

WCES-2011

Peace-based curriculum based on the theories of "difference" and "similarity"

Mostafa Ghaderi^a

^aUniversity of Kurdistan, Iran

Abstract

Following Liberal Curriculum, most of the Peace-Based curricula emphasis on Convergence, Unity and Similarity; therewith the understanding of "*difference*" can be used as a source of the Peace-Based curricula. Although differences may be the cause of conflict and clash, but through cognizance and sympathy they will change into chances to enhance each other. Differences also will cause the rise of human capacity and the creation of aesthetics. This paper aims to prove that in order to codify a peace-based curriculum, it's possible to use both postmodern theories (which focus on *differences*) and liberal theories (which focus on *similarities*) simultaneously together.

© 2011 Published by Elsevier Ltd. Open access under [CC BY-NC-ND license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Keywords: Peace-Based Curricula, Liberal Peace, Postmodern Peace, Theory of Difference, Theory of Similarity

1. Introduction

Since the division of the Berlin Wall in 1989, capitalist and communist meta-narrations were demolished. Despite the postmodern and liberal theories, new meta-narrations came into being. The Clash of Civilization by Samuel Huntington (1993) is dealing with the newborn meta-narrations. Coincidence with the emersion of meta-narrations, the reasons of war has become more complicated and multiplied. Since various reasons will lead to war, also various reasons will lead to peace. War in the Turabura Mountains, Afghanistan, is different from the Bosnia and Herzegovina War or other recent wars; as a result in the Peace-Based Curricula it is necessary to include the agents of controlling crisis and preventing violence. Understanding the nature of conflict and peace is so important for the students. Subjects like peace and family, peace and government, peace and environment, peace and art, peace and humanism, peace and human feelings, peace and media, peace and business, peace and security and peace and the World Society are important at the same level. Sometimes, according to the backgrounds, national and international affairs take the stage and sometimes peace in multi-ethnic settings, in multi-cultural settings, in religious settings, in divided societies and in rejoinings of conflict are regarded as the superior. Authentic organization of Peace-Based curriculum begins with the everyday subjects of life such as peace in school, peace in family, peace in alley and peace in city. Next, students should gain some information about peace in the World and decline of violence at the international level. In order to teach "Peace in regions and to fragmentize Peace-Based curriculum, Postmodern Theories seem suitable. So a combination of psychological, historical, anthropological, Mini theories of Sociology and religion along with the post-modernistic and

* Mostafa Ghaderi. Tel.: 98-0871-6667943
E-mail address: mostafa_ghaderi@yahoo.com

pluralistic approaches is suitable. World affairs and international circumstances and international law are important to be mentioned in meta-analysis frame.

2. Problem Statement:

The patterns of the Peace-Based curriculum should be suitable for the expecting situations of a peaceful life. Since the situations of a peaceful life are various, so the patterns of the Peace-Based curricula should be very flexible in accordance to different situations. It is known that the exact clarification of the complex and diffuse qualifications of a peaceful life is so difficult, so in order to value any pattern there should be a type of simplification. The valuating criterion of the Peace-Based curriculum models is to be able to explain the phenomena which are the subject of research. When dividing the models of a Peace-Based curriculum into two categories, the first group is in search of the idea of peace, unity and similarity while the second group is in search of multiplicity, variety and difference. Liberal models are mostly among the first group and the Postmodern Peace models are from among the second group. Although considering the level of analysis, there are many varieties among any Liberal and Postmodern models, but how much any of these models is useful depends on the centralization of the analysis on peace. International and extra-national affairs are considered as macro levels of analysis; organization, party and national affairs are considered as middle levels of analysis and inter personal affairs are considered as micro levels of analysis. Tending toward fragmentizing peripheries of peace, postmodern models mostly tend toward micro, diversity and irregular approaches. On the other hand, liberal models tend toward high levels and systematic analysis such as international relations, international organizations, international law and world unions. According to these differences, peace studying has become a interdisciplinary which relates different fields of study such as: psychology, sociology, theology, international relations, economy and even biology. Postmodern scholars mostly depend on studding of race, phenomenology, and psychology, religious and socio-cultural ones. On the other hand, scholars of liberal peace prefer to depend on the geographical, economical, international law and relations analysis. Having different levels of analysis, some of the peace models move toward systematic models. The systematic models consider those who are active in peace affairs as slaves of a Big System which seems to be a problematic attitude. Also in systematic analysis there is no chance to notice the differences in the manners of micro-systems. Many scholars believe that the true understanding of the relations between the variables of peace is dependent on the systematic theories. These scholars have the tendency toward tentative proof, understanding similarities and finding unity between the variables of peace (Oneal, Russett, Berbaum, 2003). While other scholars believe that the relation between individuals, parties, groups and nations is not a stable, external relation; rather organizations and systems within the society are established and varied through social discourses. So the rationality dominant in the Systematic theory is not sufficient in the affairs of peace, rather the logic of discussion and communication is also needed. According to these scholars discussion is as important as behavior, while logic is not always governing the relations between the groups and governments (Jepperson, Wendet, Katzenstein, 1996).

