

CULTURE OF PEACE: THEORIZATION FROM THE HISTORICAL PARADIGM BREAK

Alex Sander Pires¹

Abstract

In the year in which the Universal Declaration of Human Rights turns 75 and the escalation of international tensions is perceived with the advance of military conflicts, we propose the study on the systematization of the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly to allow the individual to understand, logically and coherently, of the process of passing from idea to theory until one can reach the practice of living life in lasting peace, conceived by the change of social action inspired by the will of individuals to live life in peace, through cooperation, tolerance, and respect among equals, conflicts being resolved by dialogue and elements of nonviolence. This is an attempt to present the coherence of the discourse enshrined in normative instruments and the logic of the microsystem of the culture of peace within a particular phase of the whole complex system of building international peace, allowing us to perceive that peace is much more than a word opposed to war, an unattainable feeling, or the inaudible foundation of society.

Keywords

Culture of peace. Conscience. System.

Summary

Introduction. 1. Declaration of Seville on (non-)violence: the same species that are capable of inventing war, are capable of inventing peace. 2. The "new" concept of "culture of peace": from Declaration of Seville to Declaration of Yamoussoukro. 3. Declaration and Programme of Action on the Culture of Peace. 3.1 Brief normative overview of the Declaration and Programme on the Culture of Peace. 3.2 Theoretical elements of the Declaration on the Culture of Peace. Conclusion.

¹ PhD in Legal and Social Sciences, PhD in Political Science, both with post-doctoral studies in European constitutional justice and another in Human Rights. Professor at the Universidade Autónoma de Lisboa – Portugal. Researcher and Coordinator of the research group on culture of peace and democracy linked to the Centre for Research and Development in Legal Sciences - Ratio Legis, Researcher integrated in the Research Centre for Justice and Governance - JUSGOV, asxpires@gmail.com.

Introduction

In the year in which the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (A/RES/3/217-A, 10 December 1948) turns seventy-five, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in a speech to the 52nd Session of the Human Rights Council, stated that: “Human rights are not a luxury that can be left until we find a solution to the world’s other problems. They are the solution to many of the world’s other problems”².

The message contained in these brief considerations is deep and can be read as supported by an inversion of the actuarial paradigm of the international system itself of (the search for) permanent and lasting peace, in which the historical moment, by repeatedly registering military, political, social and economic crises, requires a (new and constant) pact for human rights that reaffirms provisions and strengthens propositions; which, for the Secretary-General, presupposes the establishment of a "new Agenda for Peace", whose objective is the prevention of conflicts and crises of all kinds.

The current discourse on the commemoration of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, illustrated by the synthesis of the contemporary phenomenon of the need to advance in the construction of the international system of (permanent and lasting) peace, in the context of the commitment to scientific integrity that allows a stable, coherent and logical theory of peace that can be transposed to the practical reality of the various historical moments, justifies the present study on the systematisation of the culture of peace so that it can be read in theory and, from then on, adapted to

² Address: <https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/sg/speeches/2023-02-27/un-secretary-generals-remarks-the-52nd-session-of-the-human-rights-council>; last access: 03.06.2023.

the various moments of formation of consciousness for a life in peace and no-violence, for all.

At first, when we talk about a culture of peace, we usually think of a movement that belongs to the world of ideas and creates the collective imagination, but, in one or another perception, there is a feeling of something desired, but impossible to achieve. This study refutes this perception!

In fact, the idea is to start from a phenomenon (dual opposition between war and peace) in order to arrive, in view of the historical elements recognised and integrated into the reality of the United Nations (historical facts that help in the understanding of political, social, economic, military and legal phenomena, from the 1940s to the present day, which have importance for the standardisation, especially in terms of resolutions, of the United Nations General Assembly), the organisation of a system that develops in theory and is increasingly integrated into practice (given the breadth of the subject, the intention here is to recognise the reversal of the United Nations actuarial paradigm in the face of the General Assembly's standardisation between the movement to establish the International Year of Peace³ and the declaration on the culture of peace), as an effective contribution to strengthening the culture of peace in theoretically justified action.

³ In the field of A/RES/36/67, 30 November 1981 (International Year of Peace and International Day of Peace), drawn up on the basis of the conclusions of the Sixth Triennial Conference of the International Association of University Presidents (28 June 1981), based on the movement to strengthen the United Nations University (A/RES/27/2951, 11 December 1972) and the University for Peace (A/RES/35/55, 5 December 1980) and justified by the proposition that education is a fundamental pillar for achieving peace, which was accepted by the international community in A/36/197, 17 August 1981.

From the outset, it is recognised that the breadth of the subject and the polysemy of historical elements impose, on the one hand, the restriction of the analysis; and, on the other, the meaning of historical elements. Thus, in both cases, the idea is to start from a double perception: the phenomenological one, justified by the logical and coherent observation of an idea that allowed the formation of a feeling; and the empirical one, by which it is recognised that history is cyclical, at least in terms of the relationship between war and peace in the face of the fear of violence that leads to the extinction of human beings.

The phenomenological perception of the idea of a (new) human rights pact is reminiscent of the movement of the 1980s, in which, although the issue was imminent and urgent, there was no logical, coherent and scientifically appropriate concept of peace; on the contrary, what was seen was the realization (reality of international tension generally resolved by force in the face of the insufficiency of international instruments — mainly legal — to contain conflicts, together with the increasingly rapid development of the arms industry and war technology, which led to the conclusion that we were close to a war of annihilation), illustrated by an idea (inversion of the paradigm of protection from States to individuals, so that freedom would only be possible if all human beings were equal in the condition of living beings of the same species, but different in their particularities) and inspired by a feeling (formation of awareness of a full life without violence, conflicts and wars, with guaranteed access to primary social goods).

Moreover, the empirical perception is based on the observation that history is cyclical and repetitive, at least between the years 1940, 1980 and 2020: the establishment of the United Nations (1940s) was aimed at guaranteeing international peace and security,

the objective of which was to protect humankind from war of annihilation and immanent threats, a movement made possible by the awareness of the rapprochement between peoples and the legal duty imposed on States, with the necessary development of human rights and international law (the individual, beyond nationality and citizenship, was thrown into the center of international political debate).

So, in the 40th session of the General Assembly (1980s), the debate on the risk of war of annihilation of human beings was renewed, now weighted in another environment, as was the development of the United Nations system built on universal values in the face of the impact of interesting principles, both fundamental (freedom, equality, justice, development, dialogue, respect among equals, cooperation, etc.) as well as international ones (sovereignty and self-determination of peoples); and now⁴, in the 77th session (2020s), the fear of war with harmful effects for humanity still persists, but on a very different reading of peace.

Talking about peace in the current context of the United Nations means, as said, going back to the origins of the phenomenon of war of annihilation and the increase of other practices of violence and aggression, but in the perspective of the development of the peace system, largely from the movement instituted on the culture of peace.

Thus, one could analyze the change in the disarmament paradigm from the interpretation of the United Nations Charter from the perspective of international security in the search for peace, through the study on disarmament and other issues contained in A/RES/36/97, 9 December 1981, to the extensive disarmament

⁴ This study was closed in May 2023.

agenda planned for the 77th session (from the disarmament programme — A/RES/77/87, 7 December 2022 — to nuclear disarmament — A/RES/77/65, 7 December 2022); or, the rapprochement between peace and human rights, which can be read from various perspectives, by now musting be limited to the thematic axis of "peace as a vital requirement for the full enjoyment of human rights for all", from A/RES/58/192, 22 December 2003, to A/RES/77/216, 15 December 2022.

