Leadership for the Human Family- Reflective Human Action for a Culture of Peace

Kappa Omicron Nu
Research Fellow
Sue McGregor PhD Professor

2000

Table of Contents

Preamble

The prime objective of the family and consumer sciences profession is enhancing the well being of individuals and families. AAFCS's mission statement sets out the core values of the American association, including diversity, equality and human rights, global and community perspective and a healthy environment that positively affects the human condition (Chadwick, 1999). There are those who believe that peace education should figure into human relations and family life courses (Reardon 1995; Ulstrup, Cumming & Ebert, 1997). Put another way, peace education touches the whole curriculum (Thomas, 1997). Family and consumer sciences is part of the curriculum; hence, peace education should be part of higher education for family and consumer scientists. This KON project will provide a rationale for bringing peace education, and all it encompasses, within the realm of family and consumer sciences professional socialization. The objective is position the family and consumer sciences profession in the peace movement so that peace scholars and advocates will turn to the family and consumer science profession as a partner in securing family well-being through peace.

One of the basic premises of this project is that our profession could expand its concern for *the* family to include the *human* family. Family and consumer sciences (FCS) is evolving at a time when globalization is shaping the world. This project is based on the reality that globalization has serious side effects that affect peace, civility, human rights, justice, equality and security, all universal values of the profession (Bubolz & Sontag, 1988). I am assuming that practitioners will benefit from being socialized to appreciate and respect the insights gained from the broad field of peace education while attending FCS pre-professional university programs, at professional in-service sessions or both. The resultant leadership of family and consumer science practitioners could change profoundly.

Reflective Human Action (RHA) theory applied to leadership will facilitate the development of this project. RHA is a theory that helps us see leadership as intellectually and morally defensible. What could be more appropriate to understand the links between peace and the human family than a moral approach to leading? RHA leadership is action on behalf of the well-being of the earth and its inhabitants (Andrews et al., 1995). This well-being is compromised daily by conflict and violence, human rights violations and a decline in civil society. This project will strive to explain how FCS pre-service and in-service professional socialization can be augmented with a peace perspective such that practitioners are socialized to see themselves as global citizens prepared to shape the future of humanity via RHA leadership strategies.

UNESCO International Year for the Culture of Peace

This KON research initiative is especially relevant given that 2000 has been designated as the UNESCO International Year for the Culture of Peace (http://www3.unesco.org/manifesto2000/. Indeed, this Year will evolve into the International *Decade* for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence for the Children of the World. One of the logos is included here. The common picture shows two hands with fingers interlaced and each of the fingers represents the goals of the Year. The goals of the UNESCO effort closely parallel those of human action that is reflective: respect for all life, rejection of violence, sharing with others, listening to understand (empathy), preserving the planet, and rediscovering solidarity and community. The Vienna NGO Committee on the Family

(2000) recently recognized the UN Culture of Peace movement and convincingly argued that families figure prominently in the processes of education for peace, since peace is socially constructed in families and significantly affects quality of life. Furthermore, family life affects the structure of each person's understanding of themself and their relationship with others and the world.

Also, culture is not something that one is born with but something that is learned after one is born (Groff & Smoker, 1995). If we can create a world culture that values peace, then future generations will be born into a world that will be committed to socializing its children to value peace. This culture would be based on values and underlying assumptions about a peaceful, daily reality desired by the collective whole - the whole human family would want peace so it would socialize its members to be peaceful. A culture of peace aims to: transform values; empower people with peacebuilding skills and attitudes; encourage democratic participation; help people, especially women, gain equal representation and voice; ensure transparency, accountability and information flow from government and other institutional structures, eliminate poverty; promote sustainability; preserve the planet; and, advance tolerance, diversity and respect http://www.peace.ca/unesco.htm. These aims coincide perfectly with the goals and principles of reflective human action theory: reflection, authenticity, ethics and spirituality.

Furthermore, the family and consumer sciences profession has a vested interest in family and its well-being. A peace perspective, combined with a reflective human action approach to leadership, implies that the profession needs to expand its understanding: (a) of family to human family, (b) of well-being to human security, (c) of consumer rights to human rights, (d) of rights to responsibilities, and (e) of individualism and self-interest to social justice for the betterment of everyone. The tenets of reflective human action theory provide a powerful bridge between conventional family and consumer sciences curricula and peace education: (a) being true to one's own self (authenticity), (b) being ethically, intellectually and morally responsible (ethical sensibility), and (c) acting with spirituality (universal human capacity for passion and purpose for the betterment of the human condition) (Andrews et al., 1995).

Since the field of peace education is currently reconceptualizing and expanding its own understandings of what constitutes peace, it does *not* make sense to assume that members of the family and consumer science profession are familiar and comfortable with the concepts of human family, security, rights, responsibilities and social justice. To that end, after profiling RHA theory and the field of peace education, a primer will be developed about these five evolving peace concepts setting the stage for the final section which discusses the synergy inherent when using RHA leadership to build a culture of peace.

As a caveat, I know there are individuals in the field who are personally involved with larger peace and social justice issues. I do not feel, however, that the majority of current and new members are adequately socialized to appreciate the links between the human family and its security, rights and responsibilities. Instead, they are socialized to be concerned with individuals and family units at the micro level rather than the broader notion of a collection of people on the earth comprising the global human family. Even though I was eventually exposed to the holistic human ecology perspective and a global perspective and taught these to my students, peace education was never part of my socialization process so it was never part of theirs (unless they received it from other courses). Through professional socialization, family and consumer scientists learn accepted social roles, and mind sets and behaviour associated with these roles,

within their own culture. Family and consumer sciences has a professional culture (Kieren, Vaines & Badir, 1984) that could embrace the notion of contributing to a global culture of peace if members were socialized accordingly; hence, this KON research fellowship on RHA leadership for a culture of peace.

Reflective Human Action Theory and Leadership

Although strong and comprehensive materials have been developed by KON on the topic of RHA theory, this project will begin with a short precise of RHA theory as a preamble to a discussion of how it can give shape and meaning to this project. At this juncture, it is appropriate to distinguish between management and leadership because I feel that many of our programs, either by design or omission, prepare students to be managers more so than leaders. Covey (1992) makes a clear distinction between leadership and management. Fundamentally, leaders provide direction for personal and social transformation based on principles while managers provide control of resources used in transactions based on methods and procedures. Leaders adapt to situations, striving to share power while strengthening people. Managers react to situations, striving to maintain power while minimizing costs and maximizing benefits. Leaders work on changing the system and the infrastructure by looking at the lens and saying it is right for us. Managers work within the system and structures by looking through the lens, directing the producers to do the work. Both roles are necessary, sometimes done in tandem but we cannot move forward in new directions if we do not assume leadership. KON advocates bringing a reflective human action approach to this leadership role.

Principles of Reflective Human Action Theory

Andrews et al. (1995) clarify that the reflective human action theory of leadership promotes four principles:

1. accepting chaos - despite new and chaotic information, we have an unerring ability to find order leading to the personal ability to change and renew;
2. sharing information - people need to share information to be find creative, consensual solutions. Information is the invisible workings of creativity, the primary life force of the universe and it must be shared not hoarded;
3. embracing a vision - we derive clarity, purpose and a sense of direction from shared values and a vision; and
4. developing relationships - we grow and construct ourselves through our relationships since nothing is known except in relation to persons, ideas and events.

In summary, order will come of chaos if one stays with one's commitment to sharing information, developing relationships and gaining consensus of vision.

One must first appreciate that *any* action taken by a human is comprised of seven features which are present whether the person knows it or not: mission, meaning, existence, resources, structure, power and fulfilment. There are also three features of *human action that is reflective*: (a) being true to one's own self (authenticity), (b) being ethically, intellectually and morally responsible (ethical sensibility), and (c) acting with spirituality (universal human capacity for passion and purpose) (Andrews et al., 1995). These two major topics now will be discussed, the features of *any* human action and features of *reflective* human action.

Features of *any* human action

As a reminder, any action that a person takes is based on mission, meaning, existence, resources, structure, power and fulfilment, features that are present whether the person knows it or not. Figure 1 sets out a brief overview of the essence of these seven features (Andrews et al., 1995). Succinctly, any human activity is inherently shaped by a larger purpose, is done because it has meaning for the person, happens in a historical context, is affected by the level of available

resources, plans and strategies and involves a commitment of power and sprit to see it through to completion. Terry (1993) provides a powerful approach to help us see the synergy between these seven elements. Figure 2 helps us understand how to deal with leadership issues depending on which of the six features of any human action is the central problem (the seventh feature, fulfilment, is the reason the other six features exist).

