 1, to describe and compare the various theories of justice. Each theory is part of the development of the capabilities approach. They provide clarity in the understanding of the multiple components of justice and their relationship to peace. The perspectives of justice (utilitarianism, contractarianism, and the capabilities approach) are, in part, in discourse with each other. This study focuses on these three approaches to justice because they constitute the dominant theories and most vigorous discourse in modern and contemporary political philosophy and, specifically, the study of justice. Each one of these theories impacts the current political realm. For instance, the relevance of quality of life indicators, such as gross national product (GNP), is based on underlying utilitarian and social contract thinking. Critiques of social contract and utilitarian theories have resulted in advances in philosophical thought as well as the development of the capabilities approach, which embodies the actual opportunities and freedoms necessary for individual to function according to their dignity. Utilitarianism is a natural starting point, since it is the response to the version of consequentialist philosophy that came of age in the 18th century, sparked by Rawls’ (2003) monumental *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*25. Rawls’ approach to justice was, in part, a response to concerns with the dominating

---

25 Most of the references to Justice as Fairness are from the re-released version.
influence of utilitarianism. Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum’s differing perspectives of capabilities emerged in response to Rawls and other similar versions of social contract theory (contractarianism).

The three theories of justice have commonalities, but differ in terms of their approaches and dimensions. Beginning with utilitarianism, some leading thinkers offering enlightenment and modern perspectives on utilitarianism are James Bentham, John Stuart Mill, and Adam Sedgwick. In the 19th century, Bentham described utilitarianism as a summation theory, in which that which produces the most collective good is considered to be the most good or just (Snauwaert, Class Discussion, Spring 2011). For a principle or action to be right or good, it must maximize aggregate utility. The aggregation of utility (in terms of welfare utilitarianism) is the actual counting or sum of all the preferences in specific polity. Mill (2003) suggests that happiness is the ultimate end that guides all human activity and justice. In this sense, institutions are ordered according to the desires of society, or that which makes the majority within the society most happy. According to Rawls (1999), Sedgwick describes utilitarianism as a “society rightly ordered, therefore just, when its major institutions are arranged so as to achieve the greatest net balance of satisfaction supplied up over all the individuals belonging to it” (p. 26). In utilitarian society, institutions would be arranged insofar as they are consistent with the majority’s preferences. The orientation of utilitarianism attempts to maximize utility through preference satisfaction. Its focus is on the realization of human well-being, similar to the capabilities-based approach.
Foundation

The most subtle or blatant injustices can both be traced to the absence of moral equality. The foundation of justice asks, “What is the subject of justice and from what source is that moral consideration derived?” Snauwaert (2010) asks, “What determines standing as a member of a moral community?” (p. 2). To begin, Snauwaert (2010) describes moral equality as an important starting place from which to consider the foundation of justice. Briefly, moral equality concerns individual standing in various moral communities, and relates to a range of questions about treatment, behavior and expectations. For instance, what treatment can one expect from public authorities, and are they treated the same as other members of the society? These questions are concerned with the most basic concepts that inform justice, human dignity, freedom and equality. Moral equality is embodied in one’s treatment in accordance with one’s human dignity. It is human dignity that provides the basis for moral consideration, and various associated and resulting demands.

Although conceived and carried out through varying approaches to justice, the utilitarian, social contract and capabilities theories are each premised upon moral equality, but are articulated differently. The utilitarian approach is concerned with equality in the sense that it attempts to give “equal weight to each person’s utility” (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 12). At its essence, the utilitarian approach is egalitarian, and thus concerned with moral equality (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 38). Moral equality requires satisfaction of the needs of every member of society through a democratic process. Thus, it speaks to the underlying and fundamental issues of equality. An informed preference approach makes every attempt to provide full information about matters of public
discourse, and rules out choices that violate the fair distribution, even if they maximize utility. Despite this attempt at democratic and fair distributions within the utilitarian tradition, the fulfillment of majority preferences and desires works to complete justice. Thus, satisfaction is aggregated and the possibility of the dismissal of minority wishes remains ever-present. The democratic impulses are often supplanted because the counting of utility is only partly democratic. The maximization of utility has its own logic, which requires the greatest good to be achieved despite the impact on or violation of individual rights and claims.

In part, Rawls objects to the utilitarian concept on the grounds that the liberty of some may be violated as a result of determining the greatest good. He argues, “people’s claims are made secure from the unreasonable demands of others” (Kymlicka citing Rawls, 2002, p. 42). Rawls attempts to ensure that these injustices do not happen through his basic structure and principles. For Rawls (2003), the foundation of justice is conceived of in terms of free and equal persons in a well-ordered society. It also incorporates human capacities of reason, rationality and moral powers, which are germane to the discussion of both form and orientation, and related to and underlying the process of justification (which will be discussed later). In this sense, society is regulated by a public concept of justice.

The foundational dimension of justice, as a starting point, begins with the notion of citizenship (related to scope), within which the context and boundary of a state suggest moral equality among its members. For Rawls, persons’ moral powers of freedom, equality, reasonableness and rationality suggest the capacity of self-evidence, which is an innate capacity to conceive and pursue our own good and the ability to conceive a sense
of justice. Moral powers are, in part, what give citizens equal moral worth or moral equality. This foundational aspect of justice is basic, in the sense that individuals are capable of being reasonable, with the ability to adjudicate conflict. This ability, whether in use or not, defines our moral powers. The self-evident nature of this dimension is a politically normative assertion of equality (Rawls, 2003, p. 24). As an ethical claim, it articulates the moral equality of all humans. Such claims do not rely on a priori assertions or those that are validated by the so-called “divinity of aristocracies” or monarchies that justify their rule by divine right. The proclamation of moral equality is a self-authenticating source of validity of the claims commencing in free and equal persons with moral powers (Rawls, 2003, p. 18). Such self-authentication means that we claim that we are morally equal, and thus primary subjects of justice. Here, one could infer the presence of human dignity. Rawls, though, does not go so far as to equate moral equality to human dignity. There is similarity in the overlapping features of self-authentication, which is made possible through the conception of persons’ freedom, equality, and ability to choose a concept of good (moral powers). Though human dignity might be considered comprehensive and incompatible with basic pluralistic structure, it is implicit in Rawls’ concept of moral powers. People are free and equal, insofar as they can choose their own concept of good and make their own plan over a complete life, which might include a concept of good that draws from a doctrine or religion (Rawls, 2003, p. 24). Yet within this basic structure, individuals have associational freedom and can change their associations, such as religious affiliation or personal philosophy.

The foundation of justice for Sen and Nussbaum, like Rawls, is not only moral equality, but human dignity. Human dignity is premised upon – but goes beyond – moral
equality. Moral equality requires equal treatment because of membership in a specific moral community. Its equality extends from a constitution or declaration of equality. Human dignity is based on the fundamental worth and sanctity of persons. It is a transpositional, cosmopolitan conception that is not bound to sovereignty of nation-states. It is a self-authenticating value rooted in human declarations of self-worth, claim to rights, entitlement and an urgent matter of justice (Reardon, 1995, Snauwaert, 2010). Nussbaum (2006) admits that she and Rawls agree that any theory of justice has certain requirements, such as an account of good and justification for political theories and concepts of persons. Her approach represents a definite departure from the contractarian approach, though, as it takes into account human dignity. According to Snauwaert (2011):

Sen accepts the common foundation shared by all modern theories of justice – moral equality, equal intrinsic value and dignity of each person. Sen, however, extends the basic intuitive idea of dignity and worth into the further consideration of the characteristics of a good human life. (Class notes, 2-23-11)

Differences in the nature of foundations have to do with Nussbaum’s (2006) explicit reliance on human dignity as the foundation of justice and the interdependent concept of a person and their capabilities. Nussbaum (2006) frames the foundation in terms of human dignity as the source of value embodied in all people, requiring respect and opportunities for human flourishing, or, at least, functioning at the level of individuals’ capabilities. For Nussbaum (2006), dignity cannot be separated from capabilities, which
she illustrates when writing, “capabilities are … ways of realizing a life with human dignity” (p. 161). A person is conceived in terms of being worthy of a life consistent with human dignity. Thus, a life worthy of dignity is constituted by capabilities (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 162). Although Nussbaum (2005, 2011) focuses more than Sen (2009) on human dignity as a central value to justice, they both argue that the foundation of justice is human dignity.

Dignity is the moral standard by which lives are valued, as opposed to conditional or partial qualifications. Nussbaum (2006) critiques Rawls (1971, 2003), arguing that his concepts of persons are grounded in their possession of certain moral powers: reasonableness and rationality. According to Nussbaum (2006), Rawls draws on a Kantian perspective of the person that requires mental and moral powers (p.130). Nussbaum’s (2005) critique of Rawls is based on his limiting concept of a person with moral powers, rationality, reason, freedom and the ability to conceive of justice and life plans. This concept leads to the exclusion of individuals with severe impairments as a result of disabilities or aging and their resulting failure to provide mutual benefit to others in society. Those with mental impairments are excluded in the Rawlsian conception of a person because of their limited economic and political participation in the scheme of mutual advantage (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 128). Sen (2009) makes a similar point about Rawls and mutuality, arguing that individuals with mental impairments “fail to qualify” for equal citizenship and cannot engage in reciprocal relationships (Nussbaum, 2006, pp.133-135). Nussbaum (2006) argues that this concept is much too narrow, as Kant’s imperative to treat persons as moral ends makes room for the inclusion of the impaired. In addition, Mill’s concept of peace as “universal and pervading of all human relations
regulated by justice instead of injustice” suggests that relationships of care fill in and justify inclusion of the impaired (Nussbaum citing Mill, 2006, p. 129). As a result, reciprocity becomes possible if we consider these individuals alongside those who care for them and the development of such relationships of care (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 133-134). Nussbaum suggests that Rawls fails to extend principles of justice to the excluded because of parsimony, and that there is too much complexity and intuition in the extension of justice in the capabilities approach. The foundation of the capabilities view is quite inclusive, as Nussbaum conceives the possibility and actual duty of humans to nonhumans as a result of their dignity, going beyond instrumentalism. Nussbaum provides a deeper concept of dignity that extends to human and nonhuman living that does not rely on a limited definition of persons, but opens up the possibility for a foundation of all-inclusive justice on the basis of care and fellowship.

**Form**

The question of whether justice is grounded in metaphysical approaches, comprehensive doctrines or pluralistic political conceptions is the basis of the *form* dimension of justice. For utilitarianism, the most accepted versions are founded on Bentham and Mill’s comprehensive and political approaches to utilitarianism. The consequentialist approach determines what action or policy is good through the metric of greatest happiness, pleasure or pain, for the members of society (Mill, 2003). Drawing on Bentham’s (2003/1789) “greatest happiness principle,” which is guided by moral sentiment, Mill (2003) critiques the grounding of moral obligation in the a priori principles of Kant (p.97). Mill envisions a comprehensive approach that includes the
concept of a person with “the cognizance of the rational faculty” that is “capable of
determining the intellect either to give or withhold assent to the doctrine; and this is
equivalent proof” (Mill, 2003, p. 98). Mill is describing a doctrine that is validated
through the consent and acceptance of rational individuals. For Mill (2003), utility is
more than the happiness principle or preference. He criticizes it as viewing decisions in
terms of the hedonistic pursuit of pleasure. Mill (2003) views utility as that which
“promotes happiness … by happiness is intended pleasure and the absence of pain and
privation of pleasure” (p. 99). Right action is a result of the maximization of utility,
thereby satisfying as many preferences as possible. In terms of form, Kymlicka (2002)
suggests there are comprehensive and political approaches to utilitarianism, where the
latter requires individuals, in their personal lives, to act consistently with the principles of
utility. As a result, before acting there is a requirement of *compos mentis*, or full
awareness, in order to calculate the maximum utility in their interactions. This
requirement does not take the need of education for political participation or tools for
information dissemination into account. Political utilitarianism does not have such
requirements. According to Kymlicka (2002), the political, non-comprehensive version
of utilitarianism is the most accepted among contemporary utilitarian scholars. Rawls
(2003) does not distinguish comprehensive from political concepts and considers
utilitarianism a comprehensive moral doctrine (p. 14). Although it is in part
comprehensive, utilitarianism, like Rawls’ *Justice as Fairness*, is not founded in or
reliant upon the existence God, or other religious or metaphysical presuppositions (Mill,
2003; Rawls, 2003). It is a comprehensive philosophical system.

Although attributed to the *form* of justice, the role of political philosophy is
necessary to articulate political thought that constitutes justice as fairness, a well-ordered society, and its fair terms of cooperation. This is “to orient us in the conceptual space of all possible ends, individual and associational, political and social principles that reflect reason and rational, which are part of, and make up and justify a just and reasonable society” (Rawls, 2003, p. 6). The orientation of justice, besides being concerned with institutions and procedure, is informed by the political principles asserting justice as fairness. The form is closely related to the orientation, while the orientation informs and has a major role in the procedure and actions of the institutions. The liberal approach of *Justice as Fairness* is a political concept. In contrast to comprehensive approaches to liberalism in utilitarian concepts of justice, *Justice as Fairness* draws on the plurality and freedom of liberalism for overlapping consensus and acceptance of different beliefs. Overlapping consensus provides a political space within a democratic society wherein individuals with plural beliefs can meet to fulfill their social and political needs. The form of justice laid out in *Justice as Fairness* describes the most ideal space for collaboration among those in a pluralistic society. This political concept is dynamic, in that details may change but the basic structure remains unchanged; it is one that allows for diverse concepts to alter principles and procedures as needed and warranted. Rawls (1999) describes this as “equilibrium.” Future generations, not party to the original agreement or those involved, revisit the constitution to make changes as a result of political and social changes. Political liberalism is only a partial theory of political justice. The liberal concept includes the fair regulation of the basic structure of a society characterized by reasonable pluralism. Any use of comprehensive doctrines in a sphere of public discourse will lead to an imposition. The political concept of justice through
overlapping consensus is a politically normative or ethical concept, connected to the idea of free and equal people. These individuals gather together, with different concepts of good and reasonable doctrines, and agree on a basic structure for their society.

As mentioned previously, this is not an attempt to create a comprehensive doctrine, nor does this approach necessarily rely upon one. The form identifies the political concepts and approaches that are compatible with plural worldviews and what they might look like. For Rawls (2003), rational and reasonable institutions and procedures are necessary to promote fairness and justice in the space of public democracy. Drawing on Hegel’s concept of reconciliation, Rawls (2003) suggests that, due to the rational nature of institutions and the non-dominating concepts of political liberalism, citizens will be reconciled and therefore support social institutions, which will, in turn, distribute goods in a just manner as a result of their just arrangements (p.3). Even people with different goals and perspectives from others within that society will be able to agree on a concept of justice, because it is not comprehensive. As part of the structure of justice, the bare principles allow many comprehensive views, yet these views are not part of the discourse. Rawls asks individuals to suspend their private beliefs as they deliberate over public values. Public reason plays an important role in form, as people who are reasonable, rational, educated (both formally and informally through institutions and its procedures) allow a conception of justice to be known, examined, critiqued, and accepted or disregarded. The central concept of Justice as Fairness is a notion of society as a fair system of social cooperation represented in a democratic structure, where individuals participate fully to ensure continual functioning.

Similarly, the capabilities approach does not offer an all-inclusive formulation of
justice or moral theory, as utilitarianism, Marxism and some forms of liberalism do. Both Nussbaum and Sen consider capabilities to be an incomplete politically liberal approach based on the importance of human flourishing and the removal of justice. Nussbaum (2005) writes:

The capabilities approach is a political doctrine about basic entitlements, not a comprehensive moral doctrine. It does not even claim to be a complete political doctrine, since it simply specifies some necessary conditions for a decently just society, in the form of a set of fundamental entitlements of all citizens. Failure to secure these citizens is a particularly grave violation of basic justice, since these entitlements are held to be implicit in the very notions of human dignity and a life that is worthy of human dignity. (p. 155)

The capabilities-based approach is a political perspective that views welfare, freedom and the goods necessary for human functioning as a basic requirement for a just society. All citizens are entitled to these basic goods and, if this is not achieved, justice is not present. Goods, in this sense, are intrinsically connected to human dignity and what is required for a decent life and basic functioning.

The capabilities approach, like justice as fairness, relies on liberal-democratic social structures to support capabilities. Political liberalism, in the form of democratic institutions and participation, is characteristic of a society that honors human capabilities. A social structure that makes space for democratic participation, public discourse and reasoning is inseparable from the capabilities approach to justice. In this sense, the form
of capabilities is closely related to the social conditions dimension of justice, which will be discussed shortly. This dimension also overlaps with foundation, as capabilities are necessary because of human dignity, which is the foundation of justice.

**Orientation**

What does orientation refer to? The aim or outcome of utilitarianism is a certain aggregate welfare for society. In this case, the outcome would be the satisfaction of individual and social happiness and or preferences, which, in the utilitarian perspective, is good and just. Providing for human welfare is the satisfaction of utility. Utility consists of what maximizes preference, or happiness. Kymlicka (2002) points out that utilitarianism seeks human welfare by firmly rooting its focus on the outcome. It does so by taking account of all individual and social desires, or “conforming to human intuition” (p.11). The intuitionistic nature of utilitarianism is concerned with individual lives, as it concerns itself with human needs, desires and experiences. Utilitarian orientations of justice rely upon a moral calculus of majority desires and preferences to determine the distribution of goods for society as a whole.

The various approaches within utilitarianism are welfare hedonism, non-hedonistic, preference satisfaction and informed preference satisfaction (Kymlicka, 2002). This variety of a takes on utilitarianism suggests that it has evolved, adjusting to improve its approach to securing well-being. Welfare hedonism is one of the most influential utilitarian perspectives, holding the “view that the experience or sensation of pleasure is the chief human good … an end-in-itself, to which all other goods are means” (p. 13). This approach to utility is intuitionistic in its reliance on emotive aspects of
individual and collective desires to determine what the most important good is. What is most pleasurable is what satisfies a society. Hedonistic welfare, in this sense, is focused on the human experience, as guided by pleasure and the avoidance of pain. Kymlicka (2002) questions this approach when he uses Nozick’s argument about an activity that may cause great pleasure, but has no meaning or value and may possibly cause physical harm (p.13). On the other hand, many people find value what in has meaning and importance to them, in spite of critiques, negative social outcomes, or external judgments. The non-hedonistic utilitarian views the hedonistic account as wrong, because life and all of its dimensions transcend the emotions of happiness, pleasure and pain. Because hedonistic welfare can elicit satisfaction of utility from mental and emotional states divorced from experience, the non-hedonistic perspective suggests, “utilitarianism is concerned with all valuable experiences, whatever form they take” (p. 14). The eminence and opportunity for experience suggests a view that is concerned with individual lives. Preference satisfaction involves “increasing people’s utility [which] means satisfying their preferences, whatever they are” and attempting to “satisfy all kinds of preferences equally, for they equate welfare with preference satisfaction” (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 14). Welfare and preference satisfaction are inseparable from this perspective. The other end of the spectrum suggests preference satisfaction may not lead to well-being since it relies on aggregate social preference to measure social desires. The preference of the majority is usually the outcome of the aggregation to the dismay of the minority. Yet, there is value in preference satisfaction as an indicator of a majority’s social desire because the counting of preferences has an element of democracy, which was a major shift in the social context prior to the introduction of utilitarianism.26 Kymlicka (2002) argues that preference
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26 See later section on social conditions.
satisfaction “does not define good” (p.15). As a result, preference satisfaction may lead to injustice. Adaptive preferences emerge when minorities come to accept injustice as a result of the continuous denial of rights and unequal distribution of preferences. Even though majority wishes are advanced by the counting of preferences in a voting format, minority groups often suffer, as evidenced in the United States South’s oppressive Jim Crow laws and women’s liberation movements. Women, prior to the right to vote, had very little voice in advocating for political rights, resulting in their exclusion from voting. Adaptive preferences may present an inaccurate view of social preference because individuals have altered their expectations in light of existing social and political constraints (Kymlicka, 2002; Sen, 2009; Snauwaert, 2010). Adaptive preferences represent a highly problematic aspect of utilitarianism.

The informed preference approach attempts to fix the problem of adaptive preferences in preference satisfaction “by defining welfare as the satisfaction of rational informed preferences” (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 16). This approach is based on full information, which attempts to provide and correct judgments resulting from mistaken and irrational views informing the previous approaches to utilitarianism. Informed preference is considered to be the primary good, and to be rational in its approach to utility. The criterion for deciding upon a preference is full information. Yet, this view is considered too vague and difficult to measure. Kymlicka (2002) inquires how happiness and desire be rationalized, or if someone could be happy about something irrational. He concludes that it is not possible to aggregate and prioritize different preferences and determine well-being, due to the incommensurable aspects of measurement. For instance, if certain truths are hidden, one could not have the relevant issues to adequately
inform preferences. Upon the revelation of knowledge, views might change radically. Thus, Kymlicka (2002) concludes that informed preference is plausible but difficult to apply in practice, due to the difficulty in knowing what information or knowledge will maximize utility for individuals and society.

In terms of orientation, despite differing specifications, each version of utilitarianism is similarly focused on the consequences or outcome of actions and principles for well-being. Informed preference is concerned with well-being resulting from full information. Hedonistic utilitarianism is focused on emotive well-being, i.e. happiness and pleasure. Because of the aggregation of preferences to maximize welfare and human good, utilitarianism often does not achieve well-being for minorities and other marginalized groups in the society.

Indirectly, contractarianism is concerned with human well-being, but differs in its approach and focus. The orientation of the social contract position focuses on the perfect ordering of society and its institutions. If arranged accordingly, perfect institutions will meet the needs and demands of justice for society. Advanced by Kant and Hume, contractarianism, or the social contract view, is accepted widely as an important view of the aim of justice. Rawls (1977, 2003) describes, in *Justice as Fairness*, his contract approach for a well-ordered society. He argues that the purpose of justice is for the construction of perfect institutional arrangements because, if institutions are justly ordered, then the work of justice if done. Rawls rules out utility, in part because of the intuitionist impulse equating desire fulfillment to a primary indicator of the determination of justice.

As an overview of Rawls’ contractarian approach, he bases justice on principles
of fairness decided in the quasi-democratic space of his notion of “the original position.”
The original position is a hypothetical space where individuals who are rough equals
leave the state of nature to begin cooperation and establish principles and laws for mutual
Restatement, as it includes equality, economic and political rights that equally benefit all
members of society. Goods are allocated equally. Conversely, in a society concerned
with the greatest good, some individuals or minority groups suffer for the greater good of
society. In other words, utilitarianism does not consider the distinction between
individuals and their conception of the good. The utility approach fails to account for the
will and liberty of people, once the majority’s aggregate desire and happiness is satisfied.
Utilitarianism may subvert individual rights by privileging the majority’s utility. This
paradigm is played out in the denial of entitlements and goods to minority, ethnic and/or
religious groups. In terms of preference satisfaction, if a “democratic” election leads to
the denial of gay, lesbian and transgendered rights, such as marriage, this majority view
results in denial of freedoms, which is unjust.

The principles focusing on justice as fairness and capabilities both argue against
this trajectory of utilitarianism. Rawls’ (1999) conception of justice draws on Mill’s
(2003) notion of pure liberty as a pre-existing state, and one that is present at and after the
original position. As a result, liberty, in its purest sense, is opposed to utilitarianism.
Furthermore, Rawls (199) suggests that contractarianism is desirable to persons who wish
to arrive at principles based on justice, but that utility subverts choice (pp. 24-26). Parties
to the social contract would not be willing to subvert their freedom and conception of the
good for the arbitrary principle that is embodied in a utilitarian position. In part, Rawls’
entire theory of justice is an alternative to and critique of utilitarianism.

Beyond its critique of utilitarianism, the basic structure of Rawls’ social contract approach is oriented toward procedure and the perfection of social and political institutions that will operate justly for all the citizens of a given society. Specifically, a well-ordered society and a fair system of cooperation embody the institutional orientation of Rawlsian *Justice as Fairness* and this approach to contract theory. A well-ordered society is closely connected with the idea of a fair system of cooperation, comprising a structure in which citizens are well informed and supportive of the structure (the institutions which are governed by the conception of justice), and there is a sense of justice in the citizenry (Rawls, 2003, p. 8-9). Fair terms of cooperation, necessary to the idea of a well-ordered society, are the subject of justice and part of its basic structure. Fair terms of cooperation regulate all of society’s transactions, describing social relations informed by the principles of the basics of structure that constitute fair and just institutional procedures to create justice. The work of justice is done if the institutions and their procedures are fair and ordered according to the principles of justice.

The procedural nature of the original position reveals a rule-based and institutional orientation of justice. Given the procedure, structures, and principles founded in the original position, the institutional arrangement (consistent with form and process) considered by Rawls to be most compatible with the basic structure of justice as fairness is property-owning democracy, because it provides the “background structure.” The benefit of property-owning democracy is in its “aim to realize the basic institutions [and] the idea of society as a fair system of cooperation between citizens regarded as free and equal” (Rawls, 2003, p. 140). This framework provides a structure that promotes and
develops just institutions, while reinforcing political conceptions of justice, distribution of primary goods, and minimum care for those who find themselves in need. The subject of justice, for Rawls (2003), is necessarily “the end of supporting just institutions and giving one another justice accordingly” (p. 199), because it is institutions that maintain social cooperation for a well-ordered society.

Many other scholars situate their perspectives of justice in response to Rawls, as do Sen (2009) and Nussbaum (2006). Additionally, there are considerable critiques of various aspects of the important work of Rawls. In response to the groundbreaking work of Rawls, Nussbaum (2006) and Sen (2009) have most recently challenged the social contract position by advancing the outcome-oriented capabilities-based approach to justice. Examples of the differences in orientation are in Sen and Nussbaum’s view of Rawls’ conception of social cooperation or “fair terms of social cooperation” through institutions and procedures as primary and the subject of justice. For them, social cooperation is important, but secondary to individual levels. Institutions, in the social contract tradition, are primary in the scheme of social cooperation for their maintenance. Rawls believes that institutions are the primary focus of justice whereas, for Sen (2009) and Nussbaum (2006), human dignity and flourishing are the primary subjects of justice.

According to Nussbaum (2006), the capabilities approach to justice originated in the work of Aristotle and was advanced by Mill, Wollstonecraft and Marx27. This orientation of justice is comparative “focusing on actual realizations of the societies involved, rather than only on institutions and rules” (Sen, 2009, p. 9). In other words, a realization of justice orientation is focused on the quality of individual lives. As an outcome-based perspective, the purpose of the realization orientation of justice is to
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ensure that individuals receive what they are entitled to in accordance with their human
dignity. As such, all people are entitled to a decent and good quality of life. Nussbaum
(2006) and Sen (2009) describe the content of a decent quality of life as “capabilities.”
Capabilities are a species of human rights, which Nussbaum (2006) articulates as a list of
goods, rights, welfares and entitlements accorded to all individuals. Nussbaum and Sen
both articulate justice from realization or outcome-focused approach. Nussbaum (2006)
draws on Hugo Grotius when she suggests that any theory of justice should begin “with
the content of an outcome. In this sense, an account of entitlements of human beings is
required by justice, if these entitlements are fulfilled, then a society is minimally just” (p. 37).
This outcome-focused perspective considers dignity of persons as the most
important aim of justice. Therefore, the fulfillment of all rights, goods and welfares
required for an individual to live a decent life is the primary focus of justice. It looks at
the distribution of capabilities in terms of what minimum level of human functioning is
of justice, we identify a correct outcome; we then design a procedure that will achieve
this result” (pp. 81-82). As a result, the outcome orientation view of justice begins with
what is needed, a good quality of life, and proceeds from that point, because “what
matters for justice is the quality of life for people” (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 82). It also
measures injustice to determine what needs to be fulfilled. It focuses on the needs of
human lives to ensure they can function in a dignified manner, rather than on institutions.
In *Justice as Fairness*, principles of fairness are front-loaded in the procedures of
institutions to ensure a just outcome. From this perspective, the institutional arrangement
of Rawlsian approaches is less likely to have a just outcome because of the assumption
that development of just and moral supporting structures and procedures that focus indirectly on conditions will lead to human well-being. Capabilities scholars argue that this institutional focus is less likely to promote well-being.

Amartya Sen (2009) articulates an equally compelling perspective of justice based on the work of social choice theory and Adam Smith. Sen departs from what he terms “institutional transcendentalism,” which refers to the creation or invention of a perfect institutional order, which was espoused by Kant, Rawls, and other political philosophers utilizing social contract perspectives of justice. Sen (2009) is concerned with the real lives and effects of injustice, as well as capabilities. The nature of injustice describes the possibilities for justice. According to Sen (2009), the Rawlsian theory of justice as fairness looks to create perfectly just institutions. The comparison of real lives can reveal what injustices exist, measure the level of justice, and identify what is needed to stop injustices and bring about justice. “Those focusing on realization-focused comparisons were often interested primarily in the removal of manifest injustice from the world they saw” (Sen, 2009, p.7). Sen argues that Rawls’ institutional-based arrangement for justice misses the mark. Besides overlooking individual lives, institutions can never be perfect because humans, who comprise institutions, are not.

Sen (2009) is concerned with the lives of people and the conditions they live in, as he states that a “realization-focused understanding ... concentrate[s] on the actual behavior of people” (p. 7). Human behavior is much more relevant to justice, as it might contribute to or diminish people's access to a just quality of life. Social contract approaches are more concerned with the behavior of institutions, neglecting that they are composed of imperfect people. Sen asks how, then, they can be perfect. Is Rawls trying
to achieve perfection, or is he attempting to design a basic structure where procedure eliminates the possibility of injustice in processes that should be routine? Rawls is seeking perfection of human institutions through rules, in the same way that Kant attempts to make rules for human behavior in his categorical imperative (Kant, 1996/1795). There is an explicit assumption that institutions with reasonable and rational rules, known and agreed upon by all, will operate justly. We know that even the most perfectly ordered systems of rules are subject to problems, corruption and injustice. Specifically, Kant and Rawls explore institutional perfection, focusing on the arrangement of institutions, and examine behavioral norms (Sen, 2009, p. 8-9). While the utilitarian approach aims to fulfill human well-being, it inevitably leaves some behind. The social contract approach focuses on perfect institutional arrangements. Capabilities-based approaches look to the conditions of human lives to determine justice.

**Domain**

The content of justice is relevant to the dimension of domain. The domain concerns Sen’s important question of the “equality of what.” Utility is the content of justice in utilitarianism. Depending on the approach to utilitarianism, as described earlier, utility could be pleasure, preference, happiness and informed preference. The hedonistic account of pleasure is more fully articulated as a conception when described as “freedom from pain.” Bentham’s (1789/2002) Humean\(^\text{28}\) description presents utility, in terms of pleasure and pain, as a basic unit of moral and political import that governs the desire of humans, which, if fulfilled, can bring about happiness. Mill (2002) also considers pleasure and pain of great importance to utility in his description of the

\(^{28}\) In reference to David Hume (1711–76), Scottish philosopher, economist, and historian.
“greatest happiness principle” (p.99). It should be noted that happiness in this context is not completely hedonistic. Over time, this conception of pleasure has been taken to be purely hedonistic, as it is in some cases. Kymlicka (2002) describes informed preference as the utility that meets the informational requirement of justice, and requires rational and reasonable decision-making. All things being equal, there is full information in this approach to determining aggregate preferences. Each person is taken to have their own utility, which is equally considered among with others. In comparison to Justice as Fairness and capabilities, utilitarianism is the most simplistic in terms of content.

Rawls’ “primary goods index” describes what is necessary for human functioning and equality. The primary goods index includes basic rights, such as liberties and freedoms, as well as the need-based all-purpose means. Primary goods are legitimized in the contract as necessary for stability and social cooperation. The basic liberties and all-purpose goods are considered an important matter for public discourse in the political sphere, as they are connected to the basic structure. Knowledge about them is required to develop a life plan and individual conception of the good. Liberty, freedom, movement, self-respect, wealth, income and opportunity are means to a good life. Political liberties and freedoms have fair terms of value, which suggests that talented and gifted individuals have an equal access to opportunities to high offices and political participation regardless of social and economic class (Rawls, 2003, p. 46). Primary goods are all purpose goods that promote equality of opportunity (the first part of the distribution/difference principle – where the least well-off have access to opportunity and income). Any inequality would be to the benefit of the least advantaged in the second part of the second principle. All of the primary goods are of importance to a life worthy of human dignity, in which a

29 See the Aristotelian conception of happiness.
political conception specifies these goods (Rawls, 2003, p. 58).

Sen’s (2009) arguments against Rawls’ primary goods are that wealth and income are not an absolute index. Sen suggests that primary goods depend on the person’s capacity to utilize that income, because class and social standing weigh in on the convertibility of primary goods to a good life. Additionally, to say that people are equally advantaged is to mistake the value of goods. As a result, we should not look at resources as the fundamental content of justice. Capabilities relate directly with each individual’s level of functioning in accordance with their dignity. Rawls objects to capabilities on the grounds that they are difficult and too complex to measure. For Rawls (2003), the principles of justice formulating the distribution of goods prevent us from devolving into an allocated stance that can be utilitarian. Rawls (2003) concludes by noting that all we can look at is the distribution of all-purpose goods for those who are in need.

The space of capabilities provides substantive freedoms to do and be, as well as comparative assessments of injustice and possibilities for the good. Primary goods, for Nussbaum and Sen, are capabilities. Capabilities, Nussbaum (2006) writes, “takes [the] value of people’s opportunity to live good lives to be primary, and the account of political justification to be posterior to an account of what makes lives in accordance with human dignity possible” (p.154). In this sense, primary goods are very flexible, meeting the needs of individuals’ lives, including the impaired and those who cannot contribute to primary good (as used above). As mentioned earlier, Rawls will not accept the capabilities account because including impairments and disabilities in the “calculation of needs for primary goods” (Nussbaum, 2006, p.113) would be too complex of a way to
measure the least well off. For Rawls, simplicity is necessary to calculate material distribution. Extended health issues relative to the social environment are excluded from primary goods. Rawls’ approach is problematic for Sen, as capabilities are valid substitutes for primary goods because they truly reach the heart of human well-being. Rawls’ (1993, 2003) view suggests that wealth and income are equal to a quality of life. As an example, Nussbaum asks who is better off: a wealthy person in a wheelchair, or an able-bodied wealthy person. By many accounts, the able-bodied person is better off. Wealth cannot always account for well-being. Nussbaum rejects Rawls’ proposal because of his linear view of primary goods as related to wealth. She also finds difficulty in the difference principle because of this same economic focus (Nussbaum, 2006, pp. 113-114). Although Rawls does think self-respect is important, he ignores it as a primary good. Nussbaum questions why a group can have wealth and income, but not self-respect. Capabilities are concerned with human functioning that satisfies dignity, which might not necessarily include wealth and income.

The domain for Nussbaum (2005, 2011) and Sen (2009) is based on capabilities as the combined powers of innate (internal) capacities and basic or central capabilities. Innate capacities are undeveloped, but combined with the basic capabilities to do and be, constitute central capabilities. Central capabilities are dependent upon a society that is structured in such a way that people have the opportunity to choose how they wish to function or live in accordance to their dignity. Capabilities, in this sense, is a pluralistic conception, as opposed to utilitarian and social contract concepts, which focus on economic productivity as measured by gross domestic and gross national productivity. These are not good or specific measures of the quality of life, because higher incomes,
which are often isolated in elite groups, are not an accurate depiction of functioning for large groups of people. Nussbaum (2011) argues that the distinction of ‘developing nations’ for the Global South should be used in many western nations with large groups of immigrants and minorities living in poverty. Developed nations are in ways comparable to those nations of the Global South. Capabilities are not reducible, fungible or commensurable; they stand-alone and cannot be exchange or aggregated. Lives are evaluated to see what capabilities are present. These central capabilities can be instantiated in different cultural contexts, according to what is required by human dignity (Nussbaum, 2000, pp. 78-81). Nussbaum (2000) argues that practical reason and affiliation is necessary for individuals to recognize that their own good is interdependent upon that of others, and is implicit in all the other capabilities. She argues that this connection makes us truly human, and planning a good life outside of this context, without such discourse, is not realistic. Nussbaum (2000) writes, “To plan for one’s own life without being able to do so in complex forms of discourse, concern, and reciprocity with other human beings is, again to behave in an incompletely human way” (p. 82). In this sense, education or learning about obstacles and ways to access opportunities is central to this conception. Central capabilities involve access to opportunities and the ability to make life plans in concert with others, according to functioning and dignity.

**Structure**

The structure inquires into the expression of duties and claims articulated in approaches to justice. Because utilitarianism does not accept the notion of civil or political rights, but espouses a general assertion of moral equality, how might claims be
articulated? The moral equality expressed in the counting of utility justifies its inclusion giving voice to their preferences. However limited and possibly exclusionary, in utilitarianism, claims are expressed through the maximization of preference satisfaction. The utilitarian view in this dimension is narrow in the sense that even though justice is allocated among all, preferences are satisfied only according to the maximization of utility. Behind maximum utility is the intention of distribution on the basis of equality, but those that do not agree with the majority’s desire, will not benefit from this distribution. And since political and civil rights, in addition to other rights, are potentially void, there is no framework for the protection or even the redress of grievances of groups may suffer from long term deprivation. In the utilitarian sense, is equality is not equal. In terms of this discussion, utilitarianism is color blind in a pluralistic world, where seeing shades of difference may importantly inform the needs and requirements of justice. Despite these flaws, utilitarianism shares with Rawls’ *Justice as Fairness* the basic foundation of liberty, freedom and equality, although minimally. Rawls (2003) considers utilitarianism to be comprehensive (p.9).

In *Justice as Fairness*, the structural dimension includes the two principles of justice, which are decided upon in the original position. The principle includes the basic liberties of freedom and equality. Referring to the first principle, Rawls (2003) writes, “each person has the same indefeasible claim to a fully adequate scheme of equal basic liberties, which scheme is compatible with the same scheme of liberties for all” (p. 42). Therefore, all persons have an unfettered entitlement to basic liberties that include freedom of conscience, movement and association. For example, the second difference principle works to produce the fair value of basic rights and liberty responding to the
Marxist critique that the first principle is only formal and hollow. The second principle goes beyond the formality of the first, since basic rights and liberties are guaranteed by the first principle to ensure the fair value of the basic rights and liberties. The principle is based upon the idea of reciprocity and rooted in equality and inclusion. Mutual advantage is built into the structure because the first and second principles work together to provide fair equality of opportunity, regardless of social class. Rawls' difference principle suggests that inequalities are only acceptable if the least advantaged are helped. Inequality is allowed because of the difference in levels of capacities, ambitions and talents, resulting in greater benefits for some. This inequality, in the context of these principles, is made to benefit the least advantaged in society. This aspect is directly relevant to the next section and will be discussed in more detail there. The two principles form the underlying values that comprise the basic structure. There is a principle of distribution here because the basic goods and liberties are distributed equally. For Rawls (2003), if principles are adhered to, whatever distribution follows will be fair because they are consistent with procedural principles of justice. Principles one and two are purely procedural, and, as a result, do not require deciphering allocations each time there is an inequality or conditions change. Sen (2009) critiques these principles as a result of their failure to recognize plural conceptions that formulate principles. Although Sen (2009) accepts fairness as a necessary and important condition, he is skeptical about Rawls' preset principles of justice. He questions how such principles would emerge under fair conditions as a result of the plurality that will emerge in any given society (p.57). Even if the principles of fairness were to emerge, he suggests that they would have to be evaluated through public deliberations.
From Sen’s (2009) perspective, it is this commitment to plural reasoning and the comparison of justice and injustices within a democratic society that provides a framework for claims in the structure of the capabilities approach. It also demonstrates the importance of human functioning as required by dignity and gives space for such claims (Nussbaum, 2006). Although Sen (2009) does accept the human rights framework as a valid representation of claims, he also recognizes the difficulty of enforcement because of an absence of mechanisms to fulfill them in most laws. This does not mean they are invalid, nor does it mean all claims should be rights. Claims can be represented in capabilities, as they are based on individual assessments of needs. Rights provide a moral and ethical support for the enactment laws (pp. 360-361). Capabilities involve realizations of what is needed in human lives, including comparative assessment of those lives, injustices and possibilities for justice. Nussbaum (2011) notes that capabilities are a species of human rights that make demands on government for their fulfillment.

Making comparisons according to how peoples’ lives are going, although complicated, has a greater possibility of determining the actual capabilities needed for human functioning. Sen (2009) argues that this measurement need not be perfect. Even a partial listing or ranking of possibilities, needs and considerations is acceptable. For example, A and B are better than C, so C can be ruled out. This is acceptable despite the need to choose between A and B. At least we know that C will not work. This approach is necessary in a world of plural reasons for various rankings. Central to the idea of justice is that we can have an idea of justice without necessarily agreeing on all the issues. Because of the dominance and indeterminate nature of plural reasoning, complete agreement is not forthcoming. Rational agreement toward justice (i.e. how to deal with
claims) is not always possible. Because of apparent violations of dignity, there can be a strong sense of injustice. Positive and negative claims in a society that allows open and impartial public scrutiny are the basis of capabilities’ structural dimension.

