Education for peace: analysis of the cultural conditions of development in Brazil

Educação para a paz: análise das condições culturais de desenvolvimento no Brasil

Educación para la paz: análisis de las condiciones culturales de desarrollo en Brasil

André Felipe Costa Santos[*]
Clarilza Prado de Sousa[**]

Abstract: In a world reality characterized by the phenomenon of violence, non-recognition of fundamental rights, social exclusion and many other ills that constitute the Warmonger Culture and compromise the development of Peace, according to international organizations and researchers, it becomes essential the development of a Culture of Peace through Education. In this line, in 2018, the Brazilian State signed, through the National Education Guidelines and Framework Law (Law No. 9.394/1996), the commitment of the national educational system to promote the Culture of Peace. In view of that, this paper aimed at reflecting on the Brazilian cultural conditions for the development of an Education for Peace in Brazil. Thus, three contemporary social problems that compose the warrior ethos of Brazilian culture were analyzed and, in parallel, theoretical foundations were indicated for the elaboration of an Education for Peace in Brazil based on an intersubjective ethics that recognizes the Other and social realities as dialogical elements of the constitution of the being and of social transformation of the collective
Keywords: Education for Peace. Culture. Brazil. Warrior Ethos. Peace.

Resumo: Em uma realidade mundial caracterizada pelo fenômeno da violência, do não reconhecimento dos direitos fundamentais, das exclusões sociais e de outras tantas mazelas que constituem a Cultura Belicista e comprometem o desenvolvimento da Paz, conforme organismos internacionais e investigadores, torna-se imprescindível o desenvolvimento de uma Cultura da Paz por intermédio da educação. Nessa linha, no ano de 2018, o Estado brasileiro celebrou, por meio da Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional (Lei n º 9.394/96), o compromisso de o sistema de ensino nacional promover a Cultura da Paz. Em face de tal conjuntura, o presente artigo objetivou refletir sobre as condições culturais brasileiras para o desenvolvimento de uma Educação para a Paz no Brasil. Assim, foram analisadas três problemáticas sociais contemporâneas que compõem o *ethos* guerreiro da cultura brasileira e,

638

---

[*] PhD student of Graduation Program in Education: Psychology of Education, Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP). E-mail: <andrefelipecostasantos@gmail.com>.

[**] Teacher of Graduation Program in Education: Psychology of Education, Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP). Research Productivity – CNPq. E-mail: <clarilza.prado@gmail.com>.

paralelamente, indicados fundamentos teóricos para elaboração de uma Educação para a Paz no Brasil pautada em uma ética intersubjetiva, que reconheça o Outro e as realidades sociais como elementos dialógicos da constituição do ser e de transformação social dos coletivos.
Palavras-chave: Educação para a Paz. Cultura. Brasil. *Ethos* Guerreiro. Paz.

Resumen: En una realidad mundial caracterizada por el fenómeno de la violencia, del no reconocimiento de los derechos fundamentales, de las exclusiones sociales y de otros tantos males que constituyen la Cultura Belicista y comprometen el desarrollo de la Paz, conforme organismos internacionales e investigadores, se hace imprescindible el desarrollo de una Cultura de la Paz por intermedio de la educación. En esa línea, en el año de 2018, el Estado Brasileño celebró, en la Ley de Directrices y Bases de la Educación Nacional (Ley n ° 9.394/96), el compromiso de que el sistema de educación nacional promueva la Cultura de la Paz. En vista de tal coyuntura, en el presente artículo se tuvo por objetivo reflexionar sobre las condiciones culturales brasileñas para el desarrollo de una Educación para la Paz en Brasil. Así, fueron analizadas tres problemáticas sociales contemporáneas que componen el *ethos* guerrero de la cultura brasileña y, paralelamente, indicados fundamentos teóricos para la elaboración de una Educación para la Paz en Brasil pautada en una ética intersubjetiva que reconozca al Otro y las realidades sociales como elementos dialógicos de la constitución del ser y de transformación social de los colectivos.
Palabras clave: Educación para la Paz. Cultura. Brasil. *Ethos* Guerrero. Paz.

Introduction

The 20th century is characterized by two World Wars, countless isolated armed conflicts, scission of international relations, the discouragement of authoritarian ideologies among other conjunctural points (HOBSBAWN, 2005). Heir of these and other historical barbarisms, the 21st century begins by bringing a complex collective aegis that proclaims the urgency of States and Nations to reflect about Peace[2].

Due to the repercussion of this reality in the educational field, and recognizing that there is a number of interests and social forces that act on the theme of educational agendas, we find that the ideals of organizations have crystallized as referential milestones of the proposals of "Education for the 21st Century" (UNESCO, 1995; IPRA, 2000; HRW, 2016) that advocate the commitment of contemporary education to develop an Education for Peace.

Not being a recent discussion in the history of humanity, the support of education as an instrument for the development and maintenance of Peace has its epistemic foundation in the

639

---

[2] Recognizing that there is a range of concepts and the rich hermeneutic plasticity that circumscribes the concept of Peace today, this article adopts the concept of Imperfect Peace, as advocated by Muñoz (2001). According to the researcher, synthetically, the research for Peace, when adopting the adjectivation of 'imperfect', aims to reinforce an interpretation anchored in critical realism (MORGENTHAU, 2003; GALTUNG, 2003), thus understanding Peace as a phenomenon that occurs in the historical-cultural procedural context and in an incomplete way. In this line of thought, there is an epistemic reorientation that opposes the traditional conceptualizations of Peace (KANT, 1751/2001; HOBBES, 1651/1988; KELSEN, 2003) as a social and individual state to be reached at a moral ideal level through legal agreements, which weakly consider a set of elements that circumscribe social interactions between societies and subjects. In this point of view, the concept of 'Imperfect Peace', elaborated by Muñoz (2001), also contributes to a reflection on Education for Peace, based on its own independent perspective; (Peace / War, Peace / Conflict, Peace / Religion, Peace / Security and others) that biased irenic thinking (in particular, irenic thinking from the 1970s to the 1980s) and more closely approximated to questions that circumscribe the possible elements of modernity transformation such as moral values, ethical relations, social empowerment, conflict management, affective relations, complexity, among other aspects (FERNÁNDEZ-HERRERÍA, 2014). For a more detailed incursion, refer to Santos (2017), Santos e Sousa (2017) and Munõz (2001).

irenistic philosophical thought[3] of Erasmus of Rotterdam and Comenius in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. However, Education for Peace only enters more prominently in the political agora and in the scientific community from the twentieth century, considering that other epistemologies and methodologies of Peace research began to be developed in the mid-1920s, untied from influences that could be religious (Jewish-Christian), romantic, or even the restricted reading of Peace as an antinomy of phenomena such as war and violence

In these almost one hundred years of investigation and structuring of a theoretical-methodological corpus about Education for Peace, we concisely note that there are four historical movements of pacifist educational thought (SANTOS, 2017; JARES, 2002): the first moment is marked by studies of the so-called 'New School', by Piaget, Montessori, Bovet, and other scientists; the second moment presents as a mark the prominence of supranational organizations that encouraged the carrying out of scientific investigations to subsidize educational public policies addressing the theme of Peace and Human Rights[4]; the third, linked to the ideals of non-violence, is proclaimed by Gandhi and Martin Luther King. The last moment is marked by the conception of the discipline 'Peace Research', within the framework of the *International Peace Research Institute Oslo* (PRIO), developed by Johan Galtung and collaborators[5] (LEDERACH, 2007), in which a set of interpretations that interconnected the study of Peace to other phenomena was developed[6].