In order to answer all the knowledge, attitudes and skills of peace necessary for schools, some scholars of peace teaching prefer to use syncretistic theories. For instance H. B. Danesh (2006, p 64) according to psychological, economical, cultural and immaterial aspects of peace announces for a syncretistic peace curriculum based on unity-based worldview. Since peace has got different aspects, Danesh believes, the theory of peace teaching should be analyzed as a general theory or extra theory and sub-theory. In syncretistic theories like that of Danesh, it has been tried to consider the qualifications of the country, region, the psych and morale of people in high, middle and minute levels. Syncretistic models of peace are trying to answer those questions which have been standardized in accordance with the similarity situations. It is necessary to have a general curriculum if the Peace-Based books are prepared according to the levels of peace analysis including international and national government or peace at school and home. Although respecting syncretistic theories, the approach of this research is not a syncretistic one. In order to propagation of peace in different situations, it mostly delivers an occasional and pertinent pattern.

Following Liberal and Postmodern theories of peace, this research is trying to introduce some situations according to the areas in which we are in search of peace propagation. The approach of this research can be named "minuscule approach" which is based on different settlements. Instead of having a systematic or general approach to curriculum, this research suggests a pertinent approach based on or compatible with the settlement and society. Unanimous with the syncretistic approach, minuscule approach believes that violence has got different pedigrees so Peace-Based curriculum in Colombia, Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, Sudan, Palestine, Lebanon, Kashmir, Rwanda, South Ossetia,

Chechen and other conflictive and violent areas should be different. Although postmodern theories unlike liberal theories of peace are based on toleration and lenience versus differences, but even the philosophy of postmodernism is not able to reject the simultaneous existence of "*similarity*" and "*union*" along with "*difference*" and "*diversity*". On the other hand, despite the ultra emphasis of liberals on some liberal peace attitudes such as power segregation, power diffusion and defending individuality of human, liberal approach of peace is protecting pluralistic ideas. So in Peace-Based curriculum it is possible to notice both the theories of "*difference*" and "*similarity*". It can be scrutinized how it is possible to improve the students' skill, knowledge and view about peace through unity and understanding similarity or difference and *understanding diversity* ".

3. Research Questions:

1. What is the difference between the attitudes of postmodern and liberal scholars about peace?
2. Is there any consensus between the postmodern and liberal views regarding peace?
3. How is it possible to make a much more workable Peace-Based curriculum through the combination of postmodern and liberal theories?

4. Postmodern Peace and the theory of fragmentation: The Theory of Difference

The idea of postmodern peace is the idea of emphasizing on differences and to rid of the subjectivist and totalistic metaphysics. According to postmodern scholars there are various ways to reach peace. In the postmodern view, following similarities and interrelations of people through education, business and the growth of natural or sophisticated relations are not the only means of reaching peace. Postmodern scholars like Deleuze, Foucault, Baudrillard Lyotard, Baudrillard, Foucault and Derrida emphasize on the notion of '*difference*' in life. According to this viewpoint instead of Universalism, which is an impossible and difficult task, through sympathy and compassion people can cope with any difference. Our knowledge of peace according to what is derived from the theories of Deleuze, is not uni-based. There is no absolute basis, there under the knowledge of peace just as same as rhizomes are propagated and multi-based. According to Lyotard ignoring 'other' and 'others' is not fair as well as deconstruction of political, cultural and economical tendencies by noticing all the aspects will lead to 'the development of peace and justice' in the world.

Lyotard speaks of the unjust cost which is paid by human and society to gain unity, uniqueness and totality. Michael Foucault believes that what is called 'truth seeking' in reality is the 'power seeking' and criticizes some theories which according to some selfish standards, suppose whatever out of their gamut as 'other', 'unjust', and 'incorrect'. Foucault in his 'Observation and Punishment: the Birth of Prison' (based on law of 1670 in France) counts some of the physical punishments which were frequent in 17th and 18th centuries Europe. These restrict punishments mostly were the results of 'differences' between the victims' opinion and the epistemology of the established governments. According to him the only guilt of the victims of physical and mental violence in different era was 'new think (Foucault, trans. Sarkhosh and Jahandideh, 1385, p 44).

According to the essence of the crime and the culprits' conditions, physical punishments were various. Death punishment included any type of dying. Some were hanged, some were cut by hand or tongue or punctured by tongue and then they were hanged. For other heavy crimes, some were broken by bone, smacked and then leave to die, some were hit and smack to die, some were *خفه* and then they were hit, some were burn to die, some were cut by head and some were only sentenced to be broken by head.