**Distribution**

The distribution of goods is a central concern of justice. It is also the subject of much political discourse, dialogue and criticism. The distribution of goods is at the center of contemporary politics. What kind of distribution is considered fair and just? The utilitarian approach gives equal weight to each unit of utility, and distributes according to the maximization of utility. Whatever distribution satisfies the most preferences is assumed to be an equal distribution. Even though this distribution attempts to maximize the utility of every person, they are often in conflict. A large group may disagree and, as discussed previously, will not be satisfied. This distribution is considered fair because preferences are informed and not irrational. Selfish preferences or the desire of some to receive the benefits rightfully belonging to others should be excluded even if it would maximize short-term utility (Kymlicka, 2002). In reality, this exclusion is difficult because the will of the majority, in a utilitarian approach to justice, is difficult and near impossible to resist. Additionally, there is often no real way in large pluralistic societies such as the US to exclude selfish motives when they are justified in the political process. This does not mean that said distributions are fair, and they are often far from fair. This is what Rawls (2003) describes as the problem with “allocative” justice. As a result, he formulates principles to govern the distribution of goods. Even principles, if democratic and just, are often met with resistance if they act against the
Rawls’ second principle of justice is described as the distribution principle. It is that which distributes fair social principles and equal opportunity. Briefly discussed in the last section, the distribution of goods is based on the principles of fairness. Rawls believes social inequality is inevitable so long as the least advantaged are to receive the social minimum because they are, in their own way, contributing members of society. The most advantaged provide a measure of their income to support those who are less advantaged. Rawls (2003) argues that, as part of social cooperation, the most advantaged in society use “their property and wealth and their share of what they help produce … subject to taxes … which background institutions are known to impose” (p. 52). Their wealth and property is used to benefit all of society. This principle draws on social cooperation to make sure that the disadvantaged do not fall below minimum functioning. It is reasonable and logical that individuals in this conception cooperate and share resources since they benefit from the basic structure of society. Besides this caveat, Rawls (2003) also suggests equality of opportunity as the primary concern. Opportunities and positions as part of the basic structure of justice are part of fair value and equally available to all. The difference principle, as the second part of the second principle, guarantees equitable distribution of goods for those conditions and life events that emerge that make economic functioning difficult (Rawls, 2003, pp. 41-43). In providing for the needs of long-term disruption of economic production, the distribution is quite limited. The difference principle makes sure that the first principle is possible. Often liberties cannot be accessed without economic resources and opportunities that provide substantive opportunities and freedoms to make a plan for a good life. Education
is one such example, as it is necessary for social and economic attainment. These principles guarantee equality of such opportunities through distributions that support such human development. As structured, the difference and distribution principles provide equal distribution of resources for all members of society.

From the capabilities approach, Nussbaum's critique of Rawls' distribution principle and approach is similar to Sen's. Sen (2009) and Nussbaum (2006) both acknowledge the importance of Rawls' principles of distribution and the fair value of liberties. Even though morality is embedded in Rawls' original position with its focus to the just distribution of goods, his position does not deal with specific needs of the excluded. Therein lies the difficulty of Rawls' institutional focus, which is limited, because its end is institutions and their rules, as opposed to human lives. Nussbaum (2006) argues that the primary distinction between the social contract theory and realization-focus is in terms of outcome (p.86). Nussbaum admits that intuitionism underlies her perspective, as does Rawls' theory (although limited) drawing on specific principles to make moral decisions. Rawls (1999) makes specific criticisms about the overuse of intuitionism on various grounds. First, Rawls (1999) suggests that intuitionism has no higher order constructive criteria for determining proper emphasis on competing principles of justice. There is no single standard that assigns or weighs principles, addresses possibility of conflicting pluralities, or provides priority of rules. Rawls (1996) suggests that the intuitionist perspective seeks to “strike a balance by intuition – what seems thus most nearly right” (p. 30). On these grounds, Rawls notes that it is a matter of common sense for institutions to recognize pluralism by applying those principles (of pluralism – related to the principles of justice) to deal with various
situations of everyday justice colored by custom and expectation. Therefore, perspectives drawing primarily on intuitionism have no ability to deal with cases of plurality; they simply hope to balance competing principles and not are moved by their own interests. The complexity of intuitionism as opposed simplicity of principles in for Rawls (2003), leads to utility.

Intuitionism is necessary in a capabilities approach, where ends are plural, as the needs of human dignity are not singular (Nussbaum, 2006). Rawls (2003) has difficulty with intuitionism because of this complexity. He suggests that simplicity is the most practical methodology in addressing human needs. Nussbaum (2006) argues that Rawls’ problem with intuitionism is based on his linear view of quality of life. In addition to the focus on income and wealth as primary goods contributing to human welfare, there is difficulty in the complication of “balancing of plural and diverse principles as objectionably intuitionistic” (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 173). The capabilities approach is committed to “a plurality of heterogeneous entitlements, all fundamental for social justice, it rests social justice on an objectionably intuitionistic foundation” (p. 173). As follows, there is no specific or definite order of entitlements. Capabilities are concerned with human dignity and outcomes, as opposed to Justice as Fairness’s procedural approach. Although there is a conception of moral equality, the concern for dignity in the use of intuition, as a determination of the inviolability of humanity, is absent in Justice as Fairness. The complexity of intuition, such as the role democracy, care and pluralism influences the development of capabilities (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 174). Dignity is the foundation of determining issues of distribution. Capabilities represents a hybrid theory, constantly fleshing out of what is required for a quality of life. Rawls wants determinate
ideas, where there can be none. Embedded in the intuitionism of the capabilities approach are the moral sentiments of care and concern for others stemming from moral equality. This form of benevolence is the partial justification of a focus on the well-being of others. The moral sentiment of benevolence is also a primary intuitionistic departure from Rawls.

Scope

The scope is defined by the spatial and linear configurations that determine the limit or extent of justice. This dimension asks who or what justice covers. What are the spatial and linear limits or scope of utilitarianism? Utilitarianism is concerned with the utility of a fixed polis. It has a national or local reach over a space where the units of utility can be aggregated to determine how preferences should be maximized. Because of the narrow fulfillment of preferences, excluding minorities or those who hold different ideas concerning preference satisfaction, the actual reach of justice covers a homogenous group. Since the satisfaction of preference is the highest good, the majority preferences are the only ones validated. Utility assumes equal value in weighting each person’s utility. There can be no equality without understanding the contexts of preference determination and paying attention to those whose preferences are regularly overlooked. This utilitarian approach to justice is limited. The majority tends to have similar preferences. Preferences, in this case, might often fall along socioeconomic and cultural interests. Utility is not necessarily linear. Maximal utilities differ from each aggregation to the next. In one condition, utility might be a political issue, and in another it may be a natural resource or cultural norms.
The range of application for justice as fairness is concerned with the domestic sphere and basic structure of a society. Its constitutional regime is national. International and local political justices are outside of the scope of *Justice as Fairness*. The scope, as a dimension of justice, deals with how far the reach of justice should extend. In terms of the society, its members agree to cooperate under a contract agreed upon in the original position. This agreement becomes a shared constitution according to the rules of the basic structure of society. Citizens are equal at the highest and most fundamental levels, requiring the attention of the state in matters of justice (Rawls, 2003, p. 132). The foundation of justice is relevant, as the extent of justice begins with the moral equality of citizens. Their designation as citizens warrants the extension of benefits of social cooperation as described in the distributive and difference principles. The moral dimensions of citizenship concern individuals’ behavior toward each other, the state’s treatment of citizens and the positive and negative liberties entitled to them as distributed by the state. This dimension draws on the conception of a person as rational and reasonable with moral powers. Over persons’ lifetimes, justice as fairness is stable and in force, from generation to generation. The conception of justice informs the scope with regard to the public conception of justice. Moral equality, in this case, does not extend beyond national borders and local parochialism may trump domestic morality in certain cases. The limited purview of Rawls’ conception of justice presents only a partial theory of justice, as a more full theory would answer necessary questions related to the global and the local. Rawls has difficulty with the application of his theory to the international realm, as he sees difficulty in the basic structure and procedures of justice as fairness working here. In the *Law of Peoples*, justice as fairness is cooperation globally, among
“reasonable” people with some understanding of principles of justice (Nussbaum, 2006). Unfortunately, this conception has no definite mechanisms requiring the distribution of goods or responding to claims for entitlements.

The least advantaged may be unable to consistently make equitable contributions to society as a result of a lack of certain capacities of reason. As part of the basic structure of society, those with an overabundance of resources or talent provide balance by contributing more so that all may benefit (Rawls, 2003). The “normal” person (and those unable to contribute to the scheme of mutual cooperation for a time because of temporary impairments) is able to participate in public deliberation, which is necessary for cooperation in a well-ordered polity. Social cooperation is guided by public rules, procedures, fair terms of cooperation and reciprocity whereby each participant has rational advantage. The role of the conception of a person in the social contract tradition constitutes a social arrangement focused on institutions and procedure. Rational and reasonable persons are afforded justice because of institutional acknowledgement of their productive membership in society.

Sen (2009) describes capabilities as a global conception within a democratic framework resulting from the presence of plural interests, reasoning, comparisons of justice and injustice, open and impartial scrutiny, and an objective spectator. The capabilities approach recognizes the interconnection of citizens’ interests who are in the same polity. The comparison of justice and injustice creates a global framework that relies on multiple perspectives to understand and determine the needs of real lives. Sen (2009) enlists the help of what Adam Smith describes as an “impartial spectator,” an individual or group from another culture that is able to scrutinize the decision-making
process concerning the application of justice. This approach to justice attempts to garner a kind of global understanding by allowing an impartial spectator who judges various issues to avoid local parochialism. There is no requirement to take the advice. This added level of review is important to decision-making because it encourages national polities, many of whom hold similar prejudices, to act in ways reflecting the best possible judgment (Sen, 2009, pp. 108-109, 403-404). The informational requirement of utilitarianism and contractarianism are missing this layer of judgment\(^{30}\).

Contractarianism’s attempt at impartial scrutiny and observation is, to some degree, impartial, but it is closed, as scrutiny remains within the national polity. In this sense, the external review element of the impartial spectator scheme is cross-cultural and cosmopolitan in its inclusion and willingness to listen to those who are different.

Nussbaum (2006) critiques Rawls’ account of international justice in the *Law of Peoples* as thin and patronizing because he does not account for the democratic possibilities of non-Western nations. Rawls, according to Nussbaum, extends his conception of justice, albeit in a limited way, to the international realm, in terms of overlapping consensus. Liberal nations, with “decent” people, who are also to some extent reasonable, agree to a kind of global decency, but in accordance with their own customs and traditions, so as not to be culturally insensitive and respect perspectives not necessarily understood by liberal nations. Nussbaum (2006) wonders whether Rawls believes that the decent nations even have the capacity to participate in his overlapping consensus, whereby all have their own comprehensive beliefs but abide by the democratic and pluralistic frameworks of the basic structure. Further, Nussbaum

\(^{30}\) Rawls (1999) views the impartial spectator (as a device) as problematic, as it is an outside force that is utilitarian. See *Justice as Fairness* (revised ed.).
critiques on Rawls his myopic view that the source of political liberalism and democracy is only rooted in the history of western Europe. According to Nussbaum (2006), Rawls' lack of faith in the democratic potential of the global south could be construed as culturally relativistic (pp. 298-305).

Nussbaum (2006) offers a more compelling account of the scope of justice through capabilities as global human development, which is premised on dealing with global or “collective action problems” through institutions composed of individuals operating on behalf of other individuals. This global conception stems from a conception of “fairness” or fair share of the problem since institutions, such as corporations, government agencies, NGO’s have a “capacity” that individuals acting alone do not (pp. 307-308). Like Rawls (1977, 2003) and others, Nussbaum (2006) does not wish to enact a global government, but she does offer “principles for a global structure” that would support the fulfillment of capabilities. These principles are:

1) the ‘over determination of responsibility’ – global and domestic fulfillment of capabilities;

2) National sovereignty should be respected, with “the constraints of promoting human capabilities” (p. 316).

3) “Prosperous nations have a responsibility to give a substantial portion of their GDP to poorer nation”. This idea is similar to Thomas Pogge’s principle of redistribution (p. 316)31.

4) “Multinational corporations have responsibilities for promoting human capabilities in the regions of the world in which they operate” (p. 317). This principle requires

---

31 Thomas Pogge (2002) proposes a Global Resource Dividend where more developed states make payments, which are percentages of their GDP to the global south.
corporations to treat those in nations they profit from with dignity. People are ends in
themselves, not instrumental means for corporate profits.
5) “The main structures of the global economic order must be designed to be fair to poor
and developing nations” (p. 319).
6) “We should cultivate a thin, decentralized and yet forceful global public sphere” (p. 319).
7) “All institutions and (most) individuals should focus on the problems of the
disadvantaged in each nation and region” (p. 320).
8) “Care for the ill, elderly, children and the disable[d] should be a prominent feature of
focus of the world community” (p. 321). Nussbaum extends the notion of care in a
multidimensional and global meaning.
9) “The family should be treated as sphere that is precious but not private” (p. 321);
10) “All institutions and individuals have a responsibility to support education, as a key
to the empowerment of currently disadvantaged people” (p. 322).
These principles, for Nussbaum, do not constitute a plan for the promotion of global
governance, but has implications for it. While describing these principles, Nussbaum
(2006) suggests that these are open and flexible, welcoming inclusion, alterations,
deletions and any additions.

Process

The process dimension of justice asks, “On what grounds is the validity of a
conception of justice based?” (Snauwaert, 2010, p. 2) In this sense, many dimensions
overlap and converge. In terms of a utilitarian perspective, the process that creates
validity, intersecting with various dimensions, is based on moral equality and the informational requirement. Justice is validated by the equality of each person’s utility, which is counted or aggregated. Citizens, although not all, are satisfied because the majority of preferences have been taken into account. This is a process of maximizing of aggregate utility through the satisfaction of preferences and or general welfare. Preferences are judged according to the informational requirement and maximization of pleasure. The fairness of this arrangement is justified by modern utilitarian approaches that exclude irrational and unjust preferences, such as selfish preferences, from the aggregation (Kymlicka, 2002). There must be some reasonable assurance that unfair and selfish claims will not be taken into account. How is this assured in the utilitarian calculus? Kymlicka (2002) notes that utilitarianism does not involve a process, per se, but is “essentially a standard of rightness” (p. 30). Utilitarianism is justified or considered morally right if aggregate preferences are satisfied. This account of justice is particularly thin in that rights can be easily violated.

The process, in this case, does not rely upon a hypothetical situation to provide validity for institutions of justice. Informed preferences attempt to exclude selfish and irrational preferences so they do not occupy the majority of attention. Yet, fulfillment of these preferences has been justified by a majority of citizens. Consider, for example, indigenous land rights in the United States and reparations for slaves. These groups were not subjects of justice, as they were considered sub-human, non-moral beings; their preferences were invisible to white majorities. Kymlicka (2002) suggests that there is a long-term argument over whether the fulfillment of the rights of minorities could be justified as a public good impacting all liberties. This point is concluded with the
acknowledgement that the short-term denial of rights and maximization of utility is most likely, given human history and the function of utility. Might there be more specific process-related aspects in this dimension of utilitarianism? The interpersonal principle discusses whether one should use utilitarian principles or some other in the judging whether acts are correct or not. In this case, one might judge each action based on whether it maximizes utility or not. This might lead to the violation of agreements and personal relationships. Kymlicka (2002) suggests that the modern approach to utility would allow the use of other moral conceptions and principles to determine right actions within an interpersonal case. These questions are closely related to the dimension of moral resources. To conclude, there is some basic similarity in the need for justification in terms of the manner or process of justice. Moral equality and information are the center of utilitarianism and justice as fairness. Utilitarian perspectives lack procedures and structures required to insure that moral equality is achieved and that selfish preferences do not outweigh individuals’ and groups’ just claim to equality of liberties and goods.

The process for *Justice as Fairness* is public reason, the social contract procedure, and impartiality. The social contract procedure and the basic structure of society includes the rules, institutions and the procedures of these institutions fashioned by the principles of freedom, equality, and equality of opportunity, which attempt to provide a framework in which basic freedoms and fairness are protected. The procedure of the social contract is the result of the selections made in the original position. In the original position, the political conception of justice is agreed upon under what are regarded as fair conditions. The original position is a representative model for the selection and justification for the
creation of the structure and fair process. The representatives in the original position, who have left the state of nature to create a contract for mutual advantage, are symmetrical and impartial in their relations with each other and those they represent. Since the participants of the original position cannot be present at the time of agreement, people choose representatives to designate their interests in the contract. Fair conditions are possible because contracting parties, representative of themselves and others who cannot be present, proceed under a veil of ignorance to choose principles and institutional procedures for society. In terms of rational capacities, there are no asymmetries of power, information or ability among contracting parties in the original position. The original position is a device invented by Rawls (1999, 2003) to model the process of fair conditions to initiate an agreement. Equality in every aspect of the original position is necessary to insure the results are fair.

In this context, the original position is the space where the principles that inform the institutions and their social and procedural norms are chosen. The institutional procedures are general, as they do not necessarily cover the internal workings private institutions, but regulate certain aspects of behavior, such as those that touch public life, so that they do not adversely affect individual liberties. One encroachment on a private institution is discrimination and exclusion of individuals or groups. Institutions, like individuals, participate in the public forum with their own conceptions of the good. In the liberal sense, they are tolerant of others to protect their own freedom. Within the original position, the representative participants are obliged to compare frameworks for justice, such as utility and others, for the purpose of deciding on principles. This comparison validates decisions made in the original position, gaining “public

justification,” and overlapping consensus of those who inevitably come to this starting point with multiple worldviews and values. Such rigor in decision-making will lead to social cooperation. Also, mutual advantage is a very important reason for social cooperation. There are certain economic benefits to cooperating with others. Therefore, the original position is a process that requires reasonableness of its participants so that they can move beyond personal interests toward mutual advantage and a basic common good. As follows, the procedure of the original position involves comparisons that lead to the choices concerning the principles of justice and the kind of society that would best fulfill those principles. For Rawls, this society is a property owning democracy. The basic idea of the OP is that justice is forged out of fair procedures and the choice of principles and social institutional structures, at this stage by the contracting parties.

Sen (2009) suggests that a transcendental solution cannot be found33. From this perspective, Sen (2009) questions the feasibility of a just society as articulated by Rawls when he states, “an exercise of practical reason that involves an actual choice demands a framework for comparison of justice for choosing among the feasible alternatives” (p. 9). In response to the feasibility concern and the claim of unanimous choice in the OP, Sen asks if we should also examine what emerges in society (p.10). Sen answers that we cannot know if a “plurality of reason for justice would allow one unique set of reasons for justice to emerge in the original position” (p. 11). Sen (2009) argues that social justice for Rawls is explored through the identification and establishment of just institutions, but counters that, in Law of Peoples, justice is explored and can be determined by reasonable people, which opens up the discourse for a plurality of reasons without Rawls departing from the basic structure of society (Sen, 2009, p. 10-11). Sen concludes that we should

33 Sen terms Rawls’ institutional approach “transcendental institutionalism.”
not pursue institutional perfection because such institutions have little to do with real lives.

Another critique of Rawls’ original position and procedure is based in his reliance on mutual advantage as a condition of and reason for justice. The aspect of mutual advantage in the original position is problematic, as, for Nussbaum, care for others and dignity as the foundation of justice are a primary reason for cooperation. According to Nussbaum (2006), Rawls’ view of the contract is a moralistic view of the political and mutual advantage in political liberalism and related general principles necessitating cooperation based on economic interest. These reasons do not have sufficient moral grounding (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 7-13). Mutual advantage as the reason for leaving the state of nature does not account for human dignity. Since mutual advantage is rooted in the equality of capacity and resources, it excludes human dignity or those aspects necessary for human functioning, which vary across cultural beliefs, religions, genders and races. Nussbaum (2006) argues that Rawls’ assumption that humans do not have natural rights until leaving the state of nature is a point of contention, referring to the “fiction of a state of nature” (p.12). The state of nature and social contract are unnecessary contrivances for Nussbaum because humans, non-human animals, and the environment possess dignity. The contract excludes women, children, and disabled or mentally impaired people, who, even through provisions to the initial position (what Rawls refers to as reflective equilibrium or the ability to return to the original position to deal with concerns not part of the current principles of justice), are unable to refashion the principles of justice. Therefore the contract perspective of justice does not adequately address the need of all who should subjects of justice to define a theory of good that
allows human flourishing.

Sen (2009) views the process dimension of justice as requiring a democratic structures, objectivity, impartiality, reason and rationality. Objectivity is difficult, if not impossible to achieve. Sen (2009) describes the necessity of open, impartial scrutiny of decision-making that is open to those from the outside. They are able to provide a more objective perspective. The decision-making Sen (2009) advocates for is based on social choice theory, which involves “outcomes of the social choice procedure that take the form of ranking different states of affairs from a ‘social point of view,’ in the light of the assessments of the people involved”(p. 55). Individuals rank the assessments of justice and injustice to determine their course of action. The assessment takes place in a plural and open forum with public reasoning. Sen argues that open and informed public deliberation is necessary to scrutinize principles of justice. Unlike Rawls, the emergence of a basic structure to decide principles is not necessary, nor is it likely, since society is so plural and diverse. Reasoned public debate is necessary to come to some partial agreement about the principles and priority of justice.

The nature of impartial reasoning is based on an attempt to achieve objectivity. Sen (2009) writes, “To the extent that we look for ethical objectivity, the reasoning that is necessary has to satisfy what can be seen as the requirements of impartiality” (p.46). Such reasoning occurs in an open and impartial forum invoking “disinterested judgments of ‘any fair and impartial spectator,’ not necessarily belonging to the focal group” (p.123), to move beyond local parochialism in a group’s scrutiny. The objective spectator is a device Sen (2009) borrows from Adam Smith. The impartial spectator is an objective party who can comment on the proceedings of a society’s determinations
surrounding issues of justice. Sen (2009) uses a device for impartiality to avoid local prejudices invisible to members of that particular society. The impartiality requirement and the impartial spectator also help individuals move beyond their “positional (epistemological) confinement,” which refers to the fact that “what we can see is not independent of where we stand” (p. 156). In a closed society or group, there is difficulty viewing issues objectively because there is no one with differing perspectives. The impartial observer helps the group shift their view by offering a vantage point not sullied by the same prejudices of a closed group. As follows, Sen (2009) articulates an open perspective that requires transparency as a part of making reasonable, rational partial determinations to ensure justice.

Moral Resources

What personal attributes are needed for individuals to respond to others in ways consistent with human dignity and moral equality? As a consequentialist philosophy, utilitarianism is concerned with correct action that will provide the best possible outcome for the sum of lives. Human well-being is the intended outcome. Nussbaum (2006), describing Singer’s preference utilitarianism, suggests that it “holds that consequences we should aim to produce are those that on balance ‘further the interests of the affected’” (p. 339). She provides the example that to kill is not good when the person who is killed does not want to die. Murder is not acceptable to the person who wishes to live. This principle and example can be generalized across most actions, articulating that all action must be guided by the wishes of the person to whom the action is directed. This aspect of utility theory is typified in the “Golden Rule” (Kymlicka, 2002, p.33). To abide by a
person’s wishes is to recognize their moral equality through the respect of their wishes. Reciprocity and mutuality are required for this interpersonal aspect of utilitarianism. A person acts in accordance with the wishes of others out of respect for their moral equality. They have hopes that the same respect would be shown to them. This is a reciprocal relationship. Each person is aware that if they do not satisfy the preferences of others, abstaining from interference with their freedoms, they risk their own happiness. The abstinence from interference in the personal affairs, liberty and private property of citizens by governments and other individuals is the basis of Mill’s (2003) conception of liberty. Karl Marx (2001) describes liberty, in this sense, in *On the Jewish Question*, as “self-assured egotism.” Are reciprocity and mutuality, in terms of liberty and in the context of utilitarianism, thin accounts of moral resources? This account does not hold for the utilitarian account because one could simply choose not to follow the Golden Rule. If another action, such as choosing not to fulfill a promise, as Kymlicka (2002) describes, could maximize utility, in the strictest sense of utilitarian principles, it constitutes a moral act. Kymlicka (2002) holds that in these interpersonal acts, a utilitarian can choose among any principles that agree with his or her moral perspective. In essence, reasoning and moral equality, as part of the informed preference approach, may stand as a valid resource that would account for the personal attributes needed to respond to others. However, it is this intuitive ambiguity that is problematic for utilitarianism, especially in external utility, where adaptive preferences of minorities or other disliked groups, could be forced to change to fit the preferences of others, or may be ignored all together.

Moral resources hinge on the conception of free and equal, reasonable and
rational persons with those moral powers, who are aware of and can learn and apply principles of justice in their behavior toward others (Rawls, 2003, p. 92). The moral power of rationality is concerned with a person’s ability to conceive of a good life, a sense of justice, and participate in public reason to preserve and access to opportunities and liberty of consciousness and freedom of thought (Rawls, 2003, p. 93). This dimension is educative and communicative, in that it requires individuals to learn and participate in public discourse and to communicate their own perspective in clear and reasonable ways. The basic structure of justice facilitates this capacity, as it provides a forum for reasonable public discourse. Reasoning, in this sense, is the discussion of political values and perspectives in ways respectful of and tolerant to plurality (Rawls, 2003, pp. 91-92). As follows, citizens with moral powers learn from justice, how to interact with each other and participate in discourse to maintain the political space itself. They also learn about dissent as well as consent.

The capacity of moral resources concerns reciprocity and mutuality of individuals toward others, and is part of a scheme of social cooperation in justice as fairness. What is the result of a society that does not value or require a moral standard of interpersonal behavior for its citizens, or for institutions to individuals? People understand, and the basic structure, through institutional procedure, teaches them that, though they may have reasons for disagreeing with others (on the basis of politics, culture, or religion), they must be tolerant of others. They must avoid crossing any lines that would violate the liberty, freedom, or physical safety of any citizen. Consistent with notions of negative liberty, institutions must not interfere with individual freedom and liberty (Berlin, 1969; Snauwaert, 1992). Failures to avoid such interferences are violations of moral equality.
and may result in mass injustices. Infringement of basic liberties by states, institutions, and individuals erodes the framework of the basic structure of justice and de-legitimize institutions and their procedures.

Problematic, in the moral resources dimension of contractarian justice, is the absence of enactment in the conception of moral powers. Enactment, in general, is a problem for invention (Walzer, 1985, 1987). This is especially true for Rawls. The development of citizens with capacities to participate, in Rawls’ approach, is missing. How might citizens become rational and reasonable? Rawls theory of justice, as mentioned in previous sections, is shortsighted, providing for basic liberties and goods, but devoid of the actual political context of educational inequalities. To move individuals toward their innate capacities to engage in political discourse, movement along the lines of capabilities and peace education is required. Their interpretive stances must actually engage what is present to decipher what is needed. The moral resources in the capabilities approach do not necessarily have values analogous to those of political liberalism because capabilities are concerned with the “threshold level of each capability” (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 71). Reason, rationality and some conception of a good life is appropriate for moral resources, but capabilities conceives of persons in terms of what is needed for human dignity. It also asks what is needed for non-human species’ dignity or excellence qua species (Nussbaum, 2006). Capabilities interpret the needs immanent in all lives and the results of those interpretations inform the basis of moral resources.

Sen (2009) is concerned with human development and the ability to make assessments and comparisons, the freedom of choice, public scrutiny and discourse resulting from participation, democracy and open and impartial scrutiny. Because such
participation requires the development of critical thinking capacities, education about rights and preparation for democratic participation is a capability. Moral resources, for Nussbaum (2005), are central human capabilities, which are: life, bodily health and integrity, senses, imagination and thought, emotions, practical reason, affiliation, other species, play, and control over one’s environment. Since these represent broad characteristics that might not be present in all people, they could be more or less. These capabilities represent the basic level of functioning consistent with human dignity. Often, individual’s capabilities are unable to respond to others in ways that are wholly participating, if we consider the principle of reciprocity. Thus, the one cared for, the one caring, and the act of caring itself are essential parts of the capabilities approach. Conflict results from the denial of what is required to live a decent life. Although capabilities focus on the needs of human dignity, the focus on specific information about matters of war and peace, which is present in Reardon’s theory of peace, would add to the capabilities approach, making it more relevant in its attention to the human needs that inform moral capacities.

3.10: Social Conditions

The social conditions give context to the particular theory of justice. Utilitarianism emerged as the result of oppression of the working classes. They were excluded from the benefits of their labor, which were enjoyed by the elite of Britain and other Western industrializing societies of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 39). Nussbaum (2006) describes the founders as radicals with their skepticism and new welfare-centered utilitarianism, which challenged the conventional
morality of their time. She follows that it was a philosophy with a “willingness to follow the ethical argument wherever it leads” (Nussbaum, 2008, p. 338). Kymlicka argues that utilitarianism, at that time, made sense because it injected the fairness of equal distribution into the moral calculus. This approach is now conservative and unrealistic, since the material conditions of the homogenous majority have dramatically changed. In the same Western and European nations where utilitarianism emerged, the majority of middle and working class have their preferences satisfied to the detriment of minority populations. In these nations, the distinctions between majorities and minorities fall, for the most part, along diverse racial, cultural and ethnic lines in Western liberal democracies. As a result, minorities in these nations and most of the people in the global south go with unfulfilled preferences.

The social condition, in terms of Rawls’ (2003) social contract perspective, is described in the following passage on the circumstance of justice:

We are to think of the circumstances of justice as reflecting the historical conditions under which modern democratic societies exist. These include what we may call the objective circumstances of moderate scarcity and the necessity of social cooperation for all to have a decent standard of life. (p.84)

The social conditions are a reflection of the historic context surrounding the development of the particular democratic society, and the need for the cooperation of its membership in light of limited resources. Rawls sees this democratic structure as rooted in the development of political liberalism in the West. Specifically, western, European ideas inform the context and material conditions of justice as he conceives them. The
philosophy of utilitarianism is part of this political development. Attention to moderate scarcity is connected to the development of democratic societies in the sense that within a pluralistic society, there are different formulations of the good life, and the society can, to an extent, balance the good among those diverse needs. Social cooperation holds possibilities for alleviating scarcity. This idea also underlies the conception of barter and trade. Rawls goes on to point out the importance of “reasonable pluralism,” the basic structure of overlapping consensus that allows and welcomes various comprehensive conceptions of the good. None may dominate; otherwise, the system breaks down.

Nussbaum (2006) wonders if Rawls sees democracy as rooted only in the West, since his conception is based on the “reformation and its aftermath” (p. 302). Nussbaum finds this particular focus of the roots of the development of Rawls’ thinking on democracy and political liberalism peculiar, because it is narrow and limited by western European conceptions of political liberalism (p. 302). Nussbaum (2006) and Sen (2009) trace the roots of democratic throughout the world’s histories, even in non-practicing democracies, to the time of the formation of Athenian democracy. Such places include the ancient Indian empire during the same period, as well as various global sources (Nussbaum, 2006, 302-305; Sen, 2009, 321-324). The documenting of this diversity supports the need for plural grounding of democratic institutions and ways of life required by capabilities. The social conditions of the capabilities approach require a democratic orientation because of their structure and role supporting the possibility of capabilities. Democratic institutions, structures and the democratic form of life, as well as openness to other forms of life, offer the space necessary for plural reasoning for the comparison of justices and injustices.
Chapter 4

Theorizing Reardon’s Conception of Justice

Reardon’s conception of justice is a result of the analysis within Snauwaert’s *dimensions of justice* framework. This framework is useful for this inquiry into Reardon’s writings on peace education as a means to identify her theory of justice. Each of the dimensions works to isolate a particular aspect of Reardon’s conception of justice through textual analysis, situating her perspective firmly within a capabilities framework, and provides clarity about the nature of justice as an integral part of peace. From Reardon’s conception, justice is informed by her conception of peace. The capabilities approach informs Reardon's conceptions of justice and peace in terms of a theory of justice rooted in human dignity, just as Reardon's approach to peace education is rooted in human dignity. Further, capabilities offers peace education a theory of justice, which helps ground much of the peace education literature.

**Foundation**

The foundation dimension of justice is the logical starting place for understanding any theory of justice, because it provides the ethical core for these theories. The foundation is the moral source of justice, defining the values that entitle persons to justice. The foundation of justice articulates who is entitled to justice, thus it is also political. For instance, citizens are entitled to the justice of the state. This entitlement is based on the citizens’ inherent moral equality, thus, as a result, all citizens have an equal claim to justice. In addition, they should have equal access to all of the rights and protections.
The foundation of justice describes who deserves justice and what qualifies them for it. All other dimensions follow and extend from this foundation. Once the moral source of justice is known, all other matters can be answered. As follows, the defining question of this dimension is: “What qualifies one as the subject of justice?”

For Reardon, the foundation of justice is human dignity, which is rooted in moral equality and equity, as well as her conception of the person, manifested in the diversity of human culture. The human dignity inherent in all persons entitles them to justice. Humans are moral subjects, possessing moral equality and therefore are worthy of moral consideration and humane treatment. In other words, as moral equals, possessing an equal inherent dignity, they are subjects of justice. Reardon's conception of human persons and their needs, which are, in part, determined by their culture, is the other half of the foundational dimension of this theory of justice.

Human dignity as the foundation of justice in Reardon’s thought is based on her view of “dignity” within her conception of “human” persons (culture), and their relations. Human dignity is “the fundamental innate worth of the human person” (Reardon, 1995, p. 2). Human dignity, in this sense, is the most basic unit of value, and describes the moral worth and status that guides conduct in human relations. Individuals have moral worth because they are human. Dignity is present in all individuals because they are born into the human family. Moral worth is intrinsic and present within all humans from birth. The “innate worth” is a moral judgment based on the equality intrinsic in all humans. Thus, all individuals, from birth, are morally equally.

The idea of the intrinsic moral equality of all humans is a basic presupposition prominent in political thought and political and moral philosophy (Dahl, 2000;
Consistent with such perspectives regarding human dignity and moral equality, Reardon’s (1995) work suggests that moral equality is the belief that all humans have an inherent and equal human dignity that constitutes their moral worth. Moral worth informs the moral status of persons. Moral status carries a level of value, respect, and treatment accorded to all individuals. Citizens, as persons with moral equality, within a given polity, have moral status. Moral status of persons entitles them to moral equality. This moral status is inherent in the self-authentication of human dignity.

Reardon (2001) draws on the UDHR and other international agreements affirming the moral status of humans as moral subjects\(^{34}\). Reardon (2001) writes, “We also see in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights a view of the human person that articulates the philosophical basis of a belief in the fundamental humanity and equality of all human persons” (p. 68). Embodied in the UDHR is the theoretical and moral foundation for human equality and equal dignity. The UDHR contains the moral force of civil society and government's assertion of the moral status and equality of all humans. According to the UDHR:

Article 1. All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood and we would add, sisterhood.

Article 2. Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other

\(^{34}\) See UDHR and *Education from a Gendered Perspective* (p. 69).
opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

The UDHR, like other philosophical treaties, articulates a condition of freedom and equality of dignity, claims and responsibilities that, from birth, accompany humans. Yet, unlike other well-known philosophical treaties\textsuperscript{35}, the UDHR elaborates a social contract or political agreement rooted in secular, liberal humanism; it does not rely on metaphysical, religious or spiritual premises for affirmation. The UDHR was developed through the efforts of civil society, which embodied, at least in part, the voice and yearnings of many people from all parts of the world\textsuperscript{36}.

The first article describes certain capacities that facilitate humane interpersonal behavior. Because of equal freedom, dignity and rights, humans are entitled to treatment that reflects this assertion. Although Article 2 of the UDHR further elaborates on who is entitled to justice, Reardon brackets the first article writing, “and we would add, sisterhood,” pointing out an exclusion of this article. This exclusion of women is foundational in terms of the UDHR’s reference to the broad conception of humanity in the gendered term *brotherhood*. This is a significant focus of Reardon’s conception of human dignity in this dimension.

Global civil society, NGO’s and various other groups have utilized moral and legal documents such as the UDHR to proclaim human’s moral worth and status. Human dignity, with its inherent moral status and worth, is self-affirmed and codified in numerous laws and international instruments: the Universal Declaration for Human Rights; its addendum, the Declaration of Human Rights from a Gender Perspective; the Declaration of the Rights of the Child; the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of

\textsuperscript{35} See Rousseau's *Social Contract* and Hobbes' *Leviathan*.

\textsuperscript{36} In light of the exclusion of many groups and colonized nations, Reardon's reliance on the UDHR as a philosophical framework and code of ethics presents questions that will be addressed in later sections.
Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW); and many other constitutions, declarations and conventions (Reardon, 2001). These instruments are moral and legal affirmations of the idea that there are no preconditions on the bestowal of dignity upon persons.

Reardon (1995) writes, “all human beings have innate worth and the right to be treated with respect” (p. 23). From this perspective, humans’ innate moral worth entitles them to respectful treatment. This treatment must be respectful, symmetric and reciprocal. Respect is a reflexive attitude, view, or perspective along with resulting action, behavior and treatment towards persons. In this context, respect requires that human dignity being both revered and inviolable in persons and their relations toward others. The respect of human dignity is a fundamental requirement in the fulfillment of justice. Respect for human dignity includes respect for persons’ integrity, culture, and sense of self. Violence, in any form, may never be done to a person if their dignity is to be respected. What follows respect for human dignity is just treatment and the fulfillment of the needs required by dignity.

Since violence is an affront to human dignity, our interactions and approaches to conflict should be nonviolent, respectful, and mindful of the inherent symmetrical and reciprocal dignity. Symmetry and reciprocity, in this context, suggest equality or equal relationships guided by the respect for human dignity. Reardon (2001) writes that:

… equal human worth of all persons … is to be universally respected and [it is] the responsibility of all to both respect the worth of others and comport ourselves so as to be worthy of respect. Human dignity is manifest in this reciprocal respect and responsibility. (pp. 35-36)
According to this passage, the equality of persons’ intrinsic moral value requires respect. As an imperative, this moral worth of individuals is to be respected by all people without exception of persons or circumstances. This respect of others is interdependent and symmetrical between the one showing respect and the subject of that respect. Respect on both sides of this relationship is not passive, but requires the positioning of individuals’ behavior in such a way that both receive and give respect. The human dignity evident in the reciprocal relationship is constituted by respect and responsibility. Reardon views the moral equality within human dignity to be based on the respect and equality affirmed in the view and treatment of themselves and others. Not only are individuals entitled to treatment worthy of a dignified being, but their relations with others must also reflect this fundamental respect for human life and dignity.

The content of the intrinsic value of human dignity is moral equality. Encapsulated in moral equality is a requirement of equal treatment, recognition of others as equal, and the imperative that requires the removal of obstacles to equality. Thus, all humans are moral equals. One may not be treated with more respect than the other, as each life has an equal value. The value of moral equality, within Reardon's conception of human dignity, is a relational value central to her conception of justice as it is tied in to her view of the human person.

What does it mean to be human? A human being, in Reardon’s view, is a “Homo sapiens” with culture and the ability to communicate and cooperate with others (Fraenkel, Carter and Reardon, 1975, pp. 3-4). What if some humans do not have this ability, and are unable to communicate or cooperate with others? Should they be excluded? Should their status as moral equals be amended or denied? Nussbaum (2006)
critiques Rawls (2003) for this very exclusion in his conception of a person.

To start, a human, for Reardon, is based on the membership within the species distinguished biologically as *Homo sapiens*. This distinction is broad, but has important moral and political implications. Humans develop culture and have the capacity to communicate and cooperate. The capacities of reason and rationality are connected to cooperation and interpersonal communication. Rationality and reasonableness assist persons in the development of culture, intra- and interpersonal group communication, and cooperation. What follows is an assumption that, if members of the *Homo sapiens* species do not have these capacities, then they can be excluded from Reardon's conception of human persons, as well as from the moral status of subjects of justice. Fraenkel, Carter, and Reardon (1975) suggest that all persons, despite their differences, impairments or illnesses deserve to be treated humanely with respect and dignity (pp. 4-5).

Reardon does not draw a distinction between persons with or without rational capacities in her requirements for human status as subjects of justice. Reardon articulates certain behaviors that characterize being human, not as a precondition for inclusion in her definition, but as a requirement for coexistence and survival. To be human, for Reardon, is to be able to live in dignity, to treat others humanely and to have the ability and freedom to live according to one’s worldview or culture. These behaviors “reflect human responsibility to honor human dignity and respect for living creatures and systems” (Reardon, 2001, p. 61). While limited capacities for reason cannot exclude persons from their moral status as subjects of justice, persons are members of the human species and cultures, and thus have dignity.
Humane behavior is part of Reardon’s conception of persons. Humane behavior describes how Reardon conceives persons’ responsibility toward others. This responsibility is found in the UDHR’s first article, which describes a “spirit of brotherhood” (and sisterhood) that directs all people to treat others with the respect they expect. Because respect is reciprocal and reflexive among humans, dignified and humane treatment toward all is required. If persons do not show respect toward others, they are in violation of human dignity, international moral and legal standards and, moreover, justice. Even if individuals violate these moral statutes, they still have dignity and are entitled to the respect articulated in the UDHR that should be accorded to all humans.

This responsibility, as the underlying philosophy that Reardon draws on, is further elaborated in the second UDHR article, which articulates whom justice, freedom and rights must protect. The freedom and rights of all humans are urgent matters of justice. Being human, Reardon argues, goes beyond meeting the biological and anthropological definitions of humanity, and rests, instead, on the moral status of all persons defined by their fundamental dignity, potential capacities, identities, freedoms and entitlements.

At the core of Reardon's conception of dignity is a deep respect for the natural world and its interdependent relationship with human life. Reardon (1995) argues that “ecological thinking derives from reverence for life. Reverence for life is a necessary complement to the core value of human dignity and integrity as it is realized in a sustaining and sustainable environment” (p. 24). If one respects the human life, it follows that one should have that same respect for the natural world, and wish to see a healthy ecological balance between it and humans.

When there is no balance, the natural world is degraded and sustainability
becomes imperiled. The ability to sustain one’s family and community through a balance with the natural world is a matter of dignity, and a metaphor for human life itself. Without the ability to sustain oneself and the maintenance of an ecological balance, individuals and communities are deprived of the requirements for human dignity. Reardon (1995) continues, writing that this thinking is also part of “what it is to be human,” (p. 24) because “humans as self-conscious, reflective beings … are part of the living system of the Earth” (p. 25).

Reardon’s holistic thinking about human dignity delves into the relationship between humans and the natural world. The human capacities of reflection allow individuals to see their interdependency and relationship with the natural world. In *Comprehensive Peace Education*, Reardon (1988) reflects on this holistic view of balance between humans, the natural world, and the survival of the planet as matters of dignity and justice (pp. 29, 74-75). Not only is ecological balance tied to human dignity, in terms of economic sustainability, housing, and cultural connections, it is dependent on human choices and actions, as well. Reardon’s (2000) view of this relationship is based on the idea that humans are part of a sub-system within a larger planetary ecological system (p. 15).