Considering that there are complementarities between the four mentioned historical moments dedicated to the investigation of Education for Peace, we find that in the present time the 'Research for Peace' (GALTUNG, 1975), as well as the contributions of 'Supranational Organizations' emerge as the two historical moments which more proficuously collaborated for the circumscription and theoretical-methodological range of Education for Peace (JARES, 2007; NUÑOZ, 2001).

640

Specifically, with regard to the contributions of international organizations, especially those from the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), it is important to emphasize that in the context of its recommendations on Education for Peace in the twenty-first century, a perspective of Peace distinct from the one proclaimed by Galtung (1975) and other irenicist epistemologies stands out (ISHIDA, 1969; MUÑOZ, 2001; MARTÍNEZ, 2005). Although we recognize the importance of the institutional centrality of UNESCO in proposing an international dialogue regarding the planning and development of contemporary education, it is fundamental to have prudence and to analyze that within such an organization, the interpretation of Education for Peace resides prominently in two principles: the first is the defense of an Education for Peace project based on the interpretations of the deontological ethics of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) which, syntactically, proclaims that the "state" of Peace stems from a rationally structured morality decision in which it is the responsibility/duty of the State to concretize natural laws and promote general enlightenment ("Aufklärung") with a purpose of achieving Peace. Therefore, in this perspective, Peace acquires the sense of a social state celebrated through agreements between States and Nations.

---

[3] Irenism is a stream of philosophical thought dedicated to the study of Peace; its vernacular honors the goddess of Peace (Irene-Εἰρήνη) in Greek mythology.

[4] In particular, the studies of the United Nations (UN) stand out.

[5] In developing his thesis on "Theory of Peace and Conflict" (GALTUNG, 1965), J. Galtung and founding the discipline of "Research for Peace" enabled the transdisciplinary flourishing of research for Peace. Theoretical influences and influences are highlighted by the following researches: J. Lederach; Spanish authors of X. Jarez and F. Munõz; Brazilians of M. Guimarães and others.

[6] Galtung (1975) articulates Peace, especially, to the phenomena of social conflicts, security and violence.

Furthermore, the second principle is characterized by the application of an interpretation of peace education associated with a set of ideological forces that establish the universalization of supranational interests[7] (EVANGELISTA, 2003); hence, due to the cultural-historical conjuncture the 1980s and 1990s, a set of guidelines that conceive an education for peace established by a universalist speech was elaborated by the supranational body, prominently connected to a neoliberal educational plan and accompanied by the interests of multilateral organizations, such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD). Consequently, a pacifist educational proposal was constituted, marked by an "alleged idealized peace, as disposed in several documents of that institution [World Bank] [...] this movement, in a sense, politically biases a matter that is rather more complex than the one established by UNESCO" (MAGALHÃES, 2013, p. 121) [our addition].

When we are at a certain distance from those assumed educational guidelines defended by UN/UNESCO and connected to irenistic studies developed by the "Research for Peace" movement (GANTUNG, 1975; JARES, 2007; GUIMARÃES, 2005, among others) we understand that Education for Peace is:

> a particular way of **educating through values.** [...] Educating for peace presupposes education from and to **certain values**, such as justice, cooperation, solidarity, commitment, personal and collective autonomy, respect, **while questioning the values contrary to a culture of peace**, like discrimination, intolerance, ethnocentrism, blind obedience, indifference and lack of solidarity, conformism. **Educating for peace is an education that comes from action.** (JARES, 2007, p. 45) [translated and emphasized by the author]

Supported by the described conceptualization above, we show that the investigation of Peace Education here defended inscribes the need for a study that contemplates an analysis of ethical, axiological, epistemological and ontological relations. Therefore, from the assumption that the study of Education for Peace as a scientific object must guide itself as transdisciplinary cooperative research with further expertise of the multiple areas of knowledge (MUÑOZ, 2001).

641

In addition, we find that the Education for Peace praxis, based on moral values, adopts a non-neutrality perspective, requiring an open and dynamic social theory, with the intentionality of social intervention (WIBERG, 2005; GALTUNG, 1975). Therefore, the development of such an education perspective also requires a focus on the subjects, societies, and interactions between them, based on the historical-cultural and contingent conjuncture that composes these realities (BERGER; LUCKMANN, 2004). In other words, Education for Peace, having as defense "human dignity", "equality of social rights and duties", "democracy in education", among other elements, presupposes a close look at values, beliefs, representations, and experiences that constitute *localisms* and their relation to multiculturalism (SANTOS, 1997).

Due to this, we conclude that Education for Peace[8] can also be understood as a counterculture project, because in assuming a progressive educational position anchored in the

---

[7] For instance: World Bank, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) etc.

[8] Briefly, it is worth pointing out that we adopt the concept of Culture of Peace as "[...]a set of representations that constitute the life of a people and that interacts with the economic, social and political forms of life, such as the models of development; educational and cultural models; the models of relations, between peoples as between people; the role and place of non-violence and dialogue in the resolution of human problems" (GUIMARÃES, 2008, 65) [translated by the author]

Culture of Peace, it aims to develop a formative process in the learning communities[9] opposing to and breaking with the Belligerent Culture (SANTOS 2017; SANTOS; SOUSA, 2017).

In this sense, the Culture of Peace, as well as the Education for Peace here proclaimed (JARES, 2007; GUIMARÃES, 2011) are interested in developing other subjectivities based on an intersubjective ethic in which the *Self* understands itself as "being" constituent and constitutor of the *Other*[10], in a social interaction marked by the existence of contradiction, affection, emotion, ideologies and other social elements (LEVIN, 2004; MARKOVÁ, 2017). As a result of this dialogical relation, "becoming human includes becoming nonhuman [...] the subject falls into multiplicities" (GUARARESCHI, 1998, p. 175) of many *Others*, in which he is infinitely responsible for the constitution of "Us". Moreover, it is possible to observe that intersubjective ethics focusing on the Self-Other relationship has two core precepts: social recognition and reciprocity; (MARKOVÁ, 2017), thus surpassing the social interpretations, eminently marked by a deontological ethics (KANT, 1974), as reported, mostly focused positive aspects to the detriment of the subject's reflection as an active being of the development of Peace.

By recognizing these conceptualizations and research recommendations that outline the research of Education for Peace, we find that in many countries there was a weak flourishing of pacifist educational ideals (IPRA, 2000; HRW, 2003), nevertheless, we can indicate that at the end of the 20th century a scientific spirit of time (Zeitgeist) was developed to foster the strengthening of theories and methodologies that contemplate other variables of the phenomenon of Peace versed in Education (GUIMARÃES, 2008; SANTOS, 2017; FREIRE, 1992).

Considering the instrumental possibility that education allows the development of peace, and in view of the delicate development of pacifist educational ideals in many states and nations; the present article aims to analyze the cultural conditions for the development of an Education for Peace in Brazil.

Reflecting upon conditions for the development of an Education for Peace, in the Brazilian case, can be seen as opportune, mainly, in virtue of three complementary prerogatives:

1st. Brazilian regional protagonism in Latin America: Derived from the range of international agreements and treaties that Brazil is signatory[11] and through which it undertakes to safeguard and develop Peace and Human Rights. This line of thought comes from the same regional role that Brazil has in the context of South America, which enables it to be prominent in educational proposals in the field of intergovernmental organizations[12], as well as in the duties of these institutions;

---

[9] Having as defence that the Education for Peace must be implemented in formal and informal educational environments, we start from the understanding that the learning community "[...]is a project of social and cultural transformation of an educational center and its environment to achieve an information society for all people, based on a dialogic learning through a participatory community education which is based on all its spaces" (VALLS, 2000, p. 34) [translated by the author].

