Governing Peace: Global Rationalities of Security and UNESCO's Culture of Peace Campaign

Suzan Ilcan *University of Windsor*
Lynne Phillips *University of Windsor*

Abstract: This essay interrogates the relationship between governance and peace, and explores how campaigns for peace are being developed on global scales. We analyze how UNESCO's Culture of Peace program governs peace through "global rationalities of security." These rationalities—embodied in programs of action, training and capacity-building schemes and information-sharing practices—are geared towards investing in people in ways that individualize them and govern their conduct in the future. Campaigns for "a culture of peace" attempt to make particular individuals and groups responsible for acquiring certain kinds of values of "peace" and "security." In light of the current wars, violence and conflicts that besiege lives and livelihoods, the processes of governing peace force us both to question the contradictions that inhabit global peace efforts and to offer alternative thinking about peace.

Keywords: governmentality, globalization, peace, security, UNESCO

Résumé : Cet essaie remet en question la relation entre la gouvernance et la paix et explore comment on en vient à développer des campagnes de paix à l'échelle internationale. Nous analysons la manière dont le programme de promotion d'une culture de la paix de l'UNESCO tend à régir la paix par le biais de logiques sécuritaires mondiales. Ces logiques – mises en œuvre à l'aide de programmes d'action, de formation, de renforcement des capacités ou encore à l'aide de pratiques encourageant l'échange de renseignements – ont pour objectif d'investir au sein des populations de façon à les individualiser et à régir leur comportement futur. Les campagnes de promotion d'une culture de la paix tentent de responsabiliser certains individus et certains groupes afin qu'ils acquièrent certains types de valeurs face à la paix et à la sécurité. À la lumière des guerres, des violences et des conflits qui menacent actuellement des vies et des moyens de subsistance, les processus de gestion de la paix nous obligent non seulement à interroger les contradictions émanant des efforts de promotion d'une paix mondiale, mais également à proposer d'autres façons de concevoir à la paix.

Mots-Clés : gouvernementalité, mondialisation, paix, sécurité, UNESCO

Introduction

This essay is concerned with the relationship between governance and peace, and explores how campaigns for peace are being developed on global scales. Keeping in mind that international agencies have a history of rendering legitimacy for the deportment of other powerful agents, we examine one international organization that mobilizes peace initiatives. We illustrate how these initiatives constitute a multitude of plans to shape the conduct of individuals, groups and populations for the future. This organization is the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). It serves as a powerful example for illustrating how peace is conceptualized and rendered as a problem of security. Specifically, we analyze how UNESCO's Culture of Peace program governs peace through what we call "global rationalities of security." These are rationalities or ways of thinking that are developed, disseminated and embodied in a diverse range of activities across the globe, including programs of action, training and capacity-building and the dispersion of information. Through interviews conducted with UNESCO policy and research personnel[1] and through an examination of archival and policy documents, international declarations and plans of action, our analysis points to the ways in which international campaigns for "a culture of peace" are based upon orientations that attempt to make particular individuals and groups responsible for acquiring certain kinds of values associated with "peace" and "security." These campaigns are future-oriented and call for new (governed) spaces of peace education and institutional capacity training, and the circulation of information to prepare minds and bodies for a particular notion of peace. In light of the current wars, violence and conflicts that besiege lives and livelihoods, the processes of *governing peace* force us both to interrogate the contradictions that inhabit global peace efforts and to offer alternative thinking about and collectivities of peace.

Peace and Governance

Why is it that we hear or read so much about "peace" now? Some groups might say that it is related to the recent and heavy deployment of military forces in countries across the globe which seductively appear under the banner of "peace-keeping." Other groups might claim that it is tied to the sheer volume of individuals annihilated (such as the estimated 800 000 people in Rwanda over a short period of weeks in 1994) and the large numbers of people left homeless and suffering from hunger and abusive treatment as a consequence of recent ethnic conflicts in Africa, the Middle East and other sites. Many more claims could be recounted on the events relating to peace. However, in a political climate where there is an increasing demand for security (Hudson 2003) and a move towards a "new individualization of security" (Rose 1999: 236), peace-related events are often reckoned as guarding against future misfortune. Within economic orientations of neo-liberalism—especially those that foster investing in oneself as a way of taking responsibility for one's personal security and that of one's children or family—there are efforts to act upon social and cultural environments in an attempt to secure the problematic zones and the life of a population. Such endeavours aim to reduce the future likelihood of conflicts and threats to security, and often involve promoting a particular understanding of and avenue for peace. This notion of peace not only becomes associated with the problem of security but is used as a defence of certain security plans and rationalities. Within this context, peace as a social justice issue concerned with resolving the problems of poverty, unequal access to resources, and social conflicts undergirding the global economy remains marginal to those conceptions of peace which are primarily concerned with the preservation of security. As evident in the sections that follow, we demonstrate how peace is governed by global rationalities of security. As a form of power, these rationalities hinge on investing in people across the globe as an attempt to promote individual conduct that is consistent with particular kinds of peace efforts, such as those related to global peace programs, institutional capacity training plans, information sharing and environmental sustainability schemes. This style of thinking has inscribed not only "peace talks," "peace summits" and "peace-building" but also the future-focussed character of international peace programs and initiatives.

There is a plethora of internationally oriented initiatives that aim to promote peace in the face of conflicts resulting from social and political activities. At one level of the spectrum, there are transnational peace activists who continue to target state policies, especially those of superpowers, as encouraging militarization and arms races (see Lynch 1998: 159) to the detriment of the "security" of peoples and populations in various places of the globe. This kind of activism may well give credence to the view that we are living in a period of revolutionary change in warfare, particularly in the development of military technology and the organization of the armed forces, or what its proponents call the "revolution in military affairs" [RMA] (Hirst 2001: 7; see also Reid 2003). At another level, there are governments and international organizations that intervene in conflicts around the world to end violent ethnic struggles and the humanitarian suffering engendered by them, and to strive to prevent such violence by promoting the conditions for sustainable peace. For example, the United Nations has embarked on almost as many "peacekeeping" operations in the four years between 1989-93 as it did in the four decades prior to the early 1990s (Ghosh 1994: 412). Similarly, UNESCO has been and continues to be an instrumental participant in mobilizing peace initiatives and in fostering global rationalities of security that aim to shape the future conduct of individuals, groups and populations.