If there are several possibilities in view of the extensive panorama of the study of peace in the context of the culture of peace centered on the practical performance of the United Nations General Assembly, and delimited what is not intended to be investigated, on this occasion; what can the reader expect from now on?

In view of the methodological and temporal limits imposed on this analysis, the intention is restricted to the United Nations peace system in the face of the microsystem of culture of peace conceived from the results and feelings achieved since the realization of the International Year of Peace until the development of the experience that led to the declaration on the culture of peace, dedicated to reflection on a peace system that intended - perhaps still intends - to stop being utopian and theoretical to constitute itself as real and practical; and, furthermore, to present the systematisation that allows a linear, rational and comprehensible reading of peace, so that it is neither a word without purpose, nor a value opposed to war, nor an empty promise, given the logical line of the resolutions as approved by the United Nations General Assembly.

The methodological delimitation makes it possible to determine that the major claim is to propose a logical reading behind the discourse theory, based on the coherence of the argumentation, from the paradigm shift by scientific values to the theorising that,

stabilizing the system, can welcome the elements that stimulate its development, adapting to contemporary social, economic and political changes. To this end, it should be reiterated that this research focused in the research, ordering and sequencing of the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly, focusing on the phenomenon of the change in the actuarial paradigm between the theoretical and practical readings of peace for the recognition and development of a consciousness for peace, i.e. the period between the debates on the International Year of Peace (shown in Diagram 1, Annex 1) and the design of the culture of peace microsystem (shown in Diagram 2, Annex 1).

Therefore, considering the methodological delimitation, it is not possible to analyse, but to recognise the importance of the movement initiated in 1981 (A/RES/36/67 justified in A/36/197), the results of which were presented in 1987 (A/RES/42/13 justified in A/42/487, A/42/487 add.1, and A/42/487 corr.2), i.e. the proposal, integration, reflection, programming, action, realisation and sequencing of what was called the "international year of peace" are incorporated into this study⁵.

The importance of this phase is characterised by the paradigm shift that, involving the international community at the level of governments and civil society in the possible reading between States and peoples, materialised positive, organised and coordinated actions that, in addition to initiating the movement of forming awareness for peace that would allow peaceful social coexistence, also brought the hope of building a new era — from the 21st century onwards — based

⁵ It is suggested to read diagram 1, presented in Annex 1, at the end.

on this peaceful social coexistence in which theory would guarantee peace as the primary purpose of the United Nations.

Once the collective feeling had been built, the seed of the search for awareness had been planted, and the practical possibility of achieving by positive actions the path to life in peace, as perceived by the movement born with the international year of peace, had been demonstrated, it was necessary to initiate a new programme which, following the results obtained since the declaration, the proclamation and the programme of the international year of peace, would follow the practical path and not be lost in inaction, omission or return to the world of (good) ideas.

1. Declaration of Seville on (non-)violence: the same species that are capable of inventing war, are capable of inventing peace

From the conception to the implementation of the International Year of Peace, numerous activities, official and unofficial, governmental and non-governmental, were inspired and justified by the declaration, promulgation and programme of the International Year of Peace; each one, although important for thinking and acting for peace, was linked to different elements, variants and perspectives, among which can be highlighted the reflections on non-violence in the search for peace.

Having narrowed down the topic, the problem was soon defined: is violence (especially that which legitimises the discourse of war) an intrinsic characteristic of human beings? Would we be born with the innate, genetic, biological will, or any other element of propensity to the act of violence? Definida a problemática e no âmbito da A/RES/40/3, de 24 de outubro de 1985 (Proclamação do ano internacional da paz) e da A/RES/40/10, de 11 de novembro de 1985

(Programa do ano internacional da paz), reuniu-se na Universidade de Sevilha um grupo de trabalho formado por vinte especialistas⁶ das mais diferentes áreas⁷ e com o apoio das Nações Unidas para refletir sobre a relação entre os indivíduos e a violência (especialmente a guerra), cujo resultado foi a publicação da “Declaração de Sevilha sobre a Violência”, em 16 de maio de 1986.

Anticipating and converging the reading of the conclusion to the present analysis, four elements are perceived: a) point of rupture with the paradigm of violence (“We conclude that biology does not condemn humanity to war, and that humanity can be freed from the bondage of biological pessimism and empowered with confidence to undertake the transformative tasks needed in this International Year of Peace and in the years to come”⁸); b) the need for peace awareness training (“Although these tasks are mainly institutional and collective, they also rest upon the consciousness of individual participants for whom pessimism and optimism are crucial factors”⁹), c) construction of the new premise (“Just as ‘wars begin in the minds of men’, peace also begins in our minds. The same species who invented war is

⁶ David Adams (E.U.A.), S. A. Barnett (Austrália), N. P. Bechtereva (U.R.S.S.), Bonnie Frank Carter (E.U.A.), José M. Rodríguez Delgado (Espanha), José Luis Díaz (México), Andrzej Elias (Polônia), Santiago Genovés (México), Benson E. Ginsburg (E.U.A.), Jo Groebel (Alemanha), Samir-Kumar Ghosh (Índia), Robert Hinde (Reino Unido), Richard E. Leakey (Quênia), Taha M. Malasi (Kuwait), J. Martin Ramírez (Espanha), Federico Mayor Zaragoza (Espanha), Diana L. Mendoza (Espanha), Ashis Nandy (Índia), John Paul Scott (E.U.A.), e Riitta Wahlstrom (Finlândia)

⁷ Psicologia, Etologia, Neurofisiologia, Psicologia das Diferenças Individuais, Antropologia Biológica, Genética do Comportamento, Psicologia Social, Sociologia, Comportamento Animal, Antropologia Física, Psiquiatria, Psicobiologia, Bioquímica, Psicologia Política, e Comportamento Animal.

⁸ Addams, 1990, p. 1168.

⁹ Idem.

capable of inventing peace”¹⁰); and, d) a proactive call to action (“The responsibility lies with each of us”¹¹).

The conclusion presupposes the understanding of five propositions dedicated to presenting scientifically proven logic and, at the same time, dispelling related myths, all starting with the same expression: “*it is scientifically incorrect to say that*”. Therefore, “it is scientifically incorrect to say that” (a) we inherited from our animal ancestors a tendency towards war; b) war or any other violent behaviour is genetically programmed into our human nature; c) in the course of human evolution, there has been a selection for aggressive behaviour more than for other types of behaviour; d) humans have a “violent brain”; and, e) war is caused by “instinct” or by any irrational motivation.

The first proposition is not scientifically verifiable because other animal species do not use tools as weapons, and are predators, in most cases, to feed themselves while essential for their own subsistence¹². Therefore, “Warfare is a peculiarly human phenomenon and does not occur in other animals” (Addams, 1990, p. 1167); moreover, the radical change in the characteristics of warfare indicates that it is a culture favoured by the means of developing and

¹⁰ Ibidem.

¹¹ Ibidem.

¹² UNESCO published a booklet in 1991 to clarify the issue and provide didactic material built on the scientific elements contained in the Declaration of Seville on (non-)violence by pointing out: “It is scientifically incorrect when people say that war cannot be ended because animals make war and because people are like animals. First, it is not true because animals do not make war. Second, it is not true because we are not just like animals. Unlike animals, we have human culture that we can change. A culture that has war in one century may change and live at peace with their neighbors in another century” (UNESCO, 1991, p. 10).

transferring knowledge, such as language, group coordination, the use of tools and the transmission of technology. Finally, although war is biologically possible, it is avoidable, for "there are cultures that have not engaged in war for centuries, and there are cultures which have engaged in war frequently at some times and not at others" (Addams, 1990, p. 1167).