[10] Guided by Jovchelovitch's (1998, p. 69) studies, we understand the *Other* in this essay as "[...]human and non-human objects, once they become recognized as objects of knowledge. The other is simply there, but emerges as such when it is recognized. In this sense, the *Other* refers to everything that becomes an object of knowledge, including, of course, the moment when the self becomes an object for itself." [translated by the author]

[11] Highlights: Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UN, 1948), American Convention on Human Rights - Pact of San José, Costa Rica and other international agreements.

[12] In particular, the Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR), the Organization of American States (OAS), the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR), the Lima Group and others.

2nd Educational Positivation: Based on the alteration of the Law of Directives and Bases of National Education, Law No. 9.394, of December 20, 1996, by mediation of the Law No. 13.663, of May 14, 2018, that establishes in the article 12), the commitment of the national educational system[13] should foster a Culture of Peace and also of awareness, prevention of and combat to all types of violence[14] (BRASIL, 2018).

Rested on such legislative update, it is understood that the Brazilian State took on, in the year of 2008, the recognition that one of the elements that the formation of its citizens in the contemporary world, goes through the development of a Culture of Peace. Accurately, we point out that such modernization of the LDB is refractory and confluent to other legal frameworks that subsidized the historical and political conditions for the inclusion of this modification, highlighted the National Human Rights Education Plan (BRASIL, 2009) and the National Guidelines for Human Rights Education (BRASIL, 2012) by emphasizing that one of the purposes of the national education system should be the constitution of a society based on respect for the diversity, recognition, and fulfillment of human rights and respect for the dignity of the human person.

In this line of thought, we find that within the framework of Brazilian educational laws there is already a set of norms and guidelines that justify the fruitfulness of the development of studies and investigations of pedagogical/educational perspectives interested in the development of the Culture of Peace. Thus, such a scenario encourages us to elaborate this text, by focusing attention on Education for Peace.

When considering the existence of this legal prerogative to perform the present study, in addition, it is opportune to indicate that, although the inscription of the term "Culture of Peace" in the letter of the law appears as a political-social advance of the Brazilian State in asserting the representativeness and the recognition of a theoretical construct - Culture of Peace - in the orientation of national education, it is verified, through the analysis of the justifications of the proposed Law (PL No. 5.826, of 2016), which supported the alteration of LDB Law No. 13.663, of 2018, that legislators mostly classified the understanding of Culture of Peace in the educational sphere, with the restricted purpose of fight against violence, in particular, bullying. Thus, in spite of the symbolic relevance of the inclusion in the legal text of the locution "Culture of Peace", it is inferred that this term was attributed to a timid functional sense of combat to violence; reinforcing in this definition, in an underlying manner, the relevance of developing studies and educational research that equally broaden and spread new meanings of the concept of the Culture of Peace, as they occur in the studies dedicated to Education for Peace.

3rd. Social Sphere: Derives from the fact that in Brazilian society, over the last decades, there has been an alarming increase in the multiple forms of violence[15], which stimulates the

643

---

[13] Specifically, in the section that positives, regarding the errands of educational institutions and common standards of the country's educational system.

[14] For further knowledge: "Art. 12. Educational establishments, in compliance with common norms and the ones of its educational system, shall be responsible for: I - Preparing and executing one's pedagogical proposal; [...] IX - Promoting measures to raise awareness, prevent and combat all forms of violence, especially bullying, in schools; X - Establishing actions to promote a culture of peace in schools." (BRASIL, 1996) [emphasis added – translated by the author]

[15] Recognizing the existence of a vast range of concepts surrounding the phenomenon of (ARENDT, 2009; DUBET, 2004; CHAUÍ, 1999; WIEVIORKA, 1997). Violence, in this article, we consider as comprehension the interpretation of violence elaborated by Galtung (1975). According to the researcher, for the analysis of violence it is necessary to reflect on this phenomenon in three complementary forms: *1. Direct Violence 2. Structural Violence 3. Cultural Violence. Direct Violence* is characterized as the manifestation of physical and / or psychological aggression that injures or kills the person intentionally, instrumentally and rapidly, producing somatic or total trauma. *Structural*

debate about the contributions that education may present for the development of Peace and the positive transformation[16] of reality (IPEA, 2017; WAISELFISZ, 2016, 2017; HRW, 2016, 2017).

The cultural eclipse of an Education for Peace in Brazil

Recognizing that there is a range of cultural elements that each country has in order to define itself, and that these elements may be contributory or even points to be overcome/managed for the development of an Education for Peace (JARES, 2007), the present section aims to reflect on the faces of the *ethos warrior* (ELIAS, 1994) as one of the cultural elements which make the development of an Education for Peace complex (JARES, 2007) in Brazil.

"A giant by thine own nature", as the excerpt from the national anthem illustrates, Brazil presents a rich multiculturality and complexity. Having a historical process marked by colonization, the spoliation of riches and the epistemic knowledge, the Brazilian culture was developed in the spirit of resistance and imposition of European aesthetic and ethical values, therefore, having its culture built highly based on violence (LANE, 2000; FAUST, 2001). As Ribeiro reinforces (2006), when analyzing the cultural remnants of the Brazilian colonial period in modernity[17]:

> All of us Brazilians are flesh of the flesh of those blacks and Indians pleaded. All of us Brazilians are equal, the possessed hand that begged them. The tenderest sweetness and the most atrocious cruelty here combined to make of us the people who felt and suffered and the insensitive and brutal people that we are too. (RIBEIRO, 2006, p. 108). [translated by the author]

644

Considering that social groupings when experiencing successive violence in their historical course do not remain unscathed, since they perform symbolic and cultural reworkings (RIBEIRO, 2006); we can affirm that the Brazilian belligerent assiduity contributed to the continuity of a social formation demarcated by an *ethos warrior* in its historical course, as well as at the present time.

A theoretical construct developed by Elias (1994), the *ethos warrior* is systematized as ethics based on a set of norms and moral values associated with the principles of violence and pleasure. Regarding the first principle, Elias (1994) emphasizes that it is not a matter of analyzing violence as an innate characteristic between subject and social groupings. Although, it should be noted that, in the human history, the phenomenon of violence has been naturalized in social

---

Violence, focuses on "the very social, inter-human structure, between human group (society), between groups of societies (alliances, regions) in the world" (GALTUNG, 1975, p. 2) which means, *Structural Violence* originates in the economic and political compositions of society, occurs when people are victims of political oppression, economic exploitation or social subjugation. *Cultural Violence* is seen as a network that symbolically legitimizes and reinforces the other two types of violence mentioned above through its system of values, norms and behaviors.

[16] Recognizing the complexity of understandings that constitute a "positive transformation" of societies, influenced by Galtung (1975) in this manuscript , we understand that the search for a positive transformation of societies is based on the fulfillment of Human Rights (UN, 1948/199), dignity of the human person, equality of rights and duties, recognition and appreciation of differences and diversity, democracy and others emerge as fundamental values.

[17] As Marková (2017) points out, the concept of "modernity" has now become a 'buzzword' which is usually adopted, but sporadically explained; in this essay we have as premise that modernityis systematizes as a post-medieval historical period in Europe and refer to a historically unprecedented amalgam of new practices and institutional forms (technology, science, industrial production, urbanization), new ways of life (secularization, individualism , instrumental rationality, change in the relations of public and private space), and new forms of malaise (alienation, lack of meaning, an imminent sense of social dissolution).

relations, languages, rites, individual desires and among other contributory social elements for confection and sedimentation of a Belligerent Culture.

On the other hand, the principle of pleasure brings to light an ontological understanding (JAPIASSU, 1977) that composes the delineation of individual and collective relations by the desire to avoid displeasure, suffering, misfortune, among other characteristics connected to the escape of pain (ELIAS, 1994)[18].