Yet, and in light of the diverse efforts to promote peace at international levels, there remains a lack of critical attention paid to the complex relationship between peace and governance, and how peace is thought of and governed in distinct ways. Given the multifaceted character of the processes of governance, it is not possible to delimit the concept of peace in an easy, definitive way. Its meaning varies and depends on the context of its use, and the extent to which it is deployed by particular groups or organizations for certain purposes and not others. From our perspective, the concept of peace is not merely a reflection of what stands in opposition to warfare or violent conflict; it is more aptly a problem of and metaphor for security. It is a notion that is employed by governing bodies to incite the need for change. Through specific initiatives and plans, for example, particular kinds of people, economies or events are deemed to be harmful, to cause instability, or to stimulate actions against security. They are what Johnson and Shearing (2003) might call "security threats." Thus, the concept of peace can be linked to various rationalities of security or ways of thinking about security that are used to act on the security of a group or population. As discussed later in this paper, we illustrate how one global organization, UNESCO, governs peace through global rationalities of security. Based on the organization's programmatic statements, policy documents and speeches, we illustrate how these rationalities of security, as a form of power, hinge on investing in and indi-

vidualizing particular peoples. We also show how these rationalities, in an era of cultural engineering, are constituted through particular means, procedures and vocabularies that articulate with the organization's peace programs, capacity training efforts, and information sharing practices. In tracing what might be called the "field" of global rationalities, we take a different kind of ethnographic journey in the study of globalization and power, one akin to Nader's notion of "studying up" (Nader 1972). Interestingly, UNESCO has not been examined with respect to its particular peace efforts. We offer our analysis with the hope that others working on or examining peace initiatives in other ("local") contexts might see how such initiatives articulate with or are excluded by this new cultural framing of peace as security.

Our analysis here is unique in that it focusses on how UNESCO peace efforts are inextricably linked to global rationalities of security. This argument is informed by the literature on governmentality that draws on inter-disciplinary resources and provides a key entry point into investigating the ways in which rationalities of governance shape ideas and events as well as the conduct of people and populations. The governmentality literature offers alternative ways of thinking about contemporary forms of governance that go beyond formal state policy and legislation. The forms of governance initiated by UNESCO, and other United Nations organizations, exceed those belonging to nation-states and can therefore open themselves to the insights of the governmentality literature. This literature recognizes that diverse forms of governance are premised on rationalized schemes, programs, techniques, and devices that seek to shape conduct in particular ways in relation to certain objectives (e.g., Ilcan and Phillips 2003; Isin 2000; Phillips and Ilcan 2003, 2004; Rose 1999). Governance may be oriented towards achieving prescribed goals in the future and responding to issues and events in the past (Johnson and Shearing 2003: 24). Scholars working from this orientation have explored how the strategic arrangement of particular kinds of rationalities (e.g., punishment, risk-management), knowledge and expertise may assist in shaping the conduct of groups and populations. Such orientations have been applied to topics ranging from the environment, community, poverty, unemployment, empowerment and development, to that of law and criminality, psychology and space and architecture (e.g., Appadurai 2001; Cruikshank 1999; Dean 1999; Escobar 1995; Ferguson 1994; Ferguson and Gupta 2002; Foucault 1991; Ilcan and Basok 2004; Rose 1999, 1994). For example, in an analysis of "government through community," Tania Li notes how the apparent naturalness of community is always in tension with "community as a project." She points to how efforts to intervene in and reform communities for the purposes of government always produce an excess (of histories, memories, commitments) that moves beyond the limits of governmental projects and opens up a new terrain of politics (2002).

In a recent study on "governing security," Johnson and Shearing (2003) consider that one of the most significant dimensions of governance is the rationality or the "mentality" that is brought to the task. A mentality is a "mental framework that shapes the way we think about the world" (2003: 29). There are many different kinds of mentalities. For example, a risk-management mentality is future-oriented and favours a mode of governance "at a distance." In contrast, a punishment mentality is focussed primarily on past events and emphasizes coercive physical force and involves direct governance through the state. A noteworthy point in their analysis that parallels Li's argument (2002) is that a mentality is not situationally specific. It can spread and affect other areas of social, cultural, and political life (Johnson and Shearing 2003: 29-38), and give rise to the unanticipated effects and contradictory outcomes of governing populations, what we prefer to call the *unintended* consequences of governmentality.

Although governmentality studies convincingly demonstrate how various kinds of rationalities, knowledge and expertise are used to govern ideas, peoples and populations beyond the state, the complexity of approaches within the field invites additional research. In comparison to the abundance of work that focusses on specific governing practices situated within local or national sites of intensity and engagement, more detailed studies need to address the transnational and international dimensions of governmentality. The reasons for greater attention to be given to this field of inquiry relate to: the colossal emergence of global governing and non-governmental organizations since the end of World War II—including the United Nations organizations with their focus on issues ranging from peace, disarmament, justice and human rights, to issues of poverty, unemployment, economic development and globalization; and the global emphasis and dissemination of discourses and practices on "peace" and "security." In light of these occurrences, more sustained attention should be directed towards examining how specific kinds of rationalities of governance are deployed by global organizations to shape the way people perceive themselves and others in the world, and react to situations and events occurring around them. Such research may go far in illustrating the specific ways that processes of globalization bring about "new forms of governmentality" (Appadurai 2001: 26). As we show, inter-

national peace projects attempt to shape the conduct of particular populations and make particular individuals (such as women and children) responsible participants in these governing endeavours. We also suggest that the incorporation of women in the peace process can essentialize women as peaceful and men as warlike through the use of culturally defined gender stereotypes. For these and other reasons, it is important to ask not only why particular individuals are seen as potential peace participants but how peace is governed.

