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***Abstract***

The international political situation is at a complex moment. The world is experiencing growing polarization between the major powers and is witnessing the formation of tensions and conflicts in different parts of the world. There is a global trend towards a return to the logic of war, with an increase in defence spending by states. In this context, it is essential to reflect on and act towards building a culture of peace and the defence of human rights. The aim of this text is therefore to reflect on the potential of human rights education in building a culture of peace, especially since this education combines knowledge, values, attitudes, and actions. This implies that educational practices should include the values and principles and content of human rights, as well as those related to the culture of peace. Therefore, the process of training the subject of rights combined with the defence of democracy and peace is the element that can contribute to transforming the current scenario, with the promotion of active citizenship that materializes in day-to-day social relations, pacifism, knowledge of rights and responsibilities and how to demand and apply them.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The current upsurge in military and civilian conflicts in the form of wars is the result of new global disputes, with the decline in the political, military, and economic power of the United States and the advances of China. According to UN figures, two billion people lived in conflict zones in 2023[[2]](#footnote-2) , which represented a quarter of the planet's total population. This new world (dis)order is realigning geopolitics between the main powers.

Thus, the international political situation is at a complex moment, influenced by the geopolitical dispute between the United States and China, and its consequences, especially in the Middle East, Latin America and Europe. Some of these are: the war in Ukraine; the Palestinian genocide; uncertainties about the dynamics of the global economy, with the possibility of a slowdown and recession; the advance of the Southern Command (USA) in appropriating natural assets in the Latin American region; the escalation of climate chaos and its failure to be tackled; and the expansion of the power of the global far right.

In short, the world is experiencing growing polarization between the major powers and is witnessing the formation of regional tensions and civil conflicts within states in different parts of the world. There is a global tendency to return to the logic of readiness for war, with a consequent increase in defence spending, but also a worsening of the most diverse forms of violence. Furthermore, countries that are not part of conventional war contexts are not without high levels of direct, structural, and cultural violence.

It should be added that in this context, the UN is facing a crisis of legitimacy and is seeing its peace mechanisms questioned, while the Security Council is reliving the freeze of the Cold War era due to the vetoes of the major powers.

Regarding the rise of the far right, it is important to stress that this is not a localized phenomenon, but a global one, related to the systemic crisis of capitalism, which is also a crisis of ideas, expectations, and horizons, since neoliberalism is not just an economic practice, but a project for society. During this crisis, neoliberalism is trying to recycle itself, adapt itself, oxygenate itself, relying on the extreme global right, on what has been called the Reactionary International, which in many places manages to capture the anti-system sentiment of populations desperate for the loss of rights, violence, and social exclusion.

A fundamental point in this context is that in its current phase, neoliberalism is unable to develop and deepen without destroying liberal democracy. In other words, even liberal democracy is an obstacle to maintaining neoliberalism. This means that the basic principle of democratic legitimacy - citizens having the power to make decisions - is in tension and under threat.

Therefore, the political crisis, the exhaustion of the representative system, which has hit democracy hard, has as one of its main characteristics the rise and strengthening of the extreme right (and the extreme right) and of political and religious fundamentalisms. This neoconservative wave in terms of customs and neoliberalism in terms of the economy has led to an upsurge in attacks on the rights of minoritized majorities (women, migrants, racialized people, LGBTQIAPN+ people), generating more violence.

In this sense, talking about a culture of peace and the defense of human rights[[3]](#footnote-3) may sound somewhat distant from this reality that shows no signs of de-escalating. However, it is fundamental today, not least because seeking to maintain peace in the 21st century is an essential requirement for ensuring life on Earth.

That's why knowing what we're talking about when we refer to peace and a culture of peace is the first step towards understanding how we can build it. According to Sanabria Rodríguez,

In general terms, three main lines or types of peace have been identified: the first refers to the so-called "negative peace", which prioritises the absence of war or armed conflict, but disregards other types of violence such as psychological or structural. On the other hand, there is the so-called imperfect peace, which seeks to satisfy some human needs without eliminating conflicts. And finally, there is positive peace; it not only recognises the absence of war, but also includes many other factors from which social harmony, equality, justice and, therefore, the radical transformation of society are pursued.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Along the same lines, Galtung argues that peace should be defined by overcoming all forms of violence, which he categorises as direct, structural, and cultural[[5]](#footnote-5) . What this means for the author is that the conditions for peace depend on a careful look at these types of violence and require measures that promote not only the extinction of their direct effects, but also the transformation of the structural and cultural causes and contradictions that underlie them. Therefore, it is not just a question of overcoming the problem of war or armed conflict with a ceasefire, a peace agreement, or a military victory. It is necessary to articulate them with the construction of a just and equitable social structure and a culture of peace. In other words, "peace must be built in culture and structure, not just in the human mind"[[6]](#footnote-6) .