Figure 1 - Overview of seven features of any human action (Andrews et al., 1995)

mission -	What is the ultimate purpose of taking this action? What expectations are driving the expenditure of energy?
meaning	- Why something is being undertaken places the mission in context and helps the person make sense of their actions - why am I doing this? Meaning expresses significance of an action, legitimizes the action and places boundaries around the process of doing something.
existence	- What is the history of this action, this event or situation? What set the scene for needing to do something now? What are the limiting factors, forces within and beyond control and what rituals that limit taking action?
resources	- What is at hand that can be used to take the action, including tangible and intangible resources?
structure	- What are the plans and processes that can be used to accomplish this action? What arrangements, schedules, strategies, methods, designs etc. are at hand or could be found?
power	- What energy is expended and what level of commitment is there to follow through and accomplish the action? Within RHA theory, power it is not just the ability to exert one's will upon another but is also energy that can be released and focussed towards attaining fulfilment.
fulfilment	- What has been accomplished by this action? Did expectations, resources, power, structures, meaning and mission converge into one allowing the action to be fulfilled and completed?

Figure 2 - Relationship between seven features of human action (adapted from Terry, 1993)

If one of the features below presents itself	*then deal with it by working on....*
Mission (toward what are you working?)	Meaning (why are you working toward it?)
Meaning (why are you working toward it?)	Existence (what is the history of the need to take action? What is the current situation)
Existence (what is the history of the need to take action? What is the current situation)	Resources (what assets can you use to take action now?)
Resources (what assets can you use to take action now?)	Structure (through what processes can you take action?)
Structure (through what processes can you take action?)	Power (how much energy and commitment is there to take action?)
Power (how much energy and commitment is there to take action?)	Mission (toward what are you working?)

All of this should lead to fulfilment or completion of the initiated action

As an example, if the issue appears to be structure, the intervention to deal with the situation should deal with power. If people in an organization say things like "things are not well organized", "I don't know what my job is", "Who should I report to?" then the organization *appears* to be dealing with the structure set up to get things done. In fact, the leader should focus on power, or a sense of powerless among people. Power is the commitment and the energy expended to get things done. If people do not feel like they have any say in the arrangement of their work world, they will feel powerless, complain of structural issues, the obvious symptom, and fail to commit to, or put enough energy into, their job. Rearranging the work environment will not solve the problem but focussing on realigning power relationships will; that is, the leader should focus on the underlying symptoms not the apparent ones. Andrews et al. (1995, pp. 17-20) provide excellent examples of the other relationships identified in Figure 2.

Features of *reflective* human action

As can be seen from the example above, we are beginning to move from discussing *any* human action toward the dynamics among the seven features of human actions. This growing awareness opens the door to *reflective* human action.

Reflection. To be reflective entails being able to step back from the immediacy of the situation and examine ones's beliefs, attitudes, values and behaviour in a dispassionate manner (Jackson, 1990). van Manen (1995) identifies three types of reflection. Thinking about what has happened is called retrospective reflection, what may come is called anticipatory reflection and stopping to think while doing something is called contemporaneous reflection. Schön (1987) discusses *reflection on action* and *reflection in action* with the former referring to after the fact and the latter to during the action, while the "live' problem or situation unfolds and one is aware of what one is doing at the same time.

Reflection is comprised of five steps (Dewey, 1933). First, one experiences perplexity, confusion and doubt due to the nature of the situation. This stage is followed by conjecture, anticipation and tentative interpretation of the elements or meanings and consequences that the situation has for the person who is reflecting or those affected by future actions. Third, the person engages in an exploration and analysis of the situation, hoping to bring clarity and definition to the problem. This inquiry leads to the formation and elaboration of suggestions to deal with the situation and, finally, to a decision to do something to attain a desired result - that is, to take *reflective action*! Kolb (1984) tenders a similar set of stages characterizing the reflective process. First, one experiences something. After the experience, a person brings it to the forefront of their mind and thinks about all of the feelings, ideas and behaviours associated with the action, often in dialogue with others or one's self through journals. This process of in-depth reflection will lead one to generalize and tease out the insights and principles revealed, leading to the whole cycle beginning again in a new situation.

Reflection helps people engage in observation, questioning, speculation and self-awareness (de Acosta, 1995). Being thoughtful about one's practice is being reflective. The result is knowledge about one's self or *self-knowledge* resulting from self-reflection. Augmenting this self-knowledge with technical knowledge enables a reflective practitioner and leader to develop choice rules (heuristics) needed to deal with the unpredictability of real world problems. A

reflective practitioner and leader will gain courage to act in situations of uncertainty or value conflicts and to be responsible for their actions (Schön, 1987). Indeed, Bolton (1998) identifies three paradoxes of being a reflective practitioner. (a) In order to acquire confidence from reflection, one has to let go of certainty and accept and be comfortable with uncertainty. (b) One has to trust the reflective process but also has to be able to look for something when one does not know what it is they are looking for. (c) Finally, one has to begin to act when one does not know how one should act. One has to trust that one knows their area of practice and that one knows how to be reflective *about* that practice. To that end, Andrews et al. (1995) maintain that human action characterized by reflection is composed of authenticity, ethical sensibility and spirituality, as well as the seven features for *any* human action set out in Figure 2. Each of these three features will now be discussed.

Authenticity. Being true to one's own self, personality, spirit and character is an intriguing component of RHA. Authenticity entails the profound task of avoiding self-deception and hidden agendas since this unveiling helps determine what is really going on and how to expand the possibilities. To be authentic is to be genuine, trustworthy and reflective. It means being courageous, passionate and hopeful. It means facing reality as it is, looking for common ground among diversity and embracing the fact that life can be difficult and full of uncertainties. To be authentic means to examine one's self and one's relationships in the community of other human beings. Acting authentically means one can strive for a more humane future for the world and its citizens (Andrews et al., 1995).

Andrews et al. (1995) set out seven C's of authenticity as a way to judge if one is being authentic in their leadership role:

1. Correspondence - Follow up intention to act with action.
2. Consistency - "Walk the talk" captures the element of consistency which refers to action connected to meaning - do what you say others should do; mean and live what you say.
3. Coherence - Link each action with the other actions to make sure actions are internally consistent and effectively, synergetically combined.
4. Concealment - Reveal all sides of an action - not just the positive ones but the downside too.
5. Conveyance - Communicate and transmit thoughts and actions to assure openness and depth in future dialogue - take responsibility for one's dialogue.
6. Comprehensiveness -Expand frame of action as a result of embracing depth and breadth of meaning taken from dialogue.
7. Convergence - Seek common ground so it is easier to bridge differences.

Leadership that is not authentic can happen for several reasons. First, people may feel disconnected from other people and social institutions (e.g., community, church, school, work). Second, they may also question the validity of social institutions, especially the economy, government, organized religion, even family. Third, people cannot be true to themselves (authentic) if they make up their realities rather than face daily life. This virtual reality and escapism is especially prevalent and possible now with computer technology, telecommunications and transportation. Fourth, shifting from people based activity to information based activity leads to inauthentic leadership, as does a tendency towards relativism, the fifth factor mitigating authenticity (Andrews et al.,1995). Relativism refers to valuing

functional information, accepting and conforming to societal norms and standards without critiquing them, seeking the short term advantage and quick fix, shunning responsibility for one's actions and not being accountable, seeking immediate gratification, and striving for self-interests at the expense of others and nature. Relativism means "everything is relative" and useful only for the moment and that "everyone should do their own thing" - individualism versus collectivity (Schneider, 1994).

Ethical Sensibility. To be sensible is to take action marked by awareness, reason, perception, good judgement and prudence. To be ethical means to act in accordance with principles of good or right conduct. Ethical sensibility refers to leading and taking action that embraces: responsibility and accountability, justice and fairness of process, freedom (potential and possibilities), and attention and care of one's existence and situation (Andrews et al., 1995).

Andrews et al. (1995) further explain that human action and leadership shaped by sensible, ethical actions "takes tremendous courage to choose to act based on principles of human dignity and respect, to be honest with yourself, to recognize rationalizations that keep you from living true to yourself, to stand up for the principles in which you believe and to act for the common good " (p.33). Ethical sensibility obviously involves a concern for ethics, taken to be questions of right and wrong, duties and obligations, rights and responsibilities. One's behaviour is judged to be ethical if it adheres to the following five principles:

1. value for life - acting in a way which does not harm human life,
2. goodness or rightness - using the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number,
3. justice or fairness - assuring equality of treatment and fair distribution of benefits and burdens,
4. truth-telling or honesty - basing action on truth, and
5. individual freedom - assuring self determination (Mitstifer, 1989).

Spirituality. If authentic leadership is grounded in courage, hope and the faith that one's actions will contribute to the well being and quality of life of all those we meet, touch and serve, then spirituality is the component that links us to the larger world. The spirituality component of RHA leadership helps one feel attached to and connected with the world and people and fosters the call to contribute to something larger than one's self (Andrews et al., 1995). It challenges us to take responsibility for ourselves in concert with others as we seek to create and build a global commonwealth worthy of the best that we human beings have to offer each other and nature. The spirit is the component that links each person to the larger world (Terry, 1993).