In an effort to analyze the global dimensions of governmentality, one needs to interrogate how global governing organizations engage in processes of governance that can produce both *intended* and *unintended* consequences.[2] The term "intended consequences," in this context, refers to a governing organization's stated objectives which are to be the outcome of projects, programs, plans and so on. However, there is little analytical purchase to focus only on the intended consequences of an organization's stated objectives. This focus can lead to interpretations that would be unable to account for the distinctions between an organization's functional aims, and how these are deployed and circulated, and how they may articulate with other seemingly different technical and institutional practices. Based upon many years of working for UNESCO, a senior UNESCO advisor comments on how the politics of the organization itself could shift its intended consequences:

> From a knowledge point of view, perhaps the key difficulty was the heterogeneity of the different constituencies which make UNESCO. In other words, at the level of the member states and their representatives, the diplomats, it proved difficult to develop a truly independent and critical social science in UNESCO. They always preferred to see education and other areas in...less critical ways, in less analytical ways. And, they always preferred a fuzzy language rather than a critical, rigorous language, and this has been detrimental to UNESCO.

At the level of global governing organizations, it is important to inquire into "effects rather than interests" (Valverde 2003: 12) and to identify "the differences in what is said...and what allows it to be said and to have an effectivity" (Rose 1999: 57). More generally, we need to ask ourselves how particular rationalities of governance can simultaneously produce certain types of knowledge, arguments or solutions to a given problem and exclude or marginalize other knowledge, arguments or solutions to the same problem. For example, peace initiatives promoted by global governing organizations often exclude or ignore the efforts and effects of feminist peace collectives, such as: Women for Peace [South Africa]; Women in Black [Israel, Palestine, Serbia]; Organizacion Femenina Popular [Columbia]; Saturday Mothers [Turkey]; Mothers' Movements [South America]; SOS Femmes en Detress [Algeria]; The Association of Women of the Mediterranean Region; and, Red Ecuatoriana de Mujeres Líderes por la Paz [Ecuador]. We consider that these kinds of exclusions may be critical dimensions of the unintended consequences that stem from the practices associated with ruling or governing bodies.[3]

Particularly insightful on the issue of unintended consequences are case studies involving global governing or non-governmental organizations. For example, in Ferguson's research in Lesotho, it was the unintended effects, what he calls "the anti-politics machine," of international development agencies and foreign-led development projects that ultimately failed to alleviate poverty (1994). Paralleling the implications of the "anti-politics machine," Bryant's case study on non-governmental organizations and governmentality in the Philippines moves away from a focus on non-governmental organizations' utilitarian aims and intended outcomes, such as field projects completed, political processes altered, social attitudes transformed. Instead the author documents the unintended effects (e.g., the marginalization and subjection of poor peoples) produced by particular NGO-led conservation agendas (Bryant 2002: 272). Likewise, Elyachar (2002) indicates the unintended effects of "empowering" the poor through micro-lending projects when she documents the sudden enthusiasm of shop owners in Egypt to transform themselves into the kinds of informants that international organizations want to fund. This paper highlights the intended and unintended consequences of peace initiatives, focussing primarily on the efforts of UNESCO and the ways in which they have left out, reshaped, or marginalized other peace initiatives.

Peace Initiatives

In response to the perception of prevailing security threats, peace initiatives today have come to symbolize the necessity of bringing about change.[4] With the rise of global flows of capital, images, ideas and practices of governance, numerous international peace organizations, programs, institutes, workshops and activities have been launched to deal with issues of security. The sources of authority on peace (as security) have expanded from the nation-state to international organizations and institutes, such as: Amnesty International, Greenpeace, Oxfam International, The International Institute on Peace Education, the United Nations Development Programme

(UNDP), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the World Health Organization (WHO) and UNESCO. There is much variation in how the conditions of peace are thought to work and to work best. In an effort to promote peace in post-conflict situations, the UNDP views peace in relation to issues of development and supports peace agreements of this nature, such as the ones it held with El Salvador in 1992 and with Guatemala in 1996 (see Santiso 2002: 562). Likewise, the United Nations' *Agenda for Peace,* initiated in 1992 under the former UN Secretary General Butros Ghali, encompassed diverse peace initiatives (including peace support operations and post-conflict peace-building schemes)[5] that attempted to shape actions, processes and outcomes in specific directions by linking peace, development and democracy (United Nations 1992). In contrast, the International Institute on Peace Education is an organization that holds annual peace workshops and relies on peace educators and advocates to work towards its objectives.[6] In what follows, we examine the ways in which UNESCO's peace programs highlight the individual, over the nation-state, as the key arena for fostering a culture of peace.

UNESCO's Peace Programmes

> Other "rights" have been added [to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights] since 1948. These should all be taken into account, and to them should be added the right which underlies them all: the right to peace—the right to live in peace! The right to our own "personal sovereignty," to respect for life and dignity. (UNESCO Director-General 1997: 13)

Created in the wake of WWII, UNESCO has for 60 years conceived and implemented activities intended to promote education for peace, human rights, democracy, international understanding and tolerance. The Constitution of UNESCO, adopted in 1945, states that the "purpose of the Organization is to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations" (Article 1). Throughout much of this period peace was closely aligned with the concept of national security, and peace and security were envisaged together as products of a "collaboration among nations" in an emerging international setting.

In the early 1990s, with dramatic changes in the international context,[7] UNESCO's orientation shifted more explicitly to the promotion of "global'" perspectives and global rationalities of security. Thinking and acting globally, rather than nationally or regionally, pervades the organization's recent strategic frameworks. The United Nations General Assembly recognized UNESCO's culture of peace program as a "global movement" when it heard its proposal for an International Decade for a Culture of Peace in 2000 (United Nations 2000: 2). From its inception, the promotion of a "culture of peace'" was intended as a search for values beyond national interests.[8] As the preface to the second edition of a UNESCO teaching guide for peace promotion states, "It is essential to think on a global scale and advance universal values with which everyone will be able to identify. 'Planetary ethics,' 'global citizenship' and 'holistic thinking' will then be able to emerge..." (Weil 2002 [1990]).

UNESCO's initiatives to produce and globally disseminate new ways of thinking about and acting upon peace have shifted the terrain of security and its relation to peace. One of UNESCO's web fora states that "the clear distinction...between national security and international security is now meaningless: the abolition of distances and growing interdependence give credence to the idea among those who govern, and increasingly among the governed, that these two forms of security are inseparable" and calls for a "rebuilding of security, which is now human rather than inter-State" (UNESCO 2001a: 1). Within the context of developing a culture of peace, security efforts have taken on a new meaning, encapsulated in the concept of "human security." As the previous Director General of UNESCO, puts it: "'Security' is being redefined as a civil, even scientific issue, and no longer seen as a matter of warheads and delivery systems" (Mayor 1995: 2).