A culture of peace, on the other hand, means the transformation of society, with new ways of living together and actions that generate peaceful solutions.

In this sense, peace education requires a theoretical and practical concept that provides the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to create new forms of social coexistence based on solidarity, justice and respect for the environment. A pedagogy for peace must therefore be based on the strategy of establishing peace as a central value, combined with the realisation of human rights.

Considering the above analysis, this text aims to reflect on the potential of human rights education (HRED)[[7]](#footnote-7) in building a culture of peace , in other words, adopting an educational process as a response to the escalation of war and violence in the world. To this end, it discusses violence and a culture of peace; it discusses international standards in this field; and it focuses on human rights education as one of the paths towards a pedagogy for peace.

2. CULTURE OF PEACE *VERSUS* VIOLENCE

Peace can be understood as the absence or reduction of violence and the non-violent resolution of conflict, i.e. a solution by peaceful means. Peace is also the prevention of violence. According to Galtung

Peace is based on equitable, relatively horizontal relationships. Peace is based on empathy, on a deep understanding of all parties. Peace is based on reconciliation, on cleaning up the past, on building a future. Peace is based on identifying the underlying conflict and seeking solutions.[[8]](#footnote-8)

In addition, as seen above, the notion of peace has expanded to a broader meaning than just the absence of war and is related to the structural conditions for the absence of violence, such as justice, equity, solidarity and respect for human rights.

Violence can be direct, structural, and cultural. The first is the most visible form. But it has roots that are expressed in structural and cultural violence. This means that there are issues that generate conflict, such as unjust social and economic structures or socialisation in a violent culture, which are capable of provoking various forms of confrontation and social revolt. These three articulated levels result, according to Galtung[[9]](#footnote-9) , in four types of power: cultural, economic, military and political.

At the same time, Buján[[10]](#footnote-10) refers to five levels of conflict: a) micro level (intrapersonal and interpersonal); b) meso level (by a group of people in relation to others); c) macro level (between people and the state); d) mega level (between a region and a civilisation); e) meta level (possibility of a world with reciprocal learning).

Considering that the planet is during a spiral of violence, characterised by the exacerbation of supranational, regional, social, ethnic, gender and environmental confrontations, it is necessary to map and understand how conflicts emerge and their dynamics to think about and propose possible peaceful resolutions.

One of the essential points on this path, in addition to building a culture of peace, is to ensure a process of reconciliation. Without this, the prevention of future violence in the same space cannot be guaranteed. This process, which seeks to convert vicious circles into virtuous circles, involves recognising, repairing, and restoring the damage caused by the situation of violence. This implies that the main objective of reconciliation is to re-establish peace. Reconciliation is therefore

(...) a process of intervening in disputes that promotes dialogue and peace-building in relation to those social relationships where there has been an episode of violence that has broken down the relationship between the parties, reaching different dimensions of the social conflict.[[11]](#footnote-11)

To transform conflicts and establish reconciliation, it is necessary to adopt a past-present-future approach:

In order to begin reconciliation, the parties must be aware of the need to address the three temporal dimensions of the process, namely: a) the present, where the affectation of *basic needs* in the current reality of the parties is analysed, b) an efficient and in-depth approach to the present will open the door to the past and c) in order to prevent the reappearance of violence, the future is addressed (BUJÁN 2016, 43).

Thus, there must be a consensus that the agreements during the reconciliation process can include

a) the security of not suffering more violence; b) the disclosure of what happened; c) the *Perpetrator*'s acknowledgement of what happened; c) a sincere apology; d) the sincere granting of forgiveness; e) justice in some aspect, whether punitive, restorative or transitional; f) the creation of a plan to prevent recidivism; g) the summarising of the constructive aspects of the relationship; h) the rebuilding of trust over time; i) the possibility of establishing a closure on what happened .[[12]](#footnote-12)

At the same time, building a culture of peace must be a priority objective and have human rights as its fundamental pillar. According to the UN Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace, a culture of peace includes a set of values, attitudes, traditions, behaviours, and lifestyles related to respect for life, an end to violence, the practice of non-violence through education, respect for and promotion of human rights, among others.