By way of clarification, one's soul is personal while spirit is universal. This distinction is important. A pre-requisite for being a reflective leader is having a respect for, and faith in, one's inner self (Bolton, 1998). In order to engage in authentic, ethical, spiritual leadership for the betterment of all, one must consciously recognize the non-physical dimensions of being human - one's soul. The soul is one's personal substance - the depth, heart and essence of one's inner self, beyond the material and physical dimensions of life. Coming to terms with one's inner self empowers a person to expand their compassion and energy to the needs of others (Zukav, 1989). A healthy, individual human spirit contributes to one's professional goal to practice using reflective human action; that is, to engage in spirituality of leadership which leads to the betterment of the overall human condition in the world.

Overview of Peace Education

This section will provide an overview of evolving conceptualizations of peace education, a rationale for elaborating on specific concepts of peace and then sections on human family,

human security, human rights, human responsibilities and social justice.

Conceptualizations of Peace Education

Peace education has evolved considerably over the last 100 years. Groff and Smoker's (1995) compelling discussion of the evolution of approaches to studying peace is set out in Figure 3 and is the most comprehensive discussion to date.

Figure 3 - Evolution of approaches to study of peace (extracted from Groff & Smoker, 1995)

1930's Absence of War	*1940-50's Balance of Forces*	*1960's No structural violence*	*1970-80's Feminist Peace*	*1990-2000's Holistic (Gaia) peace (outer and inner)*
peace defined as **absence of war** between nations or *within nations*	peace defined as **balance** between political, social, cultural and technological factors. This balance was between nations and between *people and community.*	peace defined as **negative peace** (absence of war) and **positive peace** (presence of justice and structures that respect values of peace). Scope of peace expanded beyond nation and community to include *institutional structures* (social, economic, political and cultural) and *global structures* arranged in such a way that structural violence was taken into account	definition of peace expanded beyond the organized macro level (war) to include **peace at the unorganized micro level** (individual and family relationships). Concern for peace expanded beyond organized war to unorganized violence *within the home and at the personal level (family, women, children, elders).* Also, structural violence expanded to include **systemic discrimination** against particular individuals and groups.	definition of peace now includes **peace within the environment** and **peace within oneself** (spiritual inner peace) as well as the previous conceptualizations - a very holistic and contextual approach to understanding peace

An analysis of Figure 3 reveals that the concept of peace evolved from: (a) single to multi-factored definitions; (b) single to multiple (micro, meso, macro and exo) levels; (c) negative to positive conceptions; (d) structural to include interactions and relationships; and, (e) outer peace only to outer, inner and ecological peace. Outer peace can be found in family and individuals, community, within states, between states, internationally, globally and environmentally. We are very fortunate to live at a time when peace is seen as such a broad, holistic concept since this conceptualization provides a powerful approach to working with families, societies and world structures at a time when the integrity of each is in jeopardy.

This broad range of categories for peace thinking opens up wide avenues for peace building, making and keeping - towards a culture of peace. In more detail, peace is more than the absence of war. Peace requires special relationships, structures, and attitudes to promote and protect it (Gregor, 1999). Peace implies that love, compassion, human dignity and justice are fully preserved. It entails appreciating that we are all interdependent and related to one another and are collectively responsible for the common good ("Declaration", 1994). Peace generates an equilibrium in social interactions, so that all the members of society can live in harmonious

relations with each other. Where there is violence, injustice and absence of liberty, there is no peace (Canadian Centers for Teaching Peace [CCTP], 1998b). Fisk (2000) recognizes that a dominate conceptualization of peace includes negative and positive peace. Negative peace is the *absence* of war or other forms of violence like terrorism, warfare, etc; that is, anti-militarism. People being socialized to achieve negative peace are taught the importance of, and skills necessary for, putting out fires and stopping conflict *after* it has broken out (CCTP, 1998a). Positive peace represents the *presence* of economic, political and cultural practices which contribute to the safe, fair and healthy living of citizens. Positive peace is society building by diminishing violence. Ryan (1999) further clarifies that negative peace is the absence of violence and positive peace is the *presence of justice*.

Fisk (2000) also set out a three way distinction between: (a) education *about* peace, (b) education *for* peace, and (c) peace *through* the education process. Education *about* peace refers to accumulating knowledge, facts and ideas about things that affect peace: social justice, tolerance, gender equality, social literacy, just and peaceable living, human rights, environmental security, human security, morality, diversity, and conflict and dispute resolution. Education *for* peace refers to a process wherein people learn ideologies, values, attitudes, moral standards, sensitivities to others and new perceptions such that they are moved to take different actions than they did in the past.

Fisk (2000) describes gaining peace *through* the education process. From this perspective, he appreciates that education, done right, will lead to a collection of individuals who strive for wisdom, clarity, cooperation, democracy, human potential, and a critical awareness of life's conditions. Education done right will lead to people who appreciate that the world is full of uncertainties but who have faith in the possibilities of the future. Education done the right way will sensitize people to appreciate that they have to face their own limitations, develop capacities for trust and commitment and be willing to let go of their preconceived notions and values for the sake of new and greater knowledge and insights. People who work for the larger truths by diligently verifying facts and findings and who know it is necessary to live with uncertainty couched in human potential will have been educated to respect, strive for and settle for nothing but peace and the fair, safe and healthy living of all citizens.

To reiterate, peace requires special relationships, structures, values and attitudes to promote and protect it (Gregor, 1999). The Peace Education Network of the British National Peace Council (1999) developed a useful conceptualization of peace education, one that matches values and attitudes for peace education with the aims of peace education (see Figure 4). These values include diversity, equity (treat differently leading to equality), equality (treat the same), self-esteem, integrity of the ecosystem, respect and empathy. These values should lead to positive change, social justice and non-violence.

A special session was held at the 2000 Peace Studies Association/Consortium of Peace Research Education and Development (PSA/COPRED) conference in Texas on conceptualizing peace education. Figure 5 summarizes the result of a conceptual mapping exercise to identify the building blocks of peace education. This process marked the beginning of the task of conceptual clarification for the area of peace education. Many of the concepts set out by the British National Peace Council are reflected in Figure 5 and reflect the evolution of peace as set out in Figure 3.

Figure 4 - Values, Attitudes and Aims of Peace Education (Peace Education Network of the British National Peace Council, 1999)

Values and attitudes for peace education	*Aims of peace education*
Respect for others	understand the nature and origins of violence and its effects on both victim and perpetrator
Empathy (understand other's points of view)	create frameworks for achieving peaceful, creative societies
Belief that people can make **positive change**	sharpen awareness about existence of unpeaceful relationships between people and within and between nations
Appreciation of and respect for **diversity**	investigate causes of conflicts and violence embedded within perceptions, values and attitudes
Self-esteem - accept the intrinsic value of oneself	encourage the search for alternative non-violent skills within each person
Commitment to **social justice, equity and non-violence**	equip people with personal conflict resolution skills
Concern for the **environment** and our place in the **ecosystem**	no information provided
Commitment to **equality**	no information provided

Figure 5 - Building blocks of peace education identified at the 2000 Peace Studies Association/Consortium of Peace Research, Education and Development (PSA/COPRED) conference, Austin, Texas

human rights	individual responsibilities	negative/positive peace
a way of life	pedagogy/andragogy	respect
fairness	civil society	democracy
holistic not fragmented	security	justice
humanity (human family)	mutual understanding	awareness/consciousness
reframe and resocialize	power issues	social justice
literacy	non-violence	citizenship
dignity	privilege and power	global awareness
environment	life	human condition
community	decision making/problem solving	listening
consumption	gender	values
racism and ethnicity	deeper levels of living	relationships
trust	cooperation	caring
diversity	communication on different levels	conflict

Rationale for a Primer on Specific Peace Concepts

Select concepts from Figure 5 will be developed in the next section, concepts most related to reflective human action's features of ethics, accountability and spirituality and to the central concepts shaping family and consumer sciences: the human family, human security, human rights, human responsibilities and social justice. They are leading edge concepts within the peace education field. The other building blocks of peace education noted in Figure 5 are supposed to be in the FCS curricula already since they form the foundation of the 1993 Scottsdale Conceptual Framework for the 21st Century for Family and Consumer Sciences (see Appendix 1). These notably include: relationships and power, consumption, diversity, environment, communication and other professional skills and values, and a holistic approach to practice.

Primer on Leading Edge Peace Education Concepts

As the world changes, so must our conceptualizations of that world; hence, the following section provides an overview of emerging views on five fundamental concepts in the field of peace education: the human family, human security, human rights, human responsibilities and social justice.