Seeing the world in this way would help global citizens and learners understand their interconnection and ecological responsibilities, and would encourage them to adopt more sustainable ways of living and being in the world. In this sense, dignity for the nonhuman animals and their natural habitat can be extrapolated from Reardon’s theory. If humans have dignity and moral worth and are interdependent upon the natural world, reliant on the planet for survival, and part of a larger ecological system, and if that larger
system ecological systems functions according to its own internal logic, with its own needs and requirements, then the Earth and all if its inhabitants have their own individual and collective dignity and moral worth. Individual dignity is characterized by the requirements for the excellence (or highest functioning) of each species. Human dignity is dependent upon the dignity of all forms of life on the planet.

Reardon’s conception of human dignity is further understood through its threats. Part of the Reardon’s methodology of validating normative claims, that is, those relating to human dignity, within the foundation of justice is through the exploration of the violations of human dignity. These obstacles illuminate the foundational essence of dignity in her normative conception. The actual violations of human dignity inform us about what is needed for justice and how our moral codes inform our actions in the real world.

For Reardon (1993, 2001), moral exclusion, as rooted in patriarchy, is the basis for the denial of human dignity. Reardon (2001) writes about “the phenomenon of moral exclusion, placing persons or groups outside the scope of justice, denying them the claim to full and fair realizations” of their rights and dignity (p. 48). Moral exclusion denies the equality and moral worth of some, who are then excluded from the moral community. The excluded are treated in ways that deny their status as subjects of justice. Moral exclusion is a rationalization of the exclusion of individuals and groups, leading to the denial of their intrinsic worth and moral equality.

In Education for Peace from a Gendered Perspective, Reardon (2001) describes all forms of violence and injustice, including violations of human rights, racism and racist policies, discrimination, and genocide as being rooted in moral exclusion and serving as
obstacles to human dignity (pp. 48-49). These and other violations are rooted in the violence of the patriarchal war system.

Reardon (2001) describes how gender exclusion, discrimination, and abuse of women are so profound, long running, and deeply entrenched in our normative standards that addressing these issues is an urgent matter of human dignity, as respect and fulfillment of human dignity is central to justice. Reardon (2001) affirms this view when she writes that “one way of looking at the main tasks of creating a culture of peace is to think of the primary goals as reducing and eliminating violence, and enhancing and universalizing human dignity and equality by increasing gender justice” (p. 112). In essence, the focus on gender as a matter of justice is directly related to the expansion of moral equality and human dignity to all humans.

Inquiry into gender issues can also deepen the understanding of moral equality and human dignity (Jenkins and Reardon, 2007; Reardon, 1991, 2010b). This feminist analysis, with its focus on gender, is a way of understanding the obstacles to human dignity in terms that reflect the real world experiences of women, highlighting the failures in the application of moral standards based on human dignity. Such analyses, by examining what hinders dignity, inform the discussion and help us to improve our conceptualization of moral standards, thinking and learning about injustice and possibilities for peace and justice.

Feminism supports Reardon’s view of human dignity because it inquires into experiences that deepen our comprehension of justice in human experience. Human dignity is often subjective and based on the experiences of individuals and communities with both flourishing and deprivation.
A major focus of Reardon’s writings is on the experience of women. Although subjective, these experiences are validated by other women (and men) who have faced similar problems such as exclusion based on their gender differences in terms of their sex. Reardon (1995) writes that “standards of public and private spheres should be informed by respect of human dignity” (p. 2). Here, Reardon is referring to the separation of public and private spheres as a framework for understanding how women are excluded through relegation to the private sphere, where they have little autonomy and are prevented from public participation through systematic exclusion. The experience of many women in the private sphere is of ongoing deprivation, malnourishment, a lack of access to education, forced marriage, and abuse, more so than men. This feminist analysis is a result of documented experiences that takes these exclusions into account to inform the values that constitute our moral standards. What follows is a deeper understanding that reveals the flaws in our most basic international standards and protections.

As noted earlier, Reardon adds “sisterhood” to the first article of the UDHR to illustrate bias in its language that might rationalize exclusion of women or a hierarchy of masculine values. Reardon (2001) describes the bias in the UDHR, describing it as incorporating “language that appears gender exclusive by using the term ‘men’ in a statement commonly thought to pertain to all humans, male and female (as the word ‘men’ was traditionally used)” (p. 123). Reardon points out the problems with the words “brotherhood” and “men,” which have traditionally been used to describe all humans. While argued by many that the terms are inclusive of all humans, a strict interpretation of the language might, to some, provide a rationalization for explicit denial of rights to
women and a focus on masculine values.

Reardon describes the efforts of women’s human rights groups and other members of civil society to address this deficit through addendums to the UDHR, CEDAW and other international declarations and covenants. According to Reardon (2001), the Gendered UDHR articulates human dignity from a feminist perspective, which views the public-private distinctions as an affront to human dignity and as a core obstacle to the authentic recognition and respect for the dignity of all people. As an addendum to the original UDHR, the Gendered UDHR offers a normative analysis that provides for the full participation of women, which is part of changing the role of women from private to public.

Reardon (1991, 2010b) suggests that the separation of the public and private sphere (home or private life) is also a metaphor for sovereignty. Rulers and autocrats in their countries, like fathers in their homes, argue that they have absolute domain because of sovereignty, or the privacy of the home. As a result, people within those countries and women within the private sphere are excluded, and their abuses often hidden. If human dignity were applied, as many of the declarations and international instruments have sought to encourage, there would be a diminishing separation between the public and the private realms. This distinction has begun to change, as a result of the international instruments and call for global acknowledgement of human dignity.

For Reardon, human dignity is holistic concept through which other values are identified based on human needs, moral equality and worth. According to Reardon (1995), human dignity is a “central generative principle” (Reardon, 1995, p. 2). In this sense, human dignity is at the root of other values, producing related values that extend
from it. Thus, human dignity cannot be denied, reduced or exchanged.

Reardon’s conception of human dignity, as based on human needs defined within various cultures, ethnicities, and genders, requires attention and appreciation of cultural differences as a matter of human dignity. Reardon’s conception of a person as a being that should be respected and treated equitably is grounded in human identity and the freedoms to live according to those cultural perspectives. Reardon’s feminist approach to human dignity offers a critique to the earlier conceptions of human dignity as articulated within the UDHR. This attention to well-being of individuals according to their dignity is consistent with a capabilities approach.

Reardon and Cabezudo (2002) describe “the relationship of human dignity to the abolition of war as the integral link between justice and peace (the institution of war is totally inconsistent with the value of human dignity)” (p. 49). From this perspective, human dignity requires the abolition of war as a matter of justice. All violence and war is antithetical to human dignity. Violence, which is rooted in patriarchy, is unjust and inconsistent with human equality and moral standing. Reardon’s positioning of human dignity contributes to capabilities, an approach that views all forms of violence (intentional avoidable harm) as unjust. Reardon conceives justice as the fulfillment of human dignity and removal of all forms violence.

Prominent alternative theories of justice are expressed in the literature of Rawls (2003), Sen (2009), and Nussbaum (2006, 2011). The foundation of justice in Rawls’ (2003) model is moral equality and his conception of persons rooted in political liberalism. Political liberalism refers to a plural system with democratic structures and processes that stand as the framework for human equality (Rawls, 1993, p. 4). Moral
equality is interrelated with Rawls’ conception of a person, in that individuals are the concern of justice because they are rough equals, with the moral powers of reason, rationality and the ability to cooperate socially for mutual (economic) benefit.

While there are some similarities between Rawls’ and Reardon's perspectives, Rawls rejects human dignity on the basis that it is a comprehensive view, incompatible with a political perspective of justice. Reardon conceives of moral equality as a characteristic intrinsic to human dignity. Her conception of moral equality is conceived in terms of individuals’ intrinsic worth, which entitles them to certain rights and responsibilities.

Additionally, the notion of reciprocity is problematic in Rawls’s model. Reciprocity, in Rawls’ model, is mutual economic benefit, whereas Reardon views reciprocity as a relationship founded on the requirements of human dignity, by virtue of humans’ common flourishing and survival on the planet, requiring cooperation. Rawls’ conception of a person is rooted in moral powers of reason, rationality and a sense of justice. A person, for Reardon, is based on species memberships, the commonality of human dignity, reason, rationality, culture and humane behavior toward others. What follows from Rawls’ conception, as noted by Nussbaum (2006), is the possibility for the exclusion of those who do not possess the capacity for reasoning or mutual benefit. Reardon’s view is broader, focusing on the intrinsic equality of all people and their status as subjects of justice despite impairments and limited capacities.

The foundation for Sen (2009) and Nussbaum (2006) is moral equality and human dignity. Sen (2009) is concerned with the intuitive idea of human dignity on the basis of
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37 Persons are rough equals, with similar moral power, who enter into a social contract for mutual benefit (Rawls, 2003).
the needs of human beings, asking, “What is it like to be a human being?” (p. 414) The importance of human life, and the needs and requirements of human beings, is an underlying aspect of this question. Nussbaum (2011) suggests that Sen does not include human dignity as a central concept of capabilities, but as a comparative assessment of the quality of lives (p. 20).

The central focus of capabilities for Nussbaum (2006), however, is human dignity. She writes that capabilities are not instrumental to a life of human dignity, but are ways of realizing human dignity in the various areas of human functioning (p.161). Nussbaum argues that dignity is not defined prior to or separately from capabilities, but is part of the definition of capabilities, and that a life worthy of dignity is constituted by capabilities (p.162). Dignity is descriptive of the guiding principle and standards upon which capabilities are based.

Similarly, Reardon’s conception of dignity is the central value guiding the principles of peace and justice. Capabilities, as a class of human rights, substantive opportunities, and freedoms as required by human dignity, overlap with Reardon’s conception of human dignity as just treatment, access to opportunities, human rights, humane behavior, and reciprocal relationships.

Within her approach to capabilities, Nussbaum (2006) articulates an important account of human dignity for the impaired, and dignity for non-human animals. Within capabilities, Nussbaum critiques the Kantian conception of persons used by Rawls that prevents the extension of justice (and human dignity) to the impaired and animals. Nussbaum (2006) recounts the Kantian split between morality and animality, belonging to the reasoned-rational side and deterministic side, respectively. Thus, animals unable to
engage in moral reasoning cannot have dignity.

Nussbaum (2006) suggests that human dignity is merely a species of dignity associated with the human anima. Non-human animals have their own dignity and moral worth in relation to other animals. Much of our own dignity is inseparable from our animality. The denial of moral equality based on mutual benefit does not give attention the high levels of dependency all humans have at some time. The absence of “reason” in non-human animals denies the range and species of intelligence animals possess (pp. 131-133).

Although Reardon has an account of dignity for the natural world and her perspective acknowledges an internal dignity of the non-human living environment, her account of dignity for both the impaired and the non-human animals and the living environment is rather limited. Capabilities offers Reardon’s and others’ approaches to peace education a philosophical argument for the extension of justice and respect for dignity to non-human animals. Reardon’s account of human dignity is squarely within a capabilities approach to justice because of its focus on experience (similar to the comparative assessment of the quality of lives), the centrality of human dignity as a foundational principle, the concept of persons deserving justice because of their inherent dignity, and its concern for the natural world.

**Form**

The form dimension of justice includes the conditions for the establishment principles governing political and social relations that are acceptable for members of a given pluralistic and diverse polity. In other words, the context of the form dimension
includes how members of a society approach political reasoning in light of their varying belief systems. As described in the previous chapter, this dimension relates to whether justice is conceived as a “metaphysically grounded comprehensive doctrine of the good life” or a “political conception compatible with a plurality of comprehensive doctrines” (Snauwaert, 2011, p. 317). In this sense, a political conception is more public and general and does not contain religious or cosmological views that might not be acceptable to a plurality of persons. Comprehensive views might only be acceptable among specific cultures or those who accept those views.

Due to the realities of reasonable pluralism, wherein a conception of justice is grounded in comprehensive or metaphysical doctrines of truth requiring everyone’s acceptance, the acceptance of these principles of justice is not necessarily feasible. Rawls (1993) describes the basic structure of this society as one that affords individuals and groups with different value systems and beliefs the opportunity to meet and engage in public discourse for the purpose of establishing principles of justice for democratic cooperation. Within this paradigm, reasonable principles, as opposed to a focus on truth (either metaphysical or religious), are sought. Members of society may have different backgrounds comprising their beliefs, making them “bound by constraints [arising] indirectly from just background institutions within which associations and groups exist” (Rawls, 2003, p. 10).

While Rawls (2003) articulates the basic structure of a politically liberal society in terms of constraints, he offers that groups may operate according to their own rules, as long as the basic rights of their affiliates and other members of society are not violated. Thus individuals, while constrained, are free to participate in their own institutions or to
leave those affiliations, while allowing others to live according to their own conceptions of a good life.

Rawls (2003) offers overlapping consensus, which takes the differences among citizens into consideration as background knowledge, as a means to agree on political principles that are reasonable, given the requirements of a democratic and plural society (p.32). Thus, Rawls develops a politically liberal conception of justice based on overlapping consensus, where free and equal people, who may hold different concepts of the good, come together under a basic liberal structure to cooperate and develop political principles of justice with which everyone could reasonably agree. The form, for Rawls, is political (not metaphysical or comprehensive). The basic structure of society, in this sense, is constructed so that it can be revised, if the need arises (Rawls, 1993, 2003).

Nussbaum (2006, 2011) accepts this basic approach and structure for determining principles of justice, as does Sen (2009), who describes Rawls’ conception of political liberalism as a model for “how people can cooperate with each other in a society subscribing to ‘deeply opposed though reasonable comprehensive doctrines’” (p. 55). Sen accepts this political conception of justice in terms of its reasonableness, but departs in this and other ways from the Rawlsian system set forth in Justice as Fairness.

Nussbaum (2011) similarly articulates the importance of Rawlsian political liberalism in terms of its identification of overlapping consensus, which requires mutual respect among diverse citizens with different worldviews (p. 79). This recognition is not the current reality, but represents a possibility for a cooperating society. Political liberalism offers the normative claim that while one view cannot be forced on others, it should be respected so as to offer a space where others can participate in a reasonable
dialogue on political principles. To respect the viewpoints of others, and to abstain from
imposing one’s belief system, is to respect the human dignity of a diverse and pluralistic
citizenry in a public sphere where overlapping consensus can occur.

In this sense, the form follows logically from the foundation, since human dignity
is the moral source of justice. For dignity to be respected, individual and group beliefs
cannot be disregarded or made prominent over others. In a diverse society of people with
various beliefs and affiliations, the basic structure of overlapping consensus attends to the
maintenance of pluralism. All members of society will not agree on one belief, especially
those claiming to represent a universal truth or cosmological doctrine, but they will agree
to a political conception of justice that represents a shared and reasonable understanding
of the perspective among all. To be forced to comply with some comprehensive view
would be unfair in a democratic and pluralistic society.

For Rawls (2003), reasonableness and political liberalism is structured to facilitate
a public forum for democratic dialogue among plural groups. Political liberalism, in this
sense, is a reasonable political approach where people of different cultural and
cosmological beliefs can come to an agreement. Their worldviews are only background
information, and do not have direct influence on the formation of principles of justice.

As a result, the form dimension of justice asks if a principle of or an approach to
justice is political or comprehensive. Once we know the moral source of justice, we can
determine whether it is a comprehensive or political conception. It is important to make
such a determination, since some comprehensive views of justice are incompatible with a
society composed of people with varied belief systems.

Comprehensive perspectives consist of religious, metaphysical, cosmological and
political approaches that are self-contained, meaning that they consist of broadly applicable beliefs about the universe and all human activity. They are often composed of truth claims and universal doctrines of human existence. Even liberal doctrines applied to a public conception of justice can prove exclusionary. While a political approach can be comprehensive (Marxism, for example), political approaches consistent with the inclusion of diverse beliefs and worldviews (for background knowledge only) are consistent with democratic and participatory agreement on principles of justice. Such a basic structure makes room for people with various worldviews.

Political perspectives, in this view, are most often secular. Snauwaert (2011) identifies the defining questions of the form dimension:

Should justice be based upon a metaphysically grounded comprehensive doctrine of the good life? Or should it be constructed as a political conception compatible with a plurality of comprehensive doctrines? (p. 317)

An additional determining factor in what form justice takes is whether the foundation of justice is grounded in any comprehensive assumptions. Viewed in terms of the form of justice, one might ask whether the foundation of justice – human dignity, in Reardon’s case – is a freestanding normative claim, or whether it is grounded in a metaphysical premise. Additionally, what is the content of Reardon’s form of justice and how does it operate in the development of principles of justice? Is that content based on principles that are comprehensive or free-standing political values?

Human dignity, in Reardon’s view, is a freestanding political conception that is connected to a culture of peace, ordered and constructed by human dignity and positive
peace. The values of positive peace and human dignity are interrelated values opposed to violence and injustice and oriented toward full human equality, learning, and inquiry and the full development of participating global citizens. This perspective is informed by a feminist approach that focuses on the analysis of patriarchy to highlight long-term privation in an attempt to rectify the exclusion of many from participation in the development of principles of justice.

**Human Dignity.** Reardon’s conceptualization of human dignity characterizes the form dimension of her conception of justice. A culture of peace represents a space where public deliberation of diverse groups may seek to establish the values of peace and justice. This space is consistent with the respect for the human dignity of all people.

As related to the freestanding political conception of human dignity, Reardon utilizes culture of peace/peace education terminology to acknowledge the universality of human dignity) and need for the human dignity (although conceived differently among different groups) in the face of direct and structural violence. This connection is implied by the requirement of respect for human dignity within the overlapping consensus of the culture of peace. Violence, which is intentional, avoidable harm (Reardon, 2001), demeans human dignity and destroys the basic respect required for diverse groups to engage in discourse to choose principles of justice (Snauwaert, 2011).

Richard Peterson (2011) argues that violence degrades normal human relations. Most reasonable persons would say they prefer peace to violence, even if their actions conflict with this preference; thus, a culture that promotes peace seems reasonable.

Reardon (1985, 1991, 2010b) offers a feminist argument to illustrate how
violence is an obstacle to the respect of human dignity in the systematic denial of rights. Exclusion of women and minorities from participation, as well as direct and structural violence, prevents the development of basic structures that would facilitate overlapping consensus. Additionally, Reardon’s perspective offers a view that is critical of liberal conceptions of human equality that are rooted in the history of gender discrimination. It is a feminist view that advocates for authentic human equality as a precondition for pluralistic and democratic basic social structures. Reardon’s approach is a reasonable, non-comprehensive, freestanding conception of human dignity that allows for a culture of peace and is consistent with the capabilities approach.

Reardon conceives of human dignity as a freestanding political conception grounded in the development of a culture of peace where a variety of beliefs and cultures come together to decide on principles of justice through the realization of peace. According to Reardon (1995), “human dignity and integrity are symbiotic concepts at the center of the ethical systems comprising the social values that are the essence of human rights” (p. 5). Reardon’s conception of human dignity is, with the incorporation of the concept of integrity, the basis of an ethical system that serves as a primary informant of human rights.

In her use of the term *ethical system*, Reardon is referring to that which is political. In Reardon’s (2011) discussion of reflection and political efficacy, she describes ethics, as opposed to morals, as being distinctly in the political realm. While morality is social and may affect the political, “[moral] norms arise from the deepest cultural values of society and its dominant philosophic and religious beliefs” and may often “come to serve the cause of moral exclusion and considerable violence” (Reardon,
2011, pp8-9). Snauwaert (2011), in his discussion of this same article suggests that ethics refers to “principled practical reason” (p. 3). In the University of Puerto (UNESCO Peace Education Chair) keynote address, Reardon’s (2009c) uses “ethics” to refer to norms that are in the political realm (p. 47, 49-51).

Reardon (2009c) writes that, “as a political framework for the actualization of human dignity, human rights are the ethical core of peace education” (p. 47). Human rights are the political and ethical instruments that work to make the respect of human dignity possible. Based on this discussion, we may conclude that ethics, which inform and impact human dignity, are political, representing public values. Human dignity – the core of the social and political ethical system – constitutes social norms, which are political propositions that inform human rights. Human dignity, in this sense, was developed and constructed as a self-authenticating value agreed upon through critical inquiry and democratic discourse related to overlapping consensus.

The political arena of the UN institutions, related organizations and subsequent forums that revised the UDHR, even with its difficulties, represents a reasonable and democratic space whereby principles of peace and justice came to be established. In the decades following its establishment, citizens of diverse backgrounds from around the world acknowledged the reasonableness and mutually recognizable principles rooted in human dignity laid out in the UDHR. The conception of human dignity underlying the rights articulated in the UDHR informs Reardon’s (1995) view, especially since it was conceived in a democratic space by a global community working toward political consensus, and was dependent on the agreement of multiple diverse groups (p. xii).

The purpose of the UDHR is, in part, to eliminate the injustice and violence of
war and to develop principles of justice for a peaceful global society. The form of Reardon’s conception of justice utilizes this same spirit in its articulation of human dignity and the culture of peace it inspires. Reardon (1995) suggests that human dignity and the rights that it inspires were:

identified … as a major goal of the People’s Decade for Human Rights Education. The Decade (1991-2000), an enabling agent for the United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education (1995-2004), is a non-governmental initiative combining the efforts of formal and non-formal educators, university professors, researchers, and human rights advocates from various parts of the world. (p. xii)

In essence, this understanding of human dignity is an attempt to conceive human dignity and the following rights through international law in an open and transparent forum.

Human dignity, in this sense, is a public value and global ethic rooted in social understandings and political norms commonly understood by civil society. Human dignity is not, at least for Reardon, moralistic or rooted in religious or metaphysical doctrine. Human dignity is a freestanding ethical and political value attuned to various cultures and beliefs, though not adopting any one group’s values. It aims at a kind of universality, offering, but not imposing, a normative approach to principles of justice and peace.

Respect for human dignity is, in part, a value that influences the process of initiating a culture of peace to ensure a reasoned public discourse about principles of justice. Reardon (2001) argues that “constructive/creative contention is a form of
discourse for addressing controversies and conflicts in a way consistent with and conducive to honouring the value of universal human dignity and realizing a culture of peace” (p.168). While Reardon describes the manner of public discourse that is most likely to respect human dignity, she also places a high importance on the respect for persons’ dignity. When respecting human dignity, a culture of peace is possible.

A culture of peace, Reardon goes on to suggest, is different from most spaces for the purposes of public discourse, as it posits the moral equality of those engaging in discussion. What follows is a democratic and participatory discussion that includes all perspectives, or is, at least, open to all views, because human dignity is at the forefront of discourse on principles and connected to the content of any principles. In other words, human dignity necessarily characterizes Reardon’s form of justice because it is the basic value that guides and promotes inclusion and democratic forms of discourse, while informing all other values, processes and decision-making. Human dignity is, in part, the content of a culture of peace. Thus, Reardon’s conception of a culture of peace is democratic and inclusive, and is structured as a space for public dialog, learning and value formation where all parties have the opportunity to engage in discussion and come to consensus.

Thus, as conceived by Reardon, human dignity is a freestanding political conception from which the principles of justice are derived, leading to a culture of peace where democratic, equal, and participatory discourse about principles of peace and justice is possible.

Since human dignity informs a culture of peace, we can argue that the principles of the culture of peace are mutually reasonable and would be accepted by diverse
citizens. In defense of this proposition, Reardon (2001) suggests:

The human species is characterized as much by the fundamental physical and psychological commonalities of universal needs and aspirations as by cultural distinctions and differences of ethnic and national identities. Yet cultures and identities vary so widely, and are so diverse, that they often obscure the commonalities. In our present world the obscuring of the commonalities and the emphasizing of differences has contributed to conflict and has often rationalized violence. Indeed, the phenomenon of moral exclusion, placing persons or groups outside the scope of justice, denying them the claim to full and fair realizations of their human rights, has rationalized crimes as horrific as enslavement and genocide, practices that flourish in a culture of violence. Education for a culture of peace would help us to learn the value of cultural diversity, and how to assure that ethnic plurality flourishes in a common culture of universal human dignity. (pp. 48-49)

Thus, Reardon acknowledges the present state of human cultures as focusing on differences, and how this focus on differences and the policies and practices that reinforce them lead to injustice, violence, and exclusion.

Yet Reardon also offers a reasonable and pragmatic argument that education based on human commonalities offers the possibility of helping people understand the opposition of human rights and dignity to violence and injustice. This respect for human
dignity is, in essence, the foundation of a culture of peace.

**A Feminist Approach to a Culture of Peace.** Besides human dignity, what is the content of a culture of peace and how is it related to the Reardon’s form dimension of justice? Reardon conceptually constructs a culture of peace through a feminist analysis that aids open inquiry into the concepts of peace and justice and their obstacles (Reardon, 1988, 1993, 2001). A culture of peace offers a democratic space in which various perspectives are validated and utilized to end all forms of violence, build consensus about principles of justice through reasoned dialogue, and move toward human flourishing and the conditions of positive peace.

Reardon (2001) suggests that a culture of peace:

- helps to illuminate the conditions and causes of most forms of violence, to reveal the roots of war, to go deeper than conflictual relationships, national, political or ideological rivalries, even deeper than the institutions and policies that maintain the war system of national militaries, arms races and imbalanced economic priorities. (p. 21)

Here Reardon describes how a culture of peace includes an analysis of violence and injustice, and of their connection to other global problems and the concerns of justice. This analysis is founded on extensive and continuous inquiry characteristic of the kind of dialogue practiced in peace education learning communities. These learning communities are the same as those Reardon (1988) describes as inquiring into what peace is.
Thus, a culture of peace is a space of inquiry into the values and principles that would be most reasonable to learn what would constitute a peaceful and just society. They also try to understand how to overcome current violence and the inequalities of human societies and how the acknowledgement and respect for human dignity and needs would be brought about. This inquiry is emblematic of Reardon’s feminist approach, which provides guidance in communal learning and inquiry into violence, injustice, and the political-ethical values and principles that inform the public space of reasoned discussion in a culture of peace.

While a culture of peace is grounded in the respect of human dignity, which is a public value that informs political discourse and reasoning, the values that constitute a culture of peace result from inclusive, participatory critical inquiry and learning of individuals from various cultures. The values informing the culture of peace, as discussed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, are a construction of deepening inquiry and new understandings that emerge from communal learning and study of the issues confronting the peoples of the world.

To reiterate, the learning that emerged from grassroots networks and engagement of both women and men on projects such as the Elimination of Violence against Women (1985) and the movements underlying the Beijing Platform (1995) brought the problems of patriarchy to the forefront of the discussion of what a culture of peace should be (Reardon, 1997). As a result, the values that came forward suggest that a culture of peace is constituted by a focus on gender, racial and economic equity and a general sense of moral equality characterized by human dignity. The value of human dignity supports the efforts arising from grassroots organizations, communities and minorities that have
organized creating public declarations. This groundswell of public discourse and
discussion around issues of justice reinforces the efforts of feminism in bringing about
equality between men and women, but also calls specific attention to the problem of
patriarchy as an obstacle to a culture of peace.

Since the inequality of women and other minorities is so ingrained in social
structures and cultural practices, a culture of peace represents a fundamental shift in
values, specifically towards those that hold equality between men and women as
prominent. This change in social relations calls for the transformation of thinking toward
values consistent with human dignity. The processes of peace education are an integral
component in this kind of transformation. Transformation toward the value of human
dignity, and the education that makes such a shift possible, is in part the basis of
Reardon's feminist argument.

In this view, the political-ethical value of human dignity is fulfilled through the
feminist efforts toward gender equality and equity. In this sense, is feminism a valid
political approach rooted in public deliberation, or is it comprehensive? Reardon (1991)
defines feminism as addressing “the issues of power and inequitable political structures”
(p. 17). Feminism, in this perspective, inquires into the power structures that deny human
dignity to a large portion of the human population. From this standpoint, a feminist
analysis examines social power relations between men, women and social and political
institutions.

Reardon (1991) continues that a “feminist perspective or approach confronts the
social, economic, and psychological reasons for this inequity, in order to rectify it” (p.
17). Feminism challenges social injustices to advance toward changes of political
structures that would be more inclusive to women (Reardon, 1993, p. 17). Reardon (2001) writes that “feminists adhere to the belief that women are equal to men and that it is necessary to change fundamental relationships and structures to achieve gender equality” (p. 129). In addition to a lens through which the structures of power differences can be seen, Reardon’s view of feminisms offers a way to analyze injustices and fundamentally challenge the social, political and ethical frameworks that constitute normal human relations.

Reardon’s conception of a culture of peace is based on a feminist analysis of the structural injustice and inequality present in cultures, traditions and social and political norms and policies. Her analysis identifies a fundamental kind of inequality: one between men and women. It concerns the long-term privation and exclusion of women from participation in public discourse. Reardon (1993) writes that women are “excluded from the public realm” (p. 24). This exclusion is problematic for women and the society.

In this sense, feminism, from Reardon’s perspective, is a political approach aimed at identifying and deconstructing the cultures, policy, and practices of injustice and violence denying women, men and minorities full access to substantive opportunities to do and be, as accorded by their human dignity.

In part, feminism embodies Reardon’s radical view of a culture of peace as a space for reasoned public discourse. This view challenges the social and political values that exclude many, denying them their human dignity and the opportunity to make choices about their own lives and futures. Reardon (2000) describes the feminist critique of traditional political approaches when she writes that “feminist approaches have challenged core social and cultural values” (p. 16). Feminism is a response to patriarchy,
which is based on institutionalized values and beliefs that create moral norms of ways of being in and viewing the world based on a hierarchy of men and masculine ways of knowing. Feminism is both an approach to understanding injustice and a way of working toward the moral equality embedded within human dignity.

Reardon (1993) argues that “the ultimate and fundamental human values affirmed by feminism are the sanctity of life and the dignity of persons” (p. 145). In this context, feminism clarifies the focus of human dignity by calling attention to the moral worth of humans through a critical deconstruction of social norms and values, and offers the possibility of transforming conditions to be more equitable to women and men. Because moral worth goes unchallenged in patriarchal cultures, glaring inequalities stagnate and injustices often flourish. According to Reardon (2001):

Gender roles are cast in the mould of these assumptions and beliefs. Ideologies of “gender apartheid” are deeply embedded in the war system and the culture of violence. The quest for a culture of peace calls on us to examine the ways in which gender roles and all forms of human inequality are woven into the fabric of cultures of violence. (p. 21)

Reardon uncovers the deeply ingrained social constructions that inform cultural views and their valuations of women. These views are often ideological rather than informed by the political virtues of peace, justice, and reason. Reardon links the gender roles resulting from these social constructions and deeply held beliefs of women as unequal to the war system, which incorporates an ideology of male dominance: patriarchy.
Reardon argues that the inequality of women is a fundamental obstacle to all human equality and should be considered in any reasonable discourse where principles of justice are considered. Reardon argues that a culture of peace requires participation from women and other groups that are excluded. This inclusion is necessary if deliberation and dialogue is to be democratic and representative of the ideas that are to be discussed. Reardon’s feminist approach seeks to understand the roots of this exclusion, bringing such practices to the light for examination and asking if such exclusion is reasonable. Reardon (1985, 1993) and others suggest that social policies excluding women from public participation and other freedoms on the basis of their gender are not consistent with reason (Mills, 1969; Wollstonecraft, 1996, 1792).

Reardon’s feminist approach offers a challenge to the patriarchal structures, policies and practices inherent in many societies, based on the recognition of and respect for the fundamental human dignity inherent in both men and women. Reardon (2001) writes that “bringing forth a culture of peace requires an authentic partnership between men and women. … Equality between men and women is an essential condition of a culture of peace” (Reardon, 2001, pp. 20-21). This approach does not benefit one gender over the other, but encourages mutual respect and cooperation. Such respect and mutuality would imply the respect of human dignity.

Feminism reaffirms equal human worth and challenges long held discriminatory beliefs and practices that are embedded in cultures. Thus, a culture of peace is viewed from Reardon’s feminist lens to highlight the importance of moral equality of men and women, so that both have an equal voice in the determination of principles of justice. Reardon's feminist analysis serves as a guideline for what should be included in any
public forum discussing principles of justice.

**A Culture of Peace as a Global Conception of Overlapping Consensus.** A culture of peace is rooted in the political-ethical value of human dignity, guided by a feminist analysis that focuses attention on privation and exclusion so that people in all sectors of society have a reasonable opportunity and expectation to participate in discourse on principles that determine the focus of justice. A culture of peace is the inclusion of all cultures so that all voices are represented in global learning, dialogue and discourse about the principles of peace and justice. The United Nations system attempts to operate in such an inclusive format through the acknowledgement of conventions and declarations of principles for justice from diverse communities and grassroots movements in remote corners of the world. Their participation and the inclusion of their voices in the establishment of these principles support the assertion that the UN is an example of an effort for a democratic and dialogic culture of peace.

A culture of peace is structured around opposition to violence and injustice, since these are fundamental violations of human dignity, as an organizing value and vision for future societies. As groundwork for a society where pluralistic discourse is possible, there must be some modicum of work toward peace and the removal of violence if there is any hope for overlapping consensus. A culture of peace, where dignity is respected and valued, provides the basis for the framework in Reardon’s conception of justice in terms of a civil discourse on social and political principles.

Reardon’s conception of a culture of peace is global, addressing and deconstructing the nature and roots of culture that is often the foundation of violence.
The education for such a culture of peace involves the political processes of peace education. A culture of peace is possible through peace education. Thus, it is explicitly concerned with education for human dignity that teaches and encourages the respect for and equality of all humans. Working toward the elimination of structural violence through dialogue and the inclusion of various cultural issues and community participants is an essential and necessary for validity and consensus in authentic democracy building.

In incorporating opposition to violence in the framework of a culture of peace, Reardon suggests that attention to the problem of violence is important groundwork for any decent, tolerant and just society where the views of many are part of the construction of principles for justice. The opposition to all forms of violence is embodied in positive peace and instantiated in political education and peace education. Such an approach is political, since opposition to violence and injustice is derived from the requirements of human dignity. Thus, a culture of peace’s opposition to violence and injustice is a political proposition; one may argue that such opposition is politically reasonable, given global efforts to reduce violence.

Reardon further articulates how a culture of peace and the education it requires encourages the building of conditions where pluralistic reasoning and overlapping consensus can occur. According to Reardon (2001):

Images of a culture of peace can be located in our families, communities, nations, geographical regions and the world. We can describe conditions of peace at all these levels of human society, and could design institutions to maintain peace and assure the fulfillment of the values that lead us to seek such
conditions. All relational groups that comprise our various human cultures can be the subjects of imaging. We can imagine how our nuclear and extended families can become carriers of a culture of peace; how our ethnic groups can come to embrace the fundamental ethical principles and manifest the universal values that would infuse a global culture of peace. We can propose interpretations of our religious scriptures and modes of worship that uphold peace and universal human dignity. We can sketch out institutional changes for our municipalities, nations and regional organizations which would enhance the values and assure the human rights that we know to be the base of a culture of peace. (p. 58)

Reardon recognizes the need to attain a view of what peace would look like through the observation of normal human relations. In other words, understandings of peace are present among all people. Peace is immanent in many (nonviolent) human activities. Offering these images to the public sphere for developing consensus and cross-cultural understanding is, in part, the purpose of a culture of peace. Reardon locates overlapping consensus in images that contain peaceful cultures collaborating, recognizing the inherency of dignity in all humans, as a way to begin to realize the possibility of such a just and peaceful culture. Reardon describes the nature of human values, despite their cursory appearances, as having fundamental notions of human dignity that provide a basis for beginning dialogue to identify shared values and social cooperation. By articulating an image of peace among these relationships and various
levels, it is possible to develop processes based on the underlying values from various cultures that accomplish the requirements of peace.

The actual approaches in other cultures are grounded in traditions that, although part of a different worldview, recognize human dignity of all of the society’s members. The culture of peace may not include all cultural values, but it is consistent with the global and political values of human dignity and rights articulated in international human rights law, conventions, and covenants. This vision includes the various perspectives of varied groups, who can come together and agree upon a set of principles that lead to a culture of peace. Reardon’s view is, in some ways, similar to Rawls’ (2003) idea of overlapping consensus, because it draws on the current cultural values and comprehensive beliefs as background knowledge from which to formulate a space where a wide range of perspectives can come to a political agreement.

This culture of peace is rooted in a global democratic structure of communities learning from each other through deep dialogue and engagement, leading to shared understanding as a way of determining what is required for dignity and cooperation. According to Reardon (2001):

None of these possibilities, no matter what sphere or level, can be fulfilled without establishing the value base for the development of a range of human capacities for initiating and maintaining humane relationships and engaging in constructive citizenship. Such values and capacities can and should be developed through systematically planned education for a culture of peace. Such education should be delivered in a
manner consistent with the core ethical principles, values and
norms of a culture of peace, manifesting the values of
environmental sustainability, social responsibility and gender
equity. (p. 59)

This vision for a culture of peace is dependent on the humane relationships
established and fostered through active global citizenship. The principles upon which
this culture of peace is based are formed through the processes of peace education,
including communal discourse. Education, in this sense, is political and social. It is
rooted in the values of human dignity, giving attention to all peoples’ perspectives,
cultures, and needs. The culture of peace is based on the shared values that extend from
human dignity.

Reardon envisions a culture of peace constituted by a convergence of elements
rooted in human dignity from various cultures, while calling into to question structural
violence, such as gender inequality. A culture of peace, for Reardon, consists of values
and principles that are the result of learning about others. Such a culture would be
equitable for women and men, thus addressing long-term injustice and violence waged
against excluded groups. This vision is Reardon’s interpretation of the possibilities for a
globally peaceful culture, based on the underlying value of human dignity.

Since human dignity is a concept common to all, although with differing
definitions, Reardon proposes learning that would help people gain an understanding of
differences to synthesize principles that embody all of those belief systems. Reardon
(1988) argues that such learning constitutes a shift in consciousness, whereby individuals
come to value human dignity (pp. 2-3). Reardon (1988) does not argue that people
should be forced to adopt these values, but suggests that if society is to be peaceful and just, peace education represents a reasonable education that is upfront about its underlying values, unlike other approaches to education.

In articulating a culture of peace, Reardon does not attempt to bring forth an incoherent set of wide ranging principles, but explores how we can intuit the elements from cultures to debate and choose reasonable values and principles acceptable in all cultures. Reardon’s notions of a culture of peace, learning, and the processes of peace education provide an ethical framework and space for the democratic dialogue and participation so that people can truly understand each other for the purpose of social and political cooperation.

**Conclusion and Comparison to Prominent Alternatives.** While Reardon’s conception of the form of justice is similar, in many ways, to prominent approaches, she considers it radical. According to Reardon (2012):

> I have never considered myself to be liberal; particularly in the centrality I place on gender and the diagnosis of patriarchy I intend to be radical. Most of my work is done within the assumption of a need for systemic and structural change that does not fall within liberal frames. So, too, how I have approached culture of peace, which I argue requires a far more radical change than many who advocate it would readily embrace. Politics are a tool for realizing the changes essential to achieving justice, and are instrumental rather than
To Reardon, the culture of peace is a proposition that, in her own words, falls outside of the traditional liberal approaches. Reardon argues that the requirements for structural change based on a diagnosis of patriarchy place her outside politically liberal perspectives.

Reardon’s perspective in peace education and her conception of a culture of peace is a radical departure from the perspective of Rawls and others in the social contract tradition in terms of her analysis of global problems and liberal modes of education that inform the public discourse on the choice of political principles of justice. The traditional analysis of global problems and modern education are said by Freire (1970) to be value-free, yet they have their own subjective perspective (Reardon, 1988). The traditional approach to values that Reardon describes in *Comprehensive Peace Education* is rooted in political liberalism and liberal modes of education (Reardon citing Weston, 1988 p. 3), as opposed to the value analysis of the transformational mode of education, or inquiry toward decisions on political principles.

Is this perspective derived from public deliberation or other assumption? This approach is based on values founded in years of global discourse, discussion, and learning among groups from civil society, NGO’s, academics, and members of the United Nations community (Reardon, 1988, pp. 1-3). In this sense, the values that characterize Reardon’s transformational mode of education and inquiry were vetted and remain open to public scrutiny, and are thus reasonable political values. Snauwaert (2009a) describes the Reardon’s approach in this light as a transformational social values approach rooted in political choice and justification. Snauwaert (2009a) continues that this approach,
although subjective, is rooted in public inquiry into the values of peace and justice.

The form for Rawls (2003) is political liberalism, which he conceives as a freestanding moral claim that posits fairness through democratic and pluralistic society with overlapping consensus. Rawls does not attempt to create a moral system based on the political principles of liberalism, but suggests that members of a pluralistic society, composed of individuals and groups with various political and ethical views, whether comprehensive or not, are free, within this framework, to come together in cooperation to decide on various principles of justice. While Rawls offers the important concept of overlapping consensus, this social contract perspective that, according to Nussbaum (2006), assumes equality and power is not realistic because it does not take into account the lives of women, who are often care-givers and do not have the time or ability to participate (pp. 102-104).

Reardon’s view in Women and Peace (1993) and Education for Peace from a Gendered Perspective (2001) is consistent with Nussbaum’s critique of Rawls’ approach to liberalism. Reardon suggests that the liberal focus does not go far enough to actually achieve justice. The form of justice must necessarily focus on gender in Reardon’s conception of a culture of peace. Other views support the need to question the social contract view and liberal conception, because while they have supported human equality and democratic discourse, they have often excluded women (Gilligan, 1984; Mill, 1869; Reardon, 1985, 1991, 2001; Tong and Williams, 2009; Wollstonecraft, 1996/1792). The models offered by Reardon, Nussbaum and others support the notion that a focus on gender as part of a political conception is reasonable, especially considering the need to include all parties in the discourse on political principles of justice.
The separation of the public and private realms does not come into Rawls’ conception of fairness, even though this separation prevents women from realizing their rights and dignity. Thus a social contract position, although important in Rawls’ articulation of political liberalism as the basic structure of society for overlapping consensus, lacks attention to the problem of human inequality. Rawls (2003) does answer the problem of inequality and power with his conception of reflective equilibrium, a mechanism that entails revisiting the principles of justice under later constitutional provisions. Unfortunately, reflective equilibrium lags behind the real world needs of human dignity and the pervasiveness of violence.