For Jiménez, a culture of peace can be defined as

a dynamic and collective process that builds and strengthens values, beliefs, traditions and social expressions that, through the power of love, promote relationships, attitudes and actions that respect human rights, generating inclusion, justice, respect, tolerance, diversity, environmental balance, and the search for truth, altering the culture of violence and domination; that confronts conflicts with active non-violent processes, providing personal, socio-structural and ecological well-being, happiness and liberation .[[13]](#footnote-13)

In this process, it is essential to learn to see, perceive, recognise and value peaceful and non-violent experiences, to recognise the richness and complexity of socio-political realities and to learn new ways of living together. In other words, " the concept of Culture of Peace comes from the recognition of the social construction of violence and humanity's responsibility to build new moral values, which through education become an alternative to the prevailing culture of war in our civilisation " [[14]](#footnote-14)

Thus, it should be emphasised that the experience of women as peacebuilders is important. Not least because "as social movements, feminism and pacifism have found convergence at many moments throughout history"[[15]](#footnote-15) .

This work towards building a culture of peace is also enriched by studies in this field. As Vicente analyses,

Most of the reviews carried out on Culture of Peace studies identify three major historical stages involving this issue: The first (1930-1959), characterised as negative peace, is set in the context of the two world wars of the 20th century, which is why the Culture of Peace is identified as the absence of war. The second (1959 - 1990) was an expansion of the first and was defined as positive peace, meaning that as well as not having war, the Culture of Peace implied transformations capable of minimising social inequalities. (...) From the 1960s onwards, with the creation of the Oslo Institute for Peace, research (into the Culture of Peace) involved themes such as justice, equity, well-being, economic rights and social rights, and, in some cases, affection, solidarity and other forms of peaceful conflict resolution.[[16]](#footnote-16)

Finally, a question must permeate current concerns: how to apply the culture of peace in a changing world, with an increase in wars and armed conflicts, and dominated by neoliberal hegemony?

Based on the assumption that there is peace where people can activate mechanisms to promote democracy[[17]](#footnote-17) , attention to the ongoing processes of de-democratisation, and how to stop them, should be part of actions to build a culture of peace.

De-democratisation, which has the potential to destroy democracy, is the current stage of neoliberalism. In other words, neoliberal rationality is central to the processes of democratic loss. A rationality that restructures social relations and the state itself based on market values.

For Siracusa and Rondello[[18]](#footnote-18) , "the effects of neoliberal consolidation on contemporary democracy go beyond theoretical dilemmas". They point to an "effective process of faltering democracies, increasingly affected by neoliberalism in political life". Mainly because in the current crisis of representative liberal democracy "public action is limited to the implementation of the same programme as the demands of neoliberal financial capitalism".

Furthermore, it is important to add, following Laval's analysis, that neoliberalism has never been democratic. This means that "from the outset, at the core of its project, there is a fundamental anti-democratic content that arises from the deliberate desire to exclude the rules of the market from the political orientation of governments"[[19]](#footnote-19) . As seen above, the lack of justice, fairness, and respect for human rights, which are the norm in a neoliberal system, produces violence, making it difficult to promote peace.

It is during this neoliberal context and this process of de-democratisation that liberal democracy has entered its crisis stage. In this sense, de-democratisation means, as Origa explains[[20]](#footnote-20) , "the process of depletion of democracy". This exhaustion refers to the situation of "political relationships between the state and its citizens, which no longer have guarantees of broad, equal and mutually binding consultations". According to the author, "the symptoms of this regression are found in the populist, extremist and authoritarian wings that are spreading throughout the world", and the process of de-democratisation is not only leading to the crisis of democracy or its collapse, but also to a post-democratic scenario.

There is therefore, according to Laval, "a new combination between neoliberalism and more authoritarian nationalist populism". Together they "manage to turn the anger of the masses in the direction of radical neoliberalism". Exactly for this reason, the author continues, "the tragedy of our time is that the reaction to the aggressions of capitalism has adopted a reactionary form". In other words, "the cultural war and nationalist propaganda are based on the reactions of despair of sectors of the population particularly affected by neoliberal policies"[[21]](#footnote-21) .