It is not surprising that the principal agent for developing a culture of peace is thought to be the individual and not so much the state. The activities associated with fostering a culture of peace would enhance the social promotion of the individual through her/his own action, and the state would no longer be the stake in such peace initiatives. René Zapata, head of the co-ordination unit of UNESCO's transdisciplinary project, "Towards a Culture of Peace," states that the "prime mover" for peace is "each and every one of us. For surely the road to peace must start within ourselves..." (Zapata 2000: 1). According to Zapata, the barriers to peace are those that we create ourselves due to our ignorance, fanaticism or selfishness (ibid.: 1-2). This idea forms the backdrop to the general recognition within UNESCO that peace requires the education of people to become "responsible citizens knowledgeable about and respectful of humanistic val-

ues, human rights, and democracy" (UNESCO 1997a: 4). It is within this context that the organization envisions globalization as an important part of the solution to the problem of peace. However, one of UNESCO's prominent senior policy advisors suggests that UNESCO's engagement in processes of globalization to solve particular problems places limitations on this global governing organization:

> There is a world in which prevails a balance between private interest and public interest, if I may say so. Of course, now, this is one of the reasons why UNESCO is in a difficult position: there is no more balance between private interest and public interest. The only thing that matters is private interest. So this is the difficulty of global governance. In global governance, why globalization is so unjust and so distorted is because it is based on the idea that the only thing that matters is private interest.

Nevertheless, it is globalization processes that enable the circulation of UNESCO's rationalities of security and it is through these processes that the need for a global transformation in values, attitudes and behaviour can be signalled. As we illustrate in the following sections, by establishing contained programs of action that invest in the apparent values associated with particular people (such as women and children) and by identifying distinct "capacities" for improvement, UNESCO is intimately involved not just in promoting but in governing "cultures of peace."

An examination of UNESCO's Culture of Peace program illustrates how the organization's specific intentions articulate with rationalities of security that globally govern conceptions and practices of peace. The early linking of peace with culture can be found in the organization's Constitutional statement that "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed" (Preamble of UNESCO's Constitution). Current campaigns for promoting a culture of peace not only draw on UNESCO's historical recognition that peace is something that can be made (and unmade) by people,[9] but it reflects a new era of cultural engineering in the name of peace and security. It is perhaps not a coincidence that this new era is imbued with a sense of urgency, particularly with the identification by many of the world-wide "instabilities" arising from terrorism, aggressive nationalism and the development of new "cultures of war." This problem of security has helped to justify not only the increasing demand for security (see Hudson 2003) but also the building of intrusive plans to invest in particular people as a way to promote peace throughout the globe.

The intention of UNESCO's Culture of Peace program was to bring about a more co-ordinated and pervasive effort at promoting international peace beyond Declarations and International Conferences. The building of peace was to take place everywhere: "First and foremost, a culture of peace implies a global effort to change how people think and act in order to promote peace....Its mission also extends beyond war situations to schools and workplaces around the world, to parliamentary chambers and newsrooms, to households and playgrounds" (UNESCO 1998: 1). Such a broad scope has required the co-ordinated effort not only of all sectors and units of the organization, but of other UN bodies and beyond.[10] That the United Nations General Assembly agreed upon a long term program for peace in the form of the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World (2001-10) reflected an understanding that changing "how people think and act'" requires action beyond the establishment of treaties and declarations. This ambitious program encompasses many pressing global issues[11] which operate as a "motivating discourse" (Paley 2002) that draws a wide range of people into the net of responsibility for achieving peace. For example, UNESCO's strategic planning report on peace notes that, since poverty puts people "at risk," economic development itself is a security issue: "Human security is inconceivable without sustainable development including environmental protection. Its attainment will require profound changes in peoples' and societies' attitudes and their patterns of behaviour..." (UNESCO 2002b: 2).

While the call for a "culture of peace'" attempts to responsibilize populations, UNESCO's programs set the parameters for how the development of peace should proceed. Promoting itself as a "standard setter,'" the organization highlights its "role in gathering, transferring, disseminating and sharing available information, knowledge and best practices in its fields of competence, identifying innovative solutions and testing them through pilot projects" (UNESCO 2002b: 6). As a "standard setter," it mobilizes specific information and expertise, as well as particular conceptions of social transformation. Gathering together academics, policy-makers, religious leaders, and other "experts,"[12] UNESCO is more than a facilitator in shaping what constitutes "best practices" and "innovative solutions" for peace. By forging universal agreement on such issues, it plays a vital role in global information management.

Through a complex set of agreements, UNESCO focusses on investment through training, educating and building the capacities of people and institutions. A discussion of these activities is the subject of the next section.

What is important to keep in mind is how, by undertaking such activities, UNESCO's programs for peace work to govern notions of peace and encourage a wide variety of institutions and populations to make themselves responsible for adhering to these prescribed activities.

UNESCO: Building Human and Institutional Capacities

UNESCO does not just set standards; it also identifies itself as a *builder* of the particular values that it has identified as central components of a culture of peace. Its current strategic plan stresses this point by setting the parameters of what it considers essential for a peaceful future.[13] In attending to these parameters, UNESCO's programs focus to a large degree on developing human and institutional capacities through education, broadly defined. Investing in education is the pathway to achieving "personal sovereignty," a means by which "each [person] may become the master and architect of his or her own destiny" (UNESCO 1997d: 10). To illustrate the degree to which such investment is the object of governance, we focus on three areas of activities: the strategic support of institutional development, the training of children and the integration of women.

UNESCO articulates its investment in education in part through its mandate to member states. Its underlying concern in the global development of a culture of peace is the identification of countries without suitable democratic institutions and/or histories. Viewing democracy as the link between development and peace (UNESCO 1997b: 3; UNESCO 1997c: 3), UNESCO encourages all member states to develop National Programmes of Action for a Culture of Peace (Breines 1999) and to promote democratic institutional development. The official Action Plan for the Culture of Peace promotes a wide range of activities related specifically to enhancing democratic principles, including the implementation of democratic educational systems, the training of public officials and the establishment of democratic elections (United Nations 1999: 8-9). Investing in such institutional development is part of UNESCO's methodology for building "defences" such as democracy in people's minds and lives. Because of a special concern with "struggling democracies," Central and Eastern European countries and war torn nations in Africa and Central and South America have been particularly drawn into this rationality of security (UNESCO 2001b: 137). With initial programs in El Salvador, Mozambique and Burundi in the early 1990s (UNESCO 1995a), UNESCO has developed formal relationships within such countries in order to promote what it refers to as basic principles of a culture of peace.[14] In projects ranging from developing radio programs on peace to offering training workshops to parliamentarians, the idea of democracy is not seen to conflict in any way with UNESCO's peace initiatives. From UNESCO's perspective, establishing a "harmonious convergence" of peace and democracy is in fact a necessary "mentality" for future security, and thus investment in countries with suspect institutional bases is seen as especially legitimate.