In that conceptualization, by presenting itself as one of the components that circumscribes social structure, the *ethos warrior* is systematized as a set of sociocultural dispositions that guides competitive practices between individuals and societies, stimulating the need for success/victory through adoption of violent physical or psychological behaviors, not only to achieve the desired end, but especially to develop an *Other* to be defeated and to have their morals and their integrity destroyed (SILVA; FLORES, 2011; SANTOS, 2017).

As Elias states (1994), it is possible to verify that the faces of the Brazilian *ethos warrior*, today, are founded on a tangle of sociocultural manifestations that point to the conflictive management of an Education for Peace (JARES, 2007). Among these faces, we find the emergence of three integrated critical points that, at the same time, allow us to think about fundamentals for developing an Education for Peace (JARES, 2005) in Brazil. In addition, it is important to emphasize that these fundamentals are not educational prescriptions but rather partial reflections that aim to present contributions to the praxis of an Education for Peace guided by intersubjective ethics, based on the problematic of the *Brazilian ethos warrior*.

The first critical point that comes to light is the face of the *ethos warrior* as structural violence contained in social inequality. Not being Brazil's exclusive attribute, the phenomenon of social inequality in modernity, by bringing as a symbol the struggle for the recognition and fulfillment of fundamental rights (HONNETH, 2003), portrays the presence of structural violence in its multiple dimensions, among them, are in evidence: *1. Education; 2. Health; 3. Revenue*.

Regarding the educational dimension, although public power and social collectives made progress in expanding access to Basic and Higher Education between 2003 and 2015 (BRASIL, 2018); there are still vestiges of old historical cultural problems of social inequality in education. This scenario shows that in the year 2017 there were 11.8 million illiterates, 37% of the Brazilian population over 18 years of age with incomplete Primary Education, only 52.5% of the young people between the ages of 18 and 20 had completed High School (BRASIL, 2017), low quality of education (BRASIL, 2017), among other points to be overcome.

Based on these data, it is possible to infer that there is a State and a social corpus that vilify the right of education of the citizens, deprive the introduction of other realities of choice to the subjects, as well as curtailing the development of autonomy through school education (FREIRE, 1992). Furthermore, the perpetuation of social inequality in Brazilian education attracts more inputs due to the development of a leading social class which, although promoting a discourse of respect and compliance with the principle of educational equity, acts by

645

---

[18] It is valid to note that although there is a strong influence of psychoanalytic postulates in Elias's (1994) thought, the ethos warrior in pointing to the pleasure principle finds special intercession with the Aristotelian tradition, from the conception of virtues. As Aristotle (1979, p. 34) stresses: "[...]Virtues are related to actions and passions, and pleasure and pain accompany all passion, for this reason virtue will be related to pleasures and pains. ... *and men become evil because of pleasures and pains, for seeking or avoiding them* [...] that is why some also define virtue as a state of impossibility and serenity; but they do not define it well, because one speaks in an absolute way". [translated by the author - emphasis added]

impoverishing the fundamental conditions for the implementation of equity; such overlapping of the private interest of the ruling class cooperates, above all, for a symbolic agency that trivializes and naturalizes the preterition of the poor, minority groups, etc. (CHAUÍ, 2017; SOUZA, 2009).

Regarding the health dimension of social inequality, when we reflect only on the problem of infant mortality in Brazil, we observe that despite the decrease in infant deaths compared to the world indexes[19], Brazil still has high figures of factors linked to public social infrastructure contributing to the incidence of such phenomenon. The following factors that cooperate to the child mortality frequency emerge: the fragility of public access policies and the universalization of basic public health related to sanitary, epidemiological and neonatal control, among other elements (UNICEF, 2017). Confluent with this information, it is interesting to note that the social stratum with the highest frequency of infant mortality continues to be composed by the poorest population and social groupings that have the greatest difficulties in accessing the public power's attention (FRANÇA et al., 2001, 2017).

On the other hand, we find that Brazil shows an alarming concentration of income, as the IBGE study (2018) states, concluding that in 2017, "[...]10% of the population with the highest incomes accounted for 43.3 percent of the country's income, while the 10 percent share with the lowest incomes held only 0.7 percent of the total"; additionally, people with the highest average incomes earned R$ 27,213 and represented 1% of the Brazilian population, being "[...] 36.1 times higher than the average income of the 50% of the population with the lowest incomes (R$ 754)" (IBGE, 2018, p. 1). Due to these data, it is possible to emphasize that currently, there is a picture of a system in which the State still faces problems to provide conditions of income growth in an equitable way.

Faced with this first critical point, we concisely show that the structural violence expressed in the various dimensions of social inequality is aimed at the constitution of a State and a *social corpus* that materialize and establish a *modus vivendi* of naturalization of the non-recognition and fulfillment of fundamental rights to all. *Pari passu* with this crisis of social recognition, it is noted that this malaise of the modern state indicates, above all, the urgency of establishing self-criticism to this exclusionary democracy; therefore, it is essential that the constitution and conservation of popular participation mechanisms in the democratic system are encouraged.

In addition, thinking about the development of an Education for Peace (JARES, 2007; GUIMARÃES, 2005) in Brazil, primarily, has as one of its foundations the adoption of a critical position regarding democracy and social rights experienced by collectives. Education for Peace, while progressive, should orient its pedagogy *"to"* and *"in"* the exercise of participatory citizenship, aiming to develop the constitution of a subjectivity recognizing the *Other* as "the subject of rights" and participant of a collective that is everyone's responsibility.

Following this line of thought, Education for Peace presupposes an educational praxis guided by the dialogue of "conscientiousness" (FREIRE, 1978), which means, a pedagogy that fosters awareness of objective reality and, at the same time, promotes actions of social transformation about the contradictions of reality. In this perspective, the curriculum must be understood as "[...] lived by the protagonists of the educational process inside and outside the classroom" (SÁEZ, 2006, p. 12); thus, contemplating the experiences, the affections, the circumstances and other components of the relation of the subjects and social groupings.

646

---

[19] According to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF, 2017), in the year 2017, an average of 19 deaths per thousand live births were registered.

The second critical point that makes the development of an Education for Peace complex (UNESCO, 1999) in Brazil, lies in the face of the *ethos warrior* manifested in the direct violence suffered by social minority[20] groups and in situations of social vulnerability. Historically marked by exclusion, stigma, and marginalization, these populations daily experience a social structure permeated by moral values that serve as inputs for the strengthening of an *ethos warrior* that aims to crush, injure and exterminate the *Other* (CHAUÍ, 2017; SOUZA, 2009). After typically portraying this face of the *ethos warrior*, we bring to light the incidence of the feminicide phenomenon.

Feminicide begins before the woman is fatally victimized since she is recurrently in a social context circumscribed by a 'web of gender violence'[21] (WIEVIORKA, 1997). Therefore, as we reflect on feminicide today, we are led to ponder on one of the aspects that the *ethos warrior* executed in the Brazilian culture, which is, to hide the domestic violence suffered by women, in the name of a *habitus* that is anchored, especially, in cultural values of patriarchalism and sexism, on the assumption that the private, or rather, the 'family tradition' is endowed with a 'divinely bestowed wisdom' not being the responsibility of the public to intervene in domestic/private situations of violence. In other words, it is the force of the old adage in Portuguese "*Em briga de marido e mulher ninguém mete a colher*", which means no one must interfere in a couple's physical argument. That reveals a society that is mutually conniving in the face of the aggressions suffered by women in the domestic environment and in other places (ZALUAR, 1999).