Regarding the genetic predisposition to violence and war, as the second proposition, there is no evidence, except for rare pathologies, to justify this propensity. On the contrary, although genes are related to the entire nervous system, they can only be analysed at the level of potential development in the face of the variants brought by the ecological and social environments; therefore, although genes are involved in the endowment of human behavioural capacities, they represent an element to be added to others, far from being the only components of human personality formation (Addams, 1990, p. 1167), that is, "It is true that the genes that are transmitted in egg and sperm from parents to children influence the way we act. But it is also true that we are influenced by the culture in which we grow up and that we can take responsibility for our own actions" (UNESCO, 1991, p. 10).

The third proposition linked to the idea of a natural selection in favour of the behaviour of species dedicated to violence and war in which the strongest impose, most often by violence their will on others, is not demonstrable; what scientific studies confirm is that "status within the group is achieved by the ability to cooperate and to fulfill social functions relevant to the structure of that group. "Dominance" involves social bondings and affiliations; it is not simply a matter of the possession and use of superior physical power, although it does involve aggressive behaviors" (Addams, 1990, p. 1167).

Furthermore, there is no scientific evidence that human beings have a "violent brain"¹³, as stated in the fourth proposition. In fact, although the neural apparatus can react violently, it is not automatically activated by stimuli, internal or external; therefore, the form "How we act is shaped by how we have been conditioned and socialized. There is nothing in our neurophysiology that compels us to react violently" (Addams, 1991, p. 1168).

Finally, the most inaccurate element of analysis seems to have been instinct, or rather war being caused by instinct: firstly, because the existence of instinct is no longer accepted with such certainty as a justification for social action among human beings, because no behaviour would be so decisive that it could not be changed by learning and training; secondly, it is obvious that individuals act on their emotions and motivations (e.g. fear, anger, sex, hunger, etc.), but everyone is responsible for their behaviour; and, third, that in modern wars, one rarely acts out of emotion, decisions and actions are often based on training: for the combatants the tactics and techniques of combat, and for the people the support for war, but all with the same discourse of hatred and fear of - and for - the enemy (UNESCO, 1991, p. 11).

After overcoming the five propositions, it was clear that biology did not - and does not - condemn humanity to war; therefore, the time had come for liberation from the bondage of biological pessimism, through a change in social behaviour that involved everyone, in the public and private environment, at the individual and

¹³ The brain is a part of the body, as are the hands and legs. They can therefore act as affectionate as they can act violent, depending on the command given by the individual (UNESCO, 1991, p. 11).

collective levels¹⁴. The change in social behaviour would involve the formation of a conscience for peace, the first consideration of which should be: “just as ‘wars begin in the minds of men’, peace also begins in our minds. The same species who invented war is capable of inventing peace. The responsibility lies with each of us” (Addams, 1990, p. 1168).

2. The "new" concept of "culture of peace": from Declaration of Seville to Declaration of Yamoussoukro

The book "UNESCO and a Culture of Peace: promoting a global movement" (1995, p. 18); and, later, the brochure "UNESCO: mainstreaming the culture of peace", published in 2002 to publicise the period between 2001 and 2010 as the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence for the Children of the World (2002, p. 2), suggest that the concept of "culture of peace" was reframed from the International Congress held in Côte d'Ivoire between 26 June and 1 July 1989, called "Peace in the Minds of the Men".

In a broader reading, however, it must be admitted that the "new" concept of a culture of peace has been developing in the course of human history, accelerated by the proclamation of 1986 as the International Year of Peace (A/RES/40/3), with the practical scope

¹⁴ In order to make the information more accessible and less technical, several texts on the Declaration of Seville have been published, many on the initiative of professional and scientific institutions and organisations, including UNESCO. In view of this initiative, it was considered important to present the table in Annex 2, on the main considerations of the said Declaration as a mark of ratification of the content, as well as confirmation of contribution to the international year of peace.

given to it by the international programme (A/RES/40/10), as well as the need to renew the reading that would ensure the passage from theory to practice of the structuring precepts of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), with adherence both in the preamble ("wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be built") and in the elevation of peace to the status of purpose (Constitution of UNESCO, Article 1. 1).

Starting from the idea that peace is much more than a simple opposition to war or any other form of violence, and that it has no scientific proof of being biologically imposed on human beings, as the Declaration of Seville concluded, it was possible to build numerous reflections that allowed the theorisation of the culture of peace, now on values and scientific elements that would justify overcoming the immemorial collective thought justified in the Roman principle of *Si vis pacem para bellum* (if you want peace, prepare for war), whereby war would be an institution based on the culture of war that would present itself as an iceberg: it is always there, but you cannot always see its full extent, or rather, most of the time you cannot even see any of its parts.

In these terms, what is perceived is the gradual overcoming of the paradigm in which the idea of societies living in a culture of war based on institutionalised violence would be replaced by the feeling of the possible — and necessary — establishment of a culture of peace.

The conception would start from the proposition that violence and war are not biological elements; therefore, there would be no scientific confirmation that individuals are born predisposed to violence — and therefore war —. Thus, peace would be much more than just the absence of war, and individuals would be susceptible to what happens to them in the surrounding socioeconomic

environment, so that peace should replace war in human minds, assuming its role as the foundation for human relations in collectivity (from the closest to the most distant, from the local to the international).

Thus, between the International Year of Peace (1986) and the International Congress on Peace in the Minds of Men held in Côte d'Ivoire (1989), the new paradigm was strengthened, largely due to the events that took place in this period, as can be seen in the various resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly between the 42nd and 48th Sessions, as well as in literary production.

Specifically in literary production, the book "Cultura de Paz", published in October 1986, on the initiative of the *Comisión Nacional Permanente de Educación para la Paz de Perú*, chaired by Felipe MacGregor, draws attention. In the introduction, we read the objective proposal for reflection on the violent social reality that affects everyone and the need to create a project for peace based on education, dedicating itself, in the conclusions, to the construction of a culture of peace¹⁵ (Comisión Nacional, 1986, p. 14).

¹⁵ “La cultura de paz alude al fomento de valores, actitudes, comportamientos y estilos de vida que refuerzan la no violencia y condenan todo tipo de conflicto, considerando como sus *desiderata*: el respeto de los derechos y las libertades fundamentales de la persona. (...) Como lo puntualizara muy bien Guzmán-Barrón (2004), la tesis predominante en la conciencia común de la gente era que la paz consistía en la ausencia de guerra; un concepto pasivo, una ausencia, una definición por la vía negativa. Frente a ella el P. MacGregor insistió permanentemente en que la paz era una situación en la que el ser humano estaba libre de violencias, de manera que quedaba en condiciones adecuadas para desarrollarse en todos los sentidos de la palabra. Para lograr la paz había que borrar de la tierra no solo la guerra, sino también todas las otras violencias que disminuyen la capacidad de realización personal: desde la violencia delictiva directa hasta formas sutiles de violencia estructural como la discriminación racial y la propia pobreza. Puede verse que construir la paz no era, de esta manera, una tarea sencilla” (Riera & way, 2005, p. 15).

The objective reflection starts from the conflict, passing through the analysis of violence, until reaching peace in the field of justice, freedom, human rights, environmental awareness and the duty to promote peaceful action in society, with truth and dialogue as the paths, and both must be built and taught by the values of education. After all, we are talking about a dynamic peace, which seeks a non-violent but fair solution to conflicts, and which guarantees a balance in social interactions, allowing harmonious coexistence between individuals, that is, peace as a good for society¹⁶ (Comisión Nacional, 1986, p. 56).