Human Family

From the moment we are born, we are destined to be in relationship with others (Jackson, 1990). Family and consumer sciences has always been concerned with relationships but has often focused on intra familial relationships leading to strong individual family units (spousal, sibling and parent/child relationships). This focus needs to be expanded to include the *human family* which refers to the relationships between people comprising the world population - the collection of beings called humanity. Jackson notes that people desire to bond together, not only at the family level but, at the community level as well. Relationships with teachers, clergy, teams, co-workers, etc. build a sense of solidarity - an identity among members of a group. He takes this solidarity to a higher level, that of nations and cultures, urging those studying peace to extend it to the global level as well - the human family. Respect for the dignity of each person in the human family creates bonds between people. Jackson makes the interesting point that people tend to have less of a personal relationship with nationality and other cultures than they do with family members and close friends. It is this disconnectedness that needs to be mended if we are to nurture the human family as a whole. Our relationships with more distant members of the human family have to become personal because we all share a common destiny, that being to promote the common good. The common good is the totality of social conditions which make it possible for people to reach their full potential in a timely fashion. This common destiny means it is time for an ever-expanding sense of community so that all members of the human family can reach their fullest potential.

The profession's general slogan for the 21st century could expand beyond *"the voice for strong families*" to include "*the voice for a strong **human** family*". Figure 6 illustrates the creed for "The One Human Family" as set out on the One Human Family web site. This creed is especially poignant when one appreciates that "it is the diversity of the human family which gives it so rich a pattern of relationships. For every race and every culture has its own quality to

contribute, its own note to sound, its own force to add to the whole of humanity's progress on the evolutionary path to completion of its destiny" ("The human family", n.d., web citation).

Figure 6 - The One Human Family Creed

As a member of our One Human Family, I choose of my own free will to treat all people with respect and dignity. I recognize that every person is my brother and sister in our human family regardless of what they look like, what they believe, how they choose to live, and whether I agree with them or not. I will do my part to help all people receive fair treatment and reach their highest potential. I will have the courage to help people when they are down or in harm's way, and the wisdom to let them learn for themselves. I will show empathy to those who suffer, forgive those who have wronged me, and be a friend to those who will let me.
This is my promise to our human family. http://www.1HF.com

Clay (1997) recognizes family, among education, work, play and religion, as one of the things that makes us all distinctly human. By extension, each family should be concerned for the world's human family. This is a profoundly exciting new direction for family and consumer sciences and builds on the emerging body of research on inclusion, diversity, community and the global education/perspective found in the Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, the Journal of Vocational Home Economics Education, the Family and Consumer Sciences Teacher Education Yearbook and KON's Forum and newsletter, Dialogue. Everyone has a rightful place, and inherent responsibilities, in the world "family". New and existing professionals have to socialized in such a way that this foundation is embraced and practiced. The human family, the peoples of the world, should feel strong and connected to one another, and FCS has a key role to play in guaranteeing these global relationships.

Human Security

The family and consumer sciences profession has always been concerned with family well-being and security (McGregor & Goldsmith, 1998). A recent focus in the peace education field is the notion of human security, as opposed to national security. The latter is concerned with national defense, war and peace keeping initiatives of a nation while the former is concerned with the well-being of the citizens within the nation and within the human family. In more detail, national defense is traditionally concerned with protection of the nation-state, defense of territories and boundaries and the preservation of political sovereignty. After the end of the Cold War era, security expanded to include the personal well-being of individuals and their ability to feel secure in the basic needs that affect their day-to-day existence: food, health, employment, population, human rights, environment, education , etc. (Ayala-Lasso, 1996; Nef, 1999).

Security, simply put, is protecting oneself, other people or society from threats and challenges to safety and existence. Being secure means that risks (exposure to harm or danger) have been reduced or eliminated - feeling insecure means the risks, or the reality, of harm are still there (Nef, 1999). The concept of human security is multidimensional and these many dimensions are set out in Figure 7.

Figure 7 - Multidimensional concept of human security (extrapolated from Nye, 1999)		
Dimension of Human Security	**Main theme of each dimension**	**Symptoms of insecurity (risks) for each dimension of human security**
Environmental	right to preservation of their life and health and to dwell in a safe and sustainable environment	- death of rain forests - thinning of ozone layer - air pollution and acid rain - freshwater contamination and depletion - land degradation and erosion - food insecurity - damage to oceans - epidemics and disease - threats to the genetic pool - dangers to the Green Revolution - hazardous waste
Cultural	preserving and enhancing the ability to control uncertainty and fear	- crisis (not crash) of civilizations - mindless incrementalism (short term fixes) - hegemony of neoclassical economics - crisis of learning and crisis of ideas - impractical pragmatism (short term fixes) - abandonment of politics (no voice, laws that favor transnational corporations) - lack of moral obligations and human responsibilities - Westernization - telecommunications, transportation, information technology, media control
Political	right to representation, freedom and autonomy, participation and dissent combined with empowerment to make choices with a reasonable probability to effect change. This includes protection from abuse, access to justice and legal-juridical security.	- spread of conflict - terrorism and counter terrorism - crime and counter crime - neoliberalism - neofascism
Social	freedom from discrimination based on age, gender, race, ethnicity or social status. This means access to information, freedom to associate and access to safety nets. Access to integrated and strong communities	- population growth - migration - refugee flows - hyberurbanization - decline of communities and civil society

Economic	access to employment and resources needed to maintain one's existence, reduce scarcity and improve material quality of life in community	- persistent and expanding poverty - crisis of economic growth - debt crisis - deteriorating terms of trade - down side of global competition - unemployment and underemployment
Personal	cooperation, cohabitation and personal responsibility for own, and collective security, leads to continuity of individual lives, transmission of collective knowledge, and provision of food, medical, shelter as well as physical protection from injury or death	- weapons of mass destruction - family in crisis or transition - violence in the home - isolation and disconnectedness from collective - excessive consumerism - illiteracy

The notion of human security should resonate loudly with family and consumer scientists who have always been concerned with well-being. Fleck (1980) set out four functions of families related to the four traditional aspects of well-being: (a) provide physical necessities (food, clothing, shelter); (b) facilitate physical, intellectual and emotional development of members; (c) provide every opportunity for every family member to be happy and successful; and (d) provide a chance for every member to be contented and close to all other family members. Respectively, using Brown's (1993) model of well-being, these refer to efficiency in management and control over things in the home (economic and physical well-being), and to interpersonal relations and personality development within the family (social and psychological well-being). Table 1 provides a comprehensive summary of McGregor and Goldsmith's (1998) discussion of the seven dimensions of well-being. They expand the concept of well-being to include the spiritual, the environmental and personal autonomy - the political. These dimensions of family well-being are evident in Nye's (1999) conceptualization of global human security.

Using the human security label is a sign that governments have begun to recognize the importance of the well-being of citizens as well as the security of the state and the nation. It should be easy for us to embrace the notion of human security. Heinbecker (1999) elaborates further, noting that human security complements, but does not substitute for, national security; that individual human beings and communities, *rather than states*, are the measure of security; that the security of states is necessary, but not sufficient, to ensure individual well-being. This approach to family well-being places families at the forefront of policy and government programs, dialogue and deliberations since their interest is now also in focus along with deficit, debts and military might.

Table 1 Summary of dimensions of various aspects of well-being (extrapolated from McGregor & Goldsmith, 1998)

Economic	Physical	Social	Emotional	Environmental	Political	Spiritual
the degree to which individuals and families have economic adequacy or security.	*concern with or preoccupation with the body and its needs plus maintaining the integrity of the human body by protecting it and providing sustenance*	*the social space of the family as a group, the social needs of the individual played out daily in interactions via interpersonal relationships within the family group and with the larger community, including the workplace.*	*the mental status or space of individual family members versus the group as a whole*	*concern for our role in the earth's diminishing resources*	*family and individual's internal sense of power and autonomy based on moral and ethical freedom, concern for the welfare of the community and nation*	*captures a layer of well-being, a sense of insight and ethereal, intangible evolution not readily imparted by either social or psychological well-being as they are conventionally defined*