Given that the models for democracy in these programs are implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) western, and based on systems of economic and social inequality, a number of unintended consequences of this convergence emerge to the forefront. UNESCO is silent, for example, on how weapons figure in the development of a culture of peace. Indeed little is said about the military side of United Nations' "peace-keeping" efforts. Since such efforts occupy the majority of the UN's time and budget (UNESCO 1995a: 53), investing in peace appears to be a more highly ambiguous project than the organization indicates. There is also little room for voicing alternative forms of democracy and peace. The question is never raised, for example, about whether there exist political institutions or values outside of UNESCO's parameters that might well be more conducive to reconfiguring peace in a given locale. Thus an unintended consequence of UNESCO governance of peace may well be the marginalization and silencing of peace initiatives that slip outside the organization's particular rationalities of security.

While all member states are encouraged to develop national peace programs, UNESCO's priority is on the development of training programs for particular populations—disadvantaged groups, demobilized soldiers and other vulnerable populations (Breines 1999: 137). The mandate of the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence for the Children of the World (2001-2010) upholds the world's children as a site for investing in global peace. Children, increasingly viewed as victims and instruments of war and violence, are especially mobilized as the future participants in UNESCO's culture of peace. The Declaration on a Culture of Peace specifically resolves to: "Involve children in activities designed to instil in them the values and goals of a culture of peace" (United Nations 1999) so that this future can be secured. Formal and informal education and the use of the media (internet communications) are considered the most salient activities to "inculcate" non-violent values in children everywhere (UNAC 2004; United Nations 2000: 4).

A focus on training children in peace reflects the view that educational systems themselves may harbour values and attitudes related to violence and intolerance. In this

respect, UNESCO considers its Associated Schools Projects (ASP) central to its efforts for investing in tolerance, peace and understanding. Projects focus on non-violent education and conflict resolution and involve the development of handbooks, seminars, workshops and teaching guidelines for schools at all levels in over 120 countries (UNESCO 1995a: 31). The Declaration on a Culture of Peace also encourages requests to UNESCO for technical co-operation in revising textbooks and educational curricula to reflect a culture of peace orientation. In addition, the Culture of Peace program has developed The Interregional Project of Schools to Promote Community Conflict Management in Violence-Prone Urban Areas to offer training in mediation and conflict management in schools located in violent neighbourhoods (UNESCO 1995a: 35). A related project, "Peace Education through Art," is intended to sensitize artists and art educators to use art as a means to convey peace and non-violence in schools. "Draw me Peace—Children Colour the World" is a project involving drawing and painting contests for children between four and seven years of age that seeks to explore children's ideas about promoting a culture of peace (UNESCO 2003: 12).

In "safeguarding" its investment in children, whereby "each child is our child" (UNESCO 1997: 10-11), UNESCO folds its notion of a culture of peace into rationalities of security in ways that unintentionally individualize children. Within the parameters of UNESCO's plan, children are to achieve a peaceful orientation "each according to his own plan. Each according to his own way of thinking" (ibid.: 10). As the former Director-General (1993-1999) of UNESCO put it:

> We must tell [our young people]—they who represent our hope, who are calling for our help and who seek in us and in external authorities the answers to their uncertainties and preoccupations—that it is in themselves that they must discover the answers, that the motivations and glimpses of light that they are seeking can be found within themselves. (UNESCO 1997d: 9-10)

This individualist perspective complements global projects of neo-liberalism that emphasize how people must take personal responsibility for their own future, and hints again at the kind of unintended consequences that UNESCO's programs may effect. There is no doubt that UNESCO's stated objective of building peaceful children around the world circulates through other projects and, in the process, may help to reinforce the objectives of those projects even when their stated goals appear to be quite different. The idea that children are being considered "conflict-free zones" for purposes other than peace, for example, further indicates how the intersection of international programs may unintentionally produce children as instruments of security in the name of other rationalities.[15]

Women, too, are drawn into UNESCO's global rationalities of security. Like children, women are identified as particularly victimized by war and conflict, but women do not appear to require training in developing peaceful values. Instead, UNESCO documents emphasize the historic exclusion of women from policy-making and government and the need to reverse this situation in order to enable a culture of peace. Its plans of action focus on women's *right* to participate in a culture of peace:

> Today more than ever [women] have the right to take an active part in their country's political life and to assume the concomitant responsibilities. Building peace and consolidating democracy are only possible if more attention is paid to women's views in the places where decisions are debated and made. They have a decisive role to play in the transition from a culture of war to a culture of peace. (UNESCO 1997c: 5)

Thus, UNESCO's vision of peace specifically mentions the need to ensure equal access to education, equality between women and men in political spheres, the strengthening of women's networks, and the inclusion of women in initiatives to resolve conflict. In South Africa, where more women are parliamentarians than in most other parts of the world, attention has been paid to making day-care facilities and meeting times more accommodating for women so that they can contribute more effectively to government (UNESCO 1995a: 49).

For UNESCO, women are "peacemakers" and "peace promoters" (UNESCO 1995a; UNESCO 2001:139). If they are to receive training, it is to learn how to extend their peacemaking skills beyond their communities and to become effective leaders for peace initiatives. That the emphasis is placed on women being included and involved rather than trained in the culture of peace indicates an assumption that women are naturally peaceful and that their very presence will make a difference to peace initiatives.[16] UN-supported women's conferences are not immune to the tendency to equate women with peace, and have also identified women as life givers and life sustainers who have special skills for creating a peaceful world (UNESCO 1995b: 2). In this sense, women's essentialized disposition becomes an important component of peace as a global rationality of security. Thus, while the stated goal of UNESCO is to break down gender stereotypes (UNESCO 1995a: 46), the unintended consequences of involving women in the organization's peace plans indi-

cate the active reinforcement of gender stereotypes that emphasize women as caring and peaceful and men as violent and warlike.