Still in the context of stimulating reflection on peace and the instruments for its realisation made possible by the International Year of Peace, from the Declaration of Seville on (non-) Violence to the public-educational experience of the initiative of the *Comisión Nacional Permanente de la Educación para la Paz de Perú*, chaired by Felipe MacGregor, which marked the limits of what would come to be conceived as a culture of peace, the International Congress was held in Yamoussoukro with the theme of peace in the minds of men.

The idea of the Congress was presented by the Director-General of UNESCO in 1987 as a means of reaffirming, in the light of the results of the programme of the International Year of Peace, the Organization's objective of building peace in the light of its Constitution and the measures to be taken to achieve this end, with the broad debate on the sensitive issues of the environment and development, which motivated the selection of two topics: peace

¹⁶ “hay violência cuando no hay paz. No hay paz cuando em la vida social hay injusticia y ausência de libertad. Para que exista el mencionado equilibrio, en el dinamismo de la vida, debe estar fundado em la justicia y la libertad” (Comisión Nacional, 1986, p. 56).

among men; and, peace in the context of relations between humanity and the quality environment.

In the first topic, the Declaration of Seville on (non-)Violence was presented, having received partial resistance regarding the imprecision of the concept of violence and its variants, while recognising the importance of studying it in order to weaken the myth that violence is immanent to human beings.

In proposition, it was suggested: a) to deepen the study in order to clearly and precisely determine the meaning of violence, especially when it constitutes the idea of resistance as a reaction to unjust aggression; b) further study of the elements that, together with the biological question restricted to genetics, would form the causes of violence (e.g. resistance to cultural differences, fear of foreigners, dependence, hunger, poverty, underdevelopment, etc.); and c) the extension of the argument for scientists to devote themselves only to research and investigations in favour of peace, as opposed to those contrary to it.

The debate led to the question: what is the concept of violence? In view of the impossibility of determining a singular concept, it was preferred to present reasons that would allow reflection and, consequently, progress in the issue of understanding the study behind the Seville Declaration on Violence, especially its delimitation limited to analysing whether violence and war would be scientifically proven to be of a biological nature, that is, whether violence would be immanent to the human being.

Ending the debate, the opening notes to the Declaration that make up the Final Report of the Congress summarise: the idea that all violence must be combated is rejected (para. 16); considers that every insurrection against oppression and injustice is not only legitimate, but a fundamental reality (para. 17); it is recognised that violence is often

the last resort used by people, so that intermediate causes¹⁷ must be eliminated before the phenomenon of violence arrives (para. 18); it was recognised that the Declaration of Seville on Violence was faithful to its proposal to demonstrate that violence is not a biological factor, but exists and is related to other factors, such as social and environmental ones (para. 19); it is considered that human beings are not predisposed to violence, and it is important to dispel the myth and its arguments, i.e. to put an end to the culture of war and encourage permanent peace, both through peace education and culture (para. 20); reaffirms the need to investigate specific biological issues in relation to violence, such as the mental capacity for discernment for those who are starving (para. 21); realise that violence and war may be based on irrational factors, but modern acts of violence and aggression clearly involve the use of acquired social skills and rational considerations (para. 22); encourages that the analysis of violence should be taken into the cultural field, so that the economic, social and cultural causes can be tackled and violence between human beings avoided (para. 23); international law must be strengthened (para. 24); and, scientists must carry out their research and investigations making good use of peace, especially for the end of war, because there is no freedom without responsibility (para. 25).

A second theme, still within the first topic, analyses MacGregor and Seidel's proposal focused on preparing societies to live in peace, returning the discussion to A/RES/33/73, 15 December 1978 (Declaration of Societies for Living in Peace), from where the question was soon settled: what is peace?

¹⁷ We need to be aware of all kinds of exploitation, revisiting urbanisation models, eliminating the nuclear structure for causing fear-based inequality on a global scale.

The answer could not - and, unfortunately, still cannot - be direct and punctual. On the contrary, it should represent a stimulus and a challenge to reflect prospectively on the various dimensions, manifestations and perspectives. Therefore, the issue has been divided into three parts (theoretical construction, political dimension and economic bias linked to development in the service of peace), with paragraph 28 of part I being the most relevant¹⁸: a) what peace is not (mere silence of weapons, simple lack of war, brief interval between conflicts, an empty concept, and ancient utopia); b) what peace should be (the highest aspiration of being, the supreme intellectual ideal, and the dominant moral force of modern civilization); and, c) what is meant by peace (to be the basis for the active morality of society, to be the justification for intellectual solidarity, to be the foundation for a new international order that is fairer and better adapted to human progress, and to overcome its worst enemy, which is injustice).

Conceptualising a culture of peace is as difficult as conceptualising peace. However, in Part III on the instruments of peace, the desire to create a culture of peace based on dialogue, participation and trust, replacing the authoritarian and hierarchical culture that governs human relations, is noted (III, para. 4); a culture of respect for pluralism and cultural and behavioural diversity, one which advocates sharing, mediation, dialogue, participation and recognition of others, even an enemy, as equals in right and dignity — in short, real socialization through peace” (UNESCO, 1992, p. 34).

Among the various elements, dialogue, as a democratic duty, was elevated to the universal foundation of peace. Since then, the idea has been to bring the culture of peace and the culture of dialogue

¹⁸ See Annex 3.

closer together, so that it favours logical-rational negotiation at all levels (from east to west, from north to south, between rulers and ruled, between communities and social groups, between religions and spiritual movements, between parents and children, between teachers and students, etc.), and facilitates the understanding of each other's values and aspirations, identifying and solving problems, as well as enabling the discovery of new behavioural norms and ethical rules.

These being the structuring lines of the Yamoussoukro Declaration, the official text soon reaffirmed, in item I, peace as: a) respect for life; b) humanity's most precious asset; c) going beyond the end of armed conflict; d) a way of behaviour; e) deep commitment to the principles of freedom, justice, equality and solidarity among human beings; and, f) a harmonious partnership between humanity and the environment.

To this end, the programme for peace (item II) was defined along four axes: a new vision centred on the culture of peace (at that time called "peace culture") based on the universal values of respect for life, freedom, justice, solidarity, tolerance, human rights, and gender equality; a sense of having a common destiny for humanity that welcomes the implementation of just policies and respect for nature; a link between peace, human rights and education; and the construction of a collective, public and international awareness of environmental responsibility.

3. Declaration and Programme of Action on the Culture of Peace

After the term "peace culture" was proposed in the Declaration of Yamoussoukro in 1989 and the limits of the programme for peace were determined, UNESCO resumed its difficult task of establishing the practical elements together with the development of theory,

which, a decade later, on 19 September 1999, was made possible by A/RES/53/243 (Declaration and Programme of Action on the Culture of Peace).

This decade was symbolic, not only because of the expectation of the passage into the 21st century, but also because it historically registered the fall of the Berlin Wall together with the extinction of the "Soviet Union" and the supposed end of the tensions immanent to the Cold War: theoretically, the non-polarised global world was born on two axes (East-West, East-West), ready to serve peace, was it? Certainly, what we saw was that the change of times imposed on the United Nations an arduous and intense work, represented by actions and programmes that, directly or indirectly, reported to peace in the face of the new challenge of changing the collective feeling to refute the culture of war and welcome the culture of peace.

Education and democracy should come together to ensure a world of justice, freedom and equality, listening to the precepts of peace. This expectation would be made possible by respect among the equals, understanding, tolerance and dialogue, so that everyone, women and men, children and adults, young and old, regardless of their nationality or citizenship, could enjoy a world of sustainable development guaranteed by international law and human rights.