From this understanding, it must also be considered that the public space itself, being a composer and being composed by elements of the private space, sometimes shares a set of values, beliefs, and knowledge that disregards or discredits the violence suffered by women. Thus, the public power, by minimizing these facts, indirectly represents the continuation of violent behavior against women. This value-sharing between social spaces, as reinforced by Zaluar (1999), shows the inefficiency of the public space in accepting women in situations of violence in a respectful way and without 'blaming' them for the act they suffered.

In this line of thought, considering the fragile network of collective support and the tenuous performance of the public power to receive the victim and intervene with the aggressor(s), despite the studies presenting alarming figures regarding the direct violence suffered by women, it is estimated that the numbers are still higher, since many women do not file a report. In this sense, to expose the barbarism of direct violence suffered by women, in the year 2016, 49,497 cases of rapes and 4,645 murders were registered in Brazil[22], representing an increase of 6.4% when compared to the period 2006 - 2016 (IPEA, 2018).

Based on this second point, it is possible to note that the manifestation of the *ethos warrior*, outsourced in direct violence suffered by social minority groups and in situation of social vulnerability, presents as one of its inner elements, an element of cultural factors reminiscent of Brazilian structural violence previously reported. That represents the absence of recognition and fulfillment of social rights added to a social behavior based on moral values that hinder and impel direct violence on the *Other* (CHAUÍ, 2017; SOUZA, 2009).

In this perspective, reflecting on the development of an Education for Peace (UNESCO, 1999) in the Brazilian tradition, brings, in addition, one of its *foundations* an attentive

---

[20] Emphasis is given to the emergence of social minorities of blacks, natives, the disabled, homosexuals, refugees, among others.

[21] Examples of gender violence include psychological, patrimonial, physical or sexual violence (IPEA, 2018).

[22] 4.5 homicides for every 100 thousand Brazilians.

look at social minorities and those in a situation of social vulnerability, since such populations are the main sufferers of direct violence.

The intervention of Education for Peace relates to this foundation in two complementary social spheres. In the *collective sphere*, it is prudent to think of a Brazilian Education for Peace, based and articulated on social programs and projects structured in psychosocial support networks along with the subjects/groups involved in a situation of violence; thus encompassing both the victim and the aggressor. In this line of thought, it is possible to indicate that such education must permeate and lead the principles of the various apparatuses of the State and of civil society as a *means* to resolve violence and as an *end,* with the development of a non-violent society.

In parallel, it is essential to create social spaces for democratic participation, the exercise of restorative justice and the mediation of conflicts (LEDERACH, 2007; GALTUNG, 1975). Regarding the last aspect and its relation to direct violence, it is important to identify that by recognizing that direct violence results from a frustrating management of the *state of conflict* (SANTOS; SOUSA, 2018), we can conceive the creation of collective environments to explain the conflict with the intention to prevent violence and positively transform social problems that affect the collective. Therefore, Education for Peace in Brazil must act in the constitution of positive meanings to the *state of conflict*, as reinforced by Salgado and Ferreira:

> [...] a constructive conflict will be one in which persuasive means are used by the parties involved (as opposed to coercive means), and in which they recognize the legitimacy of the others and do not threaten their existence. They also tend to be the result of cooperative negotiations, in which acceptable solutions are found. (SALGADO; FERREIRA, 2012, p. 60). [translated by author]

648

Additionally, in the *subject sphere,* Education for Peace must be founded on the development of a critical subjectivity to the situations of suffering and authoritarian subservience that our culture has naturalized and reinforced daily (FREIRE, 1978); thus, its pedagogical practice has as one of its foundations self-criticism of the social values that are either encouraged or silenced in the face of direct violence to the *Other*. So, it is relevant that Education for Peace, in mediating the constitution of pacifist subjectivities, has the understanding that the resolution of direct violence suffered individually/collectively must be intermediated by justice and, in the light of social rights, established consensually; hence, there is a re-elaboration of the symbolic structures that proclaim revenge or any other social practice that replicates violence as a mechanism to solve the damage suffered.

Associated to this, Education for Peace is grounded on a communicative act (HABERMAS, 1988) that aims to develop an educational dialogue which does not replicate violence, but is based on negotiating interests and promoting the action of *becoming the Other*, "which means, decentering of individualism and being supportive and sympathetic" (SANTOS, SOUSA, 2018, p. 33) to the *Other*.

Finally, the last critical point that underlines the complexity of the development of Education for Peace (UNESCO, 1999) in Brazil is the face of the *ethos warrior*, as cultural violence based on belligerent ideologies.

Not being the exclusive prerogative of one social class, but commonly used by the ruling classes to spread fear, increase domination[23] and restrict freedoms, belligerent ideologies

---

[23] Influenced by Guareschi (1996, p. 90), we begin from the conception that "[...]domination" is defined as a 'relation' between people, between groups, or between people and groups, through which one of the parties

were sheltered in the Brazilian historical course along with a classist conservatism that guides the preservation of a social state and a model of '*subject*' to the detriment and negation of the *Other* (CHAUÍ, 2017; SOUZA, 2009). In spite of this, we can not be unwary to attribute the mitigation of this phenomenon as a product entirely reserved to the interests of the ruling class, for, as Le Boétie (1580/2009) and Spinoza (1677/2009) affirm, the processes of servitude and collective communion beliefs do not occur without a "corrupt consensuality" between the subject and the grouping.

In this reasoning, although we acknowledge the aforementioned contributions of the classic Brazilian social studies (CHAUÍ, 2017; SOUZA, 2009) in reflecting on the use of belligerent ideologies dealing with the conflicts of social classes interest, nowadays we add to these positions the profusion of belligerent ideologies, from the use and abuse of the application of the new forms of Digital Information and Communication of Technologies (DICT).

Taking as an interpretation that the cultural inputs that underpin belligerent ideologies were already embodied before the so-called "Communicational Revolution" of 1980 (CASTELLS, 1999; LÉVY, 1996), scholars emphasize that in a large part of the countries in the West, with the advent and the mass access of the new forms of DICT, it was possible to highlight a social structure marked by a 'symbolic geography of evil' (BAUMAN; DONKIS, 2014; WIEVIORKA, 2007, 2015; ZIMBARDO, 2007). Thus, the new DICTs have revealed a set of belligerent symbolic elements that are produced and used in the collective thought to reinforce and legitimize structural and direct violence against the *Others*.

With this point of view, the belligerent ideologies, which had already smashed social groupings in physical spaces, acquired in the virtual space another *locus* of dispersion, confrontation and with modern 'symbolic weapons' such as images, videos, fake news, and others. The social interactions established in the social networks of the Internet briefly exemplify this phenomenon (RECUERO, 2009).

649

If at a war the first victim is the truth, having anonymity and weak normalizing control of the Internet, it is possible to note that the *ethos warrior*, when manifested in the social networks through belligerent ideologies, contributed to social interactions that were permeated by fake news content. In the analysis of Bauman and Donkis (2014), the fake news phenomenon explained one of the crystallizations of the ethical and moral malaise of modern thought which, being circumscribed by values such as self-centeredness , non-empathy and consumerism, developed a collective behavior to obtain objects of desires, consensually admitting social mediations which are not necessarily based on "truths/certainties". In other words, it is not a cult of lie, but a relativization with the truth of the facts, "[...]they may or may not exist, and whether they have occurred or not in a disclosed way, that it doesn't matter to the individual" (GUARESCHI, 2018, p. 4). However, if the information represents what the person/social grouping thinks and values, they come to accept it.