3. THE IDEA OF PEACE IN INTERNATIONAL NORMS

Amid this context of democracy being undermined, in the debate on peace and the culture of peace, it is important to be aware of the international provisions in this area. As early as the United Nations Charter of 1945, there was a concern to maintain international peace in a post-war context. Article 1 states that the fundamental objective of the UN is to "maintain international peace and security", while Article 2 talks about "taking other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace". From this it can be concluded that the Charter is based on recognising peace as a fundamental good of humanity.

At the same time, UNESCO’s Charter, also from 1945, in its preamble, states that its purpose is "to advance, through educational, scientific and cultural relations among the peoples of the world, the objectives of international peace and the common welfare of mankind".

Within the framework of the UN, various documents open the possibilities for the search for peace. In 1974, at its General Conference, UNESCO approved the Recommendations on Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education concerning Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. Also noteworthy are the Declaration for the Preparation of Societies for Living in Peace (1978) and the Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace (1984). In 1995, with Resolution AG/50 173, the UN endorsed the idea of promoting a culture of peace, recognising the importance of education in achieving it. In 1999, the Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace was approved (Resolution 53/243) and year 2000 was announced as the International Year for a Culture of Peace (Resolution 52/15).

Between 2001-2010, the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World was proclaimed. In 2021 the International Year of Peace and Trust was declared, with the aim of mobilising the international community to promote peace and trust between nations and to foster a culture of peace. In 2016, the Declaration on the Right to Peace was approved by means of Resolution GA/71/189. And in 2023, the Revised Recommendation on Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and on Education for Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms was approved.

In the field of civil society, several instruments also stand out: the Seville Declaration of 1986; the Las Palmas Declaration of 1987; the Oslo Declaration on the Human Right to Peace of 1997; the 21st Century Programme for Peace and Justice of 1999; the Manifiesto 2000; the Luarca Declaration on the Human Right to Peace of 2006; and the Santiago Declaration on the Human to Peace of 2010.

However, despite the UN declarations and resolutions, especially that of 2016, it cannot be said that the right to peace is guaranteed as a right. Resolution AG/71/189 (Declaration on the Right to Peace), for example, " does not elevate peace to the status of a human right, nor does it provide it with the specific contents of this type of right"; nor does it "respond to the needs and challenges facing current international law when it comes to confronting international war conflicts, structural and cultural violence “.[[22]](#footnote-22)

Furthermore, according to Arrieta-López's analysis, " what can be observed is that the right to peace is beginning to be formulated outside the terms of a 'right', rather as a principle or a responsibility, it is becoming understood as *soft-law*, only in the declarations mentioned, but it has been related to other rights "[[23]](#footnote-23) . To summarise:

Peace as a right has been positivised from the perspective of an ideal that must be achieved. Although the resolutions of the General Assembly are of great importance, they are non-binding documents, so they do not provide tools to protect rights or safeguard them through precautionary or preventive measures. They are an ideal of law, not a state of current affairs or a human right with legal tools to realise it .[[24]](#footnote-24)

Therefore, without disregarding the relevance of the aforementioned documents or the need for international action, the educational process presents itself as a viable possibility for transforming a culture of violence into a culture of peace and respect for human rights.

4. HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION IN BUILDING A CULTURE OF PEACE

Peace is a concept that is inseparable from human rights, i.e. it is not just the absence of conflict, but a prerequisite for exercising these rights. Therefore, human rights education (HRED) becomes a path that must be developed to help implement a culture of peace. In particular, because HRED combines knowledge, values, attitudes and actions, it goes in the direction of what Galtung warns about peace processes. According to him, "peace can only be attractive if we link education with action"[[25]](#footnote-25) .

In this regard, the UN Human Rights Council, in its resolution 24/15 of 2013 (World Programme for Human Rights Education), established that this type of education contributes to the long-term prevention of human rights abuses and violent conflicts. This is why it is so important to carry out EHR processes that include education for peace and vice versa.

Thus, understanding HRD and peace education as a process that humanises, Martínez Lirola states that they "enhance peaceful coexistence, values, respect for diversity (...) respect for life, democracy, plurality, respect for fundamental rights, tolerance and non-violence, among others"[[26]](#footnote-26) .