We realise that numerous paths can be taken from this conception. However, considering the methodological limitations of this research, we must go directly to the dynamics of the culture of peace within the limits of A/RES/53/243¹⁹. In this regard, we will

¹⁹ It is important to note the beginning of the proposal with A/RES/50/173, 22 December 1995 (United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education: Towards a culture of peace); moving on to A/RES/51/101, 12 December 1996 (Culture of Peace), especially the call in Article 3 for the promotion of a culture of peace; moving on to A/RES/52/13, 20

begin with a brief historical overview in order to systematise the elements that will allow us to propose a theory of the culture of peace that will legitimise and guide its practice.

3.1 Brief normative overview of the Declaration and Programme on the Culture of Peace

A strict reading of A/RES/53/243, dated 19 September 1999, reveals that the document is divided into two parts, one devoted to the Declaration on the Culture of Peace (part A) and the other to the Programme of Action on the Culture of Peace (part B). Both, in terms of normative digression, refer to A/RES/52/15, 20 November 1997, on the proclamation of the year 2000 as the international year of the culture of peace, and A/RES/53/25, 10 November 1998, on the international decade for the culture of peace and non-violence for the children of the world (2001-2010).

A/RES/52/15, 20 November 1997, in proclaiming 2000 as the international year of the culture of peace, invoked Economic and Social Council resolution 1997/47, 22 July 1997 (E/RES/1997/47), which, in addition to recommending the proclamation to the General Assembly, suggested that it do so on the occasion of its 52nd session, as a record of the passage into the 21st century (article 1), with a focus on respect for cultural diversity and the promotion of tolerance,

November 1997, which, following the previous intention (Article 2), took an important step in calling for the development of a draft declaration on the culture of peace that would include the historical basis, its meaning accompanied by the definition, before indicating the major fields and main actors for its promotion (Article 3, a), passing through the elements for the programme of action with emphasis on objectives, strategies and concrete actions (Article 3, b).

solidarity, cooperation, dialogue and reconciliation, at the national and international levels (article 2). It also recommended that UNESCO be responsible for coordinating the Programme and its activities (Article 3).

As justification²⁰, it noted the increase in conflicts in various parts of the world, recalling the need to emphasise and disseminate the fundamentals of the culture of peace, together with development that could lead through education, science and communication, to respect for human rights and the promotion of democracy, tolerance, dialogue, reconciliation and solidarity, as well as to international cooperation and economic development, on the road to sustainable human development.

A/RES/53/25, 10 November 1998, while renewing the idea of replacing the culture of war with the culture of peace, extended the proposition to moving from violence to non-violence, at all stages of life (from newborns to the elderly) and for all human beings without distinction; and, welcoming the movement initiated by UNESCO under the support of the Commission on Human Rights²¹, recognised that the action plan should provide for transdisciplinary analysis on peace.

²⁰ Although it speaks of a theoretical justification, it must be said that this resolution is justified in normative terms, mainly in A/RES/50/173, 22 December 1995, on the United Nations Decade of Human Rights Education Towards a Culture of Peace, based on tolerance (see A/RES/48/126 of 20 December 1993 and A/RES/49/213, 23 December 1994, on the United Nations Year for Tolerance) and human rights education (A/RES/49/184, 23 December 1994).

²¹ Cf. A/51/395, Annex, 23 September 1996; A/52/191, 5 August 1997; A/49/261 add.1, 14 November 1994; E/1994/110 add.1, 14 November 1994; and, Commission on Human Rights resolution 1998/54, 17 April 1998).

3.2 Theoretical elements of the Declaration on the Culture of Peace

Reading the resolution from a positive and transdisciplinary perspective challenges numerous possibilities, especially when the analysis takes place more than two decades after the approval of the Declaration, given the strengthening of the idea of constituting a right to peace²² and the realisation of transposing peace from the international to the internal domains of States, transforming it into a theoretical practice accepted by constitutional hermeneutics²³.

The intention is to present the Declaration on the Culture of Peace, in light of the historical element recognised in the normative acts approved by the General Assembly, according to logical-descriptive convergence that allows for coherence, perception, and practical fulfilment. Therefore, specifically in the context of the Declaration, inspired and enabled by the end of the Cold War, three premises are recognised: the first, wars are born in the minds of human beings, so that it is there that peace must be strengthened (a premise previously stated in the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization); the second, the perception that peace, more than the simple absence of conflict, requires a positive, dynamic and participatory process of promoting dialogue in order to seek a negotiated solution in a spirit of understanding and cooperation of all actors; and, the third, the

²² Despite the complexity and length of the subject, the Declaration on the Right to Peace (A/RES/71/189, 19 December 2016) is worth mentioning.

²³ Among several possibilities, the teleological analysis of the thematic axis of "promoting peace as a vital requirement for the full enjoyment of human rights for all", given the various reformulations since A/RES/58/192, 22 December 2003 to A/RES/77/216, 15 December 2022.

concrete need to pursue the elimination of all forms of discrimination and intolerance.

Moreover, incorporating the sense of peace recognised and accepted from the scientific considerations approved in the Declaration of Seville on (non-) Violence in the face of the critical considerations of the Declaration of Yamoussoukro on peace in the minds of men, the Declaration on the Culture of Peace begins with the twofold proposition: one, the system of values that leads to the formation of consciousness to detach from the simple opposition to the practice of violence and conflict; and, two, that peace is a project for all, only possible from positive collective action at all levels. The two propositions are addressed, already in Article 1, under the draft definition for the culture of peace, as "a set of values, attitudes, traditions and modes of behaviour and ways of life" (A/RES/53/243, Article 1).

Furthermore, the culture of peace, as a set of values, attitudes, traditions, behaviours and ways of life, is based on: a) respect for life, an end to violence, and the promotion and practice of non-violence through education, dialogue and cooperation (Article 1, a); b) full respect for the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence of States, and non-interference in matters eminently within the domestic jurisdiction of States (Article 1, b); c) full respect for and dissemination of human rights and fundamental freedoms (Article 1, c); d) commitment to the peaceful resolution of conflicts (Article 1, d); e) endeavour to meet and satisfy the development and environmental needs of present and future generations (Article 1, e); f) respect for and promotion of the right to development (Article 1, f); g) respect and promotion of equal rights and opportunities for women and men (Article 1, g); h) respect and promotion of the right to freedom of expression, opinion and information for all (Article 1,

h); and, i) adherence to the principles of freedom, justice, democracy, tolerance, solidarity, cooperation, pluralism, cultural diversity, dialogue and understanding at all levels of society and among nations (Article 1, i).

In justifying the premises, definition and foundations, the Declaration assumes, to a degree of finality, that progress in implementing a culture of peace is only possible through the dissemination of values, attitudes, behaviours and ways of life dedicated exclusively to fostering peace among individuals, groups and nations (Article 2); education, at all levels and aimed at the dissemination of human rights, is the fundamental means for its construction (Article 4), while all must commit themselves to its strengthening, that is, governments have the primary function of promoting it (Article 5), civil society is committed to its full development (Article 6), the mainstream media must contribute to the dissemination of qualified and educational information (Article 7), the United Nations must continue with its mission to perform the critical function leading to the strengthening of the movement (Article 9), and parents, teachers, politicians, journalists, religious bodies and groups, intellectuals, all those who carry out scientific, philosophical, creative and artistic activities, health workers, humanitarians, directors of governmental and non-governmental organisations, who have the key function of promoting the culture of peace (Article 8).

Conclusion

As stated in the first lines, the aim of this study is to propose a logical reading that allows us to understand the coherence of the discourse, whose argumentation brings the theory of a life in peace, permanent and lasting, closer to the practice of living without fear of

extinction war and the most varied manifestations of violence. In general terms, to contribute to rational reflection on the transition from the idea of life in peace to the reality of a life in peace.