Consequently, there is a moral devaluation of the principle of honesty for the advent of a valorization of the "manipulation and dissipation of information", in order to accentuate

---

expropriate, steals, takes over the power (capacity) of the other. In addition, domination is a relationship where someone, with the pretext of the other possessing certain qualities or characteristics (such as the fact of being a woman, of being part of a certain race or ethnicity, of being young, etc.), appropriates one's powers (capacities) and treats the other in an unequal way. Domination, therefore, is an asymmetrical, unequal, unjust relationship." [translated by the author] In this perspective emerge dominations linked to the economy, politics, culture, religion, etc.

control and guide collective behaviors (KEYES, 2018); thus enabling the elaboration of a range of social narratives that are not always woven by human veracity and dignity.

Underlying this moral malaise, in the making of 'false or skewed' narratives (BAUMAN; DONKIS, 2014), we verify the establishment of a modern socialization that manipulates and characterizes the *Other*, from an arbitrary symbolic system that classifies and ranks cultures, classes, and values. The "Being" is no longer an *end*, as the humanist postulates of modernity advocated, but it assumes a subjection which treats it as a mere means (instrument) for a third to obtain its desire. In this perspective, cultural violence legitimizes the structures of social domination, as well as produces a simulation of discourses/subjects/social classes and directs them against each other, based on their disposition of ego interests.

Therefore, reflecting on the development of an Education for Peace in the Brazilian context, from the face of the *ethos warrior* manifested in the cultural violence of the belligerent ideologies, mainly, four fundamental points are brought to light: 1. Education for Peace must enable educators not to reproduce the cultural legitimations of structural and direct violence that border conflicts between social classes; 2. Recognize that communication processes and modern languages have been transformed and that DICTs should be used as one of the educational tools in opposition to belligerent ideologies, based on the organization of collectives that aim to disseminate studies and experiences of recognition of the *Other*; 3. Foster pacifist "leaderships" in social environments (physical and virtual), in order to constitute multipliers of the Culture of Peace; 4. Promote a digital literacy of the Internet, based on the non-sharing and defense of belligerent speeches, as well as on the critical reflection of the information spreading and sharing.

Moreover, in this third critical point, it is important to note that the cultural violence manifested in the use and abuse of the DICT exposes a conjuncture that recommends a Brazilian Education for Peace integrated with other world experiences of Education for Peace. The expansion of belligerent ideologies dissipation in the DICT reinforces that a Brazilian Education for Peace must be based on pacifist education in a "*glocal*" context (HALL, 2005); In other words, Brazilian Education for Peace must recognize, be pedagogically oriented and face the local idiosyncratic cultural violence in Brazil. Thus also to contribute to the composition of the social transformation of global belligerent cultural elements, since in today's world there is an increase in the effects of problems at the *local* level and vice versa.

Based on the three points listed above (*structural violence, direct violence, cultural violence*) which demonstrate the manifestations of the faces of the Brazilian *warrior ethos* today, there is a delicate cultural eclipse for the development of an Education for Peace in Brazil. Nevertheless, it can also be verified that when reflecting on the origin of the problems of the Brazilian reality with a purpose of acting towards social transformation, there is a flowering of theoretical foundations to be reflected and based on the circumscription of an Education for Peace that recognizes localism and idiosyncrasy values of Brazilian culture.

Final considerations

When analyzing the cultural conditions for the development of an Education for Peace in Brazil, we advocate that this possibility should begin with an understanding of a progressive education that stimulates the formation of subjectivities based on *intersubjective ethics* (LEVINAS, 2004; MARKOVÁ, 2017), changer of reality and opposed to the *ethos warrior*. This possibility has led us to reflect on a complex network of sociocultural phenomena that hinder the development of Education for Peace, manifested in three faces of the *ethos warrior*.

1. *Structural Violence*, exposed in social inequality.

2. *Direct Violence* suffered by social minority groups.

3. *Cultural Violence,* based on belligerent ideologies - that circumscribe the Brazilian society.

Thus, in the context of these reflections, taking the theoretical-philosophical irenistic foundations that consider the Brazilian reality, we attempt to elaborate possible notes to subsidize the development of Education for Peace in Brazil.

Considering also the amendment of the LDB through Law No. 13.663, of 2018 - which establishes the commitment of the Brazilian national education system to promote the Culture of Peace - we understand that it would be useful to indicate, in conclusion, that the development of an Education for Peace in Brazil must, in its majority, permeate three complementary socio-cultural spheres. Despite such proposal presenting itself far from the reality lived in the country nowadays, we understand that the present moment also requires the preparation of the theoretical basis of what will be possible to plan for the future. Thus, our proposition discusses proposals in three scopes: macro, meso and micro.

At the *macro* level, we advocate the relevance of the Union and other federated entities to establish inter-sectorial and multifocal pacifist public policies. It is a matter of formulating public policies that foster pacifist educational formation and the development of the Culture of Peace beyond the characteristics circumscribed in public educational policies - as established by LDB - and in *locus* restricted to formal education. In this logic, pacifist public policies must be expanded in order to contemplate other social areas such as justice, health, public safety, among others, as well as other institutions/apparatuses of the State, besides schools.

651

Therefore, we sustain the need for planning such public policies, considering the social subjects involved in the process of establishing laws, in order to ensure their feasibility (TEDESCO, 2004). In this perspective, there is another disposition of *making public policy*, because it integrates the collective political interests with the psychosocial recognition of the plurality of subjectivities that make up the subjects as operatives and operators of public policies. With this defense, a stimulus is manifested for the dialogical exercise of the *Subject-Other-Right triad*, which is, for a set of public interventions of awareness and recognition of the Being and the Other, as "subjects of right" (HONNETH, 2003).

Now, in the *meso* scope, we allude to the relevance of the development and further dissemination of the several social collectives that act as support networks in partnership with the public and private sectors for the development of the Culture of Peace and the Education for Peace in formal and non-formal educational environments. In this perspective, it is relevant – according to Columa (2007), Salles Filho (2016), Sousa (2007), among other researchers, - to bring light to the experiences in Education for Peace held in Brazil from the articulation of the Third Sector organizations, religious groups and companies with social responsibility to the Secretariats of Security, Justice and Regional Public Ministries interested in establishing formations and social interventions of: conflict mediation, non-violent communication training, reception of subjects in situations of social vulnerability, teaching of humans rights, etc.

At the *micro* sphere, focusing specifically on formal educational environments, we defend the urgency of institutional evaluation planning for the development of the Culture of Peace and Education for Peace (LANDAZABAL; MATEO, 2011). In this line of thought, it is the responsibility of the partnership between managers and the school community as well as

between the regular education institutions and the universities, to establish assessments that enable light to be shed on the school environment, the incidence of conflicts amid the learning community, the occurrence of violence and, among other dimensions that allow to subsidize data for the constitution of a curriculum anchored in the Culture of Peace and promoter of pedagogical attentive formations and, enabled in the psychosocial intervention of Education for Peace.

Considering the aforementioned notes that show the cultural complexity and, at the same time, present recommendations for the development of an Education for Peace in Brazil; in future reflections on this theme it is prudent to problematize if the inclusion of the Culture for Peace in the LDB will provide feasibility of an educational pacifist project for Brazil, for, as Sartre (1987, p. 26) states, society as well as "[...]men are first and foremost what they project to become, and what they are conscious of projecting to become."

Referências

ARENDT, H. **Eichmann em Jerusalém**. 15. ed. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2009.

ARISTÓTELES. **Ética a Nicômaco**: poética. Seleção de textos de José Américo Motta Pessanha. Tradução de Vincenso Cocco et al. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1979.

BAUMAN, Z.; DONKIS, L. **Cegueira moral**: a perda da sensibilidade na modernidade líquida. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2014.

BERGER, P. L.; LUCKMANN, T. **A construção social da realidade**: tratado de sociologia do conhecimento. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes, 2004.