The capabilities approach, as conceived by Nussbaum (2006) and Reardon (1993, 2001), focuses on the needs of human dignity and addresses the problems of inequality without requiring constitutional amendments. For Reardon, human dignity is a political value that characterizes the equality of voice in a culture of peace that, although radical in its placement of gender, fits into the capabilities approach, as these aspects of form are reasonable political propositions that have been discussed in the UN General Assembly. They would also be part of the discourse for overlapping consensus.

The capabilities approach specifically calls for democratic freedoms that provide substantive opportunities for persons to achieve whatever they choose to do and be according to their human dignity. Inherent in democratic participation is self-determination, which is instrumental and has a constructive value. If there is full participation, people tend to use nonviolent problem-solving methods, as opposed to war, and there are opportunities for citizens to learn from each other and to contribute to the
selection of social and political values through public discourse. Reardon’s conception of a culture of peace is similarly attuned to democratic discourse as a result of the full inclusion and participation of both men and women, which challenges structurally violent social and institutional practices and engages individuals with diverse worldviews in learning and dialogue to develop principles of peace and justice.

The driving impetus is Reardon’s definitional inquiry, which is a way of eliciting substantive views from various worldviews and comprehensive beliefs to engage all people and form a consensus or working conception through which plural peoples can cooperate and address global problems. Reardon’s view involves a negotiation with cultural values that are inconsistent with the framework of political liberalism. She does not reject structurally violent cultures altogether, but challenges their ideologies so that persons, as global citizens, can participate democratically.

Orientation

In terms of the orientation dimension of justice, Snauwaert (2011) focuses on the construction of queries that incorporate and focus on the ethical urgency of justice to better understand the end goal of the pursuit of justice. In doing so, Snauwaert (2011) asks the following important questions:

What should we be seeking in the pursuit of justice? What is of such value and importance that it ethically constitutes a great and urgent matter of justice? What should be the end, aim, or focus of justice? (p. 317)

These questions relate to the broad and overarching purposes of justice.

The orientation dimension is best explained by describing its application to perspective theories of justice, such as the social contract or capabilities models. In the social contract tradition, if institutional arrangements are sought, then justice is concerned with rules and procedures that promote and enforce justice. The application of such an approach leads to the pursuit of perfect institutional arrangements and procedures (Snauwaert, 2011); if the procedures of institutions are fair and just then justice is achieved. This orientation views improved institutional arrangements as the end goal of efforts to bring about justice. Rawls (2003) describes correcting the rules and procedures in the basic structure of society as the aim of justice. In doing so, these institutions and their procedures become the end of justice.

Conversely, the capabilities approach and Reardon’s approach to peace education are outcome-oriented, as they are focused on the lives of persons instead of rules, procedures or institutions. Capabilities, as described by Sen (2009) and Nussbaum (2005), view human well-being as the goal, and rules and procedures as the means to this end (Snauwaert, 2011, p. 323). In an outcome- or realization-oriented model, the motivation for justice is human lives, since the dignity of those lives constitutes the highest ethical priority. An outcome-focused orientation works backwards, starting with the needs and requirements of human dignity, then democratically creating the procedure to make the end, human dignity, possible (Nussbaum, 2006).

An institutional focus of justice is concerned with the rules and procedures of structures, whereas the institutional rules in the capabilities (and Reardon’s) approach of justice are only instrumental. An outcome-oriented approach focuses on well-being so
that individual and groups have a quality of life characteristic of a dignified life inherently worthy of moral equality. A realization approach is an orientation where the aim of justice is human lives. Therefore, this orientation focuses on the real and substantive opportunities that allow persons to do and be as they choose. Human freedom is elemental in this conception. The orientation dimension is of such importance because it directs our attention to human lives, which are most important and urgent. We are directed to deal with injustice because it prevents human well-being. We know what we should do and on whom we should focus because of our moral outrage and indignation at the sight of injustice.

The intuitive perceptiveness ignited by injustice reveals how this dimension logically follows the foundation and form of justice. While the foundation of justice refers to the moral source of justice, the form characterizes the conception of justice as either a freestanding political conception or a doctrine rooted in metaphysical-comprehensive terms. The form, in the case of both capabilities and social contract theory, informs the orientation of the whether principles of justice are free standing political conceptions in which overlapping consensus is possible.

In the case of Reardon’s conception, human dignity represents a reasonable, freestanding principle that informs and guides a culture of peace that actively encourages inclusive, public, and democratic discourse, thus ensuring that overlapping consensus is possible. Like the Nussbaum’s (2006) conception of capabilities, Reardon’s conception of justice begins with human dignity. The culture of peace, theoretically and experientially founded largely in positive peace, lays out what the normal, peaceful state of human relations might look like.
Reardon (1995) defines positive peace as “the good society” (p. 7), one that places reciprocal duties on each global citizen. Reardon (1995) writes that this good society represents “a set of social, political, and economic reconditions dependent on the realization of rights and authentic democracy” (p. 7). In part, positive peace is based on the focus on the human dignity of all people. Reardon (1995) continues that “in the struggle for universal human dignity … [human dignity] can be realized fully only under the conditions of a positive peace based on the respect for individual persons, social groups, human cultures, and the natural environment” (p. 7).

In this sense, the orientation of Reardon’s conception of justice is based on positive peace because it focuses on human lives through an inherent requirement that all people, as global citizens, respect the human dignity of all others. This respect extends to all members of pluralistic societies, their cultures, and the natural environment in which they live. As a result, positive peace involves an intuitive and organic process of deconstructing and challenging structural violence and providing substantive opportunities so that people can live and be what they choose, according to their human dignity and that of others’ dignity.

To summarize, Reardon’s concept of positive peace:

1. Is a broad and global conception involving justice that is constituted by human dignity.
2. Comprehends negative and positive peace as inseparable and related to injustice.
3. Is attuned to the needs and well-being of human lives
4. Is focused on developing visions of a peaceful future so that we can begin to see and then move toward human flourishing.
5. Offers further opportunities for learning. The learning from positive peace empowers citizens to do and be as they choose.

Firstly, Reardon’s view of positive or organic peace is a global conception focused on the outcome or realization of human lives, as it values human dignity and focuses on human well-being as the aim of justice. According to Reardon:

Although the term global justice, as it is used by classroom teachers, is not as precise as the term positive peace, it is appropriate, since “justice,” in the sense of the full enjoyment of the entire range of human rights by all people, is what constitutes positive peace. [Emphasis in original] (p. 26)

Global justice is loosely used to characterize a condition of positive peace. The term “global” signifies a conception focused on all people; justice is oriented toward all the people of the world, rather than institutions.

Underlying the “enjoyment of the entire range of human rights” is a deep respect for the human dignity of all persons. When individuals have access to their rights and freedoms, justice is present. Reardon (1988) connects positive peace to human dignity when she writes:

Peace as a network of humane relationships based on equity, mutuality, and the inherent worth of all persons might be interpreted as the manifestation of global justice. This concept of peace seems to be the one that is most characteristic of multicultural approaches to peace education that seek to develop appreciation of cultural differences and recognition of
human dignity as the essential basis for human relations-interpersonal, social, and structural. (p.26)

Global justice or positive peace represents the reciprocal respect of human dignity. It asserts that all persons are equal moral beings, requiring that they respect one another because of that equality.

The development of capacities that allow individuals to respect others and their cultures is part of peace education. Human dignity characterizes and guides the formation and maintenance of relationships throughout all levels of society. This aspect of education for peace is informed by positive peace. It assumes that global justice will be possible if individuals have respect for human life itself, and the perspectives and cultures of others. Posited in global justice, as a manifestation of positive peace, is a dynamic view of human life concerned with education that is developmental.

Reardon (1988) confirms this focus when she writes that “particularly human concerns … comprise positive peace” (p. 24). The domain of positive peace in this approach is internal, and constructed by the lived experience. The experience of people, guided by their dignity and intuitive understanding of justice derived from privation, deeply influences positive peace, thus informing the orientation of Reardon’s conception of justice. Reardon (1988) continues, writing:

Peace as affirmation of life is probably the most powerful and dynamic notion of positive peace. Since the goal of a global community implies the need for structural change, and since the achievement of truly equitable, mutual human relationships calls for conscious changes in values and attitudes, then
affirming life, in our current circumstances, requires active struggle. It calls for struggle against the endemic poverty that shortens life and lowers the quality of life for the majority of the earth’s peoples; against the chronic hunger and famine that sap the strength and extinguish the lives of millions; against a conventional arms race that saps resources and promotes lethal conflict within and among nations throughout the world; and against the proliferation of nuclear weapons that threatens the life of Earth itself. The preservation of the Earth is the foremost goal of those who hold this concept of peace, and it usually involves redefining the relationships between human beings and the planet. (p. 30)

The foundation of positive peace is actually focused on human lives, their relationships, and their communities. Positive peace values the inherent worth of all people and the notion of communities, their underlying relationships and the human dignity of all people located among them. Positive peace calls upon people to recognize and affirm the inherent value in life and move away from values inconsistent with this kind of affirmation. Positive peace implies a shift toward attitudes, values and principles consistent with human dignity.

Reardon locates the struggles to end poverty, protect the natural world, and achieve general and complete disarmament within positive peace’s affirmation of human life. The values of positive peace oppose the injustice of systematic poverty and other violent structures. Reardon describes the intimate connections between deprivation,
violence and human well-being in terms of them being the primary focus of positive peace for the improvement of human well-being. She suggests that the resources that could be used to attend to human well-being are instead misappropriated toward amassing weapons, an act that is, in and of itself, violent. Within this understanding is an ethical imperative that condemns the lack of focus on individual humans, whose well-being is denied in favor of institutional aims concerning the protection of regimes. This concept is educative as it describes the connections between the violations of human values with the attainment of human well-being.

Reardon asserts the need for the aim of justice to be the well-being of human lives. Instead, we have a situation analogous to what Kant (1795) described in his essay *Perpetual Peace*, where princes all engage in the buildup of armaments as a means to prevent attacks from each other. This view is emblematic of realist thinkers who view war as inevitable and the maintenance of a balance of power as the only practical response (Griffiths and O’Callaghan, 2002). This choice and focus of justice among realists is deemed to be amoral, yet Reardon (1988, 2009b) suggests that there are values in play here. There are always values that underlie actions, whether explicitly expressed or not.

As a result of its focus on the equal rights and freedoms all persons, positive peace must deal with violations of human dignity, since those violations explain what is needed to achieve justice. The structural injustice of poverty, environmental degradation, and the constant threat of proliferation all work in tandem, reducing human well-being and people’s quality of life.

As articulated by both Sen (2009) and Reardon (1988, 2001), the pursuit of justice
begins with the awareness of injustice and the harm done by such injustice to the well-being of human beings. Thus, the dynamic concept of positive peace, as understood by Reardon, is strongly concerned with injustice and violence. Reardon’s conception of positive (organic) peace combines both negative and positive aspects: negative, in that it focuses on the elimination of both direct and indirect violence, and positive in its focus on the fulfillment of the needs and freedoms of individuals.

Reardon (1988) suggests that negative and positive peace should not be separated, since negative peace is closely connected to its positive correlate. The combination of negative and positive peace, which positive peace expresses, describes how violence, as intentional avoidable harm, diminishes human well-being:

In peace education violence is considered to be avoidable, intentional harm, inflicted for a purpose or perceived advantage of the perpetrator or of those who, while not direct perpetrators, are, however, advantaged by the harm. The structural violence of unequal access to social benefits and resources is one example of such harm. To most forms of violence there are usually alternative non-violent means to achieve the ends sought by the perpetrators. Violence is not an inevitable or immutable element in human life and society, as has been asserted by scientists in the Seville Statement on Violence. (Reardon, 2001, p. 35)

This definition of violence as “intentional avoidable harm” encompasses both the traditional forms of violence and many others, all of which are unjust. Reardon considers
violence to be a social manifestation resulting from the choices of individuals and institutions that denies persons a dignified life and the social goods and freedoms required by human dignity. In this sense, organic peace starts intuitively with injustice, which characterizes all forms of violence as harmful to dignity and as obstacles to human well-being.

Reardon’s view of positive peace is complex, as it embodies, in part, Kenneth Boulding’s (1978) notion of stable peace as well as Galtung’s (1969) traditional negative and positive approaches. Reardon (1988) considers the concepts of structural violence, negative peace and positive peace, which she uses “for clarity,” but ultimately rejects them in favor of the term organic peace, which refers to peace as a “living, evolving, condition” (p. 12). Stable peace is a long-term condition, where the impulse of war is resisted. Foundational peace, which includes the mechanisms and institution to resolve conflict non-violently, is the condition out of which organic peace grows.

Organic peace, in this context, refers to the realization of the needs of human lives. While related to the common understanding of positive peace within peace related fields, Reardon’s organic peace approach is more nuanced, encompassing an outcome oriented approach to justice. It is an approach that views the elimination of both indirect and direct violence, or at least movement toward these goals, as necessary for peace and justice. Since violence in all of its forms is an obstacle to human dignity and the realization of peace and justice, it must be reduced or eliminated.

Reardon’s holistic perspective connects the elimination of direct violence in negative peace with the fulfillment of human dignity, needs and freedoms that characterize positive peace. In this sense, organic peace can be understood as an intuitive
sense of the idea that justice often begins with the recognition of what is unjust. Organic peace does not cancel out negative or positive peace, but it explains the possibilities for a the human context and lived conditions.

Is not violence unjust? As described earlier, the very essence of violence, whether direct or indirect, is an affront to human dignity and human rights (Peterson, 2011; Reardon, 1998; Snauwaert, 2011). In situations of violent conflict, there is a practical requirement that physical harm be halted before progress can be made toward peace and justice. Yet, even if these kinds of violence are eliminated, failure to attend to the structural issues of indirect violence makes future violent conflict inevitable. Thus, both direct violence and other forms of injustice that affect individuals’ lives should be the focus of justice and must be reduced, if not eliminated, if there is to be peace.

According to Reardon (1988):

Positive peace has become the concept connoting a world in which the need for violence has been significantly reduced; if not eliminated. The major areas of concern in the domain of positive peace are the problems of economic deprivation and development; environment and resources; and universal human rights and social justice. (p. 26)

In this sense, all forms of violence are the focus of positive peace and the direct concern of justice, because they are all obstacles to the human dignity of human persons. Violence is an obstacle to human well-being. Positive peace indicates the global diminution of violence. Negative and positive forms of peace are both concerned with ending all forms of violence and injustice. Injustice and violence are related, as one leads
Reardon conceptions of positive peace and intentional avoidable harm, which are similar to Sen’s notion of the intuitive nature of injustice, help us to understand that we can learn from injustice. Specifically, Reardon draws a distinction between intentional harm and intentional avoidable harm, and the impact they have on human well-being. Reardon (2001) explores this distinction in the context of environmental impact:

Avoidable harm to the environment is inflicted daily by millions of people in all parts of the world. Intentional environmental harm of a much higher order for the purpose of short-term economic advantage is inflicted by a much smaller number of industrial interests. Much of this environmental damage has significant gender consequences. Men and women often have different relationships to the environment. Much damage to the environment results from the forms of development derived from the Western, techno-industrial development which becomes ever more prevalent with the process of globalization. These policies are made by male power elites, most of whom live a life in which the natural environment is obscured by advanced development. Women in the developing countries experience many of the avoidable, damaging effects of these policies. This is just one of many instances in which the importance of both a global and a gender perspective and violence awareness are important to
understanding the problems experienced daily at the local level
where the gender disparities and avoidable harm resulting from
global policies are most readily apparent. (pp. 115-116)

One key point in this analysis is the understanding that harm can be avoided, whether intentional or not.

These kinds of activities that harm individuals’ lives and well-being are often seen as amoral and necessary for development, and yet there have a significant human cost: the violation of all basic standards of human decency. Often, though, the benefits to the few outweigh the muted voices of the many who live with and experience this deprivation daily.

Additionally, this example is illustrative of the concept of structural violence. In Comprehensive Peace Education, Reardon (1988) describes how the concept of structural violence is “used [to] identify the consequences of social, political, and economic structures, institutions, and processes that systematically violate rights and lower the material quality of life of particular groups or classes of people – the same structures that maintain (and are maintained by) the attitudes and values inherent in racism, sexism, and colonialism” (p. 7). Reardon continues that positive peace and peace education offer a means of identifying and describing this harm. While positive peace describes the building and organic growth of peaceful and just conditions, recognition of how the harm done to individuals can be avoided empowers individuals to work toward the elimination of such harms and the creation of futures they envision.

Many other perspectives of positive peace incorporate a similar concept of an intricate connection between injustice and violence. In Snauwaert’s (2009a) discussion
of Reardon, he writes:

Positive peace includes but transcends negative peace. It entails not only the elimination of armed aggression but also the positive establishment of justice. It constitutes a social order free of all forms of violence, including structural violence, as well as the establishment and sustainability of fundamental and widespread social fairness. Positive peace can be understood as the realization of the complete range of human rights: civil and political and economic, cultural, and social. It is essential to point out that for Reardon (and many others) positive peace entails a conception of global justice that transcends the boundaries of individual nation states; it necessarily applies to all human beings. [Emphasis in original] (p.2)

Snauwaert’s discussion notes how Reardon conceives positive peace, as the elimination of all violence and injustice, as a fundamental requirement of human dignity and the focus on human lives. Snauwaert’s use of the word “realization” implies that he takes her view of positive peace to mean that it is oriented toward the lives of individuals. At a macro level, global justice means that all individuals must have access to rights and freedoms, which human dignity requires. The micro level involves the substantive opportunities for individuals to choose their own conception of the good life, free from the impingement of violence and injustice.

To first separate out negative peace and then move to positive peace would not
be a good use of our efforts, especially since direct violence is often rooted in and caused by indirect violence. Positive peace utilizes the concept of global justice to direct our attention to the lives of all individuals globally. These lives are the immediate focus, since the view of positive peace as global justice incorporates a basic right to human dignity.

The concepts and content of positive and negative peace are connected and should not be viewed dualistically. Rather, the two should, in tandem, be seen as providing a reasonable approach toward understanding of the obstacles to peace and the realization and attainment of peace and justice. To see them separately is to underestimate the urgency of both in the pursuit of justice for individual lives across the world.

Focusing on an improved comprehension of injustice, which includes all forms of violence, we can identify what human needs are required to bring about a condition where human life is the aim of justice. Reardon (1988) writes that “problems of injustice are accorded great significance by peace educators. The study of forms of injustice, particularly poverty, appears to be approached in two distinct manners: problem-centered and structural” (p. 26). A significant aspect of the content of peace education (and focus of positive peace) is injustice. Specifically, the focus on the problem of violence (and injustice), and the inquiry into systemic issues are parts of the shift in focus to values education and the belief that individuals have the capacity to perceive the institutional violence that perpetuates structural violence.

The importance placed on this aspect of positive peace is the result of an approach that deems persons of such importance that their education, toward values that would improve their well-being and quality of life through the reduction of structural violence,
is paramount. According to Reardon (1991):

Positive peace requires the reduction and elimination of structural violence, the violation of life and well-being that derives from social and economic institutions. Should we need indicators of the conditions of justice and equity that comprise positive peace, we need only refer to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, an inventory of factors that deny human freedom and impede the fulfillment of security needs. (p. 71)

Here Reardon speaks to the systemic injustice that impedes human well-being and prevents individuals from achieving personal dignity. Likewise, Sen (2009), in *Idea of Justice*, points to the “plurality of reasons for justice” (p. 11) to seeking just institutions, which are opposed by existing institutions. Reardon’s descriptions are focused on the many injustices that are urgent mattes for justice.

Conversely, the UDHR incorporates, in its articulation of human rights, some of the requirements of human dignity. Nussbaum (2006) notes the importance of basic rights and their role in injustice when she writes, “Failure to secure these rights for citizens is a particularly grave violation of basic justice, since these entitlements are held to be implicit in the very notions of human dignity and a life that is worthy of human dignity” (p.155). This view is consistent with Reardon’s perspective, which identifies injustice and highlights the importance of rights that articulate the requirements of human dignity. Where those rights are not present, there is injustice. Thus, human rights help us measure injustice and understand, in part, the requirements for a decent quality of life constituted by one’s ability and freedom to choose, according to one’s dignity.
Reardon reaffirms this perspective when she writes that “the concepts of rights, as well as the specific rights enumerated in international documents, constitute an excellent yardstick by which to measure the quality-of-life factors central to the study of positive peace” (p. 34-35). This characterization of a decent quality of life is based in the comparison of the human condition as experienced by individuals under different standards of human rights. Positive peace’s educative aspects focus equally on the comparison between human rights standards and people’s living conditions. By learning about and comparing human rights standards other than those that currently apply to them, individuals become aware and thus empowered to demand new rights and freedoms.

The idea of awareness and empowerment through positive peace education is rooted in Freirian critical education approaches, which are an integral part of positive peace. Snauwaert (2011) hypothesizes that a realization-based approach is inherent in this kind of critical awareness, which, through comparison to what things should or could be like as articulated in constitutions and international legal human rights documents, prompts us to become indignant at injustice (p. 10). Sen (2009) suggests that this indignation may serve as a spark that leads us not toward perfect institutions, but towards the elimination of what is unjust. Reardon’s notion of positive peace educates from the vantage point of inquiry into present conditions, the underlying values that construct those conditions, the standards that seek to improve and eliminate those injustice, and the violence that prevent human well-being and a decent quality of life, as well as the possibilities for more peaceful human futures through envisioning.

Envisioning preferred futures and possibilities is an essential part of Reardon’s
outcome-focused orientation because it is aimed at developing both the capacities needed for human well-being and flourishing and a deep understanding of injustice so that persons can imagine, make plans, and work toward a more peaceful world. According to Reardon (1988):

   Without utopian visions to articulate the conditions of a less violent, more just world, peace cannot be described, and we will continue to lack the basic tools with which to define it. Thus the task of envisioning peace remains a challenge to both the movement and the field of education. … This task appears to belong primarily to the domain of positive peace. (p. 13)

   Re-imagining a world where the needs of people are the focus of justice is a descriptive activity, requiring skill and knowledge of present conditions and the rights and freedoms afforded to all people. Reardon (2009a) remarked, in her acceptance of the McBride Peace Prize, that such learning is an important aspect in pragmatic efforts toward positive peace. Utopian visions of a just and peaceful world are not unrealistic ephemeral conceptualizations of future possibilities, but a tool for explaining what is possible with active world citizenry focusing on learning from each other and approaching conflict through nonviolent means (Reardon, 2000, 2009a).

   A vision of a world with such reductions in violence is embodied in the UDHR and other international covenants and legal instruments. The UDHR represents a hope for all of humanity through the recognition of human rights that represent, in part, people’s underlying human dignity. Reardon (1988) articulates the importance of envisioning these ends.
Envisioning or imaging a preferred future is an often ignored, yet integral, aspect of positive peace. It helps us learn how to build consensus in human cooperation to develop values, recognize injustice by comparing our desired future with present conditions, and communicate the steps required for human flourishing. Envisioning, in this sense, is practical and focused on human well-being.

This idea is espoused by Sen (2009), who writes, “there may not … exist any identifiable perfectly just social arrangement in which impartial agreement would emerge” (p.15). Through discourse and discussion of possibilities, a reasonable and just choice, albeit imperfect, is possible. Perfection is not the aim of envisioning; rather, it is the putting forth of plans and possibilities based on the existing realities as well as an underlying respect for human dignity.

Learning how to envision possibilities is an important aspect of peace education that posits the high moral and ethical importance of all persons, regardless of status. Education, in Reardon’s view, reflects this sentiment and describes how individuals can develop capabilities to move toward what they choose to do and be. In this sense, it is also developmental of human capacities.

Lastly, education for positive peace comprises a large part of peace education and involves the notion of deep transformation for human development. It is composed of elements that deepen our understanding of injustice and human flourishing, equipping learners with the capacity to develop relationships and engage in nonviolent problem solving and learning. In describing this, Reardon (1988) writes:

Education should be devoted to the development of the ability
to learn and should concern itself with deepening and extending
the capacities that are comprehended by the notion of the positive human potential. Positive peace and the positive human potential are inextricably linked, both are developmental and organic. Many peace educators and activists would define peacemaking as conceiving, gestating, and nurturing those conditions in which all can develop their good qualities, their capacity to be fully human. (p. 54)

In this sense, Reardon's perspective on positive peace should be understood as developmental.

In Dale Snauwaert's (1993) book *Developmental Democracy*, he conceives democracy in the progressive (or Deweyan) framework as oriented toward human development. Like the concept of developmental democracy, Reardon’s view of positive peace, and peace in general, is developmental in the sense that peace helps individual develop their own capacities that realize their own good. Education in this sense is empowering, focusing on how learners can develop in ways consistent with the values of dignity and freedom.

Positive peace embodies learning that helps individuals move toward their own concept of the good, and engages learners in inquiries about human needs:

Enhancing the quality of life is a fundamental goal of three curricular approaches that I would classify as part of education for positive peace: environmental education, development education, and human rights education. (Reardon, 1988 p. 31)

---

39 Reardon’s conception of positive peace is analogous to Snauwaert’s (1993) view of developmental democracy in terms of its purposes i.e. human development.
The content of positive peace education is centered on concerns that affect human well-being and a dignified quality of life – the natural environment, globalization, structural violence, and the content and substance of human rights – because they constitute a significant part of the understanding necessary, in Reardon’s view, for a decent quality of life characterized by human dignity. Learning the content of these approaches to positive peace informs learners, helping them to develop the capacities and skills to become empowered and demand a life consistent with human dignity. In this sense, peace education is focused on uncovering values and helping individuals learn so they can develop the critical capacities to participate. In Reardon’s model of peace education, individuals who are most affected by injustice, and will thus benefit most from critical inquires, are actively invited to participate in learning communities.

Snauwaert (2011) points to Reardon’s recognition of Freire’s critical pedagogy in peace education (p. 327), and she suggests that Freire is concerned with confronting injustice and violence through our “ontological vocation” and that learning that will make us more human. Reardon, in her own writings, does the same, focusing on education as an entry point to evaluating principles consistent with moral equality and human dignity. She writes that “education for positive peace confront[s] value conflicts and call[s] for values analysis at both the personal and structural levels” (Reardon, 1988, p. 32). Education for positive peace confronts injustice through a personal and subjective critical inquiry that engages with the communities that experience it, and leads to values more consistent with what is required for human dignity.

Reardon argues, “the achievement of positive peace requires consistency of values and that certain core values must be pursued at all levels of social organization and
in all areas of human experience” (p. 32). The same means/ends dialectic that Freire articulates (Snauwaert, 2011, pp. 328-329) is found in Reardon’s approach and understanding of positive peace and the human experience. In this sense, values of the foundation of justice constitute the means for addressing what is required for the human ends.

To summarize, positive peace is an important concept indicating a realization approach. Reardon’s perspective is rooted in the well-being of human lives, and focuses on learning about injustice in the lived experience and providing individuals and communities with a blueprint for flourishing. The logic of moral equality is intrinsic in Reardon’s democratic concept of positive peace, since it is focused on the removal of obstacles to human well-being and dignity, and ensuring that individuals have the educational capacities and freedom to choose their own way of living consistent with the universal respect of all persons’ dignity.

The orientation of Reardon’s conception of justice is based on the human-centered focus of her conception of positive peace. This approach is consistent with the capabilities approach of Nussbaum (2006, 2011) and Sen (2009), but not with the contractarian position. In the social contract tradition, the focus of justice for Rawls (2003) is on the procedures, rules, and social and political institutions, which, if structured fairly, will result in justice. Rawls (2003) argues that if just principles are followed, institutions will automatically create justice. This view is flawed, since the focus on institutions and procedures has the potential to result in a utilitarian model of justice, which is precisely what Rawls deplored. By focusing on fair rules and procedure, political structures revert to a “one size fits all” approach, denying legitimate individual
circumstances and the needs of human dignity.

Sen (2009) critiques the institutional approach of Rawls and his “transcendental institutionalism” on the grounds that the perfection of institutions is never possible, although the recognition of injustice is. Sen’s (2009) intuitive recognition of injustice and comparative assessment of possibilities for justice and quality of lives are based on improving human well-being. Reardon, like Sen, views institutions as instrumental in the pursuit of justice, although procedures and rules are not an end in and of themselves. Additionally, since peace education is concerned with process, the means – institutions – cannot be violent in any way if they are to achieve a just peace. Reardon (2010b) suggests that Sen does not take this view because he does not rule out the use of violence (p.24), which is always a violation of human dignity. For Reardon, the means are closely related to the end.

Reardon’s notion of positive peace, like Nussbaum’s (2006) view of justice that starts with the recognition of human dignity, also begins with the recognition of injustice, and turns to education to learn about and offer an alternate future rooted in the requirements of human dignity. Though different from the capabilities approach, Reardon’s model categorizes injustice as violence, and incorporates inquiries and learning about violence designed to empower learners and global citizens, making them aware and helping them develop the capacity to deal with global problems and address their needs non-violently. Her approach is rooted in the value of human dignity, a core aspect of positive peace that informs the means of peace best suited to helping persons to develop toward becoming more human.
Domain

The domain is concerned with the content of justice. Snauwaert (2011) articulates the domain of justice through the following questions:

**Domain (space)** – What should be the content of justice? What goods should justice be concerned with? What is of such primary importance to a life worthy of human dignity that it becomes an urgent matter of justice? What defines what one must do or can never do to another human being? Equality of what? (p. 317)

The domain of justice is illustrated by Amartya Sen’s (1979, 1982) famous question: “equality of what?” Similarly, Nussbaum (1988) proposes that in order to determine the fairness or justice of the distribution of social goods, we need to know what is being distributed; that is, we need a clear and compelling conception of the meaning of the social goods to be distributed (p. 151). The domain of justice, therefore, refers to what we are entitled to; it pertains to what is good. Capabilities are one among many conceptions of the good, such as rights, freedoms, and other resources that constitute human flourishing. In essence, the domain consists of goods that make human flourishing possible.

The foundation of justice describes why all human beings are due equal moral consideration, the form indicates whether the foundation is comprehensive or political, and the orientation explains the focus of justice; the domain consists of the substance required for a good life. In this sense, the domain comprises the actual goods required for human dignity. Rawls’ social contract theory, for example, posits a theory of primary
goods, which are mainly resources, while Sen (2009) and Nussbaum (2006) offer a view based not on resources, but capabilities.

For Reardon, (1) if human dignity is the foundation of justice and (2) the foundation is a freestanding political conception, which is a reasonable set of public values that include a culture of peace (a culture constituted as a space of plural beliefs and perspectives free of all forms of violence, where an overlapping consensus on the principles of justice is possible), and (3) if the focus of justice is human well-being, then what is the domain of justice in Reardon's approach?

**Overview of Reardon’s Domain.** The domain of Reardon’s conception of justice is authentic human security, which, in her view, is contingent upon the actualization of a person’s conception of a good life or human flourishing, as well as the developed capacities for the enactment of human well-being. Therefore, authentic human security embodies the combined capabilities that are necessary for persons to have the substantive opportunities, goods and freedoms, to do and be as they choose.

Reardon’s definition of human security is an overarching concept that articulates a sense of being secure, in the traditional sense, as well as being a state where individuals are empowered to seek and fulfill their own conception of the good. Human security is a framework that describes the content of justice in terms of the capabilities required for a good life. Thus, human security involves the fulfillment of basic needs and the external conditions, including the substantive social opportunities that offer the substantive freedom to be and to do what one has reason to value. As an alternative to traditional approaches to security, authentic human security is characterized by what one needs to
Reardon’s Conception of Authentic Human Security. Reardon’s conception of authentic human security is defined in terms of what it means to have a good life, as it incorporates respect for human dignity, a sustainable environment, fulfillment of basic needs as required by human dignity, and freedom from avoidable harm (Reardon, 2010, pp. 19-22). Specifically, Reardon (1991) writes that “authentic security lies … in the expectation of well-being.” Thus, security comes not from the buildup of weapons, but from protection and access to basic economic and social goods, ecological balance, freedoms and liberties, as well as respect for human dignity (p.3).

In this way, Reardon’s concept of human security rooted in human well-being is juxtaposed with traditional concepts of security. Traditional forms of security are rooted in the state-centered model of the physical protection of citizens through the stockpiling of weapons and militarization so as to project power, protect sovereignty, and maintain internal order (Reardon, 1985, 1993). Human security suggests that a person’s actual security is promoted when their basic needs are met, and when opportunities and freedoms are available to them.

Reardon’s conception of human security contains a theory of the good premised on human security. Reardon (1993) argues that if security is to be authentic, it must be based on well-being that comes from a sense of actual human security, which is the fulfillment of basic economic and material needs, ecological balance that allows sustainability, a respect for the dignity of all humanity, and the freedom and protection from all forms of harm, a goal not met by military force, violence, or weapons (p. 3).

Reardon (1993) offers that “the first of the core feminist assertions on the
meaning of security identifying the sources of its assurances, is that security is in essence
the condition that makes possible the experience and expectation of wellbeing” (p. 16).
In this sense, human well-being is rooted in an understanding of what it means to be
secure, which does not come from a sense alone but from human experiences that allow
persons and their communities to be secure. This is proposed as a feminist assertion that,
as described in earlier sections, requires respect for human dignity. Such a respect
embodies the actual feeling of being respected as well as the material goods and freedoms
that actualize it. In other words, one may have one’s material needs met, but without a
sense that a good life is possible and maintainable, there is no actual security.

The sense of security can be compared with Rawls’ view of a “sense of justice for
a conception of the good” (Sen, 2009, p. 63). While Sen does not continue down this
path, which goes toward procedural justice, he does suggest that it is an important
framework, and one that he includes in his approach to capabilities. Sen (2009) argues
that this sense of justice and fairness in one’s community can influence and advance the
freedom of others. Similarly, human security offers a sense that individuals will have
well-being, rendering a community more likely to aid others.

While this sense of human security is profoundly important, so too are its actual
contents and materials, which, in part, constitute Reardon’s concept of the good.
Reardon (1993) explains that the “protection of human rights is essential to authentic
human security, so as to assure the expectation of respect for human dignity and
fulfillment of human needs” (p. 83). This focus of human security is the content of
justice, which views security in terms of freedom from harm and an approach to well-
being where one can truly feel secure and focus on one’s own conception of the good.
Reardon uses the term “human security” to refer to the fulfillment of the basic physical needs, freedoms from harm, needed protections (to the extent to which people demand protection) and a sense of security for individuals and their communities.

According to Reardon (1982), “human security is a condition based upon the expectation that human needs will be met” (p. 14). A real sense of security involves fulfillment of basic human needs. Reardon (1993) describes this more when she writes that “approaches to human rights have been deeply influenced by the notion of needs fulfillment as human rights that are essential security” (p. 80). The sense of security is derived from the concept of basic needs articulated in human rights theory, which lays out a description of resources and freedoms that encompass the requirements for human basic functioning.

Reardon (1993) recognizes “the significance of meeting basic human needs as fundamental to the achievement of global security and peace,” (p. 83) giving food security as an example of one such right; having enough food to be nourished is part of feeling secure. Reardon (1993) continues that global crises of famine teach, “an anguishing lesson in the need to prevent famine and eliminate hunger by achieving food self-sufficiency among the world’s people” (p. 83). Basic needs, as articulated by the UDHR and Reardon’s conception of human security, describe the threshold level of goods necessary for a sense of justice and a state of peace.

Reardon (1993) further identifies the basic human needs of “clean, potable water, housing, adequate food, fundamental education, and healthcare” (p. 23). While these items are not capabilities, they are required for the basic functioning that makes capabilities possible. Nussbaum (2006) suggests that “functioning may be the goal in
certain areas. … Compulsory functioning is justified by both the child’s cognitive immaturity and by the importance of such functioning in enabling adult capabilities” (p. 173). Nussbaum is ambivalent about capabilities being focused on functioning, but agrees that it is necessary to move toward a complete level of capabilities. Reardon (1993) is concerned with this same kind of functioning, in part, so that persons are healthy and nourished enough to meet their own needs and also because she links deprivation to violent and unjust conditions and insecurity. Reardon (1993) suggests that food self-sufficiency can be achieved through the prevention of famine and the elimination of hunger (p. 83).

Not only is dealing with the problems of privation part of basic functioning, it also develops the capacity for persons to move toward the abilities required to meet their needs. Reardon (1993) continues, “these conditions of deprivation represent a major constraint on the achievement of peace and security, and an obstacle to the full realization of economic, social and cultural rights condemning many to poverty, illiteracy, unemployment and ill health” (p.82). Reardon argues that poverty and unjust conditions facilitate a state of peacelessness that causes more harm and contributes to individuals’ and communities’ inability to develop the capacities required to meet their security needs and to do and be what they choose. Access to the material goods needed for human functioning, making life plans, and having the required nutrients for sustenance is a basic human need. Once these goods are attained, individuals and communities feel some modicum of security. Many of these basic needs are dependent upon a sustainable ecological system.

The fulfillment of needs supports the development of capacities that help persons
realize their goals, and thus functioning and the fulfillment of basic human needs is related to internal capabilities. Nussbaum (2000) describes the “innate equipment of individuals that is the necessary basis for developing the more advanced capabilities and a ground for moral concern” (p. 1136). Nussbaum articulates basic capabilities as fundamental goods that are necessary for more advanced capabilities, and which include a moral dimension. Since, for Nussbaum (2006), justice or capabilities start with dignity, it can be inferred that human dignity is the intuitive and ethical value involved in and underlying the basic needs that characterize internal capabilities. Internal capabilities refer to the inner development required to access freedoms and opportunities, whereas external capabilities refer to the social conditions needed (Robeyns, 2011).

Reardon (2010) argues that basic needs point to the importance of “democratic and representative policy-making bodies” in human security and development (p. 20). This view connects human security to participation in the policy process that determines the allotment of resources used to meet these basic needs. In this sense, the freedom and ability to participate in decision-making related to one’s own good is part of this aspect of Reardon’s conception of the good. It is also a capability and is related to the moral dimension of basic needs and freedoms that are available to all people. Public participation in democratic processes offers an opportunity for people to be involved in making these goods accessible to their neighbors and communities. The basic goods described by Reardon constitute the focus of peace and justice.

Respect for personal dignity, group dignity, and identity, as supported by international legal covenants described above, is a basic requirement for human security, and thus a condition of peace. Reardon (2010) writes that a “necessary source of human
security is the fundamental need for acknowledgement of our dignity and assurance that our personal and cultural identities are to be respect[ed]” (p. 20). Reardon describes, in terms of human lives, the cost of absence of such respect: long-term privation, violence, ecological damage, discrimination and a general “state of daily and constant human insecurity” (p. 21). The recognition of human dignity serves as a good that signifies value. An absence of respect for dignity is a sign that the lives, well-being and security of persons have no value. All of our international agreements and treaties affirm that human dignity posits moral equality and value in all persons.

Reardon offers a definition of human dignity as:

the fundamental innate worth of the human person. A good society honors the dignity of all persons and expects all its members to respect the dignity of others. Integrity refers to the wholeness of the physical, mental, aesthetic, and spiritual facets of the person. The good society provides for the expression and development of the multiple facets of the person and holds them to be inviolable. Good societies are built on the active recognition of individual and group rights and the fulfillment of individual and social responsibility. (Reardon, 1995, p.5)

Not only does human dignity articulate the inherent value of persons, it also describes the role of society and individual’s responsibilities in that respect and in many other dimensions related to human dignity, which should not be violated. Dignity is attuned to individuals and their own sense of self-worth and respect as well as their associations, cultures, and traditions.
From this view of dignity, Reardon articulates a conception of good based on the development of capacities and the presence of human security in terms of rights, freedoms, and dignity, from which many capabilities could emerge. Nussbaum (2006) suggests that capabilities “considers the account of entitlements not as derived from the ideas of dignity and respect but rather as a way of fleshing out those ideas” (p.172). In this sense, capabilities are an articulation of dignity. Reardon’s (1995) view corresponds with this approach when she describes human dignity as a “central generative principle” (p. 2). Respect for human dignity is synonymous with the fulfillment of basic needs, protections, freedoms and other entitlements articulated from cultural needs, so long as they are reasonable and do not cause harm to others.

This view of dignity and self-respect is secondary in the social contract tradition. Rawls (2003) argues that while self-respect is important, income and wealth are the primary goods that make all other goods possible. This view is problematic for the capabilities approach because of the relative nature of income and wealth, in terms of how those goods might be culturally valued, as well as the shortcomings of these goods as they relate to integrity and wholeness of persons. Wealth and income are relative and do not account for mental states. The presence of a sense of dignity is a core requirement for human security.

Reardon (2001, 2010) derives the protection from avoidable harm from the “international order being promulgated by the United Nations’ … ‘Responsibility to Protect’” (p. 21) as well as from her conception of positive peace, which is constituted by the respect of human dignity. Reardon (2010) describes the role of the UN as offering intervention in violent conflict and starvation and dealing with the effects of war. From
this we can take the protection from avoidable harm to be concerned with direct and indirect violence, which is both structural and unjust. This focus is, at the same time, characterized by the notion of positive peace. As described in earlier sections, positive peace is a state in which injustice is being dealt with, since injustice and violence violate human dignity. I argue that, for Reardon, this protection is central to human security and is an external capability that provides the conditions and freedoms to move about and pursue one’s own life plans.