Lyotard's emphasis on inequality and inconsistency actually shows a misgiving attitude toward world history, various cultures and various patterns of peace-based life (Lyotard, 1984). Thereafter the removal of meta-narrations of peace, various and widespread scopes in which we do not need any unity or community to establish peace will remain. The permanent peace is not attained through mono-dimensional and general structures, thus the big projects of peace are mere meta-narrations. When permanent peace is not possible, then the establishment of Utopia is not available. Relative peace is probable but organizing the rules of peace in a general category is improbable. Preparation and movement toward peace is the movement toward tolerance dissimilarity. According to Lyotard the ideal of Habermas to obtain cohesion and adhesion through conversation is impossible; also it is against the theory of dissimilarity Wittgenstein lingual plays. Any theorem acts in its especial way. Thus it is not possible to put all the facets if peace in one category.

According to Kant, rationalizing the everyday life of human promises peace, while Lyotard supposes any rational system as nothing but a game of language. In this view, not only human knowledge, skill and attitude toward peace cannot be categorized in a frame, but also its curriculum does not have any especial margin. Thus the norms and laws of liberal peace are not the only basis of the peace formation.

Postmodern scholars believe that individuals and major social structures have an equal role in the development of wars. It is possible that individuals, police, political and security systems give rise to bloody wars and change into a killing-machine. According to postmodernism there is no linear way for rational and moral growth in all the history of human life. Although Adorno is a follower of the Frankfurt School but his theories about the growth of history is not so different with the theories of postmodernism. About the employment of human experiences of peace, Adorno (1966, p 320) writes: 'there is no general history about the push from savagery to humanity, if there is one, it is from the utilization of sling to the Mega tonic bombs.'

In order to prove the meaning of inconsistency and discrepancy, Derrida applies the word 'difference'. 'Difference' means both to be different from and to postpone. According to Derrida, in every time and place, meaning can not be the same; on the other hand seeking one meaning is depend on the seeking indefinite other meanings (Derrida, 1973, p 30). According to Derrida's statement about 'difference', it is supposed that peace has got indefinite meanings while the knowledge in this regard is limited. Liberalistic meaning of peace is not certain and liberalistic peace is multiplied and indefinite. As we know Kant emphasizes on duty-based and general laws of morality. Unlike Kant, instead of putting responsibility on moral laws, Derrida supposes every body responsible. Postmoderns believe that alignment toward a universal and totalitarian morality is not enough to attain peace. Based on deconstruction theory, Derrida counts several causes to put human moral spirit into motion. Regarding responsibility and human relations, Derrida writes:

"Duty or responsibility connects me with the 'other' as being the 'other' and depends my unique individuality on the 'other' as being the 'other'. I can associate with the 'other' through staring, watching, respecting, kindness, order or request. inevitably I know that I can associate with 'other' through moral sacrifice which can be popularized via my duty or alignment responding to a similar action with the same manner and the same subject with all the 'others' (Derrida, 1995, p 68).

Derrida believes that a pacifist does not clarify his pacifism through his alignment with a universal and total morality. According to him a person like Nelson Mandela who had begun the deconstruction of apartheid worldview simultaneously with the deconstruction of his own worldview, is a sublime person (Derrida, 1987, p 15). Of course there were others like Gandhi, Abraham Lincoln and Tolstoy who had deconstructed the dominant structures of their own life and the social life around them in order to obtain peace.

Deleuze and Guattari, two postmodern scholars (1977, p 42), reject totalitarianism:

"If we find a totality along with some distinct transitive parts, the discovered part is a share of the transitive ones, although it is not their wholeness. The discovered one is a unit of the distinct parts but it does not introduce them all. It is a new added part which has been distinctively made."

What is common among postmodern scholars about war is their attitude toward the diverse tendencies of war in modern world. According to Baudrillard, the Gulf War was a kind of simulacrum which before and after that all media tried to distort it. In our time media pour the dust of ignorance, so that war seems like an unread fiction or story (Baudrillard, 1996, p 4). According to postmodernism, instead of being a certain form of rational life, liberty is to encounter with unusual and unpredictable events. Peace is not based on a standard truth or moral necessity which will deliver the primary principles and reasons. Actually ignoring these principles in favour of the secondary ones is a characteristic of a peace maker. Postmodern pacifist does not try to demolish the differences, because when a man is a warmonger he believes that "This is it and nothing else."

5. Liberal Peace and 'Universalizing' Peace: Theory of Similarity

Philosophers of the Enlightenment, Erasmus to Kant, suppose war as an irrational phenomenon and the only way to make a peaceful society is to rationalize it. Thus human reasoning and moral duty in their all facets which lead to democracy, Cosmopolitanism, growth of free business and the development of international laws are among the important solutions to develop peace. Proponents of liberal peace are optimistic regarding human abilities to attain consistent peace. Many scholars like Thomas Hobbes in his *Leviathan*, Jean-Jacques Rousseau in *The Government of Poland* and John Lock in his *Two Treatises of Government* had wrote subjects on peace. As it is known, the most

important scholar of liberal peace during the Enlightenment was Emanuel Kant besides most of the international correlations based on liberal tendencies are influenced by his thoughts. Kant believes that human moves from a nature life to civilizations which along this way he has got unpleasant experiences which lead him to think about peace in the society. Thus according to Kant moving toward a consistent peace is a natural purpose. In his view, the improvement of human morality is obvious through the progress of human history. He believes that the primary stimulus to attain peace is to establish a republic. By republic it is meant that a system made of liberty, equality in law and following the law. According to Kant a republic is the manifestation of people's will.