money income, transfers and in-kind income, financial assets, human capital, community resources, durable goods and services, time, deferred consumption, attitude toward money, control over financial affairs and resources, values, insurance-risk management ability, job security, benefits, ability to adjust to life transitions, life style decisions, loss of employment, illness, bankruptcy, bank failures, poverty, destitution in old age, unpaid labour in the home	unsafe and irresponsible personal conduct or the actions of a third party; illness, disease and malnutrition; lack of or inappropriate exercise; dangerous and hazardous products; adulterated foods; incompetent and irresponsible service delivery; environmental degradation (e.g., depletion of ozone layer), managing physical impairments or disabilities as well as sleep, tension and stress, adequate and affordable housing for protection against the elements or abusive partners; safe, durable, and comfortable clothing and textiles, safe, healthy, edible food products and nutrient supplements	interpersonal relationships and the dynamics of familial interaction,; ability to form cooperative and interdependent relationships with others, to participate with others in society, and to learn the ways of daily life; processes of cooperation and conflict, communication patterns and problem solving; conflict management, decision making and goal setting patterns; resource management, stressors in and on the family; any special needs; interpersonal skills, love, romance and relating to others	self esteem, self worth, self image, self identity self actualization, self formation and fulfilment, self concept self expression, sense of belonging feeling connected with others, status, feeling superior, self respect, prestige, ego-defence, independence self control	waste and energy management, reduction and recycling, reduced and more considered consumption habits; depletion of the ozone layer, destruction of plant and animal species, loss of oceans, growing deserts, soil erosion, deforestation. protecting the integrity of the near environments (noise, water and sound pollution) the internal environments of the buildings where we work, live, recoup and play. Sick building syndrome due to harmful indoor pollutants.	in control of one's life, being able to and having the freedom to make decisions, being aware of and able to anticipate the consequences of one's actions on one's self and others; having the skills to act on one's decisions; no longer accept unquestioningly those practices in society that are frequently taken for granted, those practices which reinforce inequality and injustice	joy and sense of completeness, holistic connectedness of the world, pure joy of living, peace, hope and faith gained from insights and moments of growth and enlightenment; being and relating rather than having and doing

Human Rights

Human security is synonymous with human rights (Ney, 1999). Peace and human security are dependent on universal adherence to human rights (Weiss, 2000). Human rights are about the denial of the full humanity of a person due to oppressive, prejudicial, discriminatory actions of their government (Thompson, 1997). A right is something to which an individual has a just claim. A "just claim" refers to a morally correct demand for something that is due or believed to be due (Gove, 1969). Human rights are those that individuals have by virtue of their very existence as human beings (to live, eat, breath, have shelter). Civil or legal rights are those granted by government (e.g., the right to vote at age 18). Rights are often associated with freedom. Bannister and Monsma (1982) define a right as powers, privileges or protections to which people are justly entitled or which have been established by law.

Human rights are inalienable, meaning incapable of being surrendered or transferred. These rights apply to every single person on this earth simply because they **are** living on this earth! After the atrocities of World War II, the newly formed UN issued the *Universal*

Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. It is intended to protect humans against actions taken by their governments. It is comprised of 30 articles organized around six themes: (a) born free and equal (2 articles); (b) civil and political rights (next 19 articles); (c) economic, social and cultural rights (next 8 articles); (d) social and international context within to achieve rights - that is, peace and human security (1 article); (e) duties to protect rights and freedoms of others in the community (1 article); and, finally, (f) one last article says that no one can take any one of the rights out of context and use it as an excuse to violate other rights in the Declaration, and that every single person, group, organization and government is responsible for making the Declaration *work*, see Figure 8 (Canadian Human Rights Foundation, 1986).

Figure 8 -	**United Nations Human Rights provide protection from actions of government not business and are comprised of 30 articles organized around six themes:**
(1)	**born free and equal** (2)
(2)	**civil and political rights** (next 19) recognition under the law, rights to fair trials and freedom of movement in and out of a country, freedom from arbitrary arrest, detention or exile, and freedom from torture as well as the rights to privacy, to have a family, to own property, to have free conscious and thought, right to public assembly and to participate in government
(3)	**economic, social and cultural rights** (next 8) employment and working conditions, social security, leisure, standards of living, education, moral and material interests/authorship, and arts and cultural enjoyment
(4)	**social and international context** within to achieve rights - that is, peace and human security (1)
(5)	duties to protect rights and freedoms of **others in the community** (1) and,
(6)	no one can take any one of the rights out of context and use it as an excuse to violate other rights in the Declaration, and **every single person**, group, organization and government **is responsible for making it *work***.

Another way to conceptualize human rights is provided by Thompson (1997): personal social and instrumental rights. *Personal rights* protect the fundamental characteristics of the *person*: life, bodiliness (food, shelter, medical care, security), self-determination, sociability, work, sexuality, family, and core values. *Social rights* specify *society's* obligation to each person: health care, political participation, adequate working conditions, education and public assembly. Finally, *instrumental rights* promote individual participation in the development of *institutions* that shape and structure daily human life: the economy, government, health care and educational systems, labour market, the law, etc. An extension of this schema was developed by Christiansen et al. (1974). They broke human rights into eight dimensions, each with three levels also labelled instrumental, social and personal, all relating to human dignity (see Figure 9).

Figure 9 - Human rights classification scheme (adapted from Christiansen et al., 1974)	
Rights	**Three different levels:**

	Instrumental (institutional)	Social	Personal
Bodily	security in sickness, inability to work, old age and unemployment	food, clothing, shelter, rest and medical care	life and bodily integrity
Political	judicial protection of political participation (suffrage and due process)	political participation	self determination
Movement	internal and external migration	nationality and residence	freedom of movement
Associational	form societies and organizations	assembly and association	social intercourse
Economic	organize unions and right to property	adequate working conditions and a just wage	right to work
Sexual and family	economic, social, cultural and moral conditions necessary for family life	right to found a family or live singly, right to procreate	choose a state of life
Religious	religious freedom	private and public expression of religious belief	religious belief
Communication	be informed truthfully	freedom of expression, education and culture	to communicate

Figure 10 provides a summary of the individual articles in the Declaration and the full text is available at http://www.un.org/rights. Reardon (1995) clarifies that the list is not a legal guarantee but rather a statement of belief. Protecting these rights should lead to a better world.

Figure 10 - Summary of Basic UN Human Rights, 1948	
Free and equal	Can own property Can have free thought, conscience and religion
Entitled to all rights and freedoms in the declaration	Can express opinion
Security of person	Can gather in public
No slavery	Vote
No torture	Right to access to public service
Are a person before the law	Right to dignity and personality via social services
Right to protection of the law against discrimination	Work
Right to effective remedy	Equal pay
Need a reason for being arrested	Pay equal to assurance of human dignity
Trial by peers	Can form and join a union
Presumed Innocent	Standard of living adequate for health and well-being with special status for women and children
Freedom from interference of privacy (family, home or correspondence)	Education
Free to move within the country	Share and participate in community and culture
Can leave and return to country	Copyright and intellectual property
Can seek asylum	Peace
Can choose a nation(ality)	Responsible to community and democratic society
Can marry of own free will and have a family	
Family is fundamental unit of society	

Figure 10 and Appendix 2 profile the first generation of human rights agreed to in 1948. Second, third and fourth generation of rights also have evolved. In the 50s and 60s other rights were added: prevention of genocide (1951) and elimination of racial discrimination (1969). In 1976, more human rights were added through two conventions, one on socio-economic and cultural rights and the other on civil and political rights. In the 80s and 90s, the right to self-determination (1981, notably in Africa's Charter), the rights of women (1981), rights against torture, etc. (1987), and the rights of the child (1990) were added. In 1984, the UN added a significant right - the right to peace, since only through peace can civilization be preserved and all other rights ensured (Canadian Voice of Women for Peace, 1999; Reardon, 1995). It is noteworthy that United States has not accepted the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural rights (Fraser, 1998). This lack of endorsement affects efforts by the profession to obtain results from their efforts to lobby for peace and human rights.

Human Responsibilities

Just as human beings have fundamental rights by virtue of their personhood, they also have human, ethical responsibilities. Indeed, the concept of rights often implies related obligations, duties or responsibilities (Küng, 1998). Obligation refers to legally or morally binding oneself to a course of action in a situation that is bound with constraints - binding in law or conscience. A duty suggests a more general but greater impulsion on moral or ethical grounds. Responsibility refers to moral, legal or mental accountability for one's actions, conduct or obligations (Gove, 1969). Küng further distinguishes between narrower legal obligations and ethical responsibilities in the wider sense like those prompted by conscience, love and humanity. The latter is based on the insights of the individual and cannot be compelled by the government through law.

It is a sense of responsibility that makes people accountable for their actions (Arias,

1997). But the concept of responsibility is complex. Someone can be said to "bear" responsibility for something meaning they sustain without flinching or they can be said to "accept" responsibility meaning they receive it with consent. Also, responsibility can be perceived as a negative thing, as a weight or as a positive, enlightening, empowering thing. The former implies culpability and the latter implies recognition of successes and the "attempt". Also, three conditions have to be present for someone to be act responsibly: (a) there must be a condition to which one perceives the need to respond, (b) the belief that it is in one's power to respond, and (c) the belief that responding is not only in one's power but is to one's benefit. Conversely, a person's lack of "response" -- "ability" could be a breakdown in any one or all of these steps (Jones cited in "Thoughts on responsibility", 1998).