Nussbaum (2006) view of the external conditions is similarly articulated when she writes:

The idea that human beings should have a chance to flourish in their own way, provided they do no harm to others, is thus very deep in the view’s whole approach to the justification of basic political entitlements. … Once we judged that a capability is essential for a life with human dignity, we have a very strong moral reason for promoting its flourishing and removing obstacles to it. (p. 361)

While Nussbaum expresses the importance of individuals' conception of flourishing, she includes a provision maintaining that no harm should come to others as part that freedom. She includes this not as an addendum to capabilities, but as a requirement inherent in individuals’ articulation of their public support of freedoms and welfare. Nussbaum links the removal of harm to respect for human dignity and the establishment of capabilities. Nussbaum articulates harm broadly, as obstacles to flourishing, while Reardon (2001) offers a more specific definition of intentional harm as
avoidable violence and injustice. These stances on freedom from harm as capabilities are similar since they both include the importance of dignity as a moral indicator that defines what humans should never do to one another.

These interrelated capabilities are the content of justice and, as such, they constitute the conditions of positive peace and embody many human rights and the notion of human dignity described in international legal documents. They are indivisible, irreducible, and cannot be substituted for one another. The indivisible nature of capabilities is expressed when Nussbaum (2006) writes that there is a “need for an irreducible plurality of opportunities for life activity” (p.167). This refers to the fact that the plurality of opportunities that exist cannot be reduced, due to the inherent right to such an array of opportunities.

The daily struggle by individuals to achieve human security through international legal channels, protests, and activism represents the actual movement toward the realization of external conditions to make capabilities possible. Critical peace education about positive peace ensures the internal development of persons’ capacities to make demands and struggle toward the fulfillment of human security through access to basic rights and freedoms. In this sense, the content of human security, which corresponds to conditions of positive peace, provides the background needed for functioning and the development of capabilities and rights.

**Capabilities or Basic Needs.** While human security as the domain provides a sense of justice or view that justice will be done in terms of access to well-being, Reardon’s description of the development of human capacities characterizes a capabilities
approach, as defined by Sen (2009) and Nussbaum (2006). The capabilities approach involves:

two core normative claims: first, the claim that the freedom to achieve well-being is of primary moral importance, and second, that freedom to achieve well-being is to be understood in terms of people’s capabilities, that is, their real opportunities to do and be what they have reason to value. (Robyns, 2011, p. 1)

This section considers whether this same view is present in Reardon’s domain, through an analysis of whether Reardon stipulates a conception of “freedom to achieve well-being.” First, what is her conception of well-being, and, for that matter, freedom? Second, does her view of human needs go beyond basic needs, and does this constitute a capabilities approach?

Arguably, Reardon’s view of well-being is based on the achievement of a decent quality of life. It encompasses a deep respect for human dignity insofar as the needs of a dignified life are fulfilled for any and every human. Freedom, for Reardon, is the result of the fulfillment of the range of human rights, which necessarily encompasses the respect and recognition of human dignity and the development of capacities that allow persons to do and be as they choose, while being responsible to others. In terms of definition, as will be discussed later, a capacity is similar to a capability, but Reardon’s formulation of capacities is as part of the development of abilities that allow one to do and be as one chooses. Thus, as will be explained, capabilities constitute Reardon’s domain of justice.

Reardon considers well-being to be a communal value that is derived from the
respect for human dignity. Well-being is ensured by the fulfillment of human rights. It is also connected to human freedom, thus requiring the development of capacities for the exercise of freedom that are part of the creation of peaceful and just conditions. In *Peace Education: Review and Projection*, Reardon (2000) suggests that (economic) well-being is among the values that researchers have determined to be core principles that reinforce and extend from human dignity. This approach deemed well-being, inter alia, to be the basis of an alternative global scheme where human rights and dignity characterize the social order (Reardon, 2000, p. 12). According to Reardon, (1978) the term *human rights*, “as used by both the reviewer and the respondents in the general conceptual sense, refers to conditions, attributes and needs of human beings which are widely considered essential to general well-being and truly a human quality of life” (pp. 2-3). Well-being, in this sense, is characterized by the standards of human rights, describing human needs in order to achieve a quality of life. We can take “human quality of life” to be a quality distinctive of a life worthy of human dignity, especially since Reardon’s conception of a human includes an entitlement to dignity as a result of his or her human status.

Human rights and the world order values, which both attempt to describe the basis of rights and the needs of dignity, are, in part, responses to global violence and war, and yet are still concerned with and directed toward the creation of conditions of positive peace. Reardon and Cabezudo (2002) describe this when they write:

> An alternative peaceful future is defined not only as the absence of open hostilities, or negative peace, but as the presence of peacemaking processes and conditions likely to ensure a secure, durable, positive peace. It implies a state of

40 See Reardon’s foundation of justice in section 1 of chapter 4
wellbeing, a dynamic social process in which justice, equity, and respect for basic human rights are maximized, and violence, both physical and structural, is minimized. Comprehensive peace education is rooted in this holistic, dynamic view of peace and is explicitly value-based. ... A value such as nonviolence is manifested through other values such as respect for human rights, freedom, and trust, while social justice is realized by values such as equality, responsibility, and solidarity. (p. 19)

This conceptualization moves beyond peace in the negative toward positive peace. Positive peace is viewed as human well-being, due to the fact that human rights are respected on all levels, as evidenced by diminished violence and a renewed focus on the conditions that embody the recognition of dignity.

Reardon makes connections between violence, well-being and human rights. If there is violence, there is no well-being, and neither human rights nor dignity is respected. Violence is always unjust. Thus, non-violence reinforces a respect for human dignity, rights and freedom. In this way, well-being is connected to freedom. Here, well-being is conceptualized as connected to justice and requiring equity. Equity is a fundamental requirement for human dignity. Equity goes beyond the notion of simple equality in that it requires more, asking us to make amends for long-term privation issues and actual human conditions. Equity acknowledges that human dignity, the basis of peace and just conditions, might require more according to the needs of that life.

Well-being constitutes a state where there is positive peace, wherein human rights
and dignity are recognized. This recognition necessarily includes human freedom. In *Education for Human Dignity*, Reardon (1995) describes how human freedom is an “interrelated value” that emanates from the respect for human dignity and integrity (p. 5). Dignity requires that persons have a sense of freedom. Reardon (1995) offers that:

> Freedom of person is primary in the Western tradition of human rights. It connotes the rights of all to control their own bodies, minds, and spirits, to choose their own personal and cultural identity and way of life, and to move freely where they will, if it does not adversely affect others, neglect important responsibilities, or cause harm to the community. It is a value that rejects slavery, unjust imprisonment, torture, enforced prostitution or pregnancy, restriction of movement within or between countries, limits in access to information, interference with personal choices. It demands the exercise of individual responsibility to refrain from and prevent infringement on the freedom of others by individuals and organizations, social groups, and governments. (p. 6)

Freedom here is conceptualized in terms of rights that designate individual autonomy to choose, with freedom of thought and bodily integrity, while simultaneously requiring individuals to be responsible for insuring the freedoms of others. Reardon argues that freedom, in this sense, is explicitly opposed to any curtailments of this autonomy, such as slavery and forced prostitution.

This description articulates a kind of individual autonomy that covers the external
conditions required for individuals to develop and access opportunities. This conception embodies a “freedom to” and a “freedom from,” which are both negative and positive approaches to viewing human liberty. Reardon (1995) directly expresses the connection between freedom and well-being when she suggests that:

The second generation is the economic and social rights generated by the socialist and workers’ movements of the nineteenth century. These two generations were conceptualized as individual rights: the first being restraints of the power over citizens to assure freedom; the second being obligations of the state to citizens to assure economic and social well-being. (pp. 8-9)

This generational view of the development of rights connects freedom to human well-being through the lived experience of social movements that utilized their freedom of speech to secure economic and social goods. In this sense, Reardon (1995) continues that “industrialism’s unchecked exploitation of the laboring classes produced the second,” which addressed injustice since it is “contradictory to the fundamental values” (p. 9). Those fundamental values are human well-being, human rights and recognition of dignity.

From this discussion, it can be gleaned that negative liberties, or the restraint of government, were needed to secure human well-being. One freedom may have led to another, but Reardon’s point is that negative freedoms are interdependent with positive freedoms. The discussion of freedom’s opposition to slavery and the promotion of freedoms to do and be suggests the complexity of Reardon’s view, which goes beyond
the well-being articulated in the U.S. Constitution. Freedom and well-being include freedom from violence as well as access to the peaceful and just conditions that make choosing of a good life possible.

Reardon’s view of freedom (and well-being) is connected to Sen’s (2009) understanding that “freedom may go beyond well-being – to choose our own lives is inherently important” (p. 18). Sen continues that persons have “freedom to choose and reason” and “freedom itself,” which “makes us accountable for what we do” (p. 19). Sen and Reardon have a profound understanding of the fact that with freedom there comes a great deal of responsibility, but that there is also a relationship between well-being and freedom. Reardon (2001) goes further when she writes, “as all are the subject of rights, all are also responsible for the protection and implementation of rights and for the wellbeing of Earth and the human community” (p. 121). Reardon highlights the commonality of existing rights and freedoms to which all humans are subject, drawing on the commonality of Earth as the home for all humans and our universal membership in a global community.

Conversely, well-being includes freedoms, but the ability to access them is part of the work of capabilities. Thus, Reardon stresses the importance of learners developing their capacities so that they can act autonomously, respond justly to others, and access capabilities consistent with their dignity.

Several dictionaries include capabilities within the definition of capacities. Capabilities and capacities are related. Robyn (2011), in discussing capabilities, refers to capacity as “power.” For Reardon, capacities are the abilities or potential to do things, which are developed or enhanced through learning. As Reardon (1988) writes,

---

“education should be devoted to the development of the ability to learn and should concern itself with deepening and extending the capacities that are comprehended by the notion of the positive human potential” (p.54). Capacities are related to the development of human potential. According to Reardon (2001), these capacities include “learning to know, to do, to be and to live together” (p. 24). Capacities, in this sense of being connected with specific areas of learning, develop in persons the ability to do something or have a capability.

Reardon (2011) suggests that peace education should focus on developing “capacities to lead not only humanly fulfilling lives, but even more to the point, to live personally, socially and politically so as to be agents of social and political transformation” (pp.9-10). The capacity development of learners is geared so that they can respond to others, as described in her conception of human freedom, as requiring a “social responsibility.” Reardon (2001) writes that the development of “human capacities designated as the goals, is the fundamental social purpose of education for a culture of peace” (p. 29). The development of human capacities is based on values, such as social responsibility, that underscore the social purpose of education, in that the aim is to create a culture of peace. From this we can see that human freedom, although including a responsibility to others, for Reardon, is only potential and not actualized until the potential is activated through capacity development.

In this sense, capacities involve a kind of human development that is not stand-alone but connected to well-being and human freedoms, creating the capability and conditions for persons to do and be as they chose. The development of capacities empowers individuals to become free, autonomous individuals who have the ability to
respond to that which is opposed to freedom. Since capacities to be more humane are developed in learning, they are connected to educational access and (for women in many nations) depend on external freedoms, liberties and rights. Reardon (2001) continues, “such capacities are but one set among the far broader range of human capacities brought into play when we consider preparing persons to be makers of the very foundation of peace, a culture of peace” (p. 68). In this sense, capacities that enable persons to understand, think and act in humane ways are developed. Their development is based on values of human dignity, relationships, and peace, since they are concerned with individuals learning in ways such that they develop the abilities needed to bring about a culture of peace.

Reardon (2001) writes:

Education must develop the ability to value freedom and the skills to meet its challenges. This means preparing citizens to cope with difficult and uncertain situations and fitting them for personal autonomy and responsibility. Awareness of personal responsibility must be linked to recognition of the value of civic commitment, of joining together with others to solve problems and to work for a just, peaceful and democratic community. (p. 80)

Reardon sees persons and communities as the primary movers in creating peaceful and just conditions. This kind of education is empowering since it does not specify what a person should do, per se, but helps them to identify conditions of injustice and enables them to express themselves and act in ways that do not diminish others or
create more injustice.

Reardon (2001) links the development of capacities to well-being and freedom when she writes:

We must also educate to the fact that economic activity is social activity; that an individual’s work while providing for self and family also has consequences for the well-being of the entire community, the society and the planet itself. … At the most basic level, education for the development of constructive economic capacities, therefore, should enable learners to understand their own local and national economies and the interrelations between them. And it should equip them with skills to provide a standard of living that enables the citizen and her/his family to live in health with dignity [when] the economic structures and conditions appear unable to provide opportunities for wellbeing and dignity. (pp. 83-84)

Reardon’s holistic view connects the development of capacities for a person’s well-being to freedoms and economic and social needs in terms of the development of responsibility that individuals and communities have to others. The capacity aspect of Reardon’s domain of justice can be viewed in this light as capabilities since it corresponds with Sen’s view of freedom and responsibility.

Sen (2009) writes, “Freedom to choose gives us the opportunity to decide what we should do, but with that comes the responsibility for what we do – to the extent that they are chosen actions” (p.19). Sen (2009) argues that this responsibility to what we do
is a capability related to what we should do for others; he calls this a “deontological
demand.”

Reardon argues for human well-being that encompasses rights and both positive
and negative freedoms that impose responsibility, developed with the basic need for
capacities that help learners understand the economic and social needs of the community.
This view is consistent with Nussbaum (2006) who posits a freedom of capabilities that
incorporates a “responsibility for those who might become impaired” (p. 123).
Nussbaum (2006) additionally describes capabilities that combine “the realm of natural
necessity and the realm of rational/moral freedom” (p. 131). While she acknowledges the
importance of the necessities, she argues that the moral freedoms that result from our
reason are equally important.

On the question of basic human needs, Rawls (2003) argues in terms of wealth
and resources; Nussbaum (2006) retorts, “Wealth and income [are] not reliable as
indicators of well being” (p. 143). She argues the “value of people’s opportunity to live
good lives to be primary, and the account of political justification to be posterior to an
account of what makes lives in accordance with human dignity possible” (p. 154).

Reardon acknowledges that these basic needs and resources are important, but
asserts that human well-being is much more complex, involving basic goods for both
human security and survival. To Reardon, there is more emanating from human dignity,
such as freedom and the responsibilities and capacities that, through learning, help us be
what we want, insofar as we do not harm others. Reardon acknowledges the complex
freedoms that are connected to human well-being and articulates capabilities that emerge
from freedom that requires responsibility of individuals to others and of governments to
citizens, so that the requirements of dignity are fulfilled.

Structure

The structure of justice is concerned with the articulation of the demands of justice, and explores the language by which claims are made. The core question, as offered by Snauwaert (2011), is, “How are the claims and duties of justice expressed?” (p. 317). This important question is focused on both “claims and duties,” which involve what one is required or obligated to do and not do in light of the conditions of justice. How these obligations are expressed refers to the mode of their perception and articulation. The expression and obligation are both understood in the context of justice.

To trace this dimension in terms of others, the structure logically follows the domain of justice, since the content of justice describes the actual material. It should be understood that the material is descriptive of a theory of good determined by individuals or groups. The perception of this good is influenced by the focus of justice. If focused on individual and group needs, the view is that the good is an urgent for justice. The orientation is derived from the form, since the focus is rooted in and is a result of the consideration of principles of justice based on either comprehensive or political doctrines. As follows, the form flows from the identification of the foundation or moral source of justice. While they overlap in places, each of the dimensions, as described in earlier sections, identify and describe the various aspects that comprise the nature of justice.

The articulations of the demands of justice explain the nature of the language used to express the claims. Language is infinitely important in the overall expression of justice as it gives meaning and informs individuals of what can be expected in the
dimensions, specifically the structure, but also in the form, orientation and others.

Meaning, in turn, involves the assertion of the demand, i.e. the kind of proposition: is it ethical or otherwise? Thus, the structure partly overlaps with the form of justice; language informs the actual expression, in terms of the action involved in that demand.

Given the framework and the previously discussed dimensions, Reardon’s structure of justice is expressed in terms of the rights and responsibilities that articulate the need and movement toward human security and conditions of positive peace as expressions of the demands of justice.

To begin, the structure of justice is concerned with the question of whether entitlements are the best way to conceive and express urgent matters of justice. Reardon’s work suggests that the entitlements expressed in human rights are of such importance that they are required for peace and demand critical learning toward this goal. As a result, the expressions of the demand of justice are described using the language of human rights (and human dignity) in the context of their close connection to peace and the importance of learning about rights. Reardon uses human rights language in describing the ethical value system that articulates the claims and entitlements required for all individuals and those available in a good society, as well as the values constituting the peace education and learning that enable individuals to feel and act responsibly toward others.

Responsibility emerges from learning about rights, thus it is not enough for there to be claims to entitlements (which human rights represent), but there must also be duties and obligations of all individuals toward others. According to Reardon (2009c):

As a political framework for the actualization of human dignity,
human rights are the ethical core of peace education; not a complement, or a particular component, and certainly not an alternative or an educationally equivalent substitute for peace education. Human rights are integral to peace education, that is, without human rights peace education lacks a primary component of its core and essential substance. Human rights are the essence and the arbiter of peace, the antithesis of violence, touching on multiple and complex aspects of the human experience, illuminating the necessity of holism to the field. The potential of human rights as the means to cultivate transformational thinking lies in viewing all human rights norms and standards as a whole, an integrated ethical system.

(p. 47)

Human rights are viewed as the vehicle through which the equal moral worth demanded by human dignity is respected and fulfilled. Human rights, as the “ethical core” of peace education, are central, representing the “ethical” or public value communicated through peace education. Human rights are political values that are part of continuous discourse and public scrutiny engaged in at a global level, often filtering into the debate about the formulation of laws and legal frameworks in the international system. They describe what we should do and what we should never do to others.

As an ethical system, Reardon suggests that there is a deep interrelationship between all human rights and peace that, when explored, informs us of the entire picture of our present condition and preferred social norms. Human rights are the content of
peace education and that which provide substance for a condition of peace. Reardon’s transformational philosophy is focused on the transformation of human values to those communicated in human rights. Social transformation hinges upon human rights as values becoming social and political norms and the focus of learning.

Reardon (2009c) continues:

The sum and ethos of the values and principles of human rights taken as a whole is – or would be – peace. Human rights standards are the specific indicators and particular measures of progress toward and the realization of peace. Human rights [put] flesh on the bones of the abstraction of peace and provide the details of how to bring the flesh to life. (p. 47) [Emphasis in original]

Reardon viewed the nature, content and underlying values of human rights as an interconnected system that, if applied, would constitute peace. As described, the adoption of human rights norms characterizes movement in the direction of a peaceful and just society. In Reardon’s thinking, the actual standards provide an example or guideline for what a good society would look like. Being of such importance, they are, Reardon suggests, the primary public values of peace and an animating force, rather than ephemeral concepts.

Reardon (2009c) continues:

Conceptual definitions encapsulate the abstract and philosophic dimensions of human rights embedded in basic principles of human worth and human dignity. Such are the ethical
injunctions articulated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Declaration defines the ethical and normative aspirations that form the principles to guide ethical deliberations about human rights issues and problems. The individual standards of the covenants and conventions are instruments for disclosure of specific, experiential dimensions of denial and enjoyment of particular rights. The standards help us to comprehend and reveal the often unobserved bulwarks or abnegations of human dignity. In their fulfillment they are hallmarks of dignity. In their denial they are indicators of vulnerability in a global system characterized by violence. We can best perceive the multiplicities of violence from a holistic perspective revealing the interrelationships between violence and vulnerability. Our analysis must put us simultaneously in touch with the systemic and the particular.

(p.58)

In this sense, human rights, as conceived and constructed in the UDHR, offer socio-global behavioral norms rooted in the value of human dignity. They provide normative guidance for inquiry into problems that concern human communities. Often, there are obscured violations of human dignity that rights uncover. As such, rights focus on human experience as what informs us of what rights should be and how we should understand them. Human rights are defined and conceptualized from the ethical norms we hope for and constructed in accordance with experience, which reveals injustices and
guides how they should be enacted.

Reardon juxtaposes the presence of rights with violent conditions, describing how rights are inconsistent with societies and situations characterized by violence. This juxtaposition also identifies human rights as a measure of societies and the ethical hopes consistent with peaceful and just conditions. Human rights are expressed in the structure of Reardon’s conception of justice as interrelated and interdependent ethical propositions that, if applied, constitute a good society, inform individuals and groups of injustice, and provide standards and norms to guide behavior, discourse, understanding, and the approach to issues at global and local levels. While also being, in part, the content of justice, human rights are the underlying values for critical learning for persons to become aware of injustice and so they can respond to others and unjust situation in nonviolent ways.

The close connections between human rights, social conditions, and peace are central in Reardon’s concept of why critically important learning emanates from human rights. Reardon (1995) points out that “within the human rights framework … society is not abstract from ethics.” Rather, rights serve as “a forum for human moral development” (p. 2), specifically, the development of public values that constitute the human rights that are eminently present in the human condition. Ethical considerations are not necessarily enshrined in all laws, but learning about them can shape public behavior and opinion, and spark grassroots demands for change toward more just conditions.

Reardon (2010) observes that:

The term human rights learning as used in my arguments refers to a process inspired by an impulse toward social justice that
takes place in all settings where people learn for civic purposes.

They include – but most certainly are not limited to – schools and universities. Human rights learning (HRL) is the conjoined philosophic twin of critical pedagogy, coming to be the preferred pedagogy of peace education, the two united by a common assumption about the relationship between teaching methodology and social and political learning. (p.48)

Reardon uses the term human rights learning, as opposed to human rights education, to differentiate between traditional institutional approaches in the transmission of knowledge and processes involving and shaped by individuals for their development and in dealing with concerns of their communities. Reardon articulates a view of HRL that goes beyond formal educational institutions to communities, as she describes its Freirian roots and communal purposes for social empowerment that embody the hopes for peace and justice and the social conditions experienced by those same individuals and their communities. She recognizes the underlying political values of peace and justice in such an educational approach. Additionally, Reardon’s change from education to learning in HRL illustrates her own reflection in the re-evaluation of the nature of learning and the problematic aspects of education, which refers to the “transference of information” from human rights documents (Reardon, 2010, p. 84). Reardon (2010) goes on to describe the problematic and didactic nature of Human Rights ‘Education’. The education aspect seems to be the opposite of the content it seeks to communicate. In line with the process orientation of peace education is the holistic and critical nature of HRL, which is active and inclusive. The constant reflection and moves to correct and grow as
new understanding arises is characteristic of Reardon’s work and thinking.

Inherent in this critical pedagogical stance is individual development for participation in bringing about the just conditions inherent in human rights standards and the local knowledge critical learning elicits. The Freirian critical approach is part of Reardon's view of HRL, which develops in persons the capacity to be responsible to others. This is a democratic and participatory form of learning that is consistent with the purposes of human rights and the dignity of all persons that underlie them.

In earlier writing, Reardon (2002), using the term education, focused on learning that views human rights as:

fundamental and central to peace education which seeks to prepare learners to take responsible, informed action toward a less violent and more just world. The substance and purposes of human rights concepts and standards help to illuminate the characteristics of a peaceful society. Addressed specifically, they provide concrete indicators with which to assess the presence or absence of peace and justice. Taken as a whole with regard to the ethical and conceptual norms and values that have produced the specific concepts and standards, they offer an image of a culture of peace with the capacity to inspire the desired learning for responsible action. As such they are a unique and essential pedagogical tool for peace education (p. 284).

The development of responsible citizens with the knowledge and capacities to
deal with injustice and violence and move toward just conditions is the basis of HRL and is characteristic of the nature of human rights as expressed in the UDHR. In this sense, the content of human rights itself measures whether or not a society is just or not. Thus, these standards are not only ethical propositions, but also educative tools that inform persons of their own moral worth and the worth of others. We learn our social responsibilities toward others. Human rights learning helps us express our obligations and the demands of justice.

In terms of responsibility, Reardon (1988) writes:

Responsive is the most essential active peacemaking capacity, one that requires as preparation rational, meditative, and interpretative reflection. Active responsibility is responsibility for and responsibility to. Responsibility for involves acknowledging and assuming the cost of our own complicity in the violence and injustice of the war system and the values that uphold it, acknowledging that we as individuals and as a society have accepted and gone along with the systems of violence and exploitation. (pp. 62-63) [Emphasis in original]

Learning about human rights involves learning about one’s duty and obligation “for” and “to” others. Reardon posits an obligation to learn about injustice and violence in a manner that consists of reasoning, thinking deeply, and reflecting alone and in communities about issues that concern human rights and the action required to make them possible. This also involves a positive focus that is concerned with the “responsibility to … those with whom we are inextricably interconnected in the global
web of life” (Reardon, 1988, p. 63). HRL is part of the development of responsibility for an active kind of engagement that elicits individuals’ experience as connected to others, which becomes a part of global discourse on rights.

Responsibility is inherent in HRL and is a part of the UDHR’s foundation, which is a primary tool for peace educators and learners as a description of ethical norms containing guiding the pedagogic principles that embody critical learning. Reardon (2001) further describes this when she writes:

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is the heart of this evolving normative system. The rights it declares are an inventory of the values which can guide us to a Culture of Peace. Were we to describe a vision of peace in terms of the way of life it would provide the human family, we might elaborate a description of a society in which these rights are indeed, normal, the fully accepted conditions that all societies actively and constantly seek to realize. The thirty articles comprise a diagnosis of the ills of the world which cause direct and specific human suffering, an inventory of most of the forms of the global epidemic of violence which must be cured to achieve a healthy, viable culture of peace. The Declaration, all the human rights conventions and covenants, and the declarations, agendas and plans of action of the various world conferences called to address particular problems that have been identified since the promulgation of the United Nations
Charter and the Declaration form a general prescription for treatment of these problems as the first step towards transformation from a culture of violence to a culture of peace.

(p. 26)

Drawing on the rights articulated by the UDHR as the center of this ethical system, Reardon sees human rights as the guiding force toward a culture of peace. This includes learning and inquiry into the values that make injustice visible. Reardon also notes the public inquiry and scrutiny of the conferences and documents that describe and address human problems. This discourse provides the background knowledge for a culture of peace. I argue that the dialog occurring in these spaces constitutes an open and impartial approach that inquires into injustice and analyzes communal values to see how they might be applicable in the human rights regime. The discourse occurring in these conventions and conferences then is filtered by experience into rights within international documents and agreements.

Reardon (2001) continues that:

Educators would place [the] UDHR among those other documents outlining the fundamental standards that the world community considers as essential to a just and peaceful society. The Framework also serves as a curriculum outline in that it summarizes the issues and problems that should constitute the content of education for a culture of peace and states a set of objectives that are derived from fundamental human values. As such it has a place among the various normative and ethical
instruments through which the United Nations has worked to create the global conditions necessary to the fulfillment of its obligations to guide the world community to the status aspired to in Article 28 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: “Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.” (pp. 25-26)

The UDHR serves as a source for educational curriculum that describes and inspires a just society. As a part of education toward peaceful and just cultures, the learning framework embodied in the UDHR draws on ethical considerations from human experience and is part of the set of international tools that provide a frame of reference for the duties of the world community toward achieving the range of human rights embodied in the UDHR.

Reardon (2002) continues:

The task now is to develop a form of peace education that illuminates the fundamental relationships between human rights and peace. This of course includes those relationships articulated in the preamble to The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but also, and especially, those that enable us to devise a reality-based, human and practical education for responsible citizenship within a global culture of peace. (p. 285)

Reardon suggests that peace education uncovers the connection between peace
and rights in terms of the UDHR’s preamble, which articulates a responsibility to educate persons about human rights. For Reardon, this is an important provision, in that it not only articulates rights, but also provides a caveat for the promotion of rights through education, which in turn helps in the development of responsible citizens who are concerned with creating a culture of peace. Like Reardon, Sen holds a view of rights as evolving over time as well as having an informational requirement, which is a core aspect of HRL.

Sen (2009) begins with a discussion of the social contract approach focusing on Rawls’ view that the demands of justice are rooted in mutual benefit, which determines behavioral norms, without coercive elements. Most claims (of rights and justice) specifying normative behaviors that are fulfilled are also codified in laws that have the binding force of legal institutions, but the contract is based on mutual agreement in the original position. Since the contract that develops this agreed upon behavior is hypothetical, how then is behavior regulated? (p. 204). Sen (2009) later suggests that behavior is often a result of plural reasons developed throughout the historical and cultural movements that established laws, rights, and capabilities.

Sen (2009) continues describing asymmetric duties, where one with power has an obligation toward one with less power. An example is that of the mother who acts freely for the benefit of her child. Mutual benefit does not come into play in this relationship. Sen (2009) writes, “If some action that can be freely taken is open to a person,” if it is feasible and possible, then that person should do it to bring about condition of justice (p.206). At a very basic level, Sen argues that the duty to others is expressed through what we see as readily possible. This is an intuitive approach to the expression of
demands. Sen argues for this basic approach to the demands of duty as an alternative to the social contract view of mutual benefit.

Both Sen and Nussbaum look to human rights to explain the importance of capabilities in the expression of the demands of justice. Sen (2009) examines the problems with and the critiques of the expression of human rights as demands to entitlements because of the broad misconception that human rights represent actual duties. While human rights are “really strong ethical pronouncements as to what should be done,” they are not always tangible or backed by sound theoretical support (p. 357).

Although Sen (2009) recognizes the history of rights in the Declaration of Independence, the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (1793), and other influential documents and notes that they are only ethical assertions. These assertions do however express “social obligations” (p. 358). Sen points out those rights are not enshrined in law and argues that they should not be because, if rights were forced upon individuals and groups coercively, that would be constrictive. He argues that the weighing of interests and freedoms in reasoned discourse is necessary to determine what should be law. Additionally and importantly, Sen argues that the ethical claims expressed by rights have only historically led to laws through open and impartial reasoning and critical scrutiny (pp. 358-359). This, argues Sen, is important for sustenance of any entitlement.

Yet it is important to recognize, even if they never become law, the moral force behind human rights as they “can serve as grounds for legislation,” social norms, and behaviors (p. 363). Legal status is only one approach for claims of justice. Sen points out the work of NGO’s and education in the development of moral awareness of the
ethical propositions embodied in human rights. Pointing out the problem that is illustrated in Rawls’ concept of the priority of liberty and freedom, Sen describes the need for promotion of real opportunities (capabilities).

Sen continues, suggesting the importance of imperfect obligations, under which individuals should do what they can to protect or promote the freedom of others. Sen (2009) writes that human rights are “an acknowledgement that if one is in the position to do something effective in preventing such violation of a right, then one does have a good reason to do just that” (p. 373). Perfect obligations, which are obligations where one as the ability and means to intervene, would be the obligation to not cause avoidable harm, while an offer of reasonable assistance in the course of a violent attack would be required under imperfect obligations. One does what one has the ability to do in that situation. This kind of complexity is part of the structure of duty and demands in human rights.

Second generation rights, such as economic and social rights are considered to be imperfect obligations, since they are often critiqued for feasibility. Sen counters that they can be, in part, realizable and can be revised over time, if need be. Sen ultimately argues that regardless of the claim, its survivability in the process of public reason and critical scrutiny is of more importance. He suggests that often the sentiments of such rights are likely to be realized through whatever plural channels for their expression arise.

Nussbaum (2006) is in agreement for the most part, but her take is based on a critique of the entitlements already enshrined in law, on the grounds that they are negative and do not affirm human needs and welfare, whereas capabilities affirm positive rights, providing clarity and a focus on real opportunities in the realm of human rights. Nussbaum notes that capabilities are a species of rights that supplement the problematic
understanding and language of rights. Beginning with the view that persons have entitlements because they are humans, basic capabilities are “prepolitical” in that they are due to person at birth. This supplementation is rooted in the affirmative approach of rights that look at the “affirmative material and institutional support, not simply [the] failure to impede” (p. 287). Thus, rights that support capabilities specify and support what persons can do and be. In the example of the Indian constitution, freedom of speech without violence is affirmed (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 287). While promoting free thought and public participation, this also allows some who might have traditionally been the subjected to denial of the public sphere because of violent retribution to be a part of the public realm.

In critiquing the lexical prioritizing (of principles of justice) Rawls in the liberal tradition, Nussbaum also links traditional liberal thinking to the separation of the public and private. Nussbaum (2006) writes, “Rights language is strongly linked with the traditional distinction between public sphere, which the state regulates, and a private sphere, which it must leave alone” (p. 290). On one hand, this separation was part of the freedom from interference; on the other, the absence of explicit rights in the private sphere amounted to the denial of the rights and capabilities of women.

In general, rather than expressing an “urgent claim based upon justice” as do rights, capabilities make the “idea of a fundamental entitlement clear by arguing that the central human capabilities are not simply desirable social goods, but urgent entitlements grounded in justice” (p. 290). In this sense, the capabilities approach, a la Sen and Nussbaum, expresses the demands of justice in terms of the important ethical underpinnings of rights, the plural reasons for their existence, the open and impartial
public scrutiny they require, and the capabilities they clarify, and are a significant aspect of human rights themselves.

Reardon’s approach to the structure of justice is similar insofar as she views human rights, human rights learning, and responsibility toward others as the way that claims to entitlements are expressed. Sen (2009) writes:

Since a capability is the power to do something, the accountability that emanates from that ability – that power – is a part of the capability perspective, and this can make room for demands of duty – what can be broadly called deontological demands. (p. 19)

From this perspective, deontological demands emanate from capabilities. If one has the power to do something, say, to fulfill some basic needs in a community, there is a moral duty. This duty is asymmetric.

Reardon’s approach to the development of responsibilities couched within human rights content and learning has this same asymmetric power, which suggests both perfect and imperfect duties toward others. Thus, learning about rights and the violations of them is to become responsible. One can only act with knowledge of what one is acting for. There is also a duty, following the UDHR, of others to know their rights and disseminate that knowledge so that those rights can be achieved.

The development of capacities connected with responsibility toward others is constructed in terms of participation and inclusion within a democratic society. According to Reardon (1995):

A central purpose of both the holistic framework and the
developmental approach is to cultivate the capacities to make moral choice, take principle positions on issues, and devise democratic discourses of citizens action – in other words, to develop moral and intellectual integrity. We hold that the vitality of democracy rests on the ability of citizens to exercise the responsibilities of citizenship in light of principled reflection. (p.3)

The holistic framework is rooted in human dignity and connected to rights, which emerge from it. These rights are the moral inspiration that inform capacity development. Human development, in turn, is a process intricately related to decision-making and participation in a democracy, informed by the ethical force of human rights. Reardon argues that a truly democratic society is the result of the capacity of citizens to be responsible to others. This responsibility is moral and it is a learned capacity that is also rooted in reflection. “Social responsibility” is an element of the formation of citizens in a good society (Reardon, 1995, p.5).

Like Nussbaum’s and Sen’s discussions of human rights as requiring a kind of fulfillment of basic entitlements as well as second generation rights, Reardon (1995) also poses that there is a broad responsibility emanating from persons, institutions, and governments to strive for economic equity, equal opportunity, democratic participation, freedoms of person, and environmental sustainability (pp. 5-6). These “values of human dignity and integrity and … the proposition of the inseparability of the various categories of human rights” cannot be reduced and require social and individual obligations for their application (Reardon, 1995, p. 6).
Reardon (1995) traces the history of rights, finding them in such documents as the Declaration of Independence as the “obligation of citizens … ‘to alter or abolish’ governments” and to “resist illegitimate authority” (p. 8). This description also includes the UDHR and various generations of rights. First generation rights are concerned with: restraints on the power of the state over citizens to assure freedom; the second being obligations of the state to citizens to assure economic and social well-being … the third generation [being] collective or “solidarity” rights sought by groups with common identity in the struggles to end colonialism, racism, sexism and the abuse of children. This generation articulates the rights to self-determination of peoples and self identification of ethnic groups (Reardon, 1995, pp. 8-9).

Reardon (1995) continues that the next generation is concerned with issues of genocide and gross human rights abuses that give voice to the perfect duties and obligations of citizens and governments to intervene (p.9). She suggests that this recognition can help to establish global standards that inform other violations and affirmations that increase human security and create conditions of positive peace. Additionally, this generational view of the development of rights expresses the articulation of the demands of justice as evolving, informed by public discourse and social movements and coalescing into demands that have been taken up by persons themselves, if governments were not concerned with them.

Reardon’s notion of an evolving nature of rights, as rooted in human needs and responses to human conditions, is also found in Sen’s (2009) description of rights, the
plural reasons for their implementation, their development, and the requirement of public scrutiny. Reardon’s grounding of duty and obligations in the development of learning for human rights and responsibility is premised on an individual focus that posits dignity in persons. It is aimed at empowering persons in communities to learn so that they can become what it is they choose to be, so long as they do no harm to others.

This view of “do as you will, but do no harm” is echoed by Nussbaum (2006), and is described in the previous section. Nussbaum (2006) notes the importance of human development through education as the method by which persons gain access to their capabilities (pp. 289-290). While taking a similar view, Reardon focuses on agency of individuals through the capacity development, which leads to a kind of “right to capabilities.” Reardon (1995) asserts that “the ultimate goal of this kind of education is the formation of responsible, committed, and caring planetary citizens with sufficiently informed problem awareness and adequate value commitments to be contributors to a global society that honors human rights” (p.3).

Ultimately, the aim of learning and human rights is the establishment of conditions of positive peace and the universality of human dignity. This learning is established in the capabilities approach and is likewise engrained in Reardon’s approach. The development of capacities linked to the underlying values of rights and freedoms encourages responsibility of citizens toward others. This responsibility is a multi-level obligation of citizens to others, of governments to citizens, of communities to individuals, etc. These capacities help individuals express themselves and articulate what they need to be and choose as they wish. The development of such capacities is the foundation of conditions of positive peace, including a sense of and actual human security.
In conclusion, Reardon’s structure of justice, or how entitlements are expressed in terms of human rights language, is based on the generational understanding of rights as evolving with human experience and needs, and on human rights learning (HRL), which allows learners to see and understand standards and requires that all individuals have and the opportunity to learn about them and have those rights fulfilled. Human rights are constructed based on the underlying value of human dignity, which has been publicly scrutinized and employed (although in many different forms) throughout history. The underlying moral impulse of the articulation of rights imposes a social responsibility for individuals who are aware of rights (and those who are not) to act in ways consistent with rights and dignity, so that human needs and protections can be fulfilled and honored. Reardon’s structure is a capabilities approach that expresses asymmetric obligations and a duty to help others, whenever possible, so that conditions of peace and justice are possible. Although not all are enshrined in law everywhere, human rights have an ethical urgency and force that express the possibilities of a just and peaceful world.

**Distribution**

As described earlier, the distributive dimension of justice is of primary importance. Snauwaert (2011) frames this dimension in terms of the question, “What constitutes a fair/equitable distribution of social goods, rights and obligations?” (p. 317). The distribution of justice logically follows from and is interconnected with the structure and other dimensions. The structure of justice is concerned with how the demands of justice are expressed; once we know how such duties and rights are expressed, we can understand how goods are to be distributed.
The characterization of a claim often gives us clues about the kind of
distributional principles that describe it. The prominent theories of distributive justice
provide examples of this. Utilitarianism defines an equitable distribution as one that
maximizes aggregate utility. Individuals’ preferences are aggregated so as to determine
what is just. Distribution in a rights-based conception, on the other hand, is based on the
assertion of the rights. It asks what constitutes a fair distribution of rights and duties.

In Rawls (2003), fair distribution is based on the distribution principle, his second
principle of justice, which calls for society’s advantaged to share their wealth and
income, through taxation, with the least advantaged. Rawl’s principles are also
concerned with the equality of opportunity, the fair value of liberties and the general
equality of distribution.

In the capabilities approach, Sen (2009) employs a comparative assessment of the
quality of life among similar and dissimilar communities, and suggests that justice
“cannot be indifferent to the lives that people can actually live” (p. 18). As a result,
distribution is determined by “an agreement based on public reasoning, on rankings of
alternatives that can be realized” (p. 17). This involves a comparative analysis of human
needs through informed and open public scrutiny.

Nussbaum (2006) argues for a capability threshold, in which:

All citizens have entitlements based on justice to all the
capabilities up to an appropriate threshold on level. If people
are below the threshold on any one of the capabilities, that is a
failure of basic justice, no matter how high up they are on all
the others. (p. 167)
For Nussbaum (2006), these capabilities include her list based on “good care,” so that capabilities support “life, health, bodily integrity, … imagination, thought, … practical reason and choice, … affiliation, … self-respect, … [and] control over one’s material and political environment” (pp. 169-169). Nussbaum suggests that distribution begins with the intuitive notion of care, so that those caring are supported in ways that enable them to provide meaningful support to those they care for, and to develop the cared for in ways that might enable them to make their own life plans. This, and whatever else is needed for a good life of choice and opportunity, in Nussbaum’s view, is the basic capability threshold that should define the distribution of justice.

Reardon’s conception of a fair and equitable distribution is rooted in the moral equality contained within the concept of universal human dignity; it is also informed by the value of care. According to Reardon (1995):

The concept of justice might be dealt with as social justice (fair treatment) and distributive justice (adequate access to goods and services available in the society). It should be indicated that, because all rights carry responsibilities, the assurance of justice in a society calls for social responsibility. The attitudes, personal behavior, and public action of the members of a society will in large part determine the degree of justice the society enjoys. This is true for all human society from local community to the entire world. So in today's world we must exercise global responsibility. (p. 20)

Reardon understands “justice” to be concerned with social justice, or “fair
treatment” and “adequate access” to goods and services. What does Reardon mean by fair treatment, fairness, and adequate access? Reardon (1993) writes that “responsibility to the others in this world system who have been deprived of a fair share of the world’s benefits calls us to critically evaluate that system and create alternatives to it” (p. 63). Reardon begins with fair in the negative, in terms of the withholding of an amount that is a “fair share.” By invoking a global responsibility to reevaluate the present order of benefits (or distribution), Reardon suggests that there is an alternate view that would be more just.

In this sense, “fair” is characterized as what would be just, in light of conditions of deprivation and the denial of goods for many. Reardon (2011) argues in her discussion of moral/ethical reflection that “fairness” is concerned with “queries focused on issues of the goodness, distribution of advantage and harm, the justice and potential detriments and benefits of relationships, effects upon quality of life and the biosphere” (p. 8). The meaning of fair is implicitly described in the discussion of reflective and ethical assessment of social values and principles of justice, which peace educators need in order to avoid ideology or reflection grounded in comprehensive values. In this sense, fair is that which is based on publicly scrutinized values that inform our ethical deliberation. Fair is rooted in human dignity and “what is considered to be socially good and humanly enhancing” (p. 8).