BIRMAN, J. Reviravoltas na soberania. In: BIRMAN, J. **Arquivos do mal-estar e da resistência**. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2006. p. 197-230.

BRASIL. Lei nº. 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996. Estabelece as Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional. Congresso. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, DF, 23 dez. 1996.

BRASIL. Lei nº. 13.663, de 14 de maio de 2018. Altera o art. 12 da Lei nº 9.394, de 20 de dezembro de 1996, para incluir a promoção de medidas de conscientização, de prevenção e de combate a todos os tipos de violência e a promoção da cultura de paz entre as incumbências dos estabelecimentos de ensino. **Diário Oficial da União**, Brasília, DF, 15 maio 2018.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação/Conselho Nacional de Educação. **Diretrizes Nacionais para a Educação em Direitos Humanos**. Brasília: MEC/CNE, 2012.

BRASIL. Presidência da República. Secretaria Especial dos Direitos Humanos. **Plano Nacional de Educação em Direitos Humanos**. Brasília: MEC/SEDH, 2009.

CASTELLS, M. **A sociedade em rede**. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1999.

CHAUÍ, M. **Sobre a violência**. São Paulo: Autêntica, 2017.

CHAUÍ, M. Uma ideologia perversa. **Folha de S. Paulo**, Caderno Mais, n. 5, mar. 1999. Disponível em: <http://www1.folha.uol.com.br/fol/brasil500/dc_1_4.htm>. Acesso em: 19 mar. 2016.

COLUMA, E. dos S. Como educar para a paz. **Psicologia Escolar e Educacional**, Campinas, v. 11, n. 2, p. 431-433, dez. 2007. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/s1413-85572007000200023

DUBET, F. O que é uma escola justa? **Caderno de Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 34, n. 123, p. 539-555, set./dez. 2004. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/s0100-15742004000300002

ELIAS, N. **O processo civilizador**: formação do Estado e civilização. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1994.

EVANGELISTA, E. G. dos S. **A Unesco e o mundo da cultura**. Goiânia: UFG, 2003.

FAUSTO, B. **Crime e cotidiano**: a criminalidade em São Paulo (1880-1924). São Paulo: Edusp, 2001.

FERNÁNDEZ-HERRERÍA, A.; LÓPEZ LÓPEZ, M. C. Educar para la paz: necesidad de un cambio epistemológico. **Convergencia**, Toluca, v. 21, n. 64, p. 117-142, abr. 2014.

FRANÇA, E. et al. Associação entre fatores socioeconômicos e mortalidade infantil por diarreia, pneumonia e desnutrição em região metropolitana do sudeste do Brasil: um estudo caso-controle. **Cadernos de Saúde Pública**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 17, n. 6, p. 1437-1447, nov./dez. 2001. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0102-311X2001000600014

FRANÇA, E. B. et al. Principais causas da mortalidade na infância no Brasil, em 1990 e 2015: estimativas do estudo de Carga Global de Doença. **Revista Brasileira de Epidemiologia**, São Paulo, v. 20, n. 1, p. 46-60, maio 2017. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1980-5497201700050005

FREIRE, P. **Conscientização**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1978.

FREIRE, P. **Pedagogia da esperança**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1992.

GALTUNG, J. Institutionalized conflict resolution: a theoretical paradigm. **Journal of Peace Research**, v. 2, n. 4, p. 348-397, 1965. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/002234336500200404

GALTUNG, J. **Peace, war and defense**: essays in peace research. Copenhagen: Christian Elgers, 1975.

GUARESCHI, P. A ideologia: um terreno minado. **Psicologia & Sociedade**, Belo Horizonte, v. 8, n. 2, p. 82-94, jul./dez. 1996.

GUARESCHI, P. Relações comunitárias: relações de dominação. In: CAMPO, R. de H. et al. (Orgs.). **Paradigmas em psicologia social**: a perspectiva latino-americana. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1996. p. 95-110.

653

GUARESCHI, P. Alteridade e relação: uma perspectiva crítica. In: ARRUDA, A. (Org.). **Representando a alteridade**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1998. p. 149-161.

GUARESCHI, P. Psicologia e pós-verdade: a emergência da subjetividade digital. **Psiunisc: Revista do Departamento de Psicologia Universidade de Santa Cruz do Sul**, Santa Cruz do Sul, v. 2, n. 2, p. 19-34, fev. 2018. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17058/psiunisc.v2i2.12242

GUIMARÃES, M. R. **Educação para a paz sentidos e dilemas**. Caxias do Sul: Educs, 2005.

GUIMARÃES, M. R. A educação para a paz como exercício da ação comunicativa: alternativas para a sociedade e para a educação. **Revista Educação**, Porto Alegre, v. 2, n. 23, p. 329-368, abr. 2006.

GUIMARÃES, M. R. Desafios para a construção de uma cultura de paz. In: MARTINS, J. R. V.; SOUSA, N. H. B. de; LEFÉVRE, J. M. (Orgs.). **Educação para a paz e direitos humanos**. Brasília: Presidência da República, 2008. p. 63-75.

HABERMAS, J. **Teoria de la acción comunicativa**. Tradução de Manuel Jiménez Redondo. Madrid: Taurus, 1988.

HALL, S. **A identidade cultural na pós-modernidade**. 10. ed. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2005.

HOBBES, T. **Leviatã**. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1988. (Original: 1651).

HOBSBAWM, E. (Org.). **Era dos extremos**: o breve século XX, 1914-1991. São Paulo: Cia das Letras, 2005.

HONNETH, A. **Luta por reconhecimento**: a gramática moral dos conflitos sociais. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2003.

HRW. Human Rights Watch. **Relatório Mundial 2003**. Disponível em: <https://www.hrw.org/pt/world-report/2016/country-chapters/285573>. Acesso em: 5 fev. 2018.

HRW. Human Rights Watch. **Relatório Mundial 2016**. Disponível em: <https://www.hrw.org/pt/world-report/2016/country-chapters/285573>. Acesso em: 23 fev. 2017.

HRW. Human Rights Watch. **Relatório Mundial 2017**. Disponível em: <https://www.hrw.org/pt/world-report/2017/country-chapters/298766#3f4ae3>. Acesso em: 23 fev. 2017.

IBGE. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. **Brasil em síntese**. Brasília: Ipea, 2018.

IPEA. Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada. **Retrato das desigualdades de gênero e raça – 1995 a 2015**. Brasília: Ipea, 2017. Disponível em: <http://www.ipea.gov.br/portal/images/stories/PDFs/170306_retrato_das_desigualdades_de_genero_raca.pdf>. Acesso em: 23 nov. 2017.

IPEA. Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada. **Atlas da Violência 2018**. Brasília: Ipea, 2018. Disponível em: <http://www.ipea.gov.br/atlasviolencia/arquivos/downloads/7457-2852-180604atlasdaviolencia2018.pdf>. Acesso em: 23 nov. 2017.

IPRA. **International Journal of Peace Studies**, v. 14, n. 1, 2000. Disponível em: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/i40087534>. Acesso em: 23 fev. 2018.

ISHIDA, T. Beyond the traditional concepts of peace in different cultures. **Journal of Peace Research**, Tokyo, v. 1, n. 1, p. 1-20, 1969. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/002234336900600205

JAPIASSU, H. F. **Introdução ao pensamento epistemológico**. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves, 1977.

JARES, X. R. **Educação para a paz**: sua teoria e sua prática. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2002.

JARES, X. R. **Educar para a verdade e para a esperança**: em tempos de globalização, guerra preventiva e terrorismos. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2005.

JARES, X. R. **Educar para a paz em tempos difíceis**. São Paulo: Palas Athena, 2007.