The second is the foundation of the Federation of Free States. Without such a federation, the governments will remain in their natural situation that is war against all. Regarding the metaphysics of morality, Kant believes that in the international correlations, like illegitimate savages, governments are living far from the righteousness (Kant, 1795, p 165). Thus the establishment of the Federation of Free States is to legalize international affairs.

The third stimulus is to make an eternal peace is to provide an international law to be done by the Federation of the Free States. Kant in his "*The Critique of Judgment (Kritik der Urteilskraft, 1790)*" says:

"In the frame of a lawful society where the interaction are organized in a way to prevent the clash of the individuals' freedom, then the nature will gain its final purpose. Thus the natural intelligences will reach the highest level. The necessary way to attain this growth is to establish a utopia in which countries will not attack each other."

Liberal peace begins with proposing that democracies will not attack other democracies. Russett (2000, p 235) believes that during the 20th century, permanent democracies did not fight each other. According to Maoz and Russett (1993, p 635): "liberal governments are as able as the illiberal ones to fight, but they have rarely had bloody wars."

Liberal leaders, less than the illiberal ones have the tendency of war. Justifying the mortal outcomes of war, satisfying the parliament and people and the high risk decisions of the beginning of war are the reasons which make the liberal Thus "war to the liberal leaders is less attractive than to the illiberal. I doubtfully and patiently leaders to decide ones" (Gaubatz, 1999, p 17; Schultz, 2001, p 14). Also, the norms of the liberal peace such as bilateral responsibility, bilateral agreement and common profits create a liberalistic culture of clash solving (Mousseau, 1998, p 227).

Economical relations along with international cooperation clear the stage for the improvement of the peace. Democratic systems are responsible and easygoing toward each other. These accommodate unions grow further thus many other governments move toward democracy until the time in which most of the countries will change into the pacifist and democrat ones. In this stage the realization of the permanent peace is available.

The idea of the liberal peace was influenced by pantheism and humanism through the ideas of philosophers like Spinoza. These theories supposed the world as a whole with a common destiny. In liberal thoughts the way to attain peace is through unity of all human along with the emphasis on a universal morality and based on human reasoning.

6. Controversies of the Postmodern and Liberal Theories of Peace

Postmodernist believe that the norms of the liberal peace are distinct ones which have been internalized in some of the European and North American countries. Most of the countries have their especial governmental norms which are supported by a long history. Misunderstandings of the common norms of the governments all around the world have lead to some wars between liberal and illiberal countries. Although some proponents of war rationalize the military intervention of illiberal systems, but classic philosophers of liberal peace do not accept military intervention and violence against societies with illiberal norms. Permission of violence using against illiberal governments by liberal one does not allow self-criticizing, scrutinizing justice in the world and solving national problems of the liberal countries. Instead of military and bloody intervention through peaceful behaviour and fair processes like improving educational systems of other countries, liberal countries can uproot violence. One of the most important differences between postmodern and liberal peace is the structural one. Postmodern scholars believe that liberal peace has got an intensive structure. By intensive structure they mean formalizing circumstances and regulating the process of life. Unlike liberals, postmodern do not suppose the major governmental and formal international structures as something suitable for the development of peace. They emphasize on informal and small public structures with less formality. Formal ones can easily change from liberalism to warmonger systems. For instance the institution of social and behavioural sciences in military organizations tries to demolish soldiers' resistance toward killing. Thus the formal systems cannot guarantee the establishment of permanent peace; while Gandhi's social resistance is a good example of informal peace-making

while the crisis of 2008 in Georgia and South Ossetia is an example of the failure of formal systems and international diplomacy.

Another difference is noticed when we suppose peace as a “human will”, this way of thinking is postmodern but if we suppose it as a “human purpose” our point of view will be liberal. Difference between will and purpose is the matter of stability and movement. In liberalism, human will moves toward human purpose that is peace. While in postmodernism, human purpose is shaped by human will. Thus in postmodernism wills are much more important than purposes. Although wills are changing but this is will toward other which creates the purpose of peace.

Another difference is that since postmodern believe in variety approaches of peace such as universal justice, Sympathy, perspectivism and Multiculturalism, so more than liberals they believe in positive peace. While liberals believe in the absence of war or negative peace. Postmodern theories suggest that peace also has got secondary and indirect causes. According to Baudrillard consumption is one these secondary reasons. He believes that consumption replaces Puritanism with hedonistic tendencies (Baudrillard, 2001, p16).