When people think about human responsibilities they cannot turn to the United Nations for guidance as they can for human rights because the UN does not have a declaration on human responsibilities. This gap may be redressed shortly given that an organization called the InterAction Council developed a proposal for a Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities and submitted it to the UN in September 1997 (Küng, 2000). At the time this document was posted, the UN Commission on Human Rights, through its principal subsidiary organ, the Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, followed up on its April 2000 decision to undertake a study on the issues of human rights and responsibilities (56th session) by announcing that Miguel Alfonso Martinze has been selected to do the study. He is supposed to submit the results at the 58th session (2002) (Commission on Human Rights, 2001).

As an aside, the InterAction Council, formed in 1983, is comprised of some 30 former heads of government or state from all continents and different political orientations. Their objective is to balance human rights with human responsibilities. They spent many years delineating the meaning of responsibilities relative to rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities developed by the InterAction Council (1997) is comprised of 19 articles, divided into six main topics: (a) fundamental principles of humanity (4 articles); (b) non-violence and respect for life (3 articles); (c) justice and solidarity (4 articles); truthfulness and tolerance (4 articles); mutual respect and partnership (3 articles), and, as with human rights, the final article says that no one can take any one of the responsibilities out of context and use it as an excuse to violate other responsibilities in the Declaration, and that every single person, group, organization and government is responsible for making the Declaration *work*. In more detail, the principles of humanity relate to treating everyone in a humane way and to the notions of self esteem, dignity, good over evil, and the Golden Rule (do unto others as you would have done to you). Non-violence and respect for life also encompass responsibilities related to acting in peaceful ways, and respecting intergenerational and ecological protection. Justice and solidarity encompass honesty, integrity, fairness, sustainability, meeting one's potential and not abusing wealth and power. Truthfulness and tolerance embrace the principles of privacy, confidentiality, honesty, and a respect for diversity and these apply to all people, politicians, business, scientists, professionals, media, and religions. Finally, the responsibility of mutual respect and partnerships includes caring for other's well-being, appreciation and concern for the welfare and safety of others especially when it comes to children and spouses but also to all men and women in partnerships (see Figure 11).

Figure 11 - Initiative to convince UN to embrace Declaration of Human Responsibilities (1997) *comprised of 19 articles, divided into six topics* (InterAction Council, 1997 - still waiting for a nation(s) to sponsor it at UN)

(1) fundamental principles of humanity (4)
treating everyone in a humane way; notions of self esteem, dignity, good over evil, and the Golden Rule (do unto others as you would have done to you)

(2) non-violence and respect for life (3)
acting in peaceful ways, and respecting intergenerational and ecological protection

(3) justice and solidarity (4)
encompass honesty, integrity, fairness, sustainability, meeting one's potential and not abusing wealth and power

(4) truthfulness and tolerance (4)
privacy, confidentiality, honesty, and a respect for diversity and these apply to all people, politicians, business, scientists, professionals, media, and religions

(5) mutual respect and partnership (3)
caring for other's well-being, appreciation and concern for the welfare and safety of others especially when it comes to children and spouses but also to all men and women in partnerships.

(6) same as human rights (1)
no one can take any one of the responsibilities out of context and use it as an excuse to violate other rights in the Declaration, and every single person, group, organization and government is responsible for making it *work*.

It is interesting that the Declaration of Human Responsibilities is part of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Culture of Peace Program, designed to support a global movement towards peace that is already underway http://www.peace.ca/unesco.htm . It is significant that UNESCO sees human's being responsible for their actions as part of the peace movement. A world in which everyone demands rights but does not accept responsibilities for their actions can never be at peace with itself. Article 29 of the Declaration of Human Rights refers to the *duties* that people have to their community because the community is where the person develops their personality and their potential. Fraser (1998) boldly states that the constant demand for rights alone, without better recognition of the *duties* referred to in article 29, means that we cannot achieve the human rights we strive for to achieve peace. Indeed, the final clause of the Human Rights Declaration states that we cannot ignore one clause to advance another. We are in fact guilty of calling for rights but not responsibilities and have seen the results in the lack of peace, security and justice in the global human family. The Declaration of Human Responsibilities is the long awaited extension of article 29 in the Declaration of Human Rights (Fraser). It would apply not only to governments (like human rights) **but also** to corporations, institutions and individual people, even families. Without this well-balanced responsibility, a civilized, humane society could not operate and the well-being of individuals and families would be jeopardized significantly.

For clarification, the InterAction Council is not the only group struggling with the gap between rights and responsibilities, although it is the only one intending to take its proposal to the United Nations. Other groups are developing their declarations of responsibilities. The Astro Temple has a link to the InterAction Council site but it has developed its own Declaration of a Global Ethic which can be found at http://astro.temple.edu/~dialogue/Center/declarel.htm The

Action Coalition for Global Change has developed its Declaration of Human Responsibilities which can be found at http://acgc.org/ethics/adeclara.htm#top.The Hart Centre in the United Kingdom has developed a Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities for their site http://www.hartcentre.demon.co.uk/udhr.htm They advised me that they were aware of the InterAction Council initiative and have been in touch with then but wanted a simpler declaration to stimulate discussion at their center on the issue of responsibilities versus rights. Even the World Economic Forum, held each year in Davos, Switzerland, has embraced the idea of a universal declaration of human responsibilities and hopes to have one drafted and approved by the 2000 meeting. This is an interesting development since the Forum is comprised mainly of American corporate power brokers who are adamantly against the InterAction Council's declaration even though Hans Küng is working on the Forum's draft and the Council's version (World Economic Forum, 1997). The Alliance for a Responsible and United World also has a declaration which it calls Platform for a Responsible and United World at http://www.echo.org/en/idx_charter.htm

This collection of actions calling for human responsibilities is especially germane to practitioners who are embracing Human Reflective Action Theory because this call for responsibilities is based on ethics, duties and accountability. RHA stresses ethical sensibility, being true to oneself (authenticity) and spirituality (inner strength for the common good). If we embrace the RHA leadership style, we cannot ethically ignore this component of peace education.

Social Justice

The final concept to de developed is social justice, the kind of justice most often referred to when people say they are working for peace and justice. How would you determine if *justice* had been served? Justice is a multidimensional concept but it basically refers to the maintenance of something that is just (morally right and good) by (a) the impartial adjustment of conflicting claims or (b) the assignment of merited punishments or rewards (Gove, 1969, p.461). Obviously we need to move beyond the dictionary meaning of the word justice, but it helps us appreciate that justice helps maintain good relationships between people, communities and nations - a prerequisite for peace (O'Mahony, 1993) by righting wrongs and making things right. It is the habits or customs whereby by people serve the rights of other people. Justice looks to the *good* of others. Social justice is a term that recognizes that people do not live in isolation but in community and have relations with other people shaping the *common* good (Ryan, 1999). The common good is "the common conditions of social life which guarantee and promote the recognition and fulfilment of man's individual and social rights" (Ryan, web citation).

Social justice is also a multidimensional concept. It is related to other types of justice: legal, commutative, distributive and vindictive (O'Mahony, 1993). Legal justice is exercised by those in authority so that laws in relation to the common good are upheld and fulfilled. Commutative justice regulates the private right to contract (e.g., buying and selling). Violations of this justice are often referred to as fraud, theft and damage. Distributive justice refers to income and wealth distribution and labour and involves the sanctity of property and contracts (just price, wage, profit). For clarification, distributive justice is based on the concept of "to each according to their contribution" while charity refers to "to each according to their needs". Distributive justice also depends on the principle of participation, in that every person be guaranteed, by society's institutions, the equal human right to make a productive contribution to

the economy both through being a worker and/or an owner. Participation does not guarantee equal *results* from contributing to the economy (wages, benefits, etc.) just the *right* to contribute. Finally, vindictive justice involves restoring justice by means of punishment which is in proportion to the guilt (Center for Economic and Social Justice [CESJ], n.d.; O'Mahony, 1993).

Reardon (1995) also refers to social justice and to distributive justice. She says that social justice represents fair treatment and reflects the statement, "*you have no right to do that to me"*. Fairness can mean imposing different rules due to different circumstances so that things are made right or different rules to serve the same purpose. Distributive justice refers to access to societal goods and services. Economic justice is part of social justice and refers to the moral principles which guide citizens as they design economic institutions (work, contracts, market place exchange rules) to help individuals gain material goods and possessions (CESJ, n.d.).

Figure 12 provides a summary of some of the issues classified as social justice issues. Social justice encompasses the struggles of people everywhere for gender equality, democratic government, economic opportunity, intellectual freedom (education), environmental protection and human rights. Social justice is concerned with oppression, equity, inclusiveness, diversity, opportunity, empowerment and liberation (University of Massachuset, 1999). Social justice emphasizes balance and harmony in the social life we all share. Equality and accessability are the conditions of a just social order, not the goal (Connell, 1993).