According to Cabezudo[[27]](#footnote-27) , "educating for peace and human rights means applying a critical, deep and serious approach to the current situation we share and the historical era in which we have been called upon to act".

To do this, according to the author,

Education for peace and human rights is now a multidimensional field and includes a set of concepts, ideas and activities that range from awareness-raising and dissemination actions to promote a Culture of Peace, to concrete pedagogical practices in formal, non-formal and informal education. Practices whose specific objectives are linked to the essential values of human coexistence.

In this direction, for Galtung there are four political tasks at the basis of this education: a) mediate conflict resolution; b) conciliate; c) empathise with all parties involved; d) build cooperation with an equitable outcome.[[28]](#footnote-28)

A human rights education based on these assumptions, seeking to integrate education for peace, also implies an integrative, critical, contextualised, and intercultural pedagogy.

This is because the purpose of human rights education is to bring about a change in mentality and social attitudes that foster the construction of a culture of respect for these rights. In this way, it seeks to promote educational processes that are critical and active, that raise awareness of the responsibilities of citizenship and of living in accordance with human rights and peace[[29]](#footnote-29) . In other words, it not only requires ensuring the human right to education, but above all that educational practices include the values and principles and content of human rights, as well as those related to the culture of peace.

Pedagogical practice in human rights must be based on a set of specific skills, known as human rights teaching skills, articulated through the following principles: a) human rights education is essentially a political education; b) it must be an ethical education; c) it must be a contextualised education; d) it must advance from a normative-legal conception to a holistic and integral pedagogical position; e) it must contribute to consolidating democracy and peace; f) it must be an education that builds the subject of rights .[[30]](#footnote-30)

The methodology, content and materials used, in turn, must articulate the levels of knowledge relating to human rights. Knowledge of laws and instruments for the defence of rights is essential, but it is necessary not to restrict human rights content to a normative sphere. For this reason, the socio-historical contextualisation of the history of human rights, with special emphasis on the movements fighting for rights and the achievements made, is a priority element, especially from the perspective of contributing to democratic consolidation. This also means reinforcing the claim of human rights as a principal contrary to passivity. The realisation that these rights can be demanded, both in the context of public policies and in the judicial sphere, encourages active citizenship.

Furthermore, in order to include content related to building a culture of peace, Cabezudo suggests

Fundamental themes such as the reality of the different social groups and their problematic coexistence; solutions and disagreements in the face of conflict; the situation of refugees and their helplessness in the face of attacks by "friends" and enemies; weaponry and the sale of weapons as a profitable global business ... must be extended pedagogically to a greater extent than mere knowledge. Extending pedagogically means - imperatively - that the themes must be the object of reflection, discussion, research, and criticism. In a permanent exercise of searching for the truth, of exchanging opinions, of individual and collective learning.[[31]](#footnote-31)

To which the author adds the need for

An analysis and search that tends towards awareness of the characteristics of the world in which we live and the search for alternatives for change from our individual and collective participation to build a more just, equitable and peaceful world. A world in which peaceful conflict resolution, constructive dialogue, participation, and solidarity are at the same time systematic mechanisms for transforming towards a more democratic society.[[32]](#footnote-32)

In this way, a pedagogical practice in line with the aspects indicated promotes the formation of the subject of rights and generates, among other issues: knowledge of protection norms and institutions; appropriation of discourse; autonomy; vigilance in relation to violations of rights, including the sphere of wars and armed conflicts; action to transform reality; self-recognition and recognition of the other in access to rights.

It also creates the possibility of overcoming the anaesthetic situation in which we find ourselves, since, according to Sánchez Rubio, we usually confine human rights to a post-violator conception of them, and it is essential to invert this logic, to act for prevention and thus add the pre-violator dimension to our practices. This means adopting a "more complex notion of human rights, which is procedurally, relationally and dynamically constructed from social practices and human actions that empower subjects.[[33]](#footnote-33)

Thus, the process of training the subject of rights combined with the defence of democracy and peace is the element that can help to change the current context, with the promotion of active citizenship that materialises in the practice and day-to-day life of social relations, pacifism, knowledge of rights and responsibilities and how to demand and apply them , seeking to guarantee access to social justice for all people.