Through an emphasis on investing in democratic institutions, training children as the future peaceful generation and facilitating women's involvement in peace promotion, UNESCO's Culture of Peace initiatives mobilize the globe's populations into the new mentalities of peace and security. Tremendous resources, spread over large areas of the earth, have been deployed so that people may become peaceful "citizens of this planet'" (UNESCO 1997b:1), a process that forms part of, what Cruikshank has called, the "technologies of citizenship" (1999). By focussing on both the interests and effects of UNESCO's programs, the link between peace and governance is made more salient. We have seen how the activities of UNESCO have moved the space that peace has occupied from an idealistic goal to a good "security'" investment. Drawing new rationalities and strategies around the populations and ideas that are to contribute to peace in the future has effectively shifted the ground of what we come to think of as "peace." Peace becomes a problem in which we must "invest," with particular consequences for how we think about children, women and social institutions. This perspective reveals how UNESCO has thus been playing a major role in domesticating the space of peace,[17] its activities laying the groundwork for how peace and non-violence are to be pursued.

Still, peace appears to be fragile, especially when fed by the "new ignorances" produced by rapid globalization (UNESCO 2002c: 2). For UNESCO, this means that the responsible citizen within a culture of peace requires continual access to information so that challenges to "personal sovereignty" may be anticipated. Individuals are obligated to seek information, and UNESCO obliged to supply it, as part of a commitment to personal security and, more generally, to the "securitization of their habitat" (Rose 1999: 249). The constant circulation of information by the organization forms part of the future-focussed character of its peace initiatives. There are many examples of this orientation. On September 14, 1999, the day the United Nations proclaimed the International Year for the Culture of Peace, which was spearheaded by UNESCO, students, artists, intellectuals, public figures and others participated in the Year's message of peace and tolerance in world-wide marches, seminars and other events. These events precipitated the sharing of information on a global basis. In some situations, such events were marked by debates and discussions from members of grassroots[18] and non-governmental organizations. In other situations, these events highlighted the "fields of visibility of government" (Dean 1999: 30) that embodied the Year's message, including, for example, the establishment of a Peace Park in Islamabad; the designation of the city of Trincomallee in Sri Lanka as a "City of Peace;" the creation of a Culture of Peace Office by the Presidency of the Republic of Ecuador; the launching of a series of radio programs on the Culture of Peace in Costa Rica; and the formation of a UNESCO Peace Room at a school in the Jordan Valley of Jordan (UNESCO 2000a). Information-sharing is advanced through UNESCO's massive global network: its field offices, UNESCO Chairs, Institutes and National Commissions, national committees of intergovernmental programs, UNESCO clubs and federations, affiliated women's organizations, and its Associated Schools Programme (UNESCO 2002c: 4). The organization also plays a major role in creating, extending, and bringing together networks of researchers, educators and civil society organizations (UNESCO 2000b), thus in many cases producing information through high levels of international scientific and intellectual co-operation. With electronic communication interchange most often facilitating these activities (UNESCO 2002b: 4; see also Dutt 2002: 153-5), it is evident that multiple processes of globalization fuel the proliferation of UNESCO's rationalities to govern peace.

Conclusion

International organizations have produced many possible pathways for formulating ideas, programs and practices of peace. In exploring the work of UNESCO's Culture of Peace program, we have attempted to register how the concept of "investing" in distinct notions of peace involves particular kinds of rationalities that require the incorporation of some things and the setting aside of other things. As a form of power, these rationalities, what we have called *global rationalities of security,* have drawn diverse individuals, groups and populations into restricted circuits of security and new forms of governance. Alongside their potential benefits, they have brought consequences as unsuitable as they are unpredictable, though the latter have been commonly played down or disregarded at the planning stage on the pretext of the grandeur of the overall objectives. As such, these rationalities of governance encourage a limited conception of security, of peace programs and of the practices related to security and peace.

As we have argued in this paper, peace is thought of in terms of security and as a problem of security. While we might agree that a peace that is governed through global rationalities of security interests is still preferable to civil war, it seems prudent to ask, at what cost does this take place? UNESCO's focus on democracy as a pre-

cursor for peace, for example, never brings into question the inequalities that form part of the democracies in which people may live. Current democracies are underlined by concepts of the free market which have been documented to subvert notions of peace, equality and social justice, in a similar way that the current demand for security has undermined "support for justice" (Hudson 2003: 203). Yet the contradiction of "investing" in peace does not appear to be one which UNESCO seems willing to explore or revise in this new era of cultural engineering.

In establishing specific human and institutional capacities for the transformation from a "culture of war" to a "culture of peace," one may wonder what other spaces of transformation might be eclipsed in the process. One may also wonder about what values of democracy or the market are attached to these spaces of transformation to peace, how such values may domesticate spaces of transformation, and how these spaces are made more available to some than to others. In this regard, are capacities for successful peace-building only recognized when governing bodies like UNESCO create them? This possibility points to the need—when there are calls for new global spaces of advocacy, education and capacity-building by international organizations—for social scientists to explore what other kinds of collectivities and mentalities about peace and peace-building are marginalized or squeezed out as a consequence.

Suzan Ilcan, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Windsor, Chrysler Hall South, 401 Sunset Avenue, Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4, Canada. E-mail: silcan@uwindsor.ca
Lynne Phillips, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Windsor, Chrysler Hall South, 401 Sunset Avenue, Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4, Canada. E-mail: lynnep@uwindsor.ca

Acknowledgments

The research herein has been supported by research funds from the Social Sciences and Humanities research Council of Canada. Lead authorship alternates with every study produced through our collaboration. Upon invitation, the authors presented a close version of this paper at the Institute of International and Security Studies, York University, January 27, 2005.

Notes

1 The authors collected archival and policy documentation, and conducted interviews at UNESCO headquarters during the summer months of 2003 and 2004. This study received ethical clearance by the University of Windsor's Research Ethics Board; the transcribed interviews have been made anonymous.