JOVCHELOVITCH, S. Re(des)cobrindo o outro: para um entendimento da teoria das representações sociais. In: ARRUDA, A. **Representando a alteridade**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1998. p. 69-82.

KANT, I. **A paz perpétua e outros opúsculos**. Lisboa: Edições UFC, 2001. (Original: 1751).

KANT, I. **Resposta à pergunta o que é "esclarecimento"?**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1974.

KELSEN, H. **La paz por médio del derecho**. Madrid: Trotta, 2003. (Original: 1944).

KEYES, R. **Era da pós-verdade**: desonestidade e enganação na vida contemporânea. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2018.

LA BOÉTIE, É. **O discurso da servidão voluntária**. Tradução de Casemiro Linarth. São Paulo: Martin Claret. 2009. (Original publicado em 1580).

LANDAZABAL, M. G.; MATEO, C. M. Evaluación de un programa de Educación para la Paz durante la adolescencia: efectos en el autoconcepto, y en el concepto de los inmigrantes, de la paz y la violencia. **Revista de Investigación en Educación**, Vigo, v. 1, n. 9, p. 102-111, jan. 2011.

LANE, S. T. M. A Psicologia social na América Latina: por uma ética do conhecimento. In: GUARESCHI, P.; CAMPOS, R. H. de F. (Orgs.). **Paradigmas em psicologia social**: a perspectiva latino-americana. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2000. p. 58-69.

LEDERACH, J. P. **La imaginación moral**: el arte y el alma de la construcción de la paz. 9. ed. Bilbao: Bakeaz, 2007.

655

LEVINAS, E. **O humanismo do outro homem**. 3. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2004.

LÉVY, P. **O que é o virtual?**. São Paulo: Editora 34, 1996.

MAGALHÃES, S. M. O. O "ser solidário" e a construção da cultura de paz. **Dialogia**, São Paulo, n. 18, p. 117-134, jul./dez. 2013. DOI: 10.5585/dialogia.N18.4213

MARKOVÁ, I. **Mente dialógica**: senso comum e ética. Curitiba: Pucpress, 2017.

MARTÍNEZ GUZMÁN, V. Filosofia e investigação para a paz. **Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais**, v. 71, p. 43-62, jun. 2005. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/rccs.1015

MORGENTHAU, H. J. **A política entre as nações**: a luta pelo poder e pela paz. Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília, 2003.

MUÑOZ, F. A. La paz imperfecta. In: LÓPEZ MARTINEZ, M. et al. (Orgs.). **Enciclopedia de paz y conflictos**: L-Z. Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada, 2001. p. 880-900 (t. II).

ONU. Organização das Nações Unidas. Assembleia Geral das Nações Unidas. **Declaração Universal dos Direitos Humanos**. 1999. (Original de 1948).

RECUERO, R. **Redes sociais na Internet**. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2009.

RIBEIRO, D. **O povo brasileiro**: a formação e o sentido do Brasil. 4. ed. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2006.

SÁEZ, P. Dez propostas para a educação para a paz. **Revista Pátio**, Porto Alegre, n. 38. p. 11-13, maio/jun. 2006.

SALGADO, J. M. de C. F.; FERREIRA, T. B. S. Educação para a paz: uma perspectiva dialógica. In: BRANCO, A. M. C. U. de A.; OLIVEIRA, M. C. S. L. de. (Orgs.). **Diversidade e cultura de paz na escola**: contribuições da perspectiva sociocultural. Porto Alegre: Mediação, 2012. p. 51-65.

SALLES FILHO, N. A. **Cultura de paz e educação para a paz**: olhares a partir da teoria da complexidade de Edgar Morin. 2016. 357 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Universidade de Ponta Grossa, Ponta Grossa, 2016.

SANTOS, A. F. C. **Construção e validação de uma matriz de referência para o estudo das representações sociais sobre educação para a paz-tolerância**. 2017. 256 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) – Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2017.

SANTOS, A. F. C.; SOUSA, C. P. A relevância de estudos em representações sociais versados com as pesquisas para a paz no desenvolvimento de uma educação para a paz. **Educação e Cultura Contemporânea**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 14, n. 37, p. 93-113, 2017. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5935/2238-1279.20170042

656

SANTOS, A. F. C.; SOUSA, C. P. Sujeito relacional: ensaio sobre o conflito. In: MOREIRA, R. M.; ROCHA, J. C. C. C. de; SERVO, M. L. S. (Orgs.). **Representações sociais e seus diversos olhares**. Curitiba: CRV, 2018. p. 27-43.

SANTOS, B. de S. Por uma concepção multicultural dos direitos humanos. **Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais**, Coimbra, n. 48, p. 11-32, jun. 1997.

SARTRE. J. P. **O existencialismo é um humanismo**. A imaginação: questão de método. Seleção de textos por José Américo Motta Pessanha. 3. ed. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 1987.

SILVA, R. C. M.; FLORES, P. J. A representação do *ethos* guerreiro em alguns contos de Rubem Fonseca. **Revista Virtual de Letras**, Goiânia, v. 3, n. 1, p. 322-333, jan. 2011.

SOUSA, L. K. de. Educação para a paz e educação moral na prevenção à violência. **Revista Psicologia da Educação**, São Paulo, n. 25, p. 131-155, dez. 2007.

SOUZA, J. **A ralé brasileira**: quem é e como vive. Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 2009.

SPINOZA, B. **Tratado teológico-político**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2009. (Original de 1677).

TEDESCO, J. C. Igualdad de oportunidades y política educativa. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 34, n. 123, p. 557-572, set./dez. 2004. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1590/s0100-15742004000300003

UNESCO. Organização das Nações Unidas para a Educação, Ciência e a Cultura. **Declaração e plano de ação integrado sobre a educação para a paz**. 1995. Disponível em: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001128/112874por.pdf>. Acesso em: 20 jan. 2016.

UNESCO. Organização das Nações Unidas para a Educação, Ciência e a Cultura. **Declaração e programa de ação sobre uma cultura de paz**. 1999. Disponível em: <http://www.comitepaz.org.br/download/Declara%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20e%20Programa%20de%20A%C3%A7%C3%A3o%20sobre%20uma%20Cultura%20de%20Paz%20-%20ONU.pdf>. Acesso em: 20 jan. 2016.

UNICEF. Fundo Internacional de Emergência para a Infância das Nações Unidas. **Níveis e tendências na mortalidade infantil**. 2017. Disponível em: <https://data.unicef.org/resources/levels-trends-child-mortality/>. Acesso em: 23 nov. 2017.

VALLS, R. **Comunidades de aprendizaje**: una práctica educativa de aprendizaje dialógico para la sociedad de la información. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona, 2000.

WAISELFISZ, J. J. **Mapa da violência 2016**: homicídios por armas de fogo no Brasil. Rio de Janeiro: Flacso, 2016.

WAISELFISZ, J. J. **Homicides of children and adolescents in Brazil**. São Paulo: Igarapé Institute, 2017.

657

WIBERG, H. Investigação para a paz: passado, presente e futuro. **Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais**, São Paulo, v. 71, p. 21-42, jun. 2005. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/rccs.1013

WIEVIORKA, M. O novo paradigma da violência. **Tempo Social**, São Paulo, v. 9, n. 1, p. 5-41, maio 1997. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0103-20701997000100002

WIEVIORKA, M. **O racismo, uma introdução**. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2007.

WIEVIORKA, M. **Retour au sens**: pour en finir avec le déclinisme. Paris: Robert Laffont, 2015.

ZALUAR, A. **Violência e crime**: o que ler na ciência social brasileira (1970-1995). São Paulo: Sumaré, 1999.

ZIMBARDO, P. **The Lucifer Effect**: understanding how good people turn evil. New York: Random House, 2007.

658