Foucault is of the opinion that controlling and disciplinarian system of ‘be everywhere’ is the cause of pressure and the break down of human psyche. In his “Wish to Understand (History of Sexuality)” writes about the pervasive influence of disciplinarian system on the birth of wars: “wars are done as the essential concept of life not as a ruler to be defended. Everybody is invited to kill each other in order to save their own life and to live. Slaughter is essential. Governments are the leaders of life, bodies and races, they are able to start all the wars and kill human (Foucault, 1383, p 157).

The other difference between postmodern and liberal theories of peace is the postmodern believe in peace as a meta-narration. Next problem is the discrepancy between the liberal freedom of individuals and the totalitarian spirit of postmodernism. Liberals suspect that relating peace to various cultures and cultural totalitarianism endangers individual freedom. While the entire universe is meaningful with discrepancy and difference, liberals have a frightening attitude toward difference. Unlike what people believe, the project of liberal peace is not a complete one.

If we suppose the project of peace as a ideal project not a real one, then this project will be a guidance to lead us toward peace. Jasper (1962, p 276) quotes Kant: “permanent peace is a leading principle what it is our duty to obey it in any political task or any moral, individual or public manners. “It is not important if the permanent peace is a reality or fantasy, what is important is out duty, that is we have to behave so that if the permanent peace is a real one” (Jasper, 1962, p 276). This quotation does not mean to equal or unify various theories of peace. Rather it means to live and work peacefully in every aspects of life. According to Kant, peace as human will or purpose is the leader and stimulus in every aspect of life like management, schematization, education and leading.

Postmodern theory tries to spread peace from sides to the centre. While liberal peace begins by the geography of government-nation. Since facts have shown that the most of the organizations which support the liberal peace are huge political ones, thereby the characteristic of the political organizations is to analyze international correlation. One of the presuppositions of universal liberal peace is that war is justifiable only through national and international correlations, so justifying peace through micro organizations is useless. Certainly smaller organizations like families, schools, stadiums, offices and big and small companies have no rule in the continental analysis of politicians. The famous sentence of “democracy is not a certain type of government, it happens in the mind of people” shows the importance of education in the establishment of peace.

Table 1. Discrepancies between postmodern and liberal peace

Postmodern Peace	Liberal Peace
Emphasize on differences	Emphasize on similarities
Society is controlled by power	Society is controlled by laws.
There are various types of governments to establish peace.	Republic is the best system of government
Offices, schools, companies, universities and stadiums are organizations to make peace.	Government-nation is the best system to make permanent peace.
Acceptance of variety and difference will lead to peace.	Acceptance of cohesion and unity will lead to peace
Universal justice will lead to peace	Universal laws will lead to peace.
Knowledge of peace is mono basis and tree-shaped.	Knowledge of peace is multi basis and rhizome

Curriculum should be according to intercultural Ones.	Curriculum should be according to universal one.
Curriculum should be based on sympathy	Curriculum should be based on human reasoning and morality.
Curriculum should follow the experiences of various cultures.	Curriculum should follow the experiences of liberal cultures.
Curriculum should be pluralism	Curriculum should be universal.
Informal, small and flexible organizations are important in t curriculum	Formal, international and major organizations are important in t curriculum.
Fragmental analysis are important	Systematic analysis are important.
Push peace from sides to centre	Push peace from centre to sides.
Studying peace in the low levels of micro analysis is important.	Studying peace in the high levels of macro analysis is important.
Violence has got various physical and mental form.	Violence is mostly physical.

In the liberal theory of peace, the development of liberal governments and establishment of a confederate of nations are essential to gain the ideal world or utopia. Despite what is believed by some, the moral-rational universality dominant in liberal spirit is not the idea of the world government or Despotism Leviathan. Rather it is the idea of cosmopolitanism based on moral, freedom and duty. While proposing a linear way of development to gain peace, liberals do not reject the possibility of recession, defluxion and refraction.

7. The Frame of the Curriculum Based on the Theories of Difference and Similarity

Many various nations like Indians, Chinese, Mongols, Africans, Turks, Arabs, Greeks, Japanese, Italians, French, Russians, Spanish and many other nationalities with various cultures are living around the world. Through three centuries ago, the unity of various nations despite their differences was supposed as the basis of modern peace. Although the development of communicative systems lead many cultures to be united; but similarities, similarities and the lack of variety has become the modern sickness. Thus the last decade of the 20th century had witnessed the turn to the praises of varieties and differences to save human spirit and rapture. Not to forget that all the nations have are common in some beliefs, purposes and many other aspects. Thus those exaggerators who create a molecular image of the world in order to justify “differences” or those who suppose “differences” as the justifications of the war, are all mistaken. By correcting some liberal ideas and empowering its weaknesses the realization of peace by the use of both similarities and differences becomes possible. Thousands of cultural sources are overthrown each year. In order to prevent extinction, main and sub cultures should have true relations.

Proponents of cultural understanding put emphasis on sensitivity and attention toward cultural differences and deliver a pattern of racial cohesion. Proponents of cultural reserves, by creating a bridge to connect the culture of minorities and the main culture put emphasis on conservation of moral identity and the language of minorities (McCarthy, 1993, p 242).