Allied to this, EDH must use the Freirean process of consciousness-raising and ethics, developing a stage of consciousness-raising (from naive consciousness to ethical-critical consciousness) and a transformative-community stage, with the construction of a propositional-organisational community response.

Special attention needs to be paid to the way human rights training is designed, organised and carried out. Thus, the need for a pedagogical practice capable of generating critical thinking must be established. This also demands the need to stimulate an education geared towards autonomy, dialogue, and action[[34]](#footnote-34) . This requires a pedagogical practice that is not neutral, but on the contrary, that is essentially political, supported by democratic, pacifist and humanising actions, understanding that education is a form of intervention in the world.[[35]](#footnote-35)

This requires, among other things: a) dialogue and participation; b) contextualisation (relating educational content to people's reality and experience); c) a focus on practice; d) valuing local culture (popular knowledge); e) seeking social transformation; f) flexibility and adaptability (in relation to the needs of groups); g) collaborative learning (cooperation between participants); i) inclusion. These characteristics underpin an educational approach that seeks not only to build knowledge, but also to promote critical awareness and empower people to become active agents in transforming their realities.

There is also the challenge of establishing, in line with Freirean pedagogy, the relationship between reading the word, reading the world, and transforming the world. Or to put it another way

the first condition for a being to be able to take on a committed act is to be able to act and reflect. Being in the world means being able to know oneself in it. Knowing that, if the way in which they are in the world conditions their awareness of that being, they are undoubtedly capable of being aware of this conditioned awareness.[[36]](#footnote-36)

This implies an understanding that neutrality in relation to the world is revealed as conditioned consciousness and therefore requires reflection on oneself, one's being in the world and one's action on the world.[[37]](#footnote-37)

Thus, in liberating education, the human being, a being of relationships, "is not in the world, but with the world"[[38]](#footnote-38) . This corresponds to integration into their context and critical awareness of their problems. Collective thinking must be encouraged. We need to develop a process of action-reflection-action[[39]](#footnote-39) . Because democratic knowledge cannot take place in an authoritarian way. It is through dialogue and people's participation that autonomy is built, in a process of liberation and the experience of rights, fostering a culture of peace.

**5. CONCLUSIONS**

As we have seen, the international political situation is complex now, with a global trend towards a return to the logic of war and a process of emptying democracies around the world, marked by the advance of the extreme right. In this scenario, the defence of peace, the construction of a culture of peace and the promotion of human rights are essential.

We need to consider that the notion of peace has expanded to a broader meaning than just the absence of wars, and that it is related to the structural conditions for the absence of violence, such as justice, equity, solidarity, and respect for human rights. In this sense, the conditions for peace depend on an attentive look at direct, structural, and cultural violence and require measures that promote not only the extinction of its effects, but also the transformation of its root causes.

In addition, it is necessary to combine a process of reconciliation in spaces permeated by violence. Without reconciliation, which involves the stages of recognising, repairing, and restoring the damage caused, the prevention of future violence is not guaranteed.

At the same time, we must work to build a culture of peace and human rights, mainly because it brings together a set of values, attitudes and behaviours that are related to respect for life, an end to violence, the practice of non-violence through education, respect for and promotion of human rights, among others. In this construction, it is essential to learn to see, perceive, recognise and value peaceful and non-violent experiences, to recognise the richness and complexity of socio-political realities and to learn new ways of living together.

To this end, it is important to carry out EHD processes that include education for peace and vice versa, considering the potential of this education in building a culture of peace, and that peace is a concept that is inseparable from human rights. Educating for peace and human rights therefore includes a body of knowledge, ideas and activities that require concrete pedagogical practices.

This pedagogy must be integrative, critical, contextualised, and intercultural. It must also consider the values and principles and content of human rights, as well as those related to the culture of peace. The methodology and materials used, in turn, must be compatible with the pedagogical proposal adopted.

Furthermore, this pedagogical practice must be capable of generating critical thinking, stimulating the autonomy of the subject of rights, dialogue, and action. This requires that this education is not neutral, but on the contrary, that it is essentially political, in line with Freirean awareness-raising and ethical processes, and that it is supported by democratic, pacifist and humanising actions.

It is from this perspective that the process of training the subject of rights, based on education for peace and human rights and combined with the defence of democracy, is an element that can contribute to changing the current context.
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