Among the many variants and hypotheses, it was decided, in the year of the 75th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to return to what can be considered the transition point between the theory and practice of life in peace for all: the culture of peace understood as a microsystem created in the face of the purpose of building lasting international peace, as it has been built from the Declaration of the International Year of Peace, through the Declaration of Seville on (non-)Violence, reverberated in the Declaration of Yamoussoukro on Peace in the Minds of Men, to the Declaration on the Culture of Peace.

This sense of a culture of peace must be understood from preparation (collective and international engagement of the community, initially scientific, to the adherence of civil society, which directly or indirectly stimulated the political initiative at all levels), through theorisation in the face of normative elements (resolutions, specifically of the United Nations General Assembly) and argumentative ones (convergent and consensual discourse, both on the need to raise awareness for peace and on the establishment of a programme that makes the transposition of peace into awareness for social action effective), up to the process of establishing an intuitive and multidisciplinary programme of action for peace, capable of responding to the challenges posed by each historical moment.

Methodologically, the historical moment was defined from a phenomenological perspective (practically the two decades that denote international tensions in the face of the economic, social, legal and political crisis that culminated in the extinction of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the cold war, as well as the fall of the

Berlin wall), chronological (between 1981 — the proposal to proclaim the year of peace, with its ramifications — and 1999 — the approval of the declaration and programme of action on the culture of peace), and, if I may say so, normative (from A/36/197, 11 August 1981, in accordance with the terms of A/RES/36/67, 30 November 1981, to A/RES/53/243, 19 September 1999).

Furthermore, in the descriptive and analytical parts of the study, the deductive method was chosen, given the historical section and sequencing of normative acts, linked to the coherence of the discourse, i.e. A/RES/36/67, 30 November 1981 (International Year of Peace and International Day of Peace), was determined as the starting point for the analysis, as conceived in A/36/197 of 11 August 1981 (request for the inclusion of an additional item on the agenda of the 36th session — day of peace, month of peace and year of peace), and the normative acts of the General Assembly's initiative²⁴ were researched and determined, which, linked to the same thematic axis²⁵, led to A/RES/53/243 of 19 September 1999, as presented in Annex 1.

In view of the methodological delimitation, moving on to the substantial element of the study, it is preferred, when it comes to demonstrating the objective contribution of the investigation, the convergence of reflection as expected before the deductive method in a descriptive and analytical perspective, by sequencing the argument:

²⁴ Preferably resolutions containing declarations, programmes and proclamations, supplemented by other instruments that would allow the discourse to be understood, such as the reports of the UN Secretary-General.

²⁵ A paradigm shift on the meaning of peace, which, no longer just the tense opposite of war, had gained the freedom to institute a culture of its own, beginning with the formation of consciousness..

1. At the outset, the initiative of the university presidents taken at the Sixth Triennial Conference (indirectly referred to in item 1 of A/42/487 of 28/06/1987) is recognised as a milestone in the movement to break with the previous system of viewing international peace in the United Nations system in the face of General Assembly practice: firstly, for contributing to the strengthening of the idea of education placed in the development domain of the United Nations University (A/RES/27/2951, of 11/12/1972), starting with the establishment of the University for Peace (A/RES/35/55, of 05/12/1980); second, because the initiative originated in civil society and was transferred to the public-governmental environment (received by the Government of Costa Rica), with the General Assembly's acceptance (A/36/197 of 11 August 1981, preparatory to A/RES/36/67 of 30 November 1981); and, third, the strengthening of institutional relations between ECOSOC, UNESCO, UNGA and UNSG, with the recognition of 1986 (the UN fortieth anniversary session) as the International Year of Peace (A/RES/37/16, 16/11/1982, as read by E/1982/15, 04/05/1982).

2. In view of the collective and practical intention to break²⁶ with the disconnected ideological vision based on an illogical

²⁶ The time was ripe for the renewal of thinking and action in peace promotion, recognising the importance of education, information, science and culture as fundamental supports for the achievement of lasting and effective peace, as well as providing an opportunity for reflection and positive conduct to strengthen the purposes of the United Nations (A/RES/40/3, 24/10/1985). In this sense, the proposal objectively addressed the question: how to achieve this lasting and effective peace? In the context of the reflection on the solution to the question, once the idea of breaking with the disconnected ideological vision based on an illogical and irrational concept had been reaffirmed, as well as the interest of the international community in its purest sense, it was admitted that the dialogue for the promotion of peace should be multilateral, with the decision being taken by consensus (A/RES/41/9, of 24/10/1986); within the limits of A/RES/40/10, of

and irrational concept of peace²⁷, preparations for the International Year of Peace were initiated through the dissemination of the values immanent in it and the call for co-operative social action. The action had a positive²⁸ outcome, exceeding expectations, as shown by the Secretary-General's reports on both the regional seminars (A/40/524, 14/08/1985) and the programme of commemorations (A/40/669, 14/08/1985 — including amendments).

3. From this point onwards, a unique path was chosen based on the idea that peace was possible in view of the objective

11/11/1985, following the guidance of A/42/487, of 28/08/1987), the objective of which should be to ensure that humanity enters the twenty-first century with the firm intention of achieving definitive peace.

²⁷ In summary, among many arguments, peace would only manifest itself when there was no conflict, a typical phenomenon of the inter-war period, being, therefore, only a word that denotes the condition of opposition to war.

²⁸ This perspective, in the context of A/42/487 of 28 August 1987 (it is suggested that A/42/487 of 28 August 1987 be read first in the light of A/RES/40/10 of 11 November 1985 and then A/RES/41/9 of 24 October 1986), allows eleven facts to be highlighted about the preparation of the programme for the international year of peace: the delimitation of the problem to be solved was confined to the international situation of tension, conflicts and crisis of the early 1980s, the programme having defined as the origin of the movement the initiative of the Government of Costa Rica, in attention to the conclusions of the Sixth Triennial Conference of the International Association of University Presidents, with the record of institutional support from the Economic and Social Council, adopting multiculturalism as the method, with a global area of action, decisions being taken by consensus, in view of the costing by financing justified on the principle of voluntary contribution; in addition, it was decided to use and disseminate information responsibly and consciously through cooperation and collaboration, to achieve the strategy of holding events, including conferences that would allow the hearing of organisations (governmental and non-governmental) and academics, the initiative of which should be taken by the United Nations Secretariat, which should remain at the forefront of the organisation and coordination of activities, in accordance with the Programme presented by A/40/669 Annex I, revised by A/40/669 add. 1 Annex I, duly adopted by the General Assembly under A/RES/40/10 of 11/11/1985.

results indicated by the dialogue and understanding, in cooperation and collaboration, between the United Nations and the international community, confirming the interest and commitment of peoples transposed to nations, and later to States, whose feeling was that everyone could live their lives in peace (A/RES/42/13, 28/10/1987). It is clear that the idea was increasingly becoming a sentiment, but progress still had to be made to answer, in theory and in practice, the question of how to achieve lasting and effective peace.

4. The shift from idea to feeling had reactivated the proposition of the Preamble of the Constitution of UNESCO that the defence of peace must be built in the minds of human beings, for it is there that war begins. Soon, then, the question became more objective: is violence (especially that which legitimises the discourse of war) an intrinsic characteristic of human beings? Would we be born with the innate, genetic, biological will, or any other element of propensity to the act of violence?

5. The problem was analysed in the context of the Seville International Congress on (Non) Violence which culminated in the approval of the official Declaration, so that the scientific refutation of the innate impulse (denying even the existence of the instinct itself) and/or the genetic predisposition to violence put an end to the dystopian vision of peace²⁹, intending to eradicate this myth, and to free humanity from the servitude of biological pessimism, through a change in social action by all, in private and public environments, at individual and collective level; the path of which would be the construction of consciousness for peace.