Thus in the teaching of peace rational, moral, religious and educational systems are noticed as same as the consideration of minor and major analysis were noticed. A survey of manners, beliefs and values of other people will clarify the course of the difference. Of course the project of permanent peace cannot be done in some months or years. In order to attract people’s votes, most of the politicians take short-term and insignificant projects. Since cultural and educational studying have gradual and intangible outcomes, politicians suppose them as secondary preferences. The wars of the 20th century are examples of the politicians’ intolerance, flagrance, pell-mell and the use of short-term solutions of crisis. For instance peace in the Middle East has become a puzzle which has been pursued by liberal patterns for a long time, but they were nearly useless although the theoretical aspects of liberal peace cannot be rejected, but that is not enough. The mystery of war needs lots of keys instead of using شاه کلید. As the reasons of wars are various, the patterns of peace should be various.

By reference to classic liberalism, it is known that liberal tendencies like postmodern ones are pluralism and universalism. Although it is possible that objective aspects of liberalism may appear in selfish, one way contemporary liberal governments. The theories of liberal peace like the theories of Kant, Roseau, John Lock and Thomas Hobbes essentially dealt with an abstract human having same qualities. According to the pioneers of liberalism although cultures, beliefs and worldviews are different, but everybody has got basic benefits in conservation of human values and

financial welfares. Based on this attitude, because human has similar benefits so everybody is free to follow his personal will until he does not bother other's identity and legitimate profits. Liberalism supposes freedom as a public law not a specific prominence. That is, not only certain governments but all the governments should have legitimate freedom and in order to gain the common profits they should have cooperation. There are many similarities in both liberal and postmodern patterns of peace. Despite their differences, it is possible to combine them to make a peace-based curriculum. Table 2 shows the common aspects of these two.

Table 2. Postmodern and Liberal Peace in both theories

1	Peace is based on freedom and personal efflorescence chance.
2	Peace is a long, graduate and endless process
3	Individual responsibility and public will are essentials of peace
4	Despite race, color and sex every human are equal
5	The best place to spread peace is school
6	Discrepancy is not the only cause of war rather conflict management and preventing violence will improve human life
7	Curriculum should be based on Local and the world of the individual
8	Pursuing peace through multiplicity and unity is acceptable
9	Pursuing peace via violence is not available
10	Peace is a human ideal
11	Conversation is the basis of moving toward peace
12	Tolerance are advised
13	Self-understanding is an important characteristic of a pacifist
14	Peace is not limited to human sphere, but also it deals with environment and other living creatures

By the combination of the ideas of postmodern and liberal peace a curriculum based on similarities and differences will be achieved. According to Donnelly since human nature is varying so the context of human right based on the essence of culture which is regional or local, should be partly universal and partly local (Donnelly, 2003, p 106).

The main characteristic of a peace curriculum based on similarities and differences is the use of the experiments of different nations to solve crisis and conflict. Different religious like Islam, Christianity, Buddhism, Tao and the teachings of the other common ethics can be used to widespread peace. Comenius, Gandhi and Tolstoy's peace which was based on love and kindness is called faith-based peace.

Also beliefs, traditions, literature and folklores about peace can be used in the curriculums of different countries. Organizing peace curriculum should move from peace with "self" to peace with "other" and "world". Peace with self can be pursued in the fields of psychology and theology. Religion and psychology moves people toward self-identifying and خودآینی which can be used to spread self-solace and confidence. Most of the religions teach their proponents to focus on their inner soul before peace with world. Solace, equilibrium and emotional rein are the cornerstones of peace. As the result of the exquisite contests, most of the students of the world do not experience enough happiness and psych solace.

Another aspect of peace curriculum is interpersonal relations and respecting people's right. Communicative technology, social psychology, sociology, individual morality and religious laws are important sources of behaviour with "others". Behaviour with "others" may include kindness, humanity, moral duty, human obligation, righteousness, forgiveness and mercy. Any practical ay of behaviour with "others" should be taught from childhood.

Regarding universal aspect, sciences of environment, saving earth, international correlations and laws should be taught to children. Totally speaking, peace curriculum should support both universal tendencies like cosmopolitanism, communication of civilizations, international laws and relations and cross-cultural tendencies like literature, religion, theosophy, perspectivism and animism. Children should be motivated and guided toward permanent peace. Despite racial, religious, lingual and cultural differences children should be sensitive to peaceful life of people all around the world. They should oppose war, killing people and ruining the environment. They should understand that the opposition against war must be based on humanity, legal defence and civil protest.

According to Foucault at the contemporary times penalized violence does not deal with bodies rather deals with psyches. "Now the penalizing system of justice should put its teeth on the dead body of this fact" (Foucault, 1385, p

27). For Foucault schools, psychoanalysis centres and offices are authoritarian places. According to him in order to have stricter controls over the students, modern schools have considered various differentiating elements; “elements of the level of progression of any student, value of each student, his less or more good characteristic, his perseverance, his cleanness, his parent’s prosperity” (Foucault, 1385, p 184). As Foucault suggests these elements are tactics to control, organize, discipline, categorized and in simple words to capture the mind and the soul of the students.