Reardon suggests that there be a reevaluation of the current order of distributing the “fair share” of the world’s benefits. Therefore, what is fair describes the amount of goods that ought to be received, which is determined through ethical reflection and public discourse (Reardon, 2011, p. 8-9). The recognition that something is not fair or is unjust
is often an intuitive starting point for Reardon’s principles of distribution. This intuitive recognition comes not only from injustice, but also from the fact that we sense and see that, in cases of injustice, human dignity has been violated.

This perspective is similar to Sen’s (2009) position, but in his case, the violation of injustice leads to the comparative assessment of justice as his conception of distribution. Sen does not offer principles of distribution, but instead calls for comparative assessment. Nussbaum (2006) similarly describes the importance of intuition in terms of violations to human dignity (p. 174). In both perspectives, distributive justice begins the intuitive search for more human principles. The concept of “fair” embodies what we intuitively know as just, and is also descriptive of an asymmetric relationship where one has the responsibility to at least reconsider the current scheme of distribution.

The intuition of care in view of distributional principles in Reardon’s (2010) thought is illustrated when she writes:

When we assert that human rights are the particular components of economic, social, cultural and political justice, we recognize that just societies are those that are conscious of vulnerabilities, seek to prevent them from becoming the occasions of avoidable harm, and devote resources to care for those who are vulnerable so long as they are in such condition. (p. 60)

Reardon’s intuition of care about injustice is similarly based on the recognition of those in need, in vulnerable situations, and at risk. The distribution starts here and, based on critical reflection, human rights standards, public discussion, and ethical outrage about
harm and potential harm inflicted upon human lives, we construct our distributive principles.

There is critical discourse about current modes of distribution because the intuitive responsibility rooted in dignity, which leads to a search for more just principles of distribution, also involves care for others. The intuitive understanding and responsibility toward others from which we begin our deliberation about the principles of justice are rooted in the fairness and the moral equality and equity of human dignity. Inter alia, this understanding and responsibility comprise Reardon’s view of the politics of peace. Reardon (2010) continues:

I mean rather politics in a more profound and basic sense of public deliberation on the aims and purposes of society: the decisions about means to achieve those purposes by sustainably producing and fairly expending the fruits of a peoples’ labors, resources and talents. I mean a politics of peace infused with a common commitment to the general public good, a just distribution and equitable enjoyment of benefits and resources; in short a politics of human rights. (pp. 50-51)

In her discussion about the nature of a politics of peace, Reardon connects the notion of fair to the public good (the general welfare or overall status of the society), having been scrutinized in an open forum. “Fair” is connected to Reardon’s notion of peaceful politics in terms of how a society’s decision-making process functions in terms of the utilization of “labors, resources and talents.” Reardon injects the common good into this discussion, so that that what is fair is based on the underlying political and
ethical values found in human rights. Since the achievement of a respect for human
dignity is the basis of human rights, for something to be fair it must be consistent with the
spirit of those rights, which also refers to equity, or “a just distribution and equitable
enjoyment of benefits and resources.”

Reardon (1993) offers that “equity … rests on the full and universal recognition
of human rights and dignity” (p. 168). In this same passage, equity is described in the
context of women and those who suffer from long-term privation. Reardon (1977)
writes:

Economic equity exists when all members of a society [have
an] equal claim upon and access to its material benefits, goods
and services. The minimal human needs of all should be met
and opportunities for the widest possible human satisfaction
pursued under the guidelines of diversity by equity. (p. 13)

Although equity here is described in terms of economic distributions, the
description illustrates its connection with human dignity. Equity involves the
reassessment of distributions to evaluate whether persons are given equal access to basic
goods and their own choice of opportunities leading to personal fulfillment and
satisfaction. Equality, in this sense, is not always equal given the histories of privation
for some members of society. As a result, Reardon pays close attention the actualization
of equal claims to entitlements. Equity also concerns full inclusion of all parties in
political participation, as evidenced in her view of “diversity by equity.”

In Education for Peace from a Gender Perspective, Reardon (2001) describes
fairness in terms of policies that reflect the equal inclusion of all people in democratic
process (p. 51). In both of these contexts, human dignity is the foundation of the concept of fairness. Thus, “fair treatment” refers to the behavior towards individuals that is consistent with and respective of their human dignity. From this description, we can take fairness to be rooted in the recognition of equal human dignity among all people in terms of the equitable access to goods that constitute an individual’s or group’s conception of a good life. Fairness and or fair treatment in this context is also related to the freedoms and liberties that allow one to choose and participate in processes concerned with distribution. In this sense, fairness and adequate access are related in terms of equity that attempts to correct unequal distributions, limited participation in political processes, and the lack of opportunities for choice within groups and individual pursuance of good lives.

Reardon (2001) treats the term “adequate” when she writes, “adequate resources to meet human needs” (p. 127). Adequate refers to having enough to meet the threshold level for functioning, or is based on fundamental requirements. Nussbaum (2006) touches on the concept of threshold levels when she writes:

All citizens have entitlements based on justice to all the capabilities up to an appropriate threshold on level. If people are below the threshold on any one of the capabilities, that is a failure of basic justice, no matter how high up they are on all the others. (p. 167)

Entitlements to ensure this basic level of functioning go beyond wealth and income, since personal situations (such as a relatively wealthy person in a wheelchair) might require traditionally unrecognized support

Reardon’s (2010) metaphor of “putting flesh on bones” relates to the importance
of access to human rights for the basic “functioning of a person in society” (p. 48). Reardon (2001) also writes that “the concept of a ‘threshold’ capacity is important to the unfolding of processes of cultural and social change and to the development of more mature relationship capacities” (p. 72). Thus, the basic threshold of functioning, which refers to a person’s adequate access, is rooted in the importance of developing asymmetric relationships into ones that care for others. Reardon (2001) acknowledges the importance of care when she writes that the “relationship of care and responsibility … is the basis of … a culture of peace” (p. 183). In this sense, adequate access is based on the threshold levels of functioning intuitively distributed according to human needs, but is fulfilled by the relationships of care that, in part, justify the distribution of individual requirements for a good life.

Reardon (2001) uses the term “threshold” to refer to a basic level of capacity that “opens the way to the development of higher-order capacities leading to the more fully complementary and mutually enhancing relationships” (p. 72). In Reardon’s approach to education, we help to develop a threshold of peace through tolerance so that persons are able to develop other deeper and necessary capacities, such as care and responsibility. The threshold, in terms of distribution, is the capacity of care, which, as along with learning, critical thinking and reflection, helps us decide what distribution is just. Snauwaert (2011) writes:

Even if the need for a threshold distribution of capabilities is valid, as Nussbaum posits, the setting of the threshold is contingent upon the social meaning of the substantive good that constitutes the opportunity aspect of the capability, and thus its
specification is contingent upon social interpretation and
deliberation. (p. 11)

Reardon (1988, 2001) gleans an understanding of this threshold level of fairness
and adequate access through her public survey of peace education values (particularly the
value of care), and her study of women’s lives and experience as a woman. In this sense,
distributional principles of justice are, in part, a result of her interpretation and communal
learning about the overall requirements of peace and justice.

“Access” is referenced when Reardon (2001) writes that “the structural violence
of unequal access to social benefits and resources is one example of such harm” (p. 35).
If access is not equal or equitable, in terms of availability to all individuals and groups,
there is structural violence and thus harm. Reardon (2001) goes on to say that “equality
means being the subject of the same universal rights and having access to the same
benefits as others, not being culturally, psychologically or physically the same” (p.79).
Thus, the equality of opportunity to the available social goods and rights constitutes
access, and adequate access is then taken to mean that the threshold and most basic level
of opportunity for material needs, goods and rights based on one’s need, is met. Reardon
suggests in the most recent statement that access and the actual goods may differ
according to culture or some other disposition.

Adequate access is also related to equitable and fair distribution. In this sense,
social justice, which Reardon (1988) argues is a conception, embodies fair and equal
access to the basic (threshold) goods required for survival and flourishing as well as the
rights that allow a person to freely choose opportunities leading to their conception of a
good life.
Reardon’s distributive principles of fairness and adequate access embody equitable access to basic needs, liberties, freedoms and rights based on the intuitive responsibility inherent in asymmetric relationships, which are rooted in and start with human dignity. The distribution is based on the public deliberation and scrutiny Reardon describes in the politics of peace. This approach is consistent with the capabilities view in several ways. When Nussbaum (2006) writes that “these entitlements are held to be implicit in the very notions of human dignity and a life that is worthy of human dignity” (p. 155), she, like Reardon, recognizes the intuitive requirements for functioning that result from the presence of human dignity. Distributional principles start here and fairness and adequate access embody the notion of human dignity and care.

Nussbaum (2006) frames the role of care in a theory of justice, arguing that “acute or asymmetrical dependency as among the primary needs of citizens … will be one hallmark of a decently just society” (p. 168). Care, for Reardon, characterizes the nature of responsibility and relationships that influence distributional principles. Nussbaum (2006) continues, “a plurality of heterogeneous entitlements, all fundamental for social justice … rests social justice on an objectionably intuitionistic foundation” (p. 173). Human entitlements, in this sense, rest on the intuition of human dignity, which is defined in terms of social justice.

Reardon (1977) writes, “social justice exists, when all members of society are accorded full human dignity and have equal opportunity to choose among all available options for lifestyle and personal fulfillment” (p. 13). Like Nussbaum, Reardon posits social justice in terms of distributional principles that relate to the equality of opportunity necessary for human dignity. In terms of open and impartial scrutiny, Sen (2009) is
concerned with distributive principles in his questioning of whether Rawls’ principles would survive. Sen (2009) suggests that:

> The approach of capability is entirely consistent with a reliance on partial rankings and on limited agreements, the important of which has been emphasized throughout this work. The main task is to get things right on the comparative judgments that can be reached through personal and public reasoning. (p. 243)

Here Sen rejects a principled conception in favor of comparative assessment. Sen also rejects Nussbaum’s threshold conception.

While Reardon does not necessarily focus on the same kind of comparative assessment, public scrutiny is still at the heart of judging what distributional principles will work. Reardon (1988, 2010) endorses this scrutiny and discourse in her definitional question, asking what peace is with a focus on continuous learning and reflection about the obstacles to human well-being.

The distributional principles of fairness and adequate access embody a capabilities approach, since education in the politics of peace is premised upon the development of capacities to participate and act responsibly toward others, in ways that acknowledge and respect human dignity and illustrate care toward others. The distributional dimension, in this sense, begins with human dignity and ends with human needs and the ability and opportunity to make choices, which characterizes conditions where justice and peace exist.

In conclusion, Reardon’s distributional principles are characterized by the principles of fairness and adequate access, which are closer to threshold approach than
comparative assessment. Fairness and access are both rooted in care and responsibility, as well as equity, which is identified through understanding the experience of the individuals. Although there is criticism of the intuition of care that is used in capacity development, it serves as a value interpreted from women’s, minorities’, and peace educators’ struggles for and learning about peace and justice, through which we can pinpoint the threshold level below which distribution should not fall.

**Scope**

The scope describes the range of justice. In other words, this dimension is concerned with whether all persons in a given community, locality, nation, or other group are covered by justice. The questions that this dimension addresses are: “How far does justice extend? How inclusive should the moral community be?” (Snauwaert, 2011, p. 317). In this sense, the extent of the polity covered by justice is the primary focus of this dimension.

This dimension is interrelated with others, since the scope describes where and how far justice should be applied. If the scope is national, then the foundation of justice, if it is moral equality, is only present, for all intents and purposes, for citizens or members of a given country. The form is also connected with the scope in terms of whether that moral equality is based on comprehensive or political conceptions. If it is comprehensive, then justice might be even more limited to those who share that particular worldview. The orientation is related to the scope in the sense that justice in global society is either focused on individuals or institutional order and procedures, as ends in themselves. The structure or expression of the demands of justice is influenced by
various cultures. If the scope is local, the demands of justice may be expressed in one way, whereas a global or transpositional scope redefines, through public scrutiny, the articulation of such claims and obligations.

The prominent conceptualizations of this dimension are included in the utilitarian, contractarian, and capabilities perspectives. In the utilitarian perspective, the scope of justice is generally viewed as national, but according to Singer (2004), utilitarianism can be global through the summation of an aggregated global utility. Rawls’ (2003) scope of justice is based on a national polity whose members are entitled to justice. Nussbaum (2006) and Sen (2009) articulate a global conception of capabilities that extend to all humans, not confined to any particular national boundary.

The scope of Reardon’s conception is based on a global and transpositional view of the extent of justice, which is informed by human dignity, care and other values developed through critical learning processes and reflective dialogue. Reardon utilizes the concept of human security to articulate a global view of the importance of human dignity and human rights as part of a global order that ensures authentic security. In this sense, Reardon’s approach constitutes a cosmopolitan ethical position where people are connected through care and solidarity, and are ensured rights and security regardless of national membership.

Firstly, the scope of justice for Reardon is global and transpositional since the extent of justice is based on the perspective that all human persons, regardless of location, as dignified moral beings, are worthy of and entitled to moral consideration and equal protection. This entitles every person to the respect required by one’s human dignity. The rights, entitlements and freedoms emerging from human dignity, as well as human
dignity itself, do not have limitations restricted to national boundaries. Reardon (1978) suggests that all humans have dignity (pp. 12-13). The world order values, which are related to peace and extend from human dignity, describe how dignity is manifested as a global value for the extension of justice. Additionally, human dignity informs both the public and private spheres, and is linked to caring and responsibility.

Secondly, as a conception justice that begins with human dignity, its intuitive nature is characterized by relationships of care and responsibility; such responsibility and care extending from human dignity describe the nature of justice as applied to all persons, rather than citizens members of a given polity. Care is indicative of Reardon’s transpositional scope of justice, since it is rooted partly in her holistic view of making connections. Care is an unconventional (or rather, nontraditional) approach to the extension of justice. Care represents an ethical framework based on the development of relationships (Gilligan, 1984; Noddings, 1986). Thirdly, people of various ethnicities and those coming from distant locations cooperate, forming global communities because of human dignity and the emerging values that characterize rights and guide the extension of justice. Additionally, they cooperate because of the plural reasons of care, responsibility and the common interests of survival that characterize the necessarily shared destiny and human conditions.

**Human Dignity, Values and Cosmopolitanism.** Human dignity is the starting point for the extension of justice. It is the reason why we care for the well-being and human security others. Human status entitles persons to human dignity. National boundaries are not in the calculus of the application of dignity. The respect for human
dignity is a necessary condition for peace. Reardon conceptualizes world peace in terms of the extension of human dignity to all people. According to Reardon (2010):

A sustainable world peace can only be assured through the universal actualization of human dignity; human rights concepts and standards are tools for the realization of the conditions necessary to human dignity. The universal actualization of human dignity and the achievement of world peace require a transformation of prevailing worldviews and modes of thought. (p. 46)

Peace is sustained because human dignity is actualized throughout the world. When human rights and the dignity of every person are respected, there is justice. Reardon suggests that this is only possible when there is transformation in human thinking in ways that place high values on the principles of human dignity, rights and lives. The view that all human lives, regardless of location, are entitled to these rights and the respect of their dignity is couched in a cosmopolitan ethical framework.

Reardon (1988) suggests the ethical norms that extend from human dignity in terms of world order values. These values articulate a state of global peace and are an analysis founded on the application of justice to all persons because they are human. The formation of values through the discourse and learning of scholars, practitioners, and educators in the World Order Model project articulates a positive state of peace, which includes the affirmation of life and universal human dignity, and the three core values of stewardship, citizenship, and relationships (Reardon, 2000, p. 70). The importance of human life is affirmed through the “universal” respect for human dignity. In Reardon’s
view, stewardship is related to citizenship and relationships in that all humans are global citizens with responsibilities to all other humans because of human dignity and an inescapable common future that results from sharing this planet. The values that emerge from human dignity reinforce our common destiny and call us to assist in the mutual and global recognition of respect for human persons and their dignity.

Reardon’s discussion of world order values offers a global-cosmopolitan perspective, which emerges from human dignity and informs us of an alternative moral treatment of the approach to the problems of the international system. Inherent in such an approach is a global view of justice that posits individuals and their human dignity as the focus of problem-solving. This perspective suggests that if human dignity and life is respected, then what emerges is consideration for the protection of the natural environment and a universal worldview considering all people to be global citizens that cooperate because they have formed relationships with others. Reardon utilizes the world order values, which are an articulation of human dignity (in a global sense), in her conception of peace. The positioning of the world order values as a tool for the ethical analysis of global problems by peace educators posits a cosmopolitan position in Reardon’s approach. She writes:

Cosmopolitanism is compatible with the premises of comprehensive peace education, and the concept of a culture of peace that accommodates its political and pedagogic complexities. The unique contribution it makes to peace education, in my view, is that it best articulates the normative goals of our evolving field. (Reardon, 2011, pp. 2-3)
Reardon suggests that comprehensive peace education and peace itself is consistent with the cosmopolitan perspective on the basis of its normative analysis. Since cosmopolitanism, as a theory, is grounded in ethical norms (such as human rights) that extend from dignity and views the inclusion of plural groups in global decision-making and consideration; cosmopolitanism is closely connected to peace and education for peace.

Let us examine this conception of peace. Reardon (2001) writes:

Peace is a set of conditions in which diverse peoples share their common planet, cultivating mutually enhancing relationships, respecting the dignity and rights of all, appreciating the richness of their diversity while living in harmony with the natural environment. (p. 32)

While human dignity has, for Reardon, its own conceptualization apart from peace, human dignity, in this passage, is a common value that is the inspiration for social cooperation and human development among people throughout the world. Human dignity is present in all persons, thus they have certain entitlements and freedoms. Reardon’s conception of peace, as the universalization of human dignity and its related values and rights, is cosmopolitan in nature. Snauwaert (2009a) concurs that Reardon’s “conception of positive peace, entailing a conception of global justice grounded in human rights, and by logical extension, Reardon’s conception of authentic peace is situated within the cosmopolitan tradition” (p. 5). Positive (authentic) peace, as global justice, overlaps with the description of peace and the world order values that describe peace.

Cosmopolitanism is concerned with peace. It is characterized by a commitment

---

42See Chapter 4, Section 4.1 Foundation of Justice
to global justice through the protection of and respect for human dignity and rights, and serves as an ethical framework, which views global problems as interrelated and responsibilities belonging to all humans (Brock and Brighouse, 2005; Caney, 2005; Griffiths and O’Callaghan, 2002; Nussbaum, 1997; Snauwaert, 2008; Snauwaert, 2009b; Sterling, 1990). The cosmopolitan framework is descriptive of an ethical-normative component of the scope of justice in terms of being connected to Reardon’s conception of peace, which embodies the actualization of human dignity and its related (world order) values.

Reardon further describes care in terms of a feminist analysis that describes human relationships as an important reason for extending justice. The core values described earlier in this section are related to this analysis. Reardon (2000) writes that “these are values in which the feminine capacity of sensitivity converges with the masculine values of rationality to provide a more holistic framework for formulating images of a preferred reality” (p. 70). Reardon argues for an interpretation of values in terms of a “feminine capacity,” which she describes in Women and Peace as care, reason, and rationality, to make connections and create a shared global future that is just and peaceful. The respect of life and human dignity in Reardon’s view calls and requires individuals to care for the natural environment and other individuals, and to include all people of the world under the umbrella of global citizens, by virtue of their humanity and dignity.

In Reardon’s discussion of ‘private and public,’ she focuses on the shortfalls of most traditional ethical and political views of justice, which proclaim human dignity.
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43 Specifically, affirmation of life and universal human dignity, and the three core values of stewardship, citizenship, and relationships (Reardon, 2000, p. 70).
without calling attention the long-term privation of many caregivers. Reardon (1995) writes that the “standards of public and private spheres should be informed by respect of human dignity” (Reardon, 1995, p. 2). The transpositional extent of justice is illustrated in this public-private distinction. Reardon’s feminist analysis describes the absence of justice within the state: nations use sovereignty as a justification for the prevention of the application of justice and the violation of rights (Reardon, 1993). The violence toward the citizens of Syria throughout 2011 and 2012 perpetrated by the government is a denial of the respect of human dignity to which they have an absolute right. The international community has been unable to intervene on behalf of Syria’s citizens because of issues of sovereignty, inter alia.

The private home is often excluded from justice, in terms of women being subjected to inhumane treatment. In addition to women, the aged, the disabled, and children are often relegated to the private sphere (Reardon, 2001, p. 123). This relegation often prevents persons from accessing what, as a result of their innate moral worth, they are entitled to. Nussbaum (2006) recognizes the public-private distinction, writing that the “public space is arranged to cater to the impairments of the normal case” (p.116). She argues that the blind and deaf are not usually catered to, and neither are different races, nor those of minority sexual orientations or genders. Reardon and Nussbaum articulate a “blind spot of justice” and attempt to rectify it by calling attention to the need for care for others.

A gendered and feminist approach offers an analysis of global problems and extends human security to all people based on their human dignity and the relational value of care. Caring, as a relational value, can help men (and women) see the
connection between global issues and people affected by them. Care, in part, shapes the scope of Reardon’s conception of justice. As a way of relating, care is the “connective tissue” of the relationships described as essential in providing for human well-being and a decent quality of life (Reardon, 2001, p. 70). In part, well-being, as an outcome of these relationships, constitutes human security. Caring plays a larger role in the dimension of injustices, through the exclusion of women due to the separation of public and private sphere. The role of caregiver and acts of caring are relegated to women, since women tend to nurture, and are more likely to care for the young, disabled, and aged. This work is devalued as a result of sexism (Nussbaum, 2006; Reardon, 1985). Sexism places caring in the private sphere, where those who provide it are silenced and excluded.

Reardon (1995) continues:

The feminist argument asserts that separations between private and public morality, as well as between the ethics applied to one’s own group and those used in dealings with others are a major cause of violation of rights of ethnic minorities, women and adversaries. Such an argument provides [a] rationale for a comprehensive conceptual approach devised to illuminate principles of human dignity. (Reardon, 1995, p2)

Reardon argues that this separation is a major cause of injustice. Ethnic minorities and when deserve the same dignity to which all humans (those in majority groups) are entitled. This view uncovers the violence and injustice done to those who are considered part of the private sphere. Because of the separation between public and private spheres, violence against caregivers is excluded from the moral equation, thus large segments of
the population are denied justice (Reardon, 1991). The status of women as moral beings is nonexistent in the private realm. Analogously, the injustices of many people are silenced because of nation state’s sovereignty (Reardon, 2010).

Nussbaum (2006) has a similar perspective, writing, “attending adequately to the problem of gender justice has large theoretical consequences since it involves acknowledging that the family is a political institution, not part of the private sphere immune from justice” (p. 1). This distinction provides a way to deal with such injustices: drawing the family and national sovereignty out of the private realm and placing them in the public light for scrutiny and application of justice.

To analyze issues in terms of gender means to pay attention to an entire class excluded from participation in the global order. Reardon articulates war as a global problem that is part of a system excluding women from decision making and relegating them to the home. Sovereignty and privacy of the home are analogous because of nation-states separation of internal matters (e.g. China and human rights) from public scrutiny and men’s control over the home on grounds that “defile the integrity of women” and excuse violent treatment of women (Reardon, 1991, p. 74). Reardon identifies the protection of the sovereignty of nations and their ability to make war with the absolute power of men in their homes over their families as a dimension of patriarchy.

She notes that “many conflicts interpreted as political and/or ideological are at base struggles for basic necessities” (Reardon, 1991, p. 64), arguing that this form of conflict is rooted in overarching patriarchal structures that are structurally and physically violent. Violence is used by the state to control and exert authority over citizens. Nation states use violence to control and coerce other nation states or maintain global
superiority. Domestic violence is similarly used to dominate women and children in the home. Domestic and global violence are analogous in that governments claim that they have ultimate authority and dominion of the people and natural resources, while men claim to have the same power over their families. Men and governments assert that their domain is private and sovereign.

Reardon (1991) finds further linkages between war, conflict, and the denial of basic human needs like food and famine (p. 84). Reardon (1991) writes about “making connections between issues, a process that is constitutive of women’s ways of thinking in terms of interrelationships” (p. 120). All forms of violence are an “obstacle to a decent quality of life” (Reardon, 1991, p. 41). In this sense, the gendered perspective is part of a framework of authentic human security that minimizes the public and private separations to provide a real sense of well-being to those relegated to the private realm. The private realm, in this sense, is synonymous with the privacy of national sovereignty. This sovereignty, in recent history, has been an excuse for autocratic rulers to commit atrocities against their people (Sudan and Libya). This violence and injustice is a violation of the role of states to protect their citizens.

National security and the role of sovereignty is one of the major obstacles for Rawls (2003) for the global application of justice. According to Reardon (2010):

Few states fully acknowledge, much less live up to, the responsibility that rationalizes state sovereignty, providing for the welfare of citizenry and protecting their rights, even though the political philosophy of the modern states as articulated in the American Declaration of Independence (1776) is that
governments are instituted to secure “the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” Happiness is taken to mean wellbeing and thus, we would argue, states have an obligation to provide for the human security of the nation. Such is authentic national security. (p. 28)

Since national security does not provide for the actual security of citizens, international organizations, peace activists, and human rights groups have been active in getting states to recognize human rights. In terms of the most basic protections, Reardon (2010) describes the UN system’s global directive requiring states to protect their citizens from genocide (pp. 21-22). This directive is supported by the Nuremberg principles and the work of the International Criminal Court. Reardon’s view of the extension of justice includes this and additional perspectives based on authentic human security that are often guided by care for others and their communities in the protection and enhancement of rights to all people.

**Global Community Membership.** Reardon considers all humans to be global citizens because of the care, shared destiny, responsibility, and the human status and dignity that connect all people to the larger world community. She writes that:

the frequent mention of community building as a peacemaking process, the emphasis on the human commonalities that transcend cultural, national, and ideological differences, and the assertion of the imperative of a common planetary future for all peoples [seem] to manifest the notion of peace as community.
There are frequent references in the curricula and in the theoretical literature, to global community as the conceptual core of a peaceful world society (Matriano and Reardon, 1976). “Community” is conceived as the recognition of common destiny and common welfare. The concept of community is reinforced by the emphasis on caring, sharing, cooperation, and solidarity as values and attitudes pursued among the affective objectives of peace education. These values are also seen as essential to the achievement of global justice and are fundamental to development education. The achievement of these values is dependent upon our willingness and our capacities to contribute to the building of the global community, to behave with a sense of global civic responsibility, and to see ourselves as global citizens. (Reardon, 1988, p. 30)

Reardon’s observations from surveys of peace educators around the world (which this section describes) offer a view that posits peacemaking (and peace, which is directly related to justice) through the development of global communities as a source for the values that make cooperation, responsibility, and care toward others possible. Reardon argues that, in this sense, “global justice” is possible, since this global community is the embodiment of the human status, regardless of location, of global citizenship. This view acknowledges the need for cooperation toward values that posit an outward focus toward community, where individuals are responsible to others and see each other as global
citizens. The notion of global citizenry is in part attached to the idea that all humans are part of an interdependent global community that is connected through dignity, which spurs care, responsibility, and membership in a global community at a global level for all persons. As a result, the consideration of whom justice applies to is not lodged within a specific national boundary, but is based on values of human dignity and care for others.

To understand Reardon’s approach in terms of capabilities is to focus on the conception of “global justice” encompassing human dignity and responsibility, which is a communal approach to securing human needs. Global justice through the establishment of conditions of positive peace correspond with Sen (2009) when he writes, “when people agitate to get global justice, they are not looking for minimal humanitarianism or [a] perfectly [just] world … they want … the elimination of some outrageously unjust arrangement to enhance global justice” (p. 26). Reardon explains global justice, writing:

positive peace requires the reduction and elimination of structural violence, the violation of life and well-being that derives from social and economic institutions. Should we need indicators of the condition of justice and equity that comprise positive peace, we need only refer to the UDHR, an inventory of factors that deny human freedom and impede the fulfillment of security needs. Peace is the antithesis of exploitation, marginalization and oppression. (p. 71)

In this sense, positive peace is not perfection or utopia, but the process of moving toward conditions of justices that apply to all people’s lives. In this conception we see that “international justice is simply not adequate for global justice” (Sen, 2009, p. 143).
In Reardon’s cosmopolitan view, the international system’s view of justice does not go far enough, because it does not intervene in the affairs sovereign nations (Snauwaert, 2009a, p. 5). Sen (2009) continues that the notion of human rights builds on our shared humanity. These rights are not derived from citizenship of any country or membership in any nation, but are presumed to be claims or entitlements of every human being (pp. 143-144). Reardon’s articulation of the application and universalization of human dignity is synonymous with this view.

The scope for Reardon is based on the extension of universal human dignity and its related values, which, in turn, encompass a cosmopolitan perspective that represents a condition of peace. The values that emanate from dignity are deepened through Reardon’s feminist interpretation that posits the importance of care. Care guides human relationships, responsibility and the view of persons as part of a global community deserving and required by their dignity to be equitably afforded all the range of needs, rights, freedoms and entitlements that constitute well-being on a global scale. Reardon's model offers a capabilities approach in terms of the scope of justice consistent with the views of Nussbaum and Sen that see justice as global through the application of dignity and the development of global conditions where this application is possible, insofar as injustice is reduced and real opportunities, freedoms, and human well-being is present.

Process

The process is concerned with the grounds or standing upon which the validity of a conception of justice is based. In other words, the process describes how principles of justice are validated as reasonable, given a pluralistic society. The primary questions for
this dimension are: “On what grounds is the validity of a conception of justice based? What constitutes the process of political justification for a conception of justice?” (Snauwaert, 2011, p. 217)

The primary views of this dimension are based on Rawls’ (1993) conception of public reason in *Political Liberalism*, whereby groups and individuals with incompatible comprehensive backgrounds are able to engage in the process of public reason, accepting a kind of reasonable pluralism in overlapping consensus to choose principles of justice acceptable among these diverse groups (pp. xvii-xix). Both Sen and Nussbaum adopt public reason and overlapping consensus. The process of the capabilities approach is democratic structures, impartiality, reason and rationality, which together constitute its validity. For Reardon, justice is validated through various forms of critical reflection and inquiry, which are also modes of learning constituting the peace educational process. This process is also a pedagogical aspect in her view of peace education and her approach to the theory of justice. In general, the critical reflection and inquiry of Reardon’s view share some common aspects with Sen’s and is consistent with a capabilities approach. This section describes the values that inform the process of validation and then interprets these approaches to reflection as an essential part of validating justice.

The process dimension of this theory is composed of Reardon’s definitional problem and approach peace education, which posits ongoing questioning, reflection, learning and public inquiry, discourse, inclusion of diverse and excluded voices, and consensus-building as necessarily the *way* in which peace is achieved and required for there to be justice. The components of the process dimension are educative and linked through a holistic view that sees values, problems, and their evaluations as connected.
In terms of the definitional problem, as described in chapter one of this dissertation, Reardon (1988) is concerned with how to define peace in terms of, “achieving conceptual clarity without closing off a continued inquiry into what constitutes peace, how it can be achieved, and how we can educate students to work for it and live in it as the normal state of human society” (p. 11). Moving toward clarity in terms of the concept of peace and what constitutes it (justice) is a primary goal of this dissertation and, more specifically, of this dimension, since defining these principles requires continued inquiry into the constitution of peace. Validating peace, in this approach, involves an inclusive process that is aimed at students and learners. Thus, the definitional question embodies a dynamic and open conception that is under constant scrutiny of learners, a category that includes all the world’s people.

This openness is illustrated in terms of the construction of a definitional problem that is always available or open for discussion, yet understood as nonviolent and just; it is connected to violence and injustice insofar as the value of peace is understood to analyze it. Reardon’s (1988) conception of positive peace, which she suggests is organic because it is “a living, evolving condition,” connects to this openness in terms of what can be seen or interpreted from human life (p. 12). The term “organic” in this view refers to that which emerges from human conditions as it evolves.

Peace results from continuous learning and inquiry about the lived experience and the requirements of human dignity (as offered throughout this dissertation). The principles of peace and justice, by logical extension, are conceived and articulated through continuous learning and inquiry into the lived experience. The principles are fluid and cannot become fixed. Principles of justice and peace are communicated and
elicited from generation to generation, in terms of what is required by human dignity. As a result, an understanding of a “sense” of peace (and its logical extension, justice) is realized through a learning community that dialogues with different others, learns and studies what peace is, from the lived experiences of theirs and various communities. This sense corresponds with Rawls’ meaning of a sense of justice, which Sen (2009 describes, in part, as, “a sense of justice and for a conception of the good” that can be understood as “the assessment of the justice of social arrangements” (p. 63).

A sense of justice is the understanding of justice through comparative evaluations of the needs of human dignity through the everyday conditions of people’s experience. This view is comparable to Reardon’s, which comprehends peace not only for the sake of its interpretation, but also for the realization of the principles and aspects that comprise it for the purpose of individuals’ and groups’ learning of how to obtain good lives while maintaining the respect of human dignity for all. The principles themselves are, on one hand, generated through a deep comprehension of the values that are interpreted from society and, on the other, the specifics (i.e., other related and equally important needs of dignity), which are validated through critical reflection, learning and public scrutiny.

Validation of principles of justice occurs within an open learning community and is carried out by educators, students, members of global civil society, global citizens, and any other interested parties. Individuals participate in public discourse to understand, learn from each other, and propose and envision possibilities for learning and action. Reflection is a core part of validation. In this sense, Reardon (2010) differentiates
reflection as three modes: “critical/analytic, moral/ethical and contemplative/ruminative” (p. 7). Critical reflection lies in the political realm, while moral and ethical reflection are concerned with fairness, distribution and human relationships. Contemplative reflection is an inner process that prepares learners for outward action as well as the other two forms of reflection.

Beginning with critical reflection, Reardon (2010) writes:

Holism and critical reflection are essential and necessary to the transformation of thinking (and transformational thinking) conducive to the political processes requisite to the realization of human rights as the basis of a peaceful world order. Holism demands that we address peace and justice problems in all dimensions and in relation to other problems, which mutually affect each other. Critical reflection is needed to assess the nature and severity of problems of peace and the viability of potential responses. (p. 46)

Critical reflection, in Reardon’s view, describes a deep inquiry into the connected aspects of global problems, the requirements to solve them and the steps needed to move toward a state of organic (positive) peace. Critical reflection is a function of a publicly oriented approach to political engagement. There is an assessment of the obstacles to peace as well as an evaluation of how to move beyond them. Reardon (2010) continues that:

Peace education is also of its very nature critical. Not in the sense of criticism as opposition, but in the sense of being
probingly analytic and evaluative. Granted analysis and evaluation may indeed lead learners to oppose some public policies or social, economic or political structures, when they find them to contradict the fundamental values of peace and justice, which guide the evaluation; or when the analysis shows failure to achieve just public purposes. (p.48)

Reardon constructs an approach to peace education that embodies critical analysis through reflection that seeks to learn, not for the sake of being oppositional, but with the intention of finding ways to understand the structures, systems, and policies that have an impact on human conditions. She understands that this deep inquiry may uncover injustice in those structures, especially if they are not oriented toward the achievement of justice and peace in human lives. Reflection is a part of learning that helps us think deeply about principles of peace and justice, as well as action and learning for peace (and justice).

Reardon describes a process of validation that posits justice and peace within the analysis. Thus, the evaluation itself of possible principles, policies, and justice has an ethical dimension, which is an attempt at fairness, inclusion, and analysis that is consistent with those values. Critical reflection helps learners develop queries to understand and deconstruct the war system. Reardon (2011) includes among these queries “the primary inquiry of critical/analytic reflection directed toward the construction of a transformed international system from militarized patriarchy to a nonviolent order dedicated to the achievement universal moral inclusion” (p.9).

Critical reflection is the process of thinking and reasoning about how to achieve
peace values and goals as well as overcoming the obstacles to peace. It is concerned with
discerning who should be included in the discourse and what the subject of the inquiry
should be. Critical/analytic reflection helps learners understand how the structures and
power-holders, who are often the cause of both structural and direct violence, affect
human well-being and quality of life (Reardon and Snauwaert, 2011).

Since violence is unjust, it is incompatible with justice and a violation of human
dignity. According to Reardon (1991), “the willingness to use violence for public
purposes stems from a form of thinking that sanctions violence and sees human beings as
inherently unequal” (p. 157). Reardon posits moral equality within nonviolence. Critical
reflection is inherent in moral equality and nonviolence in terms of the act of reflection.
It is deep thinking that opens learners to nonviolent possibilities. In this sense,
nonviolence is a core part of this reflective capacity.

In this approach to reflection, individuals consider what the most appropriate
ways are to move toward this nonviolent and peaceful order. Out of this approach to
reflection, learners might consider alternate approaches to solving conflict, such as
mediation, conflict resolution, management and transformation, and theatre of the
oppressed. These involve reflecting on the conflict, acting out situations, and returning to
reflection within a community of learners to discuss the learning and actions that are
possible in a given situation. This view also reinforces the view that the principles of
justice (and peace) that we reflect on a view that is in no way related to justice, aside
from evaluation of human lives and deep understanding of the problematic of violence.

Ethical reflection is rooted in the central value of human dignity, which represents
deep thinking guided by the norms and public values instantiated in the UDHR and
required for peaceful and just conditions. Ethical reflection reinforces the fact that human dignity is a valuable and integral part of political discourse and decision-making in the construction of a peaceful political approach and the validation of principles of justice and peace. Reardon (2010) writes:

Ethical reflection and analysis, on the other hand should be an integral component of peace learning and peace politics. The development of ethical skills can derive from applying global society’s agreed principles of justice and equity – such as those that are enshrined in law, pertaining to all no matter what moral system they may live by – to the assessment of political issues and choices. The development and application of ethical principles is a process of engagement similar to my sculpting in clay metaphor. It is a peace education and human rights learning process consistent with Freirean pedagogy. It is a process similar to what Martin Luther King may have meant when he said that serious thinking about political issues was a form of action. (p. 52)

Reardon is concerned with the engagement in politics insofar as it can be a reflective process guided by peace and justice for the development of principles that contribute to peaceful and just conditions. This suggests that politics will not produce just outcomes per se, but a process of discourse guided by such norms has a greater possibility for peaceful and just conditions. Such engagement is rooted in the need for the development of principles through a process that is reasonable insofar as it can make
room for people with different beliefs; although beliefs are taken into account and may inform persons’ thinking, they should not comprise nor be the subject of public discourse.

Reardon invokes Martin Luther King’s “serious thinking” to describe a kind of reflection that goes beyond what is normally considered to be inaction, but is required in order to take action or decide to do so. Reardon juxtaposes this critical process with structural violence, as opposed human rights standards in this approach to peace education that involves Paulo Friere’s awareness raising pedagogy. In this sense, Reardon is describing a process of validating principles of justice that is empowering in the sense that it is inclusive, democratic, and focused on making people aware of injustice. Not only is ethical reflection composed of human rights as standards for learning and norms guiding discourse, but it also consists of deep thinking among people of plural belief systems and critical awareness of social structures that are unjust.

According to Reardon (2011):

The core focus of ethical reflection that might contribute to universally practiced moral inclusion should be on the transcendence of the objectification of persons that now operates at every level of human relationships from child abuse, sexual exploitation, domestic violence, throughout popular entertainment, to racism and genocide. (p. 9)

The ethical approach to reflection is grounded in moral inclusion, which is important to human dignity. Reardon (2011) writes that “moral/ethical reflection addresses questions of fairness and moral inclusion with queries focused on issues of the goodness, distribution of advantage and harm, the justice and potential detriments and
benefits of relationships, effects upon quality of life and the biosphere” (p.8). Thus, ethical reflection is concerned with distribution of social goods and relationships embodied in human well-being and achieving a decent quality of life. Ethical reflections allow us to understand the dimensions of oppression and structural violence so that we can learn about human problems and think about their moral and ethical implications.

According to Snauwaert (2011), Reardon defines morality as principled conduct for living that is rooted in ethics, which are reasoned and guiding principles. The ethical is situated in the public realm (Reardon and Snauwaert, 2011, p. 4). Thus, ethical and critical analyses are concerned with public reason, informing public discourse and action contributing to peaceful political efficacy.

Deep thinking and consideration of various interrelations is an important aspect of contemplative/ruminative reflection because these interrelations have the possibility of opening new understandings. According to Reardon (2011):

Contemplative/ruminative reflection is a process consistent with the breadth of thought inspired by a cosmopolitan view. It is a wider sphere of reflection, which facilitates perception of the full scope of the complex systemic, dynamic interrelationships comprising our natural and humanly constructed environments. It makes space for affect and intuition as more complex forms of reason. (p. 9)

The capacity to make holistic connections is developed in contemplative reflection, connections between issues, possibilities, and human relationships. The contemplative reflective capacity is the reflection essential to inner development of
empathy or concern for others and their human dignity, which constitutes the fundamental shift in values that describes transformation. The cosmopolitan ethic is present in this approach to reflection, in terms of this concern for others. This global ethic is rooted in human moral worth, which extends to the attention to their problems. We intuitively perceive the systemic injustice in the lives of those we care and have empathy for as we learn (through reasoning) about how those socially constructed systems cause harm. Reardon, in the aforementioned passage, suggests that this perception from our intuition may lead to critical reflection in the development of what is rationally and reasonably possible in addressing that injustice. This intuitive approach does not split the animal and rational, but as Nussbaum’s (2006) critique of such dualisms suggests, it invokes care as a consideration in terms of what is reasonable for us to do in terms of justice (pp. 131-133).