²⁹ What has been determined as the disconnected ideological view based on illogical and irrational concept of peace.

6. Because of its content legitimised by scientific authority, the Declaration of Seville on (Non-) Violence was quickly welcomed and disseminated by organisations and institutions, including UNESCO, making at least eight considerations internationally known: (a) peace is possible because war is not a biological necessity, therefore humanity is not condemned to war and violence by biological causes; (b) there is nothing in biology that constitutes an insurmountable obstacle to the abolition of war and other institutional violence; (c) war is a social invention fully possible to be replaced by peace; (d) peace is possible and war can be extinguished; e) it is not true that there is scientific evidence that slavery and domination by race and sex are biologically verifiable, on the contrary slavery has ended and now the world has worked to eradicate domination by race and sex; f) war is a human culture that can be changed to the culture of peace; g) wars can be ended and their causes eliminated, but the work must be done by all, starting from the belief that it can be done; and, h) war was invented in time immemorial, and, likewise, peacetime can be invented, and such a change depends only on each of us.

7. Based on the considerations and conclusions of the Declaration of Seville on (Non-) Violence, with emphasis on the scientific hypothesis of establishing peace as a culture based on the formation of conscience to be transposed to social action in cooperation, reflections advanced (between 1986 and 1989) with the maturing of the logical argument of gradually overcoming the paradigm of societies living a culture of war based on institutionalised violence for the idea of the possible and necessary establishment of a culture of peace, since violence and war would not be biological elements, there would be no scientific confirmation that individuals would be born predisposed to violence — and therefore war —, peace

would be much more than just the absence of war, individuals would be susceptible to what happens to them in the surrounding socio-economic environment, so that peace should replace war in human minds, assuming its role as the foundation for human relations in collectivity (from local to international).

8. There have been many debates and initiatives on the new premise, at various levels and in various environments. Therefore, among the various paths of analysis, we have chosen, on the one hand, the initiative of the Comisión Nacional Permanente de Educación para la Paz de Perú, chaired by Felipe MacGregor, in particular the book "cultura de paz", published in 1986; and, on the other hand, the deliberations of the International Congress on peace in the minds of men, held in 1989, which gave rise to the Declaration of Yamoussoukro.

8.1. On the book "Cultura de Paz", the need to create a project for peace based on education was recorded, dedicating the conclusions to the construction of a culture of peace, that is, the objective reflection starts from the conflict, passing through the analysis of violence, until reaching peace in the field of justice, freedom, human rights, environmental awareness and the duty to promote peaceful action in society, having in truth and dialogue the paths, and both must be built and taught by the values of education. After all, we are talking about a dynamic peace, which seeks the never violent but fair solution of conflicts, and which guarantees balance in social interactions, allowing harmonious coexistence between individuals, i.e., peace as a good for society as a whole.

8.2 The breadth of the international conference on peace in the minds of men challenges careful analysis which, in this research, has been restricted to two questions: what is violence? And what is peace?

Both, however, do not have an objective concept, but guidelines that allow theoretical understanding and practical exercise.

8.2.a. For the first question (what is violence?), the final report of the international congress on peace in the minds of men listed the considerations in ten well-drawn paragraphs (16 to 25), admitting the following punctuation of the most relevant elements: violence as a reaction to unjust aggression and oppression must be viewed with reserve and attention; as violence is the last human resort, intermediate causes must be eliminated by avoiding the extreme act; and, it is recognised that violence is not a biological factor, but it must be identified which factors lead to this end (economic, social, environmental, etc.), so that they can be combated in the cultural field.

8.2.b. The second question (what is peace?), which is just as complex as the previous one and therefore impossible to conceptualise directly and objectively, was dealt with by reading it in three parts (what peace is not³⁰, what peace should be³¹, and what is intended by peace³²), so that it could be further reflected upon in order to theorise the culture of peace. Thus, the culture of peace should: a) be based on dialogue, participation and trust, replacing the authoritarian and hierarchical culture that governs human relations; b) be a culture of respect for pluralism and cultural and behavioural diversity, one that would advocate sharing, mediation, dialogue,

³⁰ What peace is not: a) mere silence of arms; b) simple lack of war; c) brief interval between conflicts; d) empty concept; and, d) ancient utopia

³¹ What peace should be: a) the highest aspiration of being; b) the supreme intellectual ideal; and, c) the dominant moral force of modern civilisation.

³² Peace is intended: a) to be the basis for the active morality of society; b) to be the justification for intellectual solidarity; c) to be the foundation for a new international order that is fairer and better adapted to human progress; and, d) to overcome its worst enemy, injustice.

participation and recognition of the other, even the enemy, as equal in right and dignity — in short, a true socialisation for peace.

8.3 Under the Declaration of Yamoussoukro, in the light of the two above elements, peace was defined as: a) respect for life; b) the most precious asset of humanity; c) more than an end to armed conflict; d) a way of behaving; e) a deep commitment to the principles of freedom, justice, equality and solidarity among human beings; and f) a harmonious partnership between humanity and the environment. In addition, this concept was carried forward into the programme for peace, in four axes: a new vision centred on the culture of peace (at that moment called "peace culture") based on the universal values of respect for life, freedom, justice, solidarity, tolerance, human rights, and gender equality; a sense of having a common destiny for humanity that welcomes the implementation of just policies and respect for nature; a link between peace, human rights and education; and, building a collective, public and international awareness of environmental responsibility.

9. The new theoretical conception of peace, which had been accepted by the international community and encouraged by the United Nations system, had to be put into practice, i.e. the "peace culture"³³ had to become the "culture of peace", so that education and democracy had to come together to ensure, by listening to the precepts of peace, a world of justice, freedom and equality. This expectation would be possible on the basis of respect among the equals, understanding, tolerance and dialogue, so that everyone, women and men, children and adults, young and old, regardless of

³³ Semantic proposal to indicate the movement of the theory of formation of a culture for peace from the formation of conscience to the practice of collaborative social action.

nationality or citizenship, could enjoy a world of sustainable development guaranteed by international law and human rights.

10. As historical facts show, the decade following the Declaration of Yamoussoukro was marked by significant global socio-political, socio-economic and geopolitical movements³⁴ that shifted observations to distinct types of global tensions and conflicts. This phenomenon required the United Nations, particularly the General Assembly, to act attentively, constantly and diligently, evidenced by the adoption of numerous resolutions³⁵ until the Declaration and Programme on the Culture of Peace, introduced by A/RES/53/243 of 19 September 1999, could be reached.

11. Again, in view of the complexity of the subject and the methodological delimitation proposed for this analysis, the research was restricted to the theoretical introduction of the declaration on the culture of peace, as determined in Part A of A/RES/53/243 of 19 September 1999. To avoid redundancy, we invite you to read section 3.2, where you can see the sequencing and ordering of the theoretical elements in five interconnected perspectives: premises, propositions, definition, foundations and purpose.

12. This sequencing and ordering of the resolutions according to the proposed reading was complemented by the systematisation in two synoptic tables (see Annex 1), which, in addition to the quick

³⁴ Historical milestones: the fall of the Berlin Wall, the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War.

³⁵ Considering the dynamics of the historical period and the high level of normative production approved by the General Assembly, a punctual and brief normative digression was made to introduce A/RES/53/243 of 19 September 1999, so that only A/RES/52/15 of 20 November 1997 (proclamation of the year 2000 as the international year of the culture of peace) and A/RES/53/25 of 10 November 1998 (international decade for the culture of peace and non-violence for the children of the world: 2001-2010) were referenced.

retrieval and clear visualisation of the main normative instruments and relevant documents, also made it possible to objectively perceive the period of time that is the subject of this study: the international year of peace (75 months from the idea to the official results), and the declaration accompanied by the programme of the culture of peace (167 months between the proclamation of the international year of peace which welcomed the Declaration of Seville on (non-) Violence and A/RES/53/243 of 19 September 1999).