Trainers should increase their responsibility and respond to establish peace in a consuming society. Based on McGregor extreme consumption is a way to spread violence in a consuming society (McGregor, 2007).

In Hindu and Shinto countries which have an easygoing tendency toward difference, since the religious beliefs have become internalized the religious pattern of democracy would be much more influential to be included in a curriculum. While democracy is the centre of the curriculum, it should be included in both the unwritten laws of the formal curriculum and informal curriculum. For instance it is not possible to use a general peace curriculum for the students of Haiti, Netherlands and Switzerland. Contentious minds in the most of the countries need to be taught by peace. Sometimes it is needed to ask the elites or pacifist NGOs to arrange peace curriculum. In controversial areas in which people think about the positive results of wars, the ugly and negative aspects of wars should be included in the curriculums with greater amplitude.

Hirachi patterns of schools based on contest internalize conflict and strike among the students. In order to establish peace it is necessary to put emphasis on cooperation and acceptance. Universal statement of the United Nations, ratified in the 10 September 1948 should be taught in the schools all around the world.

Based on, the scholars of peace teaching, to arrange peace curriculum we should notice both positive and negative aspects of peace (Rashed 2000, Sandy and Perkinz 2002). In positive peace contrast or conflict are the results of social, economical or political inequality which should be removed before reaching a stable peace. Negative peace which is a traditional tendency is mostly limited to obviation of violence and conflict.

To develop peace in the schools of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Danesh (2006, p 73) emphasize on the Culture of healing which spreads reconciliation and mutual trust. According to him in a general and syncretistic education it is essential to teach reporters, clerks, educational and cultural associations and parents.

Peace curriculum should notice both universal aspects like universality, communication of cultures, international correlations and laws and cross-cultural aspects like literature, religion, theosophy, perspectivism and animism.

According to what was said above, stages to organize a peace curriculum based on similarities and differences are as below:

7.1. Pedigreed study of violence and conflict

Violence and conflict has a historical background. The analysis of the history of violence and conflict in a region or geographical location needs a group of researches to find some information about hidden and apparent aspects of conflict, animosity, jealousy, hatred and positive or negative relations of individuals and groups who are the main targets of the curriculum. As the result of obliviousness toward hidden and indirect agents of the curriculum, many of the peace curriculums have remained barren and useless. To reach the consensus, we need suppositions, beliefs and experiences of families, religious organizations, political powers, senators and local leaders. The necessary information to arrange a peace-based curriculum needed by the scholars may not be available directly. So there is a need to a group of detailed and follow up researches.

7.2. Movement from similarity toward difference

After recognizing their similarities to each other, students have to recognize their differentiating characteristics. They must learn not to demolish differences. A problem of peace-based curriculums is their attempt to depart students’ mind from differences. Actually a suitable peace-based curriculum should decrease the fear of differences as an individual, group or racial crisis. Although the total removal of the fear of difference is not possible and human are afraid of differences by instinct, but the decrease of this fear can make the stage for sympathy with another and understanding other as being the other. According to Jessup in a postmodern deconstructed situation the true and false idea will be depend on the cultural selection (Jessup, 2001). The question of if various cultures have true thinking about peace, is not important rather it is important that the cultures should understand peace to a level that they would never solve their material or immaterial problems by violence or war. All the given solutions have got their specific shortcomings. All the cultures should leave any totalistic and inflexible tendencies toward life and do not force each others to follow their

rules. The realities of social life have spread among various cultures and cultural actors must know that the evolution of human life have always changed the cultures and their signs like beliefs, language, attitude and costumes according to time and place previously and also in future. Thus attempting to change the others in a fast speed is erroneous.

7.3. *Movement from difference to similarity*

Students can talk about their differences. Discussion in equal, fair and همدلی situation may increase the friendship. Students should know that accepting others does not mean share thinking or imitation. Our understanding of acceptance may have various meanings of cooperation. The exact meaning is cooperation while being different and evaluate each other. Different abilities, tendencies and beliefs can evaluate each other. Students should learn that they can use the abilities of each other in free situation and by internal will. Respecting self actualization rejects necessity of cooperation. Thus the stimulus of any cooperation is free will. Even when the changing of the “other” is for the sake humanity and helping people, it should be gradual and slow through education. Peaceful changing through education needs a long time. Surely in the peace project, cultural changes are much more useful than political ones. By transmitting violence to the next generations, projects of war to make peace have got negative and inhuman results. Children who lost their parents during wars have reflexive and aggressive violence. Also as the result of negative emotional experiences of war, there will be no space for logical communication.