2 In this global context, see: Ilcan and Phillips (2003) on the role of expertise and knowledge; Phillips and Ilcan (2003) on the role of science and the imagination.

3 One of our current research initiatives deals with the political and cultural dynamics of particular women's organizations located within and beyond the United Nations.

4 An important historical example of this relationship between security threats and change is the Paris conference of 1919. The conference was viewed as a moment in global governance in which an international community would be formed through legal and moral principles, enunciated in the Treaty of Versailles and through the establishment of the League of Nations (The United Nations' predecessor), to set the terms of peace in the aftermath of WWI (Charnovitz 2003: 63).

5 See Halliday's analysis of the intervention of the United Nations in peace-keeping and peace-enforcement efforts (2000: 32).

6 For example, the Institute organized an educational program on "Human Security: Building a Culture of Peace" in Istanbul, Turkey in August 2004.

7 UNESCO documents often cite the fall of the Berlin Wall as the beginning of a new era of globalization that mobilized the Organization to construct a new vision of peace (e.g., UNESCO 2002a: 2).

8 The concept of a "culture of peace" was first elaborated at the International Congress on Peace in the Minds of Men in Yamoussoukro (Côte d'Ivoire) in 1989. The concept was further developed at the National Forum of Reflection on Peace, Education and Culture (San Salvador 1993) organized under the auspices of UNESCO. The First International Forum on the Culture of Peace was held in El Salvador in 1994 (UNESCO 1994). The Culture of Peace became an official component of UNESCO's strategic plan in 1995 and the Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1999 as Resolution A/53/243 (see UNESCO 2002a: 2-3).

9 This point reflects Margaret Mead's often quoted remark (Mead 1940) that "war is a social invention."

10 UNESCO's peace efforts dovetailed with other global efforts including: the Integrated Framework of Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights, and Democracy (Paris, 1995); the Plan of Action for the United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education (1995-2004); the Declaration of Principles on Tolerance and the Follow-up Plan of Action for the United Nations Year of Tolerance (1998-2000); and the Year of Dialogue among Civilizations (2001).

11 The programmatic base for the Decade, for which UNESCO is lead agency, involves eight domains of action: "culture of peace through education; sustainable economic and social development; respect for all human rights; equality between women and men; democratic participation; understanding tolerance and solidarity; participatory communication and the free flow of information; international peace and security" (UNESCO 2002b: 1; see also United Nations 1999).

12 Examples include: the Seville Statement on Violence (1986) written by an international team of scientists proclaiming certain propositions regarding violence, war, and aggression to be "scientifically incorrect"; the Venice Declaration (1986), the product of a symposium of experts on Science and the

Boundaries of Knowledge; the Barcelona Declaration (1994), formulated by religious leaders and academics on the role of religion in the promotion of a culture of peace; the Declaration of the 44th International Conference on Education (Geneva 1994) signed by attending Ministers of Education; and the Report of the Expert Group Meeting on Women's Contribution to a Culture of Peace (Manila, 1995).

13 The two principal "axes" are: universal principles to protect the "common public good" and the full participation of people in the emerging knowledge society (UNESCO 2002b: 5). What UNESCO refers to as pluralism is also important in this schema, but only to the degree that it does not interfere with "the" knowledge society and "the" common good. For example, see UNESCO (1997a: 9) for the recommendation that the "international language of culture of peace" be translated into many other languages "so as to be comprehensible to the people in their specific context."

14 These principles derive from UNESCO's definition of a culture of peace as "a set of values, attitudes, traditions and modes of behaviour and ways of life" based on respect for a variety of specified rights and freedoms (see Article 1, Declaration on a Culture of Peace).

15 The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) employed the method of declaring children a conflict-free zone to provide immunization to children in El Salvador. According to one UNESCO document, the ICRC "has come to symbolize the peace work of the international community" (UNESCO 1995a: 79.

16 An interesting parallel is the identification of indigenous knowledge and indigenous rights with initiatives on "tolerance" (see Action 14 in the Declaration on a Culture of Peace).

17 See Phillips and Ilcan (2000) for an analysis of how the processes related to "domesticating spaces in transition" have circumscribed various places of the "developing" world and have underscored the gender and development literature.

18 While there have been feminist approaches to women's grassroots interventions that could be relied upon in formulating international peace policies, Rabrenovic and Roskos (2001) argue that these approaches are often appropriated by mainstream bodies in piecemeal ways that limit their effectiveness for creating or fostering conditions of what Betty Reardon has called "positive peace" (2001: 42). Positive peace consists of a set of dynamic "relationships among people and nations based on trust, cooperation, and recognition of the interdependence and importance of the common good and mutual interests of all peoples" (Reardon, 1993, 4-5 cited in Rabrenovic and Roskos 2001: 42).

References

Appadurai, A.
2001 Deep Democracy: Urban Governmentality and the Horizon of Politics. Environment and Urbanization 13(2): 23-43.

Breines, I.
1999 A Gender Perspective on a Culture of Peace. *In* Towards a Women's Agenda for a Culture of Peace. I. Breines, D. Gierycs and B. Reardon, eds. Pp. 33-56. Paris: UNESCO.

Bryant, R.
2002 Non-governmental Organizations and Governmentality: "Consuming" Biodiversity and Indigenous People in the Philippines. Political Studies 50: 268-292.

Charnovitz, S.
2003 The Emergence of Democratic Participation in Global Governance (Paris 1919). Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies 10(1): 45-77.

Cruikshank, B.
1999 The Will to Empower. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Dean, M.
1999 Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society. London: Sage.

Dutt, S.
2002 UNESCO and a Just World Order. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Escobar, A.
1995 Encountering Development. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Elyachar, J.
2002 Empowerment Money: The World Bank, Non-governmental Organizations, and the Value of Culture in Egypt. Public Culture 14(3): 493-513.

Ferguson, J.
1994 The Anti-Politics Machine: "Development," Depoliticisation, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Ferguson, J. and A. Gupta
2002 Spatializing States: Toward an Ethnography of Neoliberal Governmentality. American Ethnologist 29(4): 981-1002.

Foucault, M.
1991 Governmentality. *In* The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality. G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller, eds. Pp. 87-104. London: Harvester.

Ghosh, A.
1994 The Global Reservation: Notes Toward an Ethnography of International Peacekeeping. Cultural Anthropology 9(3): 412-422.