Figure 12 - Social Justice Issues

children and youth	housing and shelter (homelessness)
community	labour and work (child labour, sweatshops, the economy, jobs)
consumer issues	poverty and low income (income security, pensions, tax issues)
crime and punishment	race and ethnicity
civil rights and liberties	violence and abuse
human rights and responsibilities	trade and global investment
education	government budgets (debt, deficit and surpluses)
freedom and liberty	health and safety
gay and lesbian and alternative life styles	
gender	

Finally, Ryan (1999) identifies six principles of social justice that help solidify the links between peace, rights, responsibilities and security:

1. A human right is not the same thing as an individual advantage. The former is a something that someone is due based on their humanity and the latter is something that someone would like to have. Any action taken by society that does not respect human rights is *unjust* because it does not contribute to the four things people need to fulfil their human nature - work, own things for sustenance, have knowledge and love.
2. Social institutions (e.g., schools, church, family, economy, political system, labour market, marketplace, businesses) are supposed to serve the persons living in that society. Hence, a society or social institution that is not people centered is *unjust*.
3. We can only ensure that social institutions are people centered and serve human rights if the people affected have a clear voice in the operation of those institutions. Any institution that does not provide access for citizen participation is *unjust.*

4. There are times when respecting a person's human right has to be subordinated to the requirements of the common good, with the most obvious instances being the use of scarce natural resources and the accumulation of wealth and property rights, actions that can be detrimental to the common good.
5. Because people make up the human family, there must be institutions and international social structures to insure justice between nations and on world scale (these do exist yet).
6. Social structures need to change to accommodate the changing awareness of what constitutes the common good (changing worker rights, women's rights, children's rights, environmental integrity). The role of the citizens is to challenge what appears to be a lack of or failure of one of the conditions of the common good.

Synergy between Family and Consumer Sciences, Peace Education and RHA Leadership

The transition from a professional culture focused on individualism and the family unit to a culture focused on peace, security, rights, responsibilities and justice within the human family is a process of individual, collective and institutional transformation. Alger (2000) claims that peace building necessarily involves people in a diversity of professions and therefore should be included in all of the sciences, arts, humanities and administrative curricula. There is a place for family and consumer sciences in peace education, especially if we embrace the reflective human action theory for leadership. The final section of this project will identify synergies between family and consumer sciences, peace education and leading from a RHA perspective.

The discussion will illustrate the convergence between them, convergence that is possible because of compatible approaches, tools, concepts, theoretical perspectives and values. Hopefully, this final section will illustrate the solid framework that exists already within our profession such that pre and in-service professionals can see themselves as legitimate, necessary players in the movement for peace. Figure 13 profiles the 15 themes that characterize the synergy existing between the two fields and the RHA leadership approach to practice. Each theme will be discussed in some detail, contributing to my conviction that these two fields should work together for peace and well-being of the human family.

Figure 13 - 15 themes that characterize the synergy between FCS, peace education and the RHA leadership approach to practice

Both fields:

- ♦ are considered to be social movements
- ♦ advocate for a global, holistic, ecosystem perspective
- ♦ value day-to-day life
- ♦ embrace a long-term perspective rather than the quick fix
- ♦ are concerned with relationships and interactions as well as structures
- ♦ recognize different levels of physical and intellectual action (how to, talk/values and emancipation)
- ♦ agree that there is order in the chaos
- ♦ respect diversity
- ♦ strive for balance between rights and responsibilities
- ♦ work for enhanced quality of life, well-being and security
- ♦ are sensitive to how events and issues are framed, determining expectations and actions
- ♦ hold congruent value systems
- ♦ are concerned with community
- ♦ embrace the critical, reflective approach
- ♦ are recognizing that peace and well-being include outer, inner/spirituality and eco-dimensions

Considered to be Social Movements

In the face of violence, peace movements have grown. In the face of changing economics and societies, the home economics movement, with its focus on families, has grown. A social

movement is a form of collective *action* directed toward change in the existing social system (Baldwin, 1991). Boulding (1990) distinguishes between "the peace movement" and "the movement for peace". The former refers to organizations which overtly and consciously exist to promote peace activities while the latter includes any type of international cooperative activities that strengthen the fabric of the international system leading to support for the creation of peace in the world, even though that is not their overt or conscious purpose. As an observation, family and consumer sciences, and its organizations and affiliations, probably comprise part of the movement for peace because they strengthen the fabric of families, a democratic institution that is part of the fabric of the international system. Indeed, home economics has been conceived as a social movement focused on reflective enlightenment leading to deep impact on the quality of life and well-being of individuals, families and societies (Baldwin). RHA assumes practitioners will lead guided by reflection before, during and after their action(s). One such action can be involvement in the movement for peace with a focus on the forces that can undermine the well-being and state of peace of the human family.

Advocate for a Global, Holistic Ecosystem Perspective

Alger (2000) recognizes that there is a need for peace education that takes a broad, systemic view. Aull (1985) identifies a value system conducive to a holistic, systemic approach to living on this earth: (a) perceive self as global citizen first and national citizen second; (b) increase interfaith collaboration to ensure mutual understanding and peace, (c) eliminate racism by fostering inclusion and respect for ethical diversity, (d) ensure equality of sexes to eliminate oppression and foster justice and equity, (e) eliminate poverty and wealth gaps to reduce disparity and economic injustice, and (f) implement universal (global) education to reduce ignorance and foster understanding. Holistic, systemic thinking is all about relationships and maintaining balance between these relationships. Halloran and Bale (1997) develop the concept of the global ethos, by which they mean transforming the way people interact with each other, institutions and the environment due to respect and nurturance of these relationships. Babiuk (1996) agrees that embracing the "holistic principal" means being mindful, authentic, caring and accepting of the global, ecosystem perspective. The result would be a global consciousness leading to a global society shaped by a global ethic and value system that forges and fosters sustainable relationships at the local, national, international and global level (Halloran & Bale).

The AAFCS *conceptual framework for the 21st century* mandates the profession to bring a holistic, ecosystem perspective to its practice. Powerful work has been done already in the FCS profession around the topic of ecosystems and a global perspective (Crawford, 1993; Engberg, 1993; McGregor, 1999b; Smith & Peterat, 1992; West, 1990; West, et al., 1990; Williams, 1990). A global perspective helps educators understand the family or household as an ecosystem, an environment where decisions are taken which can lead to a better quality of life for all (Engberg). She argues that this point of view is possible because families are seen as dynamic ecosystems that can adapt and change themselves rather than remain static, grounded in how they were initially socialized to be consumers. They can be socialized to care for each other and the earth, to appreciate that living in harmony with environments demands ethical judgements about how to live differently, and to see the merits of embracing stewardship rather than exploitation. With help, consumers can critically question consumption, production, distribution and institutional practices that shape the world and take action to better this world.

Curricula that help people embrace a global perspective help them: (a) gain an

understanding of the world human condition, (b) examine various frames of reference and points of view (values) other than one's own, (c) prepare people to participate responsibly in the world, (d) foster respect for harmony, diversity, pluralism and interdependence, and (e) predispose students to gain knowledge and understanding of themselves in a two way relationship with the world community (Williams, 1990). From a global perspective people recognize that the pursuit of self-interest necessitates cooperation and that people need to appreciate the rights and duties of people toward each other, especially across nations (West, 1990). Crawford (1993) recommends that the following concepts should be entrenched in any curriculum designed to sensitize people to a global perspective: the relationship between values and behaviour; the diversity of family resource management patterns; the interdependence between global systems and family resource management behaviour; ethical and global family resource management issues and problems; critical thinking; and, the power of global actors to create alternative futures. Leaders practising from an RHA perspective would embrace ethnicity, spirituality (connectedness) and authenticity, concepts central to a global, holistic approach to peace and family well-being.

Value Day-to-day Life Experiences

Family and consumer scientists should have little problem embracing education for peace because we value the daily life of families, just as peace educators do. Peace is a complex idea that calls for the contributions of all interested in conceptualizing and effecting it in the multiple levels of everyday life (Weigert, 1999). The same can be said for families. Fisk (1997), a peace educator, agrees that education for peace is learned through our normal, daily life experiences, especially as we strive to live in harmony with each other. Home economics has always been concerned for the everyday life of individuals and families. Turkki (1998) affirms the richness and complexity of everyday life and our historical role in its evolution. Everyday life is often looked upon as trivial and mundane - a matter of common sense. But research is showing the exact opposite. Everyday life is complex, interlocking processes impacting greatly on societal development and the quality of life of humanity (Shanahan & Ekström, 1998). Human action based on reflection embraces the authenticity of daily life and the spiritual dimension as well, dimensions of peace that are now front and center of the peace field. Witness the concern for inner peace and ecological peace that is evolving within the peace education field (Groff & Smoker, 1995). Kawada (1997) refers to the reciprocal relationship between three levels of peace: inner peace, social or outer peace in the community of humankind and eco-peace with the earth. He claims that greed, ignorance and hatred, if not respected and mitigated, can spew forth from the inner lives of individuals on a daily basis to engulf families, ethnic groups, nations and eventually the whole of humanity and the natural ecosystem. Living our daily lives based on greed, ignorance and hatred can only lead to lack of peace so it is important to continue to focus on the day-to-day experiences of people such that peace is the end result.