The conflicting aspects of the اختلاف can be solved by “being together” without “being similar”. A peace curriculum should notice both cultural interactions through similarities and understanding cultural conflicts through difference. When cultural interactions, cooperation and unity if thoughts is not possible, understanding others and sympathy should be the topic of the arrangement of peace curriculum. If we suppose culture in its general reference as the pattern of life and facing the world, so then any culture or sub culture had formed as a response to a certain time and condition. During centuries, each group and nation had encountered with different needs. Even in the minute stages, the history of a person’s life differentiates the characteristics of the individuals. Individual, group, racial and national differences will never finish and this is the most important lesson for the students to learn in social studies.

7.4. *Commonality of the peace curriculum*

To prepare the purposes of the peace curriculum all the related and interest groups should be included as the sources of need assessment. Teachers, students, parents, school chairmen, municipality chairmen, university members and scientific associations are the sources of preparation of peace curriculum.

Finally it should be mentioned that we don’t mean the arrangement of a general pattern which can be used lots of times in different conditions. Rather it is necessary that according to social status, cultural and Idealistic characteristics, the Dynamic patterns of the curriculum should be prepared and change in harmony with the experiences.

8. Conclusion

Not to be accepted as a meta-narration by postmodern, it can be said that in our time peace is one of the essentials of human life. Since the destruction human by nuclear wars is probable, nor can postmodern scholars deconstruct peace, neither classic and modern liberals can prospect the pacifism of democrats and the rise of governmental An .unions ontent of the curriculum should be the c ,based curriculum-To accomplish the peace .internalized supervision is needed based on the users environment and should be done by their participation. Based on the Theories of "Difference" and "Similarity" in peace curricula we need both pluralism and universalism.

In a peace-based curriculum, mentioning the differences is as important as mentioning similarities. Thus their mechanism is like a pair of wings to make an ideal and influential curriculum.

References

- Adorno, W. T. (1966). *Negative Dialectics*, trans . by E.B. Ashton, Routledge,1990,P.320.
- Baudrillard, J. (2001). *The Consumer Society*. In M. Poster (Ed), *Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Danesh, H.B. (2006). *Towards an Integrative Theory of Peace Education* , *Journal of Peace Education* , Vol. 3, No. 1, pp.55-78.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1977). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. New York: Viking.
- Derrida, J. (1987). *The Laws of Reflection: Nelson Mandela*, in : J. Derrida & M. Tlili (eds), *Admiration, for Nelson Mandela* . New York: Seaver Books, Henry Holt and Company.
- Derrida, J. (1995). *The Gift of Death*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Donnelly, J. (2003). *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality*. trans. Sarkhosh, N and Jahandideh, A. (1385). Tehran : Nashre Nei.
- Gaubatz, K. T. (1999). *Elections and War*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Huntington, S.(1993). *The clash of civilizations*. Foreign Affairs.
- Jasper, K. (1962). Kant. Edited by Hannah Arendt. Trans. Ralph Manheim .A Harvest Book. Harcourt Brace & World, Inc. New York.Farsi trans. By Naghibzadeh, M.A, Tehran:Tahori Press.
- Jepperson, R. Wendt, A & Katzenstein, P. (1996). "Norms, Identity, Culture, and National Security" in Katzenstein (ed), *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Jessup, M. (2001). Truth: The first casualty of postmodern consumerism. *Christian Scholar's Review*, 30(3), P. 289-304.
- Kant, Immanuel. (1795). *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*, trans. H .B. Nisbet . Kant, *Political Writings*, ed. H.S. Reiss, Cambridge University Press.1991
- Lyotard, J.F. (1989). *Universal history and Cultural Differences*. In A. Benjamin (ed.) *The Lyotard Reader*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Lyotard. J.F. (1984). *The Postmodern condition: a report on knowledge*, trans Geoffrey Bennington and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota press.
- Maoz, Z., and Russett, B. (1993) *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 87, No. 3, pp. 624-638.
- McCarthy, C. (1993). Multicultural approaches to racial inequality in the United States. In L. Castenell & W. Pinar (Eds.) *Understanding curriculum as ext: Representations of identity and difference in education (255-246)*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- McGregor, S.L.T. (2007). Consumerism, the common good and the human condition [Feature Article]. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences*, 99(3), 15-22.
- Mousseau, M. (1998). Democracy and Compromise in Interstate Conflicts, 1816-1992. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42:210-30.
- Oneal, J.R., Russett, B & Berbaum, M. L. (2003). Causes of Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations. *International Studies Quarterly* 47(3): 371-393.
- Rasheed, S. (2000). *Curriculum Reportcard*, United Nation Children's Fund, New York.
- Russett, B. (2000). How Democracy, Interdependence, and international Organizations Create a System for Peace, In Charles W. Kegley Jr. and Eugene Wittfopk (eds.) *The Global Agenda* 6th ed. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Sandy, L.R & Perkins, R. (2002). The Nature of Peace and its Implications for Peace Education. *OJPCR: The Online Journal of Peace and Conflict Resolution* .
- Schults, K.A. (2001). *Democracy and Coercive Diplomacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.