Halliday, F.
2000 Global Governance: Prospects and Problems. Citizenship Studies 4(1): 19-32.

Hirst, P.
2001 War and Power in the 21st Century. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hudson, B.
2003 Justice in the Risk Society. London: Sage.

Ilcan, S. and T. Basok
2004 Community Government: Voluntary Agencies, Social Justice, and the Responsibilization of Citizens. Citizenship Studies 8(2): 129-144.

Ilcan, S. and L. Phillips
2003 Making Food Count: Expert Knowledge and Global Technologies of Government. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 40(4): 441-461.

Isin, E.
2000 Governing Cities without Government. *In* Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City. E. Isin, ed. Pp. 148-168. London and New York: Routledge.

Johnson, L. and C. Shearing
2003 Governing Security: Explorations in Policing and Justice. London and New York: Routledge.
Li, T.
1999 Compromising Power: Development, Culture, and Rule in Indonesia. Cultural Anthropology 14(3): 295-322.
2002 Government through Community in the Age of Neo-Liberalism. Paper presented at Agrarian Studies Conference, Yale University, October 11.
Lynch, C.
1998 Social Movements and the Problem of Globalization. Alternatives 23: 149-173.
Mayor, F., with collaboration of T. Forstenzer
1995 The New Page: Culture of War and Culture of Peace. Paris: UNESCO.
Mead, M.
1940 Warfare Is Only an Invention—Not a Biological Necessity. Asia 40(8): 402-405.
Nader, L.
1972 Up the Anthropologist—Perspectives Gained from Studying Up. *In* Reinventing Anthropology. Dell Hymes, ed. Pp. 284-311. New York: Pantheon Books.
Paley, J.
2002 Toward an Anthropology of Democracy. Annual Review of Anthropology 31: 469-496.
Phillips, L., and S. Ilcan
2000 Domesticating Spaces in Transition: Politics and Practices in the Gender and Development Literature, 1970-99. Anthropologica 42(2): 206-216.
2003 "A World Free From Hunger": Global Imagination and Governance in the Age of Scientific Management. Sociologia Ruralis 43(4): 434-453.
Rabrenovic, G., and L. Roskos
2001 Introduction: Civil Society, Feminism, and the Gendered Politics of War and Peace. NWSA Journal 13(2): 40-54.
Reardon, B.
2001 Education for a Culture of Peace in a Gender Perspective. Paris: UNESCO.
Reid, J.
2003 Foucault on Clausewitz: Conceptualizing the Relationship between War and Power. Alternatives 28(1): 1-28.
Rose, N.
1994 Expertise and the Government of Conduct. Studies in Law, Politics and Society 14: 359-397.
1999 Powers of Freedom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Santiso, C.
2002 Promoting Democratic Governance and Preventing the Recurrence of Conflict: The Role of the United Nations Development Programme in Post-Conflict Peace-Building. Journal of Latin American Studies 34: 555-586.
UNAC (United Nations Association in Canada)
2004 UNAC website. Electronic document, http://www.unac.org/peacecp/decade/background.html, accessed February 5, 2004.
UNESCO
1994 Final Report of the First International Forum on the Culture of Peace. February 16-18. San Salvador, El Salvador: UNESCO.
1995a UNESCO and a Culture of Peace: Promoting a Global Movement. Paris: UNESCO
1995b Statement on Women's Contribution to a Culture of Peace. Fourth World Conference on Women. September 4-15. Beijing, China: UNESCO.
1997a Advisory Committee on Education for Peace, Human Rights, Democracy, International Understanding and Tolerance. Final Report. Paris: UNESCO Headquarters.
1997b Address by Mr. Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO at the opening session of the International Conference on Culture of Peace and Governance. Maputo (Mozambique), September, 1, 1997, DG/97/32.
1997c Address by Mr. Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO at the opening of the Forum on the Culture of Peace. Bamako (Mali), March 24, 1997, DG/97/13.
1997d The Human Right to Peace: Declaration by the Director General. Electronic document, http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0010/001055/105530Eb.pdf, accessed September 10, 2004.
1998 Transdisciplinary Project "Towards a Culture of Peace." Electronic document, http://www.unesco.org/cpp/uk/projects/infoe.html, accessed September 7, 2003.
2000a International Year for the Culture of Peace Celebrated Worldwide. Electronic document, http://unesco.org/bpi/paix2000/roundup.html, accessed February 25, 2004.
2000b Address by KoVchiro Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO, on the occasion of his visit to the Kyiv Tara Shevchenko Institute for International Relations. Kiev, September 18, 2000.
2001a Sécurité humaine/Human Security. SecuriPax Forum. Electronic document, http:unesco.org/securipax/secpax.htm, accessed February 23, 2004.
2001b Report of the Director-General, 1998-1999. Report of the Director-General on the activities of the Organization in 1998-1999 communicated to Member States and the Executive Board in Accordance with Article VI.3.b of the Constitution. General Conference, Thirty-first Session. Paris: UNESCO.
2002a Mainstreaming the Culture of Peace. Culture of Peace Coordination Unit of the Bureau of Strategic Planning. Paris: UNESCO.
2002b Medium-Term Strategy (2002-2007). Contributing to Peace and Human Development in an Era of Globalization through Education, the Sciences, Culture and Communication. Paris: UNESCO.
2002c Address by Mr. KoVchiro Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO, 165th session of the Executive Board, Items 3.1.1. and 4.1., UNESCO, October 7, 2002.
2003 Promoting Peace and Security through Education and Science: Elements for a UN Strategy against Terrorism. Bureau of Strategic Planning. Paris: UNESCO.

United Nations
1992 An Agenda for Peace—Preventive Diplomacy, Peace-Making and Peace-Keeping. Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the statement adopted by the Summit Meeting of the Security Council on January 31.
1999 Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace. Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, October 6, 1999. A/RES/53/243.
2000 General Assembly Hears 19 Speakers address "Culture of Peace." 55th General Assembly Plenary, November 2, 2000, GA/9807.

Valverde, M.
2003 Law's Dream of a Common Knowledge. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Weil, P.
2002 [1990] The Art of Living in Peace: Guide to Education for a Culture of Peace. Paris: UNESCO.

Zapata, R.
2000 The Fabric of Peace. UNESCO Courier, January.