Reflection, in this sense, has some commonalities with the capabilities approach. Both Reardon and Sen articulate public reasoning and democratic discourse and processes as part of the validation process of principles of justice. Sen (2009) writes that:

reflection can take us beyond the pursuit of a very narrow view of self interest, and we can even find that our own well reflected goals demand that we cross the narrow boundaries of exclusive self-seeking altogether. These can also be cases in which we have reason to restrain the exclusive pursuit of our own goals (whether or not these goals are themselves exclusively self-interested), because of following rules of decent behavior that allow room for the pursuit of goals.
(whether or not self-interested) by other people who share the world with us. (p. 33)

Sen is explaining the importance of reflection in the scrutiny of principles of justice, so that we are not choosing values that do not take others into account. This is why Reardon posits a communal approach to reflection, insofar as it is part of learning, based on public standards of human rights as a guide. This reflection helps us to focus on the needs of dignity for others and ourselves.

While critical reflection examines and critiques injustices and possibilities for justice in the political realm, the political is scrutinized on the grounds of ethical and moral standards. Contemplative reflection is ruminative and part of the struggle to interpret the response to the other forms of reflection. How then should they think and act? How does this change the way I view the world and what is now my responsibility? Each of the approaches to reflections constitutes the capacities that are necessary for global citizenship (Reardon, 2010). They are grounded in human dignity, founded on the notion of persons worthy of choosing their own life plan and participating in discourse on distribution of resources and goods. It posits a deeper responsibility for learners and global citizens to think about how their actions contribute to global problems and solutions.

In general, Reardon’s reflective capacities operate as a value based on principled reason within a community of learners. Inherent in this perspective is the importance of plural discourse and learning within democratic spaces. These capacities of reflection “test belief.” One of the most important goals of this dissertation is to interpret a theory of justice because many peace educators fail to adequately describe what justice means.
Justice is untested and often not reflected on by peace educators. Reardon’s articulation of the reflective capacities is a very important contribution to peace education pedagogy and practice. This reflection is part of the development of learners for action toward peace and human development. Individuals develop the capacity to identify and assess forms of injustice and principles for justice.

**Moral Resources**

The dimension of moral resources is concerned with the internal human capacities that we draw on to respond to others in ways consistent with ethical norms. Snauwaert (2011) offers the following as a primary question for this dimension: “What moral capacities are required to justly respond to others?” (p. 117). This question involves two parts, which are “moral capacities” and “responding justly to others.” This formulation suggests an explicit connection, in terms of the moral source, with the foundation dimension of justice.

The moral source extends from the foundation, providing us with the internal facilities that involve intuition (in some cases) and ethical reasoning for why there should be a just response to others. The foundation of justice, along with moral resources, determines what behaviors and actions toward others are ethical as well as what must never be done to others. The orientation provides the focus of our response, while the distribution is part of a just response in terms of the principles determining the allocation of goods. The scope would suggest to what extent, where, to whom and on what levels our response should be. This dimension overlaps with others since it expands upon the principles, content, direction and basis, inter alia, of justice.
The primary alternatives for moral resources include the utilitarian perspective, which utilizes reciprocity and mutuality to respond to others justly. Yet this view is consequential, and as such, it is “thin” in that a response could appear to be just, but might only be prudential or simply coincidental. For Rawls (2003), the moral resources of justice are rooted in the conceptualization of persons as rational and reasonable individuals who cooperate with others for mutual advantage and are able to respond justly (reciprocally) to others.

Nussbaum (2006) suggests that this view of persons is limited because, although moral powers are important, they are not possessed by all humans in the same way that Rawls articulates. Nussbaum (2006) suggests that the social contract theory assumes equality of power, capacity and rationality, but this is often not the case (pp. 103-104). Nussbaum argues that individuals, in the Rawlsian sense, are more likely to pursue the good selfishly, “with no interests in the interests of others” (p. 103). Nussbaum (2006) highlights:

the relations of care in which all human beings in some ways, at some times, and to some degree stand. [This] includes … the advantage of respecting the dignity of people with mental disabilities and developing their human potential, whether or not this potential is socially “useful” in the narrower sense. (p. 129)

Nussbaum describes the importance of caring for the mentally impaired not only so as to aid in their development, but also as an example of reasons that relate to any persons who are not viewed as having equal moral powers. She suggest that they are subjects of
justice because of their dignity and because we care for them. Those that we care for are supported in their development so they can respond morally to others, as well as those caring for them.

Sen (2009) adds the importance of public reason in order to temper “the reliability of our feelings and impressions” (p. viii). The development of a sense of injustice mediated by public reason and critical examination helps us to respond justly to others, while that sense of care (for Nussbaum) also gives us reasons to respond justly to others.

Within the context of these theories, Reardon’s conception of justice offers that our human status and resulting dignity requires that persons be respected and treated as subjects worthy of justice. Reardon suggests that within human dignity, and for the development of conditions of peace and security, individuals treat others with respect. Inherent in the respectful treatment of others is the requirement that persons act responsibly, with tolerance and care toward others. Education for development of these capacities and deep inquiry into the conditions required for peace and justice, which enable learners to be tolerant and (eventually) care for others, are fundamental to acting in ways that reflect responsibility.

Following the concept of moral resources articulated by Reardon, responsibility involves the capacities to act responsibly toward others, which is characterized by tolerance for others and care for human well-being. Human dignity also suggests that we must go beyond tolerance toward respect of persons, because they are human. Reardon (2010) writes, “democracy is the politics of tolerance” (p. 11). Tolerance is the bedrock of a democratic society as far as the development of a discourse of civility and the basic needs of social cooperation among diverse groups. Tolerance in our view of others opens
the discourse to beginning comprehension for the requirements of human dignity.

Reardon (1997) argues in *Tolerance – The Threshold of Peace* that tolerance is the beginning and a framework for understanding intolerance for the purpose of peace-building (pp. 11-12). Learning about human dignity can begin with education for tolerance and civility. For instance, Reardon, in *Education for Human Dignity* (1995) and *Tolerance – The Threshold of Peace* (1997), provides example lesson plans that map out, with developmental appropriateness and nuance, explanatory guides for teachers in terms of the forms of diversity and intolerance that serve to acquaint learners with the fundamental basis of human dignity and values of all persons. This learning is the foundation of the development of the capacities of learners to understand their own moral worth and that of others. The content includes documents such as the UDHR presented in ways that learners can understand, as well as examples of rights violations in terms of people they can relate to.

Tolerance is a threshold capacity that enables individuals to view others as worthy of engaging in dialogue. At all levels, including the social and political, having the ability to listen, consider, and tolerate the perspective of the other is essential. Tolerance and civility in discourse posit a respect for the human dignity of the other (Reardon, 2010). Reardon (2010) articulates tolerance as both, “acting to assure that letting the other be other and, especially, as we deal with those with whom we profoundly disagree” and “abstaining from doing harm to the other” (pp. 16-17). In terms of a baseline respect for others, tolerance ensures civility and “living and letting others live.” It is not a complete respect for others, but a “hands off” approach that ensures a kind of freedom from interference. It also requires that they abstain from any form of violence against
Tolerance in this sense is concerned with a basic acceptance, allowing the freedom to act in accordance with one’s views. It informs fundamental protections from harm. To tolerate is refrain from causing intentional avoidable harm. Public discourse is dependent on tolerance and civility as a way to progress dialogue, include different perspectives, and assess possibilities. Activities focused on multicultural perspectives and listening to others provide possibilities for deeper learning. At the IIPE in Cartagena (2010), Colombian peace educator Amada Benavides described how she used critical pedagogy activities at high-level government and UN meetings with important officials as a way to humanize them, and to help them begin to relate to others as persons. In this sense, tolerance is a moral resource that other higher order capacities, such as care can be built upon.

Care is a capacity that is developed through learning, and is related to how we see and respond to others. The capacities of reflection integrate care for others, as subjects of justice, and with ways to think on how we might act toward them. According to Reardon (1988):

The acting-out of caring, for active commitment and social responsibility are those qualities that manifest and sustain the value of humane relationships, in the global social realm as well as the personal. It demonstrates care for those with whom we are interlinked, even when we do not directly encounter them. (p. 77)

Care includes a sense of social responsibility involved in maintaining human
relationships that enables individuals to respond to the needs of human dignity. We feel a responsibility to others because we care for their well-being. Care, in Reardon’s view, is not limited by proximity. Care is cosmopolitan, in that it is rooted in the notion that human dignity is present in all persons. By virtue of the universal presence of dignity, we must act in ways that recognize and respect dignity. Reardon suggests that caring for others because of their inherent dignity offers a way to exercise social responsibility so that all people are treated as subjects of justice. Reardon (2001) offers that care is an essential capacity that “will facilitate the emergence of a culture of peace” (p. 85). Care is a basic skill needed in the development of a culture that respects human dignity.

Reardon (2001) writes, “the arts and skills of caring are learned” (p. 85). In this sense, we learn to be caring. Caring in this context is important because it is a way of relating to other persons that illustrates their importance. Reardon (2001) continues:

It is a human capacity that lies within men as well as women. We have many examples of men who are caring, and an increasing number of men are involved in care work. Care is a capacity that can be developed in everyone. If we are to develop a caring culture, all must develop this capacity to the extent of which each is capable. Care must become as important a factor in the public realm as in the private. Care is learned through practising the skills of caring. It must be practised by men as well women in the making of public policy. For all to learn to care, caring needs to be included in education, and certainly must be a major practice in education.
for a culture of peace in a gender perspective. (p. 85)

Reardon offers that caring is a capacity present in all humans, regardless of gender. Care is associated with a particular kind of work that is relegated to women in the private sphere. The importance of care to justice is in the development of persons to have the ability to respond to others. Caring, in this sense, is a capacity that is learned and related to human relationships in terms of developing a culture of peace, in which human dignity is respected.

In what ways is caring a moral resource/capacity? What internal capacities does one have to cultivate in order to care for others? Reardon (2001) answers these questions in her description of education that focuses on the importance of care because of its role in socializing learners to respect others equally. Reardon (2001) writes:

Skills, as noted in the case of care, are often developed for the performance of gender roles, and in many cultures skills are valued most when they contribute to the capacity to compete. As competition is seen to be played out more in the public realm traditionally populated by men, skills development in boys is seen as preparation for competition. Care and cooperation, perceived as attributes of the private realm of family and close community are seen as skills essential to girls. Thus boys have traditionally been educated for public economic and political roles. Girls in most cultures are still educated for caring and domesticity, roles that have long kept them from enjoying equal educational opportunities, and thus denied them
political, economic and social equality (pp. 95-96).

The notion of care is socialized in gender roles that connect girls and women to the private realm, which includes certain kinds of work associated with the family and cooperation in the community. Boys are socialized to compete, while girls are socialized to care for their family and community. This socialization is operationalized when women are prevented from participating in the public realm and not given the same educational opportunities because the caring work they are socialized to do ties them to the private realm of the home and community.

Reardon suggests that care is a capacity that should be developed in men as well as women, so that they have the ability to cooperate, as opposed to being focused solely on competition. Reardon links caring to affording women with the equal opportunities that are required by our human dignity. As follows, if the development of the capacity to care is established as equally important for men, then women will have the time and freedom to pursue educational opportunities and develop capacities for public participation.

Caring develops the capacities to relate to others, build communities and nurture and develop future generations. In Women and Peace, Reardon (1993) connects caring to the communal work that ensures human security and well-being through social cooperation. So the ability to cooperate is learned from caring. Caring embodies the asymmetric relationships where individuals have responsibility for and to others. We care and act responsibly for and to others because they are human with dignity, which describes one’s fundamental self-worth, value, equality and relationships of responsibility.
In essence, education for men and women to be equally caring persons gives rise to a sense of responsibility under which one feels obligated to respond to others by helping to secure the basic material needs, rights, and freedoms required for a good life. This articulation of care leads to human security. Human security (as discussed in the domain section of this dissertation) involves a feeling of being secure as well as that which is required to be secure. Because of the tenuous and strained condition of insecurity, it is often difficult to respond, in this state, justly to others. Thus, an external sense of security and the actual capabilities and material needs are necessary for individuals to respond or even develop the internal capacities necessary to respond in just ways to others.

Reardon’s feminist analysis describes how human security is met through the care of others. Out of that care emerges a sense of responsibility to help others meet the needs of authentic security and to ensure the development of capacities in learners so that there is the actualization and a sense of actual security. Reardon (1993) writes that authentic human security, as conceived in peace education, is aimed at instilling and meeting the needs of human dignity through to the cultivation of “society’s ability to care for the vulnerable and to meet fundamental human needs” (p. 82). This ability is diminished through the diversion of resources that could be used for human welfare, to the war system and for “national security.”

Even so, communities and individuals feel a deep responsibility to others inside and out of their communities and act on this obligation because they care. Caring is an intuitive aspect of moral resources that enables individuals to have a feeling for the well-being of others who may not necessarily be in the same vicinity. When there is care and
the emerging responsibility, human dignity is respected and rights are secured, or at least in process.

Caring, in this sense, is interrelated with the struggle toward the achievement of human well-being, since to care for someone is to assume responsibility for him or her, a concept that is embodied in the goals of human rights learning. Human rights, as normative social standards, also guide reflection on principles of justice and peace. Reardon (1995) writes:

> the ultimate goal of this kind of education (human rights) is the formation of responsible, committed, and caring planetary citizens with sufficiently informed problem awareness and adequate value commitment to be contributors to a global society that honors human rights. (p.3)

Human rights are the normative standards by which a community’s well-being is judged.

Human well-being is a goal of women in their work to secure communities. The responsibility to do so is a result from the capacities of care developed in their socialization. If men develop those same capacities, might not the work of men in the public sphere be also concerned with human well-being? Reardon (1993, 2001) suggests that it would. However, in terms of the previous passage, human rights learning is a critical exercise that guides the normative development of individuals, helping develop caring in persons so that they understand, on both the intuitive and critical reflective levels, the importance of rights and the ability to connect those rights to persons. Human rights learning succeed when the “caring planetary citizen” is “sufficiently informed” with awareness of problems. Not only are persons caring, but they also have a sense of
responsibility that leads them to reflect on global issues. This reflection is guided by human rights norms and values.

Reardon understands that the teaching of capacities for care and reflection is illustrated on multiple levels. First, she writes that “the way in which inquiry and discussions are conducted and lessons presented in the classroom is one of the means through which teachers manifest the care for the learner as a whole person” (p. 147). Students in the classroom learn caring from the example of teachers. At the same time, caring is part of the teacher-student relationship that acknowledges the students’ and teacher’s humanity. Caring, in this sense, is analogous to all other human relationships in terms of human dignity. It is the formative learning that contributes to social transformation. At early educational levels, students should learn how to care. This caring is operationalized in other acts. Reardon’s approach to peace education is based on the dissemination of such knowledge so that all teachers can educate for caring capacities.

Reardon (2008) suggests that caring should be a “viable social principle” that would help people respond to global catastrophes (p. 134). In this sense, caring would lead to just and peaceful conditions because, over time, caring would constitute the normal human relationship. Justice is ultimately about relationships and the way in which we respond to others. Care is a human capacity that posits value in the needs and rights of other persons and normatively informs decision-making.

Caring is prominent in Nussbaum’s (2006) approach to capabilities in ways that are similar to Reardon’s. Nussbaum (2006) points out that “caregiving is connected to gender justice,” in terms of women’s work not being valued and relegated to the private
sphere (p. 100). Those that women care for are excluded from justice because they do not fit the normal, reasonable and rational conception articulated by Rawls in the social contract tradition (pp. 101-106). Nussbaum (2006) writes that individuals with mental impairments “fail to qualify for equality,” but “reciprocity becomes possible if we consider them with those who care for them” (p. 133-134). She suggests that the development of a relationship of care involves asymmetric reciprocity, but is equally valuable in the development of the mentally impaired, who often have extreme dependency.

Nussbaum frames the role of care in a theory of justice, arguing, “acute or asymmetrical dependency as among the primary needs of citizens … will be one hallmark of a decently just society” (p. 168). Nussbaum (2006) describes care in terms of its connection to “human dignity” (p. 160). Care is focused on those who are excluded from justice and as a value that is intricately connected to justice in terms of whom we respond to. Caring is an ability that is part of the response to others. While Reardon focuses on care in achieving full human dignity and human security, as an alternative to national security, she recognizes the (asymmetric) caring role of women as an example and value that men should take on, developing the capacities to care to respond justly to others.

Secondly, care informs the critical reflective capacities that were discussed in more detail in the process section of this chapter. The capacity of care is the intuitive aspect of moral resources. Although care guides the struggle for human well-being, as Sen (2009) suggests, critical examination is also necessary. The ability to make critical examination of our values is integrally connected to the role of reflection. In Mediating
on the Barricades, Reardon (2010) clarifies the importance of thinking deeply about beliefs so as to make sure they are not ideology, and as critical for the sake of enabling learners to convene and participate in open dialogue and civil public discourse on the politics of peace.

Critical/analytic reflection, as rooted in Freire's critical pedagogy, focuses on reflecting on social and political structures for awareness of learners, so they can diagnose problems and see how they can offer possibilities (Reardon, 2010, pp. 7-8). Learners need this reflective capacity, as they are subject to the current educational and socio-political structures, which do not provide such education for awareness. Without this capacity, learners may accept unjust social structures as norms and, by logical extension, recreate and follow the social rules and norms that they implicitly reproduce.

In my own classes, I often ask students, through critical questioning and calling on students, to reflect on whether standardized testing is just and what, if anything, could be done. Many students offer that they had never considered testing a problem, but saw it as normal and “the way things are done.” After reflecting, students resolve to be more reflective and offer student-centered and democratic approaches in tandem with the required testing. Some even suggested they would advocate changing the existing structures. Teachers reflect on these structures and, because they care about the well-being of students, they feel a responsibility to offer alternatives and challenge these unjust social structures.

The moral/ethical reflection is, in part, a normative evaluation of our beliefs, injustice, and the possibilities of peace. Reardon (2010) suggests that this reflection is concerned with our rights and human dignity. This reflection asks us what a dignified
person is entitled to and what should never be done to them because of their dignity. This reflection can be utilized in assessing both global and local issues, from international intervention in Syria to bullying in schools. Without the normative standards upon which these ethical reflections are based, we would not consider human dignity or the rights of persons. So care moves us to have a sense of responsibility toward others and ethical reflection, through normative analysis in our decision-making. This leads and guides our thinking in terms of why and how we should intervene in Syria and why bullying must never be accepted.

Contemplative reflection helps us to be aware of the various connections between thinking more deeply and moving our other forms of reflection beyond the simplistic toward higher order thinking. Reardon (2010) suggests that this reflection calls for “more room for silence in our class” (p. 10). This silence cultivates an understanding of the subject and the identification of connections to students’ lives with the subject at hand, especially since learning is often not relevant for students until they can make those connections. Reardon (2010) writes that “a cosmopolitan view requires not only seeing the world as a whole but fully perceiving its complexity and diversity” (p. 11). Reardon continues that this form of reflection allows individuals to connect theory to practice and distinguish their own personal comprehensive and religious view from public values. This is related to moral resources in terms of what capacities learners need for public discourse and civility. So this reflective capacity is also related to tolerance. Beyond making impassioned pleas for one’s own worldview, contemplative reflection extends to public and civil discourse, insofar as it asks learners to make connections about what is reasonable in a plural society.
These reflective capacities are constituted by human rights and based on human dignity. In an interview, Reardon (1987) explains that human rights are the “ideal vehicle for achieving one of the fundamental purposes of peace education” through “facilitation of learnings to help us develop capacities to create a just civic order on our planet” (pp.1-2). Human rights offer the content and standards for human behavior necessary in the development of a just world. Human rights and dignity inform reflection as a normative standard to measure and assess justice and, in this context, to respond to others. Reardon continues:

Reflection on the questions of human universality and cultural diversity can also help to clarify aspects of gender and deepen understanding of both the complexities and the possibilities of bringing cultural and gender perspectives to the task of learning to build a culture of peace. Reflection on human universals is important for understanding the principles upon which human-rights standards have been constructed. (p. 74)

Cultural diversity and pluralism, as an aspect defining the conception of a person with human dignity, is an important subject for reflection, which is especially needed before action. It is also a central feature of reflection itself. Since reflection occurs in a community, the contemplation or ethical reflection about an issue articulated by another person reveals an interest in their perspective. It suggests that one views the other person’s perspective as important. Reflection, in this sense, requires individual development of capacities to think clearly about problems, the moral value and worth of others, and public contemplation, and the discussion and scrutiny of values that direct our
responses to others.

Sen (2009) offers a similar perspective when he writes that values and actions must be “critically examined through reasoned scrutiny to see whether [they] can be the basis of a sustainable condemnation” (p. viii). He continues, “open-minded engagement in public reasoning is quite central to the pursuit of justice” (Sen, 2009, p. 390). Sen places a high importance on publicly and reasoned scrutiny as a focus of justice and the determination of injustice. Reardon’s view of reflection is the inquiry into and learning about the needs of human dignity and injustice in order to understand and respond to human needs. This learning is inclusive and community-based. Thus, Reardon does not solely rely on caring to understand how we should respond to others, but also incorporates inclusive communal reflection and consensus building. While she does not employ an impartial spectator, per se, this communal learning is left open for questions, and made available for public discourse.

While Sen does not mention caring in the way Reardon does, he writes that:

The significant place of emotions for our deliberations can be illustrated by the reasons for taking them seriously (though not uncritically). If we are strongly moved by some particular emotion, there is a good reason to ask what that tells us. Reasons and emotion play complementary roles in human reflection. (p. 39)

Our feelings, which include caring, have a role in reflection or scrutiny of justice and injustice and our response to it. They work in tandem.

Both Reardon and Nussbaum articulate caring as a starting point for justice. It is
a reason to consider the injustices of a stranger. Caring is reciprocal, but not always directly so. We may care for others who do not have the capacity to reciprocate. Nevertheless, human dignity, along with our common human future, offers a reason to care. Caring and reflection are connected through the underlying value of human dignity that guides public and reasoned scrutiny and open dialogue and discourse. Reflective capacities involve caring, in the sense that we often think deeply about issues, people and possibilities we care about.

Capacities, for Reardon (1988, 2001), represent abilities that must be developed through continuous learning and reflection, while capabilities are the substantive opportunity to do and be according to human dignity. The organizing ideas of caring – responsibility for human security and dignity and capacity development for capabilities and critical reflection – in Reardon’s approach to peace education are complementary to Sen and Nussbaum’s approaches to capabilities. While a constant focus of Reardon is capacity development for the elimination of war, human well-being is equally a part of her calculus and consistent with the capabilities approach, in terms of Nussbaum’s (2006) requirement for “freedom from harm” and the external capabilities needed to actualize freedoms and opportunities. Capabilities required in response to the well-being of others are nurtured through the development of abilities to do, be, think and reflect. These abilities are necessary for global citizens. Capabilities are the opportunities for people to develop capacities. Capacities in this sense are constituted by capabilities. It is these and other capacities that constitute moral resources.

In summation, the moral resources for Reardon’s conception of justice are the interrelated notions of tolerance as a necessary baseline capacity. Tolerance is the
hallmark of a democratic society, and it allows us to cooperate and be civil, although minimally, with each other. Tolerance opens the door to caring and responsibility. Caring is a more complex, “higher order” capacity that is closely connected to gender. Caring must be developed in men as well as women. Caring leads us to be responsible for others in the pursuit of a secure, peaceful and just social order. In Reardon’s view, we are not only responsible to others because we care, but also because the development of the critical reflective capabilities enable learners to think deeply, act ethically and form connections with others. Tolerance, care, responsibility, and reflection constitute the internal moral resources, interrelated components that have the possibility to transform human values, away from violent ones, toward a just and peaceful world culture.

**Social Conditions**

This dimension describes the material or lived conditions of the world, in which justice is applied, interpreted and understood. Snauwaert (2011) asks, “What material and social conditions are necessary for the achievement of justice (including the educational development of the supportive moral resources)” (p. 318).

From this view, the social conditions involve the state of the socio-political community. This state is related to many of the dimensions of justice, insofar as they contribute to what moral foundations, political values, and distributional principles justice is founded on and why, and to whom justice is available. The scope, for example, is dependent on the societal view of who is covered by justice. Snauwaert (2011), points to the fact that this dimension relates to social structures, such as education, that are in place to support the moral resources. We may infer that educational systems, structures,
pedagogies determine the moral resources, in the sense that if the educational foundations supporting moral resources were not present, citizens would be unable to sufficiently respond to others.

The primary approaches describing this dimension are the utilitarian, social contract and capabilities approaches to justice. The material conditions for the utilitarian perspective were the lack of moral equality, as evidenced in the impoverished working class in Great Britain. This view suggested that the preference or happiness for each person was important, thus worth counting.

The social contract approach, in Rawlsian terms, understands the social conditions as defined by moderate scarcity, thus necessitating social cooperation. For Rawls (2003), social cooperation in light of scarcity offers more than the counting of preferences, such as cooperation of rough equals who provide for the least well off in society, dealing with the problem of majority preferences.

Within the capabilities approach, democratic institutions from global sources (i.e., philosophies and worldviews) and plural reasoning for the comparison of justices and injustices are the social condition. By positing the importance of democratic institutions as a basis for understanding and dealing with injustice through the comparative assessment of quality of life, a democratic ethic of inclusion is primary in achieving good lives according to the requirements of human dignity. For Reardon, patriarchy and the violence and injustice it manifests, along with global civil society as a democratic polity that emerged as a response to patriarchy, constitute the material conditions.

Violence as the central problematic in peace education is rooted in patriarchy. According to Reardon (2010):
I define violence as intentional, avoidable harm – usually committed to achieve a purpose. By designating it as intentional harm, I intend to indicate that using violence, especially to achieve economic or political purposes or to maintain social conditions (such as male dominance) is an act of choice, strategic as well as ethical choice (p. 55).

By defining violence as “intentional harm,” Reardon designates all injustice emanating from systems as part of the social conditions. Reardon argues that violence, as a tool of male dominance, is the result of decision-making processes that reinforce the role of power-holders in our social structure. She suggests that the use of violence is not coincidental, necessary or even convenient, but the result of political calculations with ethical implications.

Patriarchy, as Reardon explicitly states, comprises a key social condition. Reardon (1985) describes patriarchy as system of domination based in religious traditions, aristocracies and other comprehensive doctrines whose supreme authority was often male or father-like god figures and which posited value in maleness and masculine values and patriarchal authority. According to Reardon (2010):

patriarchy, the ways of knowing of the nearly universal system of male dominance privileges a minority of powerful men, their interest, values and perceptions over those most other men and all women, children, the aged, and for the most part anyone who does not fit the identity profile of patriarchs. Those of less social value in this order are described on the basis of their
differences from the patriarchal norm to be less intelligent, incapable of exercising power. Wise men are those best equipped to think about important issues and decide for the rest of the population. (p. 25)

Reardon describes a global structure, or at least a system present in nearly all cultures, that privileges the views and interest of elite men over those of everyone else. It excludes all who do not share the same specification of the patriarch. In this system, patriarchs are superior to all others in society, and have power to enforce their perspective over others. Their authority, domination, and control are often equated with wisdom, intelligence and even the ability to lead. Reardon (2010) suggests “contemporary forms [of patriarchy are] the continued use of and systematic threat of violence to maintain the power order” (p.14).

Patriarchy is validated through the willingness of those who benefit and those who are unaware of it to use violence as a coercive force for the will of the patriarch. The assumption about the wisdom and the ability (of men) to lead others because of patriarchy is conflated with the control and domination the patriarch exerts over others. Reardon (1991) writes that “violence …, as well as war itself, is tolerated as a means of maintaining patriarchy, inequitable privilege and hierarchical and authoritarian systems” (p. 41). Violence and inequality manifested in highly regimented and dictatorial societies are rooted in patriarchy. According to Reardon (2010):

Through the tenacity of patriarchal thinking, hierarchical arrangements of society based on race class and gender, buttressed by inequitable access to the benefits of production
based on what has become global corporate, free market capitalism, psychologically reinforced by the fear of others engendered by fundamentalist religious precepts and ultranational xenophobia, patriarchy as the basic paradigm of human institutions continues to prevail. (p. 14)

Reardon describes how patriarchy has remained a relevant structure where the roots of sexism, racism and other forms of discrimination are found. Patriarchy, as manifested in the privilege of some in the economic system is essentially discrimination characteristic, according to Reardon, of free market capitalism. Reardon locates patriarchy within the inequality of capitalism, with structural violence rooted in nationalistic exclusion that influences economic transactions. In this passage, Reardon critiques the imposition of patriarchy as a value that is pervasive in social relations, while at the same time distorting it. My view (and one I believe Reardon would share) is that the diffusion of patriarchy into society is similar to the ubiquitous nature of violence. Patriarchy constitutes many of the challenged and unchallenged values of human culture, albeit constructed and possibly waning and challenged on many fronts.

Reardon is consistent in her discussion of patriarchy, particularly the inquiry into it as a necessary part of learning to help learners analyze and understand how to respond to it. She writes:

Indeed, conscientization is in its first stages a process of conceptualization, or “naming” of the social conditions that impede or enhance human dignity, such as circumstances and indicators of oppression or justice. Concepts are the
components from which we construct the holistic frameworks used in peace education, the core ideas of the problems to be addressed and/or goals to be pursued. So, too, they figure in the pedagogies of human rights learning, and provide an instructive mode for the curricular use of the international human rights standards. (Reardon, 2010, p. 57)

Reardon is explicit about how patriarchy characterizes the social conditions as an obstacle to the dignified life that constitutes justice, and offers a critical approach to education embodied in learning about human rights. Reardon (2010) continues, “inquiring into the means to achieve the vision within a holistic framework of human rights enables the learners to hold in mind two or more possible sets of social conditions, what is and what could be” (p.69). Critical learning about human rights and patriarchy enables learners to assess injustice and move toward different social conditions.

Reardon is focused on the transformation of human thinking so that the dimensions of violence and injustice can be uncovered to empower learners to think about what is possible, rather than focus on the conditions that are present. Reardon promotes this learning in communities and through civil society as a democratic and inclusive manifestation operating not only in response to injustice, but toward a more hopeful society. The institutionalization of peace education is central in the social condition of justice for Reardon.

The material conditions of patriarchy, as the root cause of violence and injustice, are, in part, one for the reasons the work of Reardon and others in civil society who have sought to provide a way to collectively challenge the dominant order. The development
of civil society, out of its response to the problem of war, emerged in the struggle toward conditions of peace and justice. According to Reardon (2001):

There was among these movements recognition that the relations between nations needed to be ordered by institutions dedicated to these same goals. Ranges of such institutions were established such as the International Labor Organization, the League of Nations and its successor the United Nations. With the rise of global civil society, the concept of global citizenship became a practical political reality. Two cogent examples of active global citizenship are the World Order Models Project of the 1970s and The Hague Appeal for Peace Civil Society Conference of 1999. (p. 56)

Reardon describes the historical development of civil society in the International Labor Organization and the League of Nations as the beginning of an era which many at that time referred to as “global citizenship.” These organizations comprised activists, scholars, diplomats and individuals who were interested in understanding and challenging war and global injustice and working for peace and justice, and sought to develop forums and spaces to discuss engage in public democratic discourse. Many saw the UN as one of the spaces where this work could take place. The presence of these new global organizations, networks of activists, and a new wave of global thinkers signaled the value of citizens’ participation in global decision-making, or at least in making their voices heard regarding global conflict.

According to Reardon (2001):
The last decades of the twentieth century saw the emergence of global civil society as an important influence in international decision-making. Citizens from all regions of the world banded together to work in co-operation for the achievement of such common goals as environmental standards, eliminating violence against women, and the outlawing of land mines. Much of the work that convinced the United Nations to mainstream gender in its programmes and policies was done by non-governmental organizations and women’s movements which have been an energizing force in global civil society. It is in the rapidly expanding and ever stronger global civil society that the concept of world citizenship is now being realized. So evident and important has it become that students themselves are now calling for more systematic education for world citizenship. Such a call was issued by a global group of secondary-school students at a conference of international schools in October 1999 in Global Citizenship: A Draft Declaration [12]. (pp. 81-82)

Reardon describes the materialization of global civil society as an irreducible component of global cooperation, public discourse, and democratic participation in challenging and addressing urgent world matters. The term *global citizen* evolved to *world citizen*. “Global” is a reference to people from various perspectives, while “world” is inclusive of all the Earth’s people, moving toward a common goal (Reardon, 2001).
Reardon points to the collective impact of individual efforts toward issues relating to the environment, war, women, and weapons, which have had significant effects on the idea of world or global citizens that began to emerge as an important manifestation of individuals’ participation in dealing with global problems.

This movement has influenced many international instruments that are now part of international law. According to Reardon (2001):

To be a citizen gives an individual standing in a nation-state which carries legal rights and responsibilities within the state. “Citizen” also connotes being a part of a civil society in which persons also have rights and responsibilities that are social and ethical in nature. It is the fulfillment of these social and ethical rights and responsibilities that most concerns education for a culture of peace, as it is from the realm of civil society that the aspirations and actions for the transformation of the culture of war and violence come. (p. 87)

Reardon describes the conception of citizens as individuals with moral standing and worth as a result of their human dignity. Reardon posits that, within role of the citizen responsibility, this relationship of reciprocity, the access to standing and simultaneous duty to protect and respect the moral standing and rights of others is the basis of individuals’ commitment to the efforts of civil society.

Civil society, as a grassroots movement, often lobbied, protested, and worked to persuade governments to respect and protect human worth through the fulfillment of rights. This effort toward transforming public policy was not only focused on the nation-
state’s role in providing for human security, but also on assisting and working in solidarity with citizens, NGO’s and grassroots organizations to persuade citizens to support efforts and carry out projects toward greater human security.

Reardon (1993, 2001, 2010) acknowledges the role of nation states in perpetuating patriarchy through national security practices. While many nations publicly support efforts toward human rights and gender equality, their explicit financing of war is counter-productive. In this sense, civil society is often the arbiter of justice, working toward the end of patriarchal practices and gender equity.

Lastly, Reardon is concerned with the institutionalization of peace education for the transformation of human values to eliminate the violence and injustice resulting from patriarchy and for the conditions of peace and justice to be present. Reardon (1988) argues for comprehensive peace education embodying the learning and political efficacy needed to transform human thinking to establish a peaceful and just society. Reardon (1988) writes:

Comprehensive peace education connotes a generalized approach to education for global responsibility in a planetary nuclear age; it operates at all levels and in all spheres of learning, includes all fields of relevant knowledge, and is a lifelong, continuous process. Although its general purpose can be described as education for peace as a transformed global social order, the learning entailed in acquiring the skills and arts of peacemaking is far more than education about peace.

Given the breadth of the purposes of the field and the far-
reaching character of the recommended content, I would argue that comprehensive peace education should be the fundamental framework for most social learning, and certainly for all formal education. In short, the basic direction for educational development should be toward embracing the possibilities of the human transformation that is both urgently needed and possible. (p. 74)

Reardon argues that comprehensive peace education, in light of our current social conditions, which are that of a highly weaponized global order, should be institutionalized in all levels of learning. There is urgency in Reardon’s writing born out of the view that, as the phrase “planetary nuclear age” implies, human survival is on the verge of peril. Yet she is hopeful, suggesting a long-term approach that posits learning for and about peace in formal and informal modes at all levels has the possibility to transform human thinking so that behavior can be consistent with what is required for a peaceful and just world.

This education is premised upon the notion of the transformation of thinking based on the world order values, caring, and human rights learning, among others, which she proposes be institutionalized in schools, disseminated by grassroots organizations and NGO’s and supported by government agencies. Reardon (1988) points to the establishment of the U.S. Institute for Peace (USIP) and University of Peace (UPEACE) as indicators that institutionalization dedicated to such transformation is possible. Since Comprehensive Peace Education was written, many other institutions dedicated to peace and justice have emerged. Reardon’s conception of peace education, I argue, has
influenced this institutionalization. This call for institutionalization is instrumental as the content and focus of many of the initiatives she discusses is aimed at improving human well-being and eliminating war and violence.

Reardon’s view is comparable to those of Sen (2009) and Nussbaum (2006) in its support of educational development to support and maintain democratic institutions and its critique of social conditions that do not support capabilities. According to Nussbaum (2000), “even a highly developed internal capability can be thwarted by social conditions” (p.1152). In describing how the inner conditions needed for capabilities might be disrupted by the material circumstance, Nussbaum, in her discussion of women, describes the need for an approach that deals with external problems. She argues that “choice is not pure spontaneity, flourishing independently of material and social conditions” (Nussbaum, 1992, p. 227). Thus, democratic structures and processes, and the freedom of choice that should come with them, are required for the full capabilities of persons to be achieved. In this sense, patriarchy is often rooted in societies and directly influences policies and practices that prevent women and other minorities from making choices and participating in the choice of a good life of their own.

Nussbaum’s work is similar to that of Reardon in terms of the exclusion of women and the capability of freedom from harm. Nussbaum does make references to the problem of patriarchy, but does not connect it to a system to violence and injustice the way Reardon does. Like Sen, Reardon is concerned with democracy, but her expression of it is focuses on the democratic space that is made by members of civil society in the assertion of rights and dignity for all the members of our global community, which includes all persons.
These democratic assertions are a response to the social conditions of patriarchy and the violence that emerge from it. Patriarchy projects a normative view and hierarchy for race, sexual orientation, class, gender, ethnicity, religion and more. If one deviates from this norm, there are consequences. This structure of patriarchy is also reinforced by the threat of violence, which is present in the traditional view of security. The grassroots struggle composed of learners, activists, and others works to understand patriarchy and bring it to light so that it can be deconstructed through the transformation of human thinking so as to transform the current structures that propagate such violence and injustice.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, Reardon’s conception of justice is a capabilities approach whose foundation is human dignity that is based on a conception of human persons that require respect and is constituted by moral worth and value that results from their biological distinction and status of being human.

The form of justice is based on the public value of human dignity, which is universal among pluralistic groups. Human dignity is a reasonable value that guides a culture of peace and provides a space in which public discourse is possible. The orientation is a reality-based conception focused on human lives as evidenced in Reardon’s conception of positive/organic peace. The domain is a sense and the actual content of human security and capabilities, which are articulated as the capacities developed through learning in order to ensure human freedoms and well-being. The structure of justice is expressed in terms of human rights, human rights learning and
reponsibility for others. The distribution is based on the principles of fairness and adequate access, as a threshold approach that guides her theory of good. The scope of justice for Reardon is global and transpositional, suggesting that, since all persons have human dignity, they are all entitled to justice regardless of their national identities or locations.

Reardon’s conceptualization is cosmopolitan and rooted in values that emerge from human dignity. Her view posits that we are all global citizens. In the process, justice is validated through the definitional problem of peace and the critical, ethical, and contemplative forms of reflection, which guide our analysis and assessment of the principles of justice. They constitute communal learning and open discourse that are similar to open and public scrutiny. The moral resources are the capacity of care, and the responsibility that emerges from care. Because we care, we also feel responsibility to others and our resulting action is guided by the critical, ethical, and contemplative reflection that helps us in decision-making, and connects us with our human dignity and the respect of others in holistic ways. Reflection helps us become aware of deeper structures that contribute to or prevent human well-being.

The social conditions are defined by patriarchy, which creates a social order that hierarchically ranks people based on social norms. Grassroots movements, NGO’s and education disseminate peace knowledge in response to patriarchy and as a means to establish a peaceful and just world order. Peace education is oriented toward social transformation through the institutionalization of peace education at all levels. Peace education, in Reardon’s model, actualizes capabilities, providing methods, normative analysis, and a pragmatic and hopeful process for the creation of conditions of peace.
Peace education is an urgent proposition, which reveals and interprets what is present and seeks to transform it through democratic, inclusive, peaceful education.
Chapter 5 Implications and Conclusions

This study began with a discussion of peace, and the centrality of justice in that conception of peace. As such, the uncovering of Reardon’s conception of justice now informs the conception of peace and, in turn, peace education. In this final chapter, the conclusion to this dissertation, I will discuss how this understanding of justice informs peace and peace education through each dimension of justice.

General Summary

Reardon’s global conception of justice has been theorized in this dissertation as constituted by the following elements. For Reardon, peace is:

- Founded on human dignity as the moral source of justice
- A public value
- Outcome-oriented, thus focused on human lives
- Constituted by capabilities, specifically, the substantive freedoms and opportunities to do, be, and choose a life plan
- Supporting of persons caring and acting responsibly toward achieving human security and well-being
- Expressed in terms of the rights and responsibilities, which articulate the need and movement toward human security and conditions of positive peace as expressions of the demands of justice
- Global and transpositional in terms of human dignity that requires care and responsibility toward others
- Along with principles of justice, validated through learning and critical reflection
• Defined, in part, by the capacities for tolerance, acting responsibly and caring for others
• And informed by patriarchy and violence, as well as the response of civil society and grassroots struggle toward the institutionalization of peace education for social and political transformation.

Reardon’s conception of justice, which constitutes peace, is characterized by critical, public and inclusive reflection rooted in the values of well-being, freedom from violence, ecological balance and universal human dignity. From this perspective, justice comprises peace. It is an approach to justice that is compatible with Reardon’s conception of peace.

As follows, peace education, in terms of justice, is composed of the learning required for the transformation of human thinking so as to enable the development of human capacities and peaceful conditions, thereby realizing the aim of justice. Peace education represents the operationalization of a particular conception of justice, moving toward conditions of organic (positive) peace. Reardon’s conception of justice, in relationship with peace and peace education, has implications for pedagogy, educational policy and practice (at all levels), as well as politics and activism.

The capabilities approach begins with human dignity. Human dignity is an urgent matter of justice and also peace (since justice, in part, comprises peace). Reardon’s conception of justice addresses injustice as a form of harm, as a form of violence. From Reardon’s feminist analysis, the attention to violence in the pursuit of justice adds a needed focus on violence, the war system and patriarchy. Reardon’s conception of capabilities approach offers a unique conceptual tool that peace and justice educators, researchers, and activists may find useful in achieving conceptual clarity in what should
be an ongoing search for understanding about peace and justice. The understanding that justice is not violent or retributive, but peaceful and focused on human lives should guide people around the world as they struggle for human well-being. Reardon’s view attempts to help us understand that we can interpret the needs for peace and justice by learning and reflection on the human experience.