Normative references

- A/36/197, de 17 de agosto de 1981. Pedido de inclusão de um item suplementar na agenda da 36^a sessão. Declaração de um ano de paz, um mês de paz e um dia de paz: carta datada de 14 de agosto de 1981 do Representante Permanente da Costa Rica junto às Nações Unidas dirigida ao Secretário-Geral. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/22359?ln=en>, último acesso em 20.05.2023.
- A/38/413, de 10 de outubro de 1983. Ano Internacional da Paz: relatório do Secretário-Geral. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/49764?ln=en>, último acesso em 20.05.2023.
- A/39/500, de 24 de setembro de 1984. Ano Internacional da Paz: relatório do Secretário-Geral. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/69406?ln=en>, último acesso em 20.05.2023.
- A/40/150, de 19 de julho de 1985. Agenda Provisória do 40º Período de Sessões da Assembleia Geral:

<https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/85705?ln=en>, último acesso em 23.05.2023.

A/40/524, de 14 de agosto de 1985. Relatório do Secretário-Geral sobre os contributos dos seminários regionais na promoção dos objetivos do ano internacional da paz: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/89747>, último acesso em 23.05.2023.

A/40/669, de 26 de setembro de 1985. Relatório do Secretário-Geral sobre o ano internacional da paz: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/99653?ln=en>, último acesso em 23.05.2023.

A/40/669 add.1, de 06 de novembro de 1985. Relatório do Secretário-Geral sobre o ano internacional da paz: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/104298?ln=en>, último acesso em 23.05.2023.

A/40/PV.70, de 11 de novembro de 1985. Discursos proferidos na 70ª Reunião Plenária da Assembleia Geral referente ao item 27 da Agenda: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/106242?ln=en>, último acesso em 23.05.2023.

A/41/586, de 17 de setembro de 1986. Relatório do Secretário-Geral das Nações Unidas. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/123126?ln=en>, último acesso em 26.05.2023.

A/42/487, de 28 de agosto de 1987. Relatório do Secretário-Geral sobre o Ano Internacional da Paz. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/196123?ln=en>, último acesso em 26.05.2023.

A/42/487 Add. 1, de 14 de outubro de 1987. Relatório do Secretário-Geral sobre o Ano Internacional da Paz. Disponível em:

<https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/145988?ln=en>, último acesso em 27.05.2023.

A/RES/3/217 (A). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/210080?ln=en>, último acesso em: 03.06.2023.

A/RES/2951 (XXVII), de 11 de dezembro de 1972. Estabelecimento da Universidade das Nações Unidas. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/191548?ln=en>, último acesso em: 20.05.2023.

A/RES/35/55, de 05 de dezembro de 1980. Estabelecimento da Universidade para a Paz. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/25747?ln=en>, último acesso em: 20.05.2023.

A/RES/36/67, de 30 de novembro de 1981. Ano Internacional da Paz e Dia Internacional da Paz. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/28728?ln=en>, último acesso em 20.05.2023.

A/RES/37/16, de 07 de dezembro de 1983. Ano Internacional da Paz. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/40567?ln=en>, último acesso em 20.05.2023.

A/RES/38/56, de 16 de novembro de 1982. Ano Internacional da Paz. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/58368?ln=en>, último acesso em 20.05.2023.

A/RES/40/3, de 24 de outubro de 1985. Proclamação do Ano Internacional da Paz. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/102926?ln=en>, último acesso em 23.05.2023.

- A/RES/40/10, de 11 de novembro de 1985. Proclamação do Ano Internacional da Paz: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/103267?ln=en>, último acesso em 23.05.2023.
- A/RES/41/9, de 24 de outubro de 1986. Ano Internacional da Paz. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/122953?ln=en>, último acesso em 26.05.2023.
- A/RES/42/13, de 28 de outubro de 1987. Realizações do Ano Internacional da Paz: resolução adotada pela Assembleia Geral. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/196174?ln=en>, último acesso em 26.05.2023.
- A/RES/50/173, de 22 de dezembro de 1995. Década das Nações Unidas para a educação em Direitos Humanos. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/207147?ln=en>, último acesso em 02.06.2023.
- A/RES/52/15, de 20 de novembro de 1997. Proclamação do ano de 2000 como o ano internacional da cultura de paz. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/249807?ln=en>, último acesso em 02.06.2023.
- A/RES/53/25, de 10 de novembro de 1998. Década internacional para a cultura de paz e não-violência para as crianças do mundo (2001-2010). Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/263510?ln=en>, último acesso em 02.06.2023.
- A/RES/53/243, de 19 de setembro de 1999. Declaração e Programa de Ação sobre a Cultura de Paz. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/285677?ln=en>, último acesso em 02.06.2023.

- A/RES/55/282, de 07 de setembro de 2001. Dia Internacional da Paz. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/447991?ln=en>, último acesso em 20.05.2023.
- A/RES/71/8, de 17 de novembro de 2016. Educação para a Democracia. Disponível em: <https://undocs.org/Home/Mobile?FinalSymbol=A%2FRES%2F71%2F8&Language=E&DeviceType=Desktop&LangRequested=False>, último acesso em 20.05.2023.
- A/RES/77/268, de 24 de janeiro de 2023. Educação para a Democracia. Disponível em: <https://www.undocs.org/Home/Mobile?FinalSymbol=A%2FRES%2F77%2F268&Language=E&DeviceType=Desktop&LangRequested=False>, último acesso em 20.05.2023.
- E/1982/82, de 04 de maio de 1982. Resolução do Conselho Econômico e Social das Nações Unidas: Ano Internacional da Paz e Dia Internacional da Paz. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/195737>, último acesso em 20.04.2023.
- E/RES/1997/47, de 22 de julho de 1997. Resolução do Conselho Econômico e Social: Ano Internacional da Cultura de Paz, 2000. Disponível em: <http://www.un-documents.net/e1997r47.htm>, último acesso em 01.06.2023.
- E/RES/1998/54, de 17 de abril de 1998. Resolução da Comissão de Direitos Humanos: Rumo a cultura de paz. Disponível em: <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/263224?ln=en>, último acesso em 01.06.2023.

Bibliographical references

- Addams, D.; et. al. (1990), The Seville Statement on Violence. In American Psychologist, Vol 45 (10), Oct 1990, 1167-1168.
- Comisión Nacional Permanente de Educación para la Paz (1986), Cultura de Paz, Ministerio de Educación de Perú.
- Kant, I. (2016), A Paz Perpétua e Outros Opúsculos (Trad. do Alemão), Edições 70.
- Riera, J. C. & Way, E. T. (2005), Felipe McGregor: Vida y Obra de um Maestro. IN Revista Educación, V. 14, N. 27; 7-22.
- UNESCO (1991), The Seville Statement on Violence — Preparing the ground for the construction of peace, UNESCO.
- UNESCO (1992), International Congress on Peace in the Minds of Men — Final Report, UNESCO. Disponível em: <https://fund-culturadepaz.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Congreso-la-Paz-en-la-Mente-de-los-Hombres.pdf>, último acesso em 30.05.2023.
- UNESCO (1995), UNESCO and a Culture of Peace: promoting a Global Movement, UNESCO – Culture of Peace Series.
- UNESCO (2002), UNESCO: mainstreaming the culture of peace, UNESCO. Disponível em: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000126398>, último acesso em 30.05.2023.