Strive for Long Term Perspective Rather than Quick Fix

Alger (2000) commented on the trend in peace education towards adopting a long term perspective to peace to replace the short term fix that is characteristic of the current mind set. He is referring to the trend to study why people stay with the peace movement over the long term. Home economics is a mission oriented profession meaning that it engages in practice that strives to reform the system from within (Vaines, 1980). In a mission oriented profession, practitioners generate knowledg*e to use it to help families help themselves* rather than simply to accumulate a body of knowledge for knowledge's sake (Vaines). This approach to practice contradicts the

quick fix approach dominant today and necessitates that we accept that we may never see the results of our practice for years or decades. That does not mean we do not strive to create situations that enable people to be empowered, just that we accept that this approach to practice takes time and has to progress at the other person's pace not ours (McGregor, 1997a,b). RHA theory also accommodates this reform approach to practice by allowing for reflection, dialogue and ethical action. For a long time, educators trying to teach from a critical thinking, empowerment and emancipatory approach have acknowledged that they may never see the results of their actions in their own generation. This fact makes it even more important that peace education continue, especially within the field of family and consumer sciences. In a modern industrial world, complex technologies and large scale social institutions have led to fundamental separation between people as well as between people and the living world. This scale makes it increasingly difficult to know the effects of our actions on other people and nature - our arms have been so lengthened that we no longer see what our hands are doing (Norberg-Hodge, 1994). The education process is not immune from this feature of the modern, global world but leaders practicing from the RHA perspective will be sensitive to the fact that people need to learn when they are ready to learn and it may not be when they are in the formal education system. This learning may occur years into the future - but a culture of peace dictates that we at least strive for critical emancipation and understanding in the short, intermediate and long term. Life long learning and a long term perspective are imperatives of both peace and family and consumer sciences leaders and RHA provides that orientation.

Concerned with Relationships and Interactions as Well as Structures

An image of positive peace cannot be present without the social structures that lead to justice (Marullo, Lance & Schwartz, 1999). As well, the web of relationships among the people in, and affected by, these structures, is crucial to the presence of peace. To that end, peace education has evolved to accommodate interaction and the nature of relationships between parties as well as structural imbalance and violence (Groff & Smoker, 1995). Family and consumer sciences has also evolved to the point that it values relationships between individuals, their families and their larger environment (the ecosystem perspective) as well as the structure of families - what they look like (single parent, common law, etc). Both disciplines are converging on the concern for the dynamics of relationships as well as the soundness of the infrastructures of societies. This is exciting and conducive to RHA theory which assumes that leaders need to act with spirituality meaning a concern for the one's sense of attachment to, and connectedness with, the world at large, as well as with community and family (Andrews et al., 1995). In fact, Andrews et al. drew heavily on Wheatley's (1994) conceptualization of leadership with underpinnings of chaos theory and quantum physics. Wheatley explains that the quantum worldview assumes that there are no independent entities anywhere - it is all webs of relationships. Kawada (1997) agrees that all things occur and exist *only through* their interrelationships with all other phenomena - other human beings, all living things and the natural world. This web of relationships sustains the life support of people and nature. RHA was conceived with this concept in mind - that relationships and the structures in which they develop are central to forward thinking conceptualizations of leadership. Peace education is moving towards embracing relationships as well as structures (Groff & Smoker). There can be an exciting meeting of the minds about this point leading to peace for the human family.

Recognize Different Levels of Physical and Intellectual Action

Fisk (2000) profiled three ways to approach the study of peace, three ways that have powerful parallels to the system of actions approach advocated by Brown and Paolucci (1979) for home economics. For clarification, *action* in this context refers to reflective thinking before taking physical action. Figure 14 compares Fisk's approach with Brown and Paolucci's illustrating the obvious synergy between the two approaches to practice. Both paradigms move people from learning about things, to thinking about things, to taking action. KON would have that action be reflective (Andrews et al., 1995) as would leading edge peace thinkers (Jackson, 1990).

Figure 14 - Comparison of Approaches to Peace Education and Systems of Action

Peace Education (Fisk, 2000)	**Three System of Actions (Brown & Paolucci, 1979)**
Education about peace refers to accumulating *knowledge, facts and ideas* about things that affect peace: social justice, tolerance, gender equality, social literacy, just and peaceable living, human rights, environmental security, human security, morality, diversity, and conflict and dispute resolution	**Technical Action** is often called the "how to" approach to practice and comprises the skills necessary to meet material, day-to-day needs. Delivering technical skills enables families to cope with or survive the daily impact of change but they do not have to change themselves or analyze the situation; rather, they just learn another skill. Technical action is concerned with accomplishing goals using criteria set by an expert.
Education for peace refers to a *process* wherein people learn ideologies, values, attitudes, moral standards, sensitivities to others and new perceptions such that they are moved to take different actions than they did in the past	**Interpretative or Communicative Action** is often called the "talking or language" approach since it involves individuals and families discussing *why* they feel a certain way about something in the hopes that this understanding will lead to personal change or a change within the family unit. This enables families to understand, adapt to and conform to change instead of just coping or getting by. Interpretative action is concerned with talking and communication within and between families and society about values, beliefs, attitudes, perceptions, feelings and meanings and with understanding why they decide to act, or not act, in a certain way.

Peace through the education process means that education, done right, will lead to a collection of individuals who strive for wisdom, clarity, cooperation, democracy, human potential, and a critical awareness of life's conditions and who strive for and settle for nothing but peace and the fair, safe and healthy living of all citizens	**Critical, Emancipatory or Empowerment Action** is often called the "take action" practice which leads to changes in societal values and morals such that everyone is better of, especially the family. This leads to the ability to affect or shape familial and institutional change to benefit society at large. It encourages self-reflection and self-direction to determine what is and what we should be doing so that communities, societies and the world are a better place; it is concerned with morals, ethics and value judgements. From this type of practice, we are no longer seen as the expert, dolling out advise; rather, we provide a safe environment for dialogue and reflection leading to morally justifiable, ethical, sustainable resource management decisions

See the Order in Chaos

AAFCS recognizes that chaos is the norm (Anderson, 1999) and RHA assumes that there is order in the chaos (Andrews et al., 1995). Peace educators also acknowledge that chaos and constant change are characteristics of today's world. Lind (1995) describes chaos as a continuum of conditions ranging from equilibrium to disequilibrium. At one end of the continuum is order, predictability and stability. At the other end is a turbulent, unpredictable, dynamical process far from equilibrium! There is also a point along the continuum where the balance comes into jeopardy - called the "edge of chaos". Those people, organizations, institutions or systems that are able to bring order to the disorder are said to be adaptive because they make the collection of experiences they encounter on the edge work to their advantage (they frame the event differently, to be discussed shortly).

Both disciplines agree that a relevant approach to deal with this chaotic situation is to embrace multiple alternatives and to combine a number of tools, perspectives and approaches to yield a comprehensive approach to finding order in the chaos (Alder, 2000; Anderson, 1999). One of those approaches is human action based on reflection. Such action is based on the assumptions that order will come of chaos if one stays with one's commitment to sharing information, developing relationships and gaining consensus of vision (Andrews et al., 1995). The vision of peace educators is a world comprised of structures and relationships that value the human condition (Groff & Smoker, 1995). The vision of family and consumer sciences is a profession that values diversity, equality and human rights, a global and community perspective and a healthy environment that positively affects the human condition (Chadwick, 1999). There is no doubt these two disciplines hold mutual concern for finding order in the chaos of the daily life of individuals, families and communities leading to peace and well-being.

Respect Diversity

Diversity is a concept capturing the quality of being made of many different elements, forms, kinds or individuals. Valuing diversity deals with our ability to develop respect for those who are different from ourselves, for their ability to offer something to the human condition and for the fact that people are people, no matter their origin. Valuing diversity also involves: (a) being tolerant of someone or something even though it may be unpleasant - to endure if not embrace; (b) accepting and acknowledging difference without denying their importance; (c)

respecting people by admiring them and holding them in high esteem; and, (d) accepting others and their cultures as legitimate and as valid vehicles for learning. This leads to affirmation, solidarity and healthy critique (Andrews, Paschall & Mitstifer, 1993).

AAFCS's mission statement sets out the core values of the American association and includes diversity (