**Implications by Dimension**

The dimensions of justice provide an analysis that uncovers Reardon’s conception. Because Reardon’s conception of justice is based on her comprehension of peace, what results from each dimension in this exploration are emerging possibilities related to the current field of peace education, peace studies, and social and political activism. What follows is a summary of each dimension of justice as theorized in this dissertation of Reardon’s conception of justice accompanied by a discussion of various implications of the dimension for peace education and peace work.

**Foundation.** Specifically, the foundation of Reardon’s conception of justice is human dignity, which is based on the moral equality and equal worth that all persons have, as well as among human cultures, and the idea of ‘human persons’ that contribute to her conception of persons. The universalization of human dignity, as the foundation of justice, is needed for there to be conditions of peace. Reardon (2001) writes, “peace is a set of conditions in which diverse peoples share their common planet, cultivating mutually enhancing relationships, respecting the dignity and rights of all” (p. 32). Peace is a state or condition that is composed of justice, and both peace and justice are present
when there is respect for human dignity. Human dignity provides an ethical framework for viewing other persons in a plural society; it is the beginning of deep understanding to respect those who are different. Human dignity informs people’s views of others as urgent subjects of justice worthy of respect so much so that their well-being is forefront in our thought. Thus, we have an understanding that there are certain obligations in terms of the availability and delivery of goods, freedoms, and resources to all by virtue of human dignity and the inherent moral status that we all possess.

**Educational Implications of Human Dignity as a Foundation of Justice.** This aspect of Reardon’s conception also has direct implications on pedagogy, as human dignity is a fundamental value that underlies learning in a democratic and pluralistic society. For many who have limited experience with different cultures, this approach to education for human dignity, which informs learners of the lives of others and their lived experience, can be transformational. In the discussion of international understanding in Chapter 2, this approach to peace education was the basis of learning for students. The pedagogical process, which infuses human dignity into the all aspects of education, orients learners to the needs, views, and understanding of all people regardless of difference. Reardon’s transformational impetus is directed toward individuals’ values and behaviors, which are informed by her conception of justice in terms of the nature and content of the educational process and the expectations of institutions, political structures, and individuals. In this sense, the question that arises is, “How might educational practice and institutions be changed if they viewed all students as moral equals, with the same humanity as the children of the elite?” The outcome of the pedagogical and
curricular inclusion of human dignity as a core tenet of justice in turn relates to the possibilities for learning.

Learning and teaching, as a result of this integration, is the basis of helping future generations learn the value of human life, the resulting demands of a dignified life, and human responsibility toward others in and outside of our communities. Teachers, in this sense, may begin to value students as moral equals, acknowledging a responsibility to them and their learning. Teachers, administrators and policy makers have to view the student as an individual learner with hopes and dreams, not as a number or a widget on a production line. If teachers were viewed as valuable professionals with the ability to offer insights to and about learners, they would operate differently in the classroom. In this light, peace education offers an approach that is based on the respect for human dignity as an urgent matter of justice, necessitating the abolition of all forms of violence and injustice. Human dignity is the foundation of ethical and political education because it is central to peace and justice values. Human dignity informs human well-being and relationships of all kinds, as well as a holistic connection to the problems and possibilities of peace and justice.

At this level, Reardon’s foundation of justice informs peace and peace education in terms of describing the specific characteristics that constitute it. Reardon’s foundation guides human behavior and provides an articulation of the most basic values. I argue that human dignity should be the basis of learning at all levels. Teaching about the universality of human dignity helps learners see the humanity in others. This view of the other enables learners to understand that, although they may be different, others still
possess the same moral worth. Since respect and equity is a part of human dignity, this value guides behavior toward others.

**Form.** Human dignity, in terms of the form dimension, is a freestanding public and political value on which rational and reasonable people can agree. In my own class discussion about religious tolerance, my students and I discussed this very perspective. I asked them, assuming that we all have plural backgrounds and worldviews, what values can we, as educators at public institutions, agree on so as to not harm or exclude any learners or citizens? One of my students volunteered, "We should remove religious or non-public values from the public discussion and discourse. We can all agree that murder is wrong." The political form of Reardon’s conception of justice continues from this point, suggesting that there must be values that allow us to maintain our diverse backgrounds while deciding on public, political principles and values. Reardon offers human dignity that inspires and is the basis of human rights as such a public value.

Reardon describes how a culture of peace, as a global conception, offers an overlapping consensus where human dignity is the public value that guides the rational discourse of people of plural backgrounds, where just and peaceful principles familiar and recognizable to all can be chosen, rather than comprehensive values construed to be offensive or harmful to anyone (including women and minorities). The form of justice informs peace by distinguishing what values are appropriate and reasonable for public discourse. Reardon posits, therefore, a political form of justice.
Political Form of Justice Grounded in Feminist Critique. Reardon articulates a feminist argument concerning human dignity that posits the full (equity) equality and inclusion of women. The prominence of gender issues in Reardon’s discussion of dignity is necessary, in her view, because of the fundamental dualism of human inequality that is present in the treatment and view of women (and men). Though equal in our philosophical, ethical, and even political discourses, the real world has borne out the unequal and subordinate status of women, Reardon (1993) argues, since the emergence of war in human history. This perspective challenges the traditional liberal view of moral equality. The exclusion of women manifest in pervasive historical bias is often judged to be the nonbiased norm. Reardon’s feminist analysis illuminates the nature of patriarchy. Patriarchy operates as a global political hierarchy and set of norms that facilitates exclusion, violence, and even injustice to maintain control. Reardon’s approach argues that liberal views of equality are not equal because of wide scale violence and injustice still occurring in the face of legal, political, and ethical recognition of the moral equality and rights of all humans. Without the real life conditions that justice demands as a result of adherence to the principle of universal human dignity, such recognition is hollow, a view liberal principles echoed by Marx (2001).

Reardon’s feminist analysis is critical and it links the form of justice, in its inclusion and equitable reassessment of public values, to a perspective of peace that leads to reasonable dialogue that addresses past exclusions and seeks to rectify them.

Educational Implications of Reardon’s Political Form of Justice. A culture of peace offers a kind of overlapping consensus where human dignity is the public value
that informs a reasoned discourse by people of plural backgrounds in the choosing of just and peaceful principles familiar and recognizable to all, as opposed to comprehensive values construed to be offensive or harmful to anyone (including women and minorities).

Peace education is grounded in the open discourse that comprises learning, informing teaching that attempts to avoid ideology and posits reasonableness in learning and the development of rational actors guided by human dignity in the public sphere.

From the perspective of the feminist critique, the mainstreaming of gender sensitivity, gender justice, and gender equality in educational curriculum, pedagogy, and policy is imperative so that women and girls are treated fairly. Reardon (1993) describes how girls, under the same roofs, often receive less food than boys, are denied the same access to education as boys, and even in ‘developed nations,’ are forced into sexual slavery. Currently, around the world, such exclusion and unequal status (although changing) describes the day-to-day reality of women and girls. Reardon logically extends this inequality to other minorities in terms of their value in the face of patriarchy. Long-term privation for women and minorities suggests the need for equity, which is required for the purpose of achieving actual equality (Reardon, 2001). The need for equitable education for girls is a result of systematic exclusion and abuse informed by the separation of private and public spheres. The implication for education is that there should be more opportunities that specifically focus on achieving educational access for girls. Additionally, women who are forced into sexual slavery should not be treated as criminals, but should be recognized as the victims of criminal activity, protected and given opportunities to move out of their bondage. There should be widespread education about the plight of women, not only in ‘developing’ societies but also in the West, since
many young women throughout the US are kidnapped and tricked or forced into sexual slavery. Justice from this perspective informs peace education so that learners can view injustices against women as violent and apply this knowledge to the learning community so that these violations of justice can be avoided. As a field, peace education would benefit from a conception of justice, which comprises peace that attempts to ground itself in values that have been publicly vetted. In this way, we can avoid and respond to critiques of ideology and offer an inclusive open space.

**Orientation.** The orientation of this conception focuses on human lives. This outcome-oriented, realization-focused conception of the central aim or focus of justice is articulated in terms of Reardon’s global conception of positive peace as an umbrella term that includes efforts to end all forms of injustice and violence as well as movement toward a state in which people enjoy well-being. Justice indicates a state of positive peace. In this sense, positive peace subsumes its negative counterpart by comprehending present conditions of human lives while educating people to envision possibilities that emerge from imagination and an awareness of injustice, including possible and actual rights violations. The orientation, or the question of whether justice is focused on the quality of people’s lives, is rooted in a conception of organic (positive) peace.

**Defining Peace as a Realization-Focused Orientation of Justice.** As argued earlier, Reardon’s notion of organic peace is explicitly open, defined by an understanding of the needs and hopes of human lives. The notion of organic peace strikes a chord in about the debate over the *negative* and *positive* terminology. As Reardon (1988) and
others note, the terms are, in a sense, overly dualistic, although they may be helpful in understanding the complexity of peace. Given the emerging acceptance of peace education and the many new educational programs related to peace and justice, there is an informed contingency of people who understand the problematic nature of the negative and positive peace distinction. Should we replace the terms negative and positive with foundational and organic peace? This question, although related to the discussion of orientation, has implications for further research.

Given her realization-based focus of justice concerned with a decent quality of life for human well-being, the term organic peace best captures the meaning of peace as understood by Reardon. An adequate quality of life is necessary for human well-being. Organic peace comprises human well-being that is focused on person’s quality of life, the elimination of violence and injustice, and a vision for human flourishing. For Reardon, a decent quality of life, in accordance with human dignity, is achieved through nonviolent human relations, inclusiveness, civility, and care and concern for others, both those within and outside of one’s community, as well as the natural world. The relationships of a good quality of life help people to communally achieve well-being. All humans, by virtue of their connection to the planet, have similar needs and share a collective fate. Well-being, which is achieved through the sense of and actual human security, is constituted by basic economic needs, ecological balance, and respect of human dignity and freedom from harm.

Reardon’s conception of the state of organic peace embodies Nussbaum’s (2006, 2011) outcome-focused approach to capabilities, since the freedoms and opportunities described in her central capability list are similar, although worded differently.
Reardon’s (2001, 2002) assessments of examples of violence and injustice as a tool to learn about the conditions of human lives are analogous to Sen’s comparative assessment of people’s qualities of life, the realization of lives, and his capabilities failure (Nussbaum, 2011, pp. 19-20). There is comparative view in Reardon’s approach due to the openness of organic peace in order to foster dynamic and continuous dialogue. This view, unlike Sen and Nussbaum’s view of capabilities, also includes explicit normative critiques of violence (which violates human dignity), as a rooted in patriarchy and described through feminist analysis of the obstacles to equitable quality of life and human well-being. Reardon’s envisioning, which is rooted in human lives, the requirements for human dignity, and the normative basis for rights can be compared with Nussbaum’s list of capabilities, which we might also call “preferred futures.” In this view, Reardon’s orientation, which focuses on human lives, provides a wealth of educational possibilities rooted in Freirian critical education approaches. Snauwaert (2011) discusses Freire’s outcome-focused approach to justice. This, in part, has implications for Reardon’s conception, especially since she draws on a Freirean approach for critical reflection and education for the empowerment of students. The critical nature of the Freirean approach is related, in terms of the centrality and respect for human lives, to an organic (positive) conception of peace, which is understood as global justice. Therefore, this dimension of justice reveals that peace is focused on humans: their lives, experiences and ideas of what constitutes a good life, both as individuals and as members of a community. In this sense, and as discussed in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, Reardon’s conception of peace is related to international development. Instead of promoting development policies and actions that provide charity and often reinforce injustice and a view that the people of the
West know best, we can help to build capacity guided by the direction of local people who know what they want for their lives. Organic (positive) peace, as seen through the lens of an outcome focused approach to justice, offers an approach that is developmental of persons, since individual lives are the focus. Learners are empowered to enact the change they want and need, as opposed to Western imposition of values and well-being, insofar as the locally directed policy and action do not cause harm to anyone.

**Educational Implications of an Outcome-Focused Orientation of Justice.**

Education for a decent quality of life focuses on how people are connected, with emphasis on the importance of deep learning and inquiry into various human cultures to learn about differences and commonalities among people. Learning for organic peace includes inquiry into the obstacles of security, envisioning alternative possibilities, and developing relationships that connect human experiences with the struggle towards authentic human well-being. Within educational institutions, Reardon (2001) describes the importance of working for the assurance of the well-being of learners. So the orientation of justice, as focused on human well-being, is directly concerned with education in terms of the view that teachers should be concerned with the well-being of students (Reardon, 2001, p. 147).

This notion has several dimensions. Many students are less likely to achieve academically if they feel that their teachers do not care for them (Woolfolk, 2010, p. 75). Caring about the well-being of students means that teachers have a moral responsibility to students, thus their actions and teaching is for the purpose of student empowerment and “wide-awakeness” (Greene, 1978, p. 47). This concern for the well-being of learners
involves asymmetric responsibility that is especially relevant to the conditions in urban schooling. The material aspects of well-being must be fulfilled for learning to occur. From this understanding, the content and process of peace education is necessarily Freirean and concerned with human development of capacities that enable persons to achieve their own sense of well-being and security.

**Domain.** The content or domain of justice for Reardon involves the sense and realization of authentic human security that is actualized through capabilities required for a good life. Reardon posits that human security is an alternative to traditional models of state-centered security, focused on human well-being rather than military power. When traditional security is juxtaposed with human security and actual capabilities, it is reasonable to conclude that justice is served through the latter. This conception of justice reveals that peace consists of actual security and capabilities as well as the sense of security. In this conception, “security” for people living in conditions of privation requires an individual sense that they will have basic needs met and opportunities in order to pursue and live a good life. Human security is achieved through real opportunities, freedoms, and the fulfillment of the basic needs required to pursue one’s own life plan. Violence and injustice are the obstacles to this good life. Societies that are violent or use violence to maintain security often cause social disruption and serious harm to innocent people. The constant shelling in the Syrian suburb of Holmes does not increase the well-being or security of anyone, not even the current regime’s supporters. Although this is an extreme example of traditional state-centered security, it provides a clear illustration of how nations, rather than providing for the materials, freedoms, and opportunities for
well-being for their citizens, they use resources to protect their own existence at the peril of their citizens. They also diminish authentic security, defending their actions on the grounds of sovereignty and defense against terrorism. For me, there is no question that the US would not do the same to maintain order in the face of peaceful protests, regardless of the political party is in power. The Occupy movement has provided a case in point of the willingness of those in power to use police, violence, and often unwarranted force against citizens speaking up for basic human needs. Human security is an alternative to the nation-centered approach.

In terms of the broader capabilities discussion, Nussbaum’s (2006) list of capabilities, which constitute her domain, starts with human dignity and includes freedoms, opportunities, and the material needs that are required to plan a good life of one’s own choosing. The content of human security, for Reardon, overlaps with this list. Nussbaum (2006) also includes “freedom from harm,” which is a pivotal aspect of Reardon’s conception of human security and capabilities. For Sen (2009) and Nussbaum (2006), understanding and attention to violence is not an explicit part of their conceptions. Because they are not explicit in this view of violence, capabilities in their articulation could underlie (or be used as a justification for), as an example, a cadre of policies and actions that include war and violence, or even utilize some retributive approaches. I would argue that Nussbaum’s approach, more so than Sen’s, would not be consistent with such violence-accepting approaches because of the importance of human dignity and the capability that requires freedom from harm. However, Sen44, according

44 Gibson and Reardon (2007) criticize the Ogata-Sen Human Security Now report for the view that human security is a complement to traditional security policy rather than an alternative, also absence of a gendered perspective (p. 54).
to Reardon (2010), suggests that human security is an approach that complements traditional forms of security. Reardon’s conception of justice abhors violence. It educates learners to engage in ways to help them to understand violence and how it affects and often disrupts human security and well-being. Violence is a core part of the traditional approach to national security.

The core problematic of Reardon’s approach to justice is violence, defined as “intentional avoidable harm.” The traditional approaches to national security, as derived from realists’ views of the international realm, are grounded in patriarchal beliefs and practices that reduce human well-being. This approach considers violence as reasonable and part of the acceptable methods of dealing with conflict. Human security challenges traditional approaches to security, which is, in part, the content of justice. As a result, the content of justice for Reardon is similar to combined capabilities, since it operates as a vehicle for the achievement of the central capabilities through human security and educational development of capacities to achieve those capabilities.

**Educational Implications of the Domain of Justice.** Human security has implications for educational practice and policy. It offers a valuable subject for student learning. In many of my Social Foundations of Education courses, I offer a “global priorities” exercise and ask pre-service teachers to identify their society’s spending priorities. They can choose among a myriad of options and order them from highest to lowest amounts. Many are surprised to learn how much financial resources are used for the military. The response is often “But we need security!,” my response to which is “What is security and what makes us secure?” By problematizing the meaning of
security, we often come to alternative possibilities for security. Students learn about the policy implications of security through their juxtaposition of the resources used for the military with those allocated for education. Human security, in this sense, is presented as a set of inquiries into the current social structures. It helps students reflect on and consider alternative possibilities. As a component of peace education, authentic security and capabilities invokes a normative analysis about the use of violence as a means to solve problems, presenting real and pragmatic alternatives for learners in their considerations of what is reasonable and possible in terms of human well-being. The actual and sense of human security, as well as capabilities involve the development of capacities for their achievement. As follows, the domain of justice (in terms of peace education) suggests that education be grounded in the development of these capacities. This approach argues that education for human security and capabilities must be foundational.

**Structure.** For Reardon, the structure of justice is expressed in terms of rights and human rights learning. Human rights represent urgent ethical considerations rooted in human dignity that may not be tangible parts of the law, but which have moral force that exerts an influence on law and policymaking in many parts of the world. Human rights have evolving ethical agency because they represent the needs of human lives in terms of freedoms, opportunities, and protections. Human dignity requires that all people have, in some cases, equal (e.g., political and civil rights) and, in other cases, equitable access to rights (e.g., economic and social rights).
*Educational Implications of Reardon’s Structure of Justice.* Human rights learning (HRL) is a distinct part of Reardon’s structure of justice because it attempts to fulfill the requirement in the UDHR that rights be disseminated and understood by all people so as to make sure they are fulfilled. HRL is also active and critical since it embodies the Freirian focus on persons, empowering individuals so they feel and act out in their actions toward others the responsibilities embodied in human rights. Human rights are eminently fertile grounds for learning, policy analysis and development, activism, and grassroots struggles for peace and justice.

Reardon’s (2010) address on HRL in Puerto Rico describes how human rights embody the ethics, politics, and pedagogy of peace. While we learn, using critical and reflective thinking, our understanding is deepened through active inquiry in communities with others so that we can deepen our understanding of human needs and there obstacles. This educative process informs our politics. Human rights are the ethical values that guide our political discourse and comprise the content of our policymaking. When we protest and take action, it is done nonviolently and peacefully so that we act in ways that reinforce the dignity of others and ourselves. Human rights offer standards and frameworks for action that guide inner and outer dialogue as we plan for a peaceful and just future. The demands of justice are expressed in terms of human rights and, by logical extension, their fulfillment indicates a state of peace. Thus, peace education is composed, in part, of human rights learning in terms of underlying values, and its goal includes the ethical standards that human rights represent, which constitute the conditions of a peaceful society.
**Distribution.** The distributional principles of Reardon’s conception are fairness and adequate access to opportunities, freedoms, and goods, as the threshold for meeting human needs. Distribution, in this view, is guided by the intuitive capacity of individuals to care for the well-being of others. Through this notion of care, we recognize injustice and human need; through the application of reasoning and public scrutiny, learning in communities, and mutual respect for others as needed in civil and public dialogue, we decide on how to distribute goods (or distributional principles) for the benefit of human lives. The distributional principles recognize that all humans are entitled to an equitable share of freedoms, resources, and opportunities. Reardon describes a strong masculine bias that is inherent in values and thinking that tend to place control of resources in the hands of the elite (usually men). Wealth is concentrated in a few hands, whose goal is perpetuating their own interests rather than the good of entire communities and nations. Such distributions are unfair. The emergence and political activity of the Occupy Wall Street movement is a direct result of a view of unfair distribution of goods, freedoms and opportunities to citizens45. The nonviolent and nonhierarchical approach of the Occupy Wall Street movement offers an example of the emergence of a politics of peace to challenge unjust and unequal distributions. Fairness and adequate access to resources freedoms and opportunities constitute Reardon’s distributional principles.

*Educational Implications of Reardon’s Distributional Principles.* The implications for a pedagogy and educational practice that result from Reardon’s notions of distribution embody learning and inquiry into power, and those values inform current

---

45See [http://www.democracynow.org](http://www.democracynow.org)
views of power and alternative approaches such as caring as a way to inform how we might distribute goods justly. The development of the capacity of caring, in which we see ourselves as responsible to others, is an essential element of peace education. It deals with how teachers ought to view students in the classrooms and how policymakers should understand those whom their policy directly affects. To care about others in this way is to be concerned with the obstacles that individuals face daily. We can understand these obstacles through the inclusion of communities in the democratic processes and public dialogue, as well through preparation to do so through the critical learning comprised by HRL and peace education. The overall nature of Reardon’s conception is distributional. The discourse around the nature of peace and “social” justice most often refers to distributive justice. Reardon’s approach to peace education offers that for justice to be just, it must be informed by human dignity and thus be nonviolent. In this sense, distributions that do not take human dignity and the quality of individual lives into account are unjust.

The emergence and political activity of the Occupy Wall Street movement is a direct result of a view of unfair distribution of goods, freedoms and opportunities to citizens. The nonviolent and nonhierarchical approach of the Occupy movement offers an example of the emergence of a politics of peace to challenge unjust and unequal distributions. This conception of distributional justice imparts the notion that the value of peace is based on equitable, fair access to goods insofar as it provides human lives with real well-being. Peace education, in this sense, is focused on education so that

46See http://www.democracynow.org
individuals and communities operate with this sense of fairness in terms of what all are entitled to.

**Scope.** The scope of justice in this conception is global and transpositional since it extends to all persons as well as the natural world. Most configurations of the extent of justice are considered in terms of vicinity. Reardon’s view is relational, as she takes into account the nature and holistic connections of human dignity between persons and those they care for, the environment, community in which individuals live, and the distinction between the public and private spheres. Human dignity posits moral equality and value among all persons. Reardon’s perspective offers a cosmopolitan ethic and approach that distinguishes all persons as global citizens. Thus, we are all connected in a global community by virtue of our human dignity, and also because we choose to care for the problems and obstacles to others’ well-being. Justice, in this sense, is not confined to national boundaries, but is accorded to all people because they are human with dignity and worth, sharing the same fate as all other citizens of Earth. The transpositional nature of this theory provides that justice should be extended to all humans, non-human animals and the natural world because of their own inherent dignity and interdependence of all living species. As a result, survival and flourishing is dependent on a kind of balance only possible through a respect for the inherent dignity of the living world. Values that influence this extension of justice are the world order model values, the various aspects of human security and caring.

People choose to care for others outside of their immediate sphere of concern because they care. Justice is extended to all people for plural reasons, such as the
common experience of women, which necessitates the reconsideration of rights for
equity, the indigenous group and the general human connections to the natural world that
encompasses a great portion of human dignity for well-being, and the general
interrelationship between global problems and possibility. These connections and
conscerns for the application of justice are encouraged by activists, scholars, and members
of civil society to become the focus for government and power holders.

**Educational Implications of Reardon’s Scope.** Since these institutions and elite
power holders have been reluctant and slow to address problems and alternative futures
beyond realist positions, peace educators and others focus on development of capacities
for people to become empowered to demand and build their own peaceful and just future.
Learning how to approach problems and envision possibilities, such as the transformation
of conflict, and the fulfillment of human needs is a primary focus of peace education.
Peace educators seek to design learning so that the values informing these goals are
rooted within the structure of curriculum and the approach to pedagogy. Peace educators
work to develop networks of solidarity to support their work and help attain human
security for our colleagues and those who request assistance from around the world. We
stand in solidarity with all people who face injustice because of the intuitive notion that
“injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere”47. Beyond this intuition, justice is
validated through the cosmopolitan global discourse embodied in the communal learning
and critical reflection of Reardon’s approach to peace education. A global scope of
justice suggests, as do some other dimensions, that peace is rooted in universal respect for
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47 See MLK quote at http://www.africa.upenn.edu/Articles_Gen/Letter_Birmingham.html
human dignity that is instantiated in the development of communities that are equally concerned with all members of the global family. The value of peace, in this sense, is cosmopolitan, as is peace education, which is concerned with education for global solidarity, critical thinking and reflection, responsibility, and caring for others.

**Process.** The process of justice is based on public inquiry, learning, and scrutiny into what values constitute peace and justice. It includes the ethical, contemplative and critical reflections required to validate principles of justice. Communities learn together and reflect on the principles of justice and the problems they face to create alternative possibilities to the violence and injustice they experience. The learning that results from this critical reflection is transformational for global citizens in ways that facilitate behaviors that are conducive to nonviolent and sustainable practices and ways of being. Ethical reflection is guided by the public value of human dignity, as part of a normative analysis that looks at global problems in terms of their moral dimensions, and helps learners consider what action should be taken in the interest of peace and justice. The contemplative reflection engages learners in deepening subjects and making connections so as to see how they are connected to and responsible for others. The critical/analytical reflection in the spirit of HRL and Freire’s critical education empowers individuals to see the structures that are present and work toward possibilities that move beyond them.

**Educational Implications of Reardon’s Process of Justice.** Critical reflection has implications for educational policy and practice in terms of how students are taught. Are students educated to be critical thinkers who engage thoughtfully with the world, or are
they trained to passively accept the society as it is and reproduce the social order? This view challenges educators, policy makers, and activists to think deeply before acting, to uncover an understanding of their deeply held values for the sake of preventing harm toward those they have power over. Are our values ideological or otherwise? Encouraging deep reflection among learners sets an educational precedent that suggests a concern for students as persons who will be required to engage in the future development of our society and will be making choices in their own lives. In this context, critical reflection, learning, and democratic dialogue is a hallmark of peace. Validating the principles of justice and peace requires an educated populous with a sense of justice and peace, so that there can be reasoned scrutiny of social values and policies. From this discussion, justice reveals that peace cannot be ideological, and is inconsistent with values that are unable to be publicly scrutinized. Thus, peace education is more so about the critical process of validating principles. From her earliest articulations, Reardon’s conception of peace education has offered a critical, process-oriented perspective. In this sense, how are the “new” conceptions of “critical peace education” new, and do they even meet the criteria of “critical” in terms of this depth of reflection?

The moral resources of justice include tolerance, care, and responsibilities to others, with which capacities “to do and be” are developed so that individuals can respond to others. Learning is the primary way in which the internal capabilities are developed, but the external conditions, capabilities, basic goods, and freedoms (human security) must be present if there is the expectation of a response informed by normative social and political values. Moral resources posit the democratic values of participation and the inherent moral worth of humans as a mode of operations. Caring, often
associated with women’s ways of knowing, is viewed as a capacity that is necessary for people to connect with others. Reardon argues that caring, among other values, should equally complement masculine values. Reflection and caring are pedagogical tools that help teachers and students relate to each other. Caring is also a capacity that, if developed, relates to the attainment of capabilities, in that the one caring exercises social responsibility, helping the one cared for to achieve his or her capabilities. This is illustrated in some teacher and student relationships. A caring learning environment elicits deeper inquiry and reflection from students and teachers. The moral resources dimension of justice provides a description of what persons need to respond ethically to others. This response characterizes the social norms that would be present in a peaceful society, thus tolerance is the threshold for peace, while caring opens up individuals to be responsible to others, so as to secure human well-being. Justice, as part of peace, suggests that human flourishing is the result of the development of moral resources. School is one of the primary places in the public sphere in which citizens can develop the moral resources to respond justly to others. This is one of the primary viewpoints of peace educators: that education should work to develop critical capacities to care, act, and think responsibly, with agency and autonomy, in order to benefit the entire human community.

Moral Resources. The moral resources of justice in Reardon’s conception are tolerance, care, responsibility, and reflection, which are developed within individuals so that they have the capacity to respond to others. Without these internal capacities, there is no moral guidance in terms of what individuals should never do to others and how they
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should, in general terms, respond to others. Tolerance is the basis of a democratic society; without it, there can be no cooperation. While tolerance does not require the acceptance of a person’s lifestyle or beliefs, it requires a basic respect for the person and his or her way of life. It allows one to listen to the other, even though there may be no agreement. Tolerance is a threshold capacity that opens the way for the deeper respect involved in care and responsibility. Caring for someone involves attention to his or her well-being. Responsibility emerges from care. Often, the exercise of responsibly is the result of care. Reardon (2001) suggests that caring is a feminine capacity that men need. She suggests it contributes to gender equality by releasing women from their social roles and allowing them equal time and opportunity to participate in the public sphere.

Reflection embodies the critical capacities that provide scrutiny and reasoned oversight of the emotive aspects of this dimension. The development of the internal capacities of tolerance, care, responsibility, and reflection are developed in learners so that they have a moral compass and the critical capacities necessary to participate in a pluralistic society. Respect for human dignity is the basis of these capacities.

**Educational Implications of Moral Resources.** This dimension suggests that the focus of curriculum and pedagogy be on helping learners and citizens develop the capacities to respond to others in ethical ways. As discussed in earlier sections, human dignity is a fundamental and central component in the curriculum of peace education. Yet, the specific capacities of tolerance, care, responsibility, and reflection offer a focus on school social behavior, such as bullying, as well as politics. Our society is now attempting to deal the problem of bullying; students who are bullied are 2 to 9 times more
likely to consider suicide\(^{48}\). Due to online bullying, students have committed suicide, been forced to change schools and have resorted to violence themselves. Most bullies have been bullied. Reardon (1996) suggests that bullying is a major problem connected to other forms of discrimination and violence, such as racism and sexism (p. 3).

Education for tolerance offers the basic notions of respect, listening, and allowing others to be as they may. Often those who have non-majority identity components such as disabilities, LGBTQ status, language, or race, are targets of bullying. The need for the basic capacity of tolerance in schools and society in general is extremely great. The values that tolerance can open up learners to include caring and being responsible for other students. Through the development of moral resources, students could move beyond being bystanders, instead responding and intervening to prevent harm and advocate for others. Viewing bullying as unjust and violent is important, because it highlights the seriousness of the issue for teachers, administrators, and educational policy makers. At a global level, the U.S. has been accused of being a bully\(^ {49}\); what kind of lesson is learned from the behavior of the biggest kid on the block?

Tolerance not only addresses bullying, but other aspects of social and political discourses as well. Reardon (2010) discusses the need for tolerance, as the hallmark of civility, in a democratic society. As a result, her work over the past few years has focused, in part, on the importance of tolerance in public discourse. Education, as part of the political landscape, is missing a sense of tolerance, care, responsibility, and reflection. It may be because those making policy decision with wide ranging effects do not have the

\(^{48}\) http://www.bullyingstatistics.org/content/bullying-and-suicide.html

\(^{49}\) http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/54798/garry-wills/bully-of-the-free-world
said moral resources, and respond only to the needs of their narrow constituencies. This and the other capacities are needed for all levels of learning in the human experience.

At all levels and in all areas of society, education for the capacities of tolerance, care, responsibility, and critical reflection is imperative. Professional schools, for instance, need more than one course in business, legal, political or medical ethics. As a finance student during my undergraduate education, I was only required to take one ethics course, which was not taken seriously. All students must have education in order to develop a fundamental respect for human life and respond ethically in all of their interactions. Reflection is sorely missing from all levels of education. If critical reflection were used, maybe policy makers would see the damage of standardized testing, corporate control of schools, and the large human toll these practices take. In this sense, the human experience illuminates how critical reflections on policies and their effect on individuals, as opposed to a new policy initiatives or bottom lines, might lead to outcomes that are more humane. The questions, “Was I tolerant? Am I caring? Did I act responsibility?” are part of the reflections that all persons in society must have the ability to ask as we engage the world. Reardon’s conception of moral resources illustrates the most fundamental internal capacities that demonstrate our humanity, in terms of our connections, relationships, and actions toward others. Moral resources, in this sense, are part of the shifting of values needed for broader social transformation.

**Social Conditions.** The social conditions that make justice possible are found in the transformational impetus of peace education. Educators and learners at all levels throughout civil society enact peace education through inquiry into patriarchal structures
and systems that cause violence and injustice. Responding to patriarchy is only part of Reardon’s moral calculus; providing an alternative to the current social conditions is an equally important act. Inquiry into and learning about the obstacles to peace and justice as the basis for the formation of strategies and education to address patriarchy constitute a large part of the social conditions of justice. During the 1980’s many peace educators and members of civil society, although vigorously working to address violence and injustice, understood that there was a problem with focusing solely on the war system and the resulting violence and injustice. As a result, many in civil society began to envision and educate about developing systems and alternative possibilities that would bring about a just and peaceful world. Transformative education for peace and justice transcends violence and injustice to prepare learners for a world characterized by authentic human security, human rights, and flourishing. Based on the premise that war begins in the minds of humans, peace and justice must also begin in the same place. Thus, education is essential, as expressed in the phrase “no peace without peace education.” Similarly, as an integral component and process of peace, there can be no justice without justice education.

**Educational Implications for Social Conditions.** As a peace educator and learner, much of my education in this field has been composed of learning about the war system and injustices. To be sure, violence and injustice sparked my curiosity and has been one of the reasons I have continued this far in my work and education. My learning was also composed of thinking about the nature of rights, dignity, justice, and peace in terms of values that can guide the way our future could be. As follows, the social
conditions dimension of Reardon’s theory of justice implies that, although violence and injustice make up a large part of the response of grassroots efforts and struggle in civil society for peace, there must be envisioning for alternative conditions of peace and justice. My own courses and education have included envisioning for preferred possibilities, based on transformative social values. Curricula at all levels, and especially peace and justice related curricula must include this approach if there is to be a peace and just world. Some examples of this curriculum are conflict simulation models, which offer training in nonviolent strategies and conflict resolution to find peaceful ways of managing conflict. Reardon and her colleagues did a series of publications entitled *Crisis in World Order* and *Ways and Means* as a way of looking at past violent conflict to consider alternate approaches to deal with them. Envisioning and imaging alternative possibilities is necessary for peace education’s goal of social transformation. At the National Peace Academy Summit in 2009, a large part of the defining and establishment of this organization was centered on envisioning how it would look and operate. I was part of this process. We brainstormed at the conference and developed a framework. I was part of the peace research group that offered a positive peace research agenda. We developed a document that focused on “positive peace through inquiry into the conditions of justice and equality, environmental sustainability and cooperative interdependence through innovative research methodologies and to implement research findings through praxis.” This approach to research and envisioning illustrates the need for deep thinking and reflection about possibilities for alternative futures. It is a core component
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51 Taken from National Peace Academy Research Planning Group: Elements of a Positive Peace Research Agenda - submitted to the National Peace Academy April, 2009.
of the transformation that peace education hopes to move toward. These elements are necessary in political dialogue also. We must educate our students to be able to make convincing and well thought out arguments for the peaceful society that we imagine. This imagination is not whimsical, but is, in part, a response to the conditions of violence and injustice and is based on the ethical norms of human rights.

To conclude, Reardon’s conception of justice constitutes a capabilities approach that informs and is informed by peace and peace education. Justice and peace are dialectically connected. They are in conversation with each other. They are not necessarily the same, but have similar and overlapping components. Justice is a part of peace, but peace is incomplete without justice. What is violent may not be characterized as just. As Gandhi stated, “peace is the way.” Peace characterizes the ends and means of justice. This dissertation points out the importance of justice as an essential feature of peace and the peace education process. The processes of peace education, such as inquiry, reflection, holism, and envisioning from Reardon’s feminist analysis constitute a distinct conception of justice. Capabilities are developed through education and are a succinct way to view the rights, substantive freedoms, and opportunities that are required by dignity for a good life of one’s own choosing. Without educational attainment, individuals are less likely to achieve what they would like to in life. Without education, Black and Latino boys are more likely to be incarcerated. We can see this in the correlation between school suspensions and the involvement with the criminal justice system (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2009; Hirschfield, 2008; MacIntosh, K., Flannery, K., Sugai, G., Braun, D., and Cochrane K. 2008). The lack of capabilities, or the presence of substantive freedoms and opportunities, is related to privation, civil
unrest, and potential violence. All of the answers to the problems of violence and justice are not and cannot be answered here, but I believe that framing what justice is, within the context of peace, begins to open a discourse that empowers individuals to begin their own inquiries into justice and what peace is and is not in their own situations.

**Limitations, Implications and Further Research**

This research, although focused on the work of one of the most prolific peace educators, is limited to a conception of justice within Betty Reardon’s work only. Other peace educators’ work may not be consistent with this view, although I believe it is an important starting place for thinking about justice within the context of peace. Some implications and directions for further research include:

- What can peace education (and Reardon’s work specifically) offer to the capabilities approach and how might the discussion of violence and patriarchy and violence as intentional avoidable harm inform such discourse?
- In terms of peace education, should we be using the terms organic and foundational peace rather than positive and negative peace?
- Is critical peace education truly “critical,” since the understanding of the nature of justice, as the content of peace, is not expressed?
- How does the transformational mode of peace education inform us of the demands and duties within the capabilities?
- How does Reardon’s discussion of responsibility, as emerging from care, inform Nussbaum’s view of care in the extension of justice and reasons for justice?
How does human security inform us of the capabilities approach that comprises peace, vis-a-vis Sen’s view of human security as complementary to state security? In this sense, is Sen’s view complicit with state sponsored violence and does this affect his own capabilities discourse? How would the prominent approaches to capabilities characterize the war system and traditional security?

These questions are important because they deal with conceptual clarity in peace and justice related fields of work and study, helping us to be truly critical rather than ideological in our approaches. If we do not address negative and positive peace, do we risk a focus on a rigid and dualistic view of peace that could become as hierarchical and some traditional approaches to peace? The concepts of organic and foundational peace, while framing the conception of peace, leave the conversation open to develop according to the human experience. Do we miss out on the foundational questions, such as, “What is peace?”, as well as the other arguments that Reardon made in *Comprehensive Peace Education*? I argue that Reardon’s “comprehensive” approach was and still is very critical. Bajaj (2008) writes that there is a need “for a reclaimed ‘critical peace education’ in which attention is paid to issues of structural inequality and empirical study aimed towards local understandings of how participants can cultivate a sense of transformative agency” (p. 135). This speaks to the difference between critical and ideological education. The difference and importance of critical education is in its reflective nature, which speaks to validity and realization of human lives. Education ceases to be valid for real lives in a plural society if it is ideological. This is important, but what of the nature of justice and peace? What is the response of communities in their full awareness of structural inequality? Might it be violent? I argue that critical peace
education (except for Snauwaert’s contribution in the recent special issue on critical peace education in Journal of Peace Education) may be lacking conceptual clarity about the positive or organic dimensions of peace. In this case, do we become just as ideological as critics of the field claim us to be? Reardon’s recent work on the politics of peace and reflection addresses the problem of ideology. Reardon (2010) writes:

peace education should not be “politicized” by privileging any particular political bias or ideology. … Such political privileging - as does the shaping of curriculum to conform to particular religious beliefs - compromises the integrity of the critical inquiry which is the essence of responsible peace education (p. 14).

Reardon is arguing the importance of seeking objectivity and reasonableness among plural groups to avoid politicization. Learning might constitute understanding politics and the political realm, but a particular ideology presents the danger of indoctrination. If we accept the underlying liberal ideology without reflection and clarification, we become biased.

In general, Reardon’s approach to peace education has undergone changes as a result of her own reflection about the human condition, the nature of peace, peace education, and education in general. Her educational stance toward reflection and learning, in communities, has remained constant. As a result, much of her work reflects attempts to build, clarify and better understand the present conditions and how they inform thinking about peace education. To have a particular stance as a learner is to be engaged and mindful of the dignity of others. Some of the major shifts and evolutionary
changes in Reardon’s thinking are described in Chapter 2 and mentioned throughout this dissertation. Human rights learning, as opposed to education, is part of making understanding of human rights consistent with the dynamic lives and holistic issues they reflect. Reardon’s work in Mediating on the Barricades (2010) offers a critical perspective of the reflection necessary to avoid ideology in peace education. This constant looking back and forward is prophetic in the way Cornell West (2000) describes the “Prophetic Post-Modern thinker,” as one who continues to think and teach for the continuous development of learners.

The other questions deal with the capabilities approach and the impact of peace education. As one individuals engaged in of the newest and most important philosophical and practical approaches to justice, it is necessary that we consider violence and gender deeply, in terms of traditional security approaches and the importance of care in that approach. Peace education’s transformational impetus can inform the capabilities approach of an important kind of values education that goes beyond basic education, but should be included in it. It is not enough to say that girls’ education is a human right; we must be explicit about values in all approaches to education, especially if we wish to see a world where realization of capabilities is possible.

In this same vein, violence as intentional avoidable harm must be framed more explicitly because of the harm it inflicts. Capabilities offer an avenue for policy makers to see how the lack of substantive opportunities can have devastating effects on lives, leading some to violence and crime. We must also frame corporate environmental damage, illegal foreclosures, and immoral investment practices as not only unethical but violent as well, because they harm human well-being and are avoidable. Being explicit
about violence and peace in capabilities, in terms of these and other types of government-sanctioned violence will help clarify how this injustice causes some to act with violence against governments. The discourse of patriarchy, gender and care can also inform the capabilities approach, because although a comparative assessment may illustrate what is missing, violent conditions and structurally violent policies often further disrupt and prevent justice after conditions have been initially improved. The discourse around human security may prove illuminating the notion of care in Nussbaum’s view and the general approach to human well-being and functioning.

This dissertation offers inquiries into the nature of peace and justice that could prove useful, especially in this era of social change and mass protest. Reardon’s approach to peace education and her conception of justice offers a guide to authentic transformation embodied in person-centered, incremental and sustained steps toward a peace that values human dignity. Peace education provides the hope that by planting seeds now, real, authentic, and sustainable peaceful and just conditions are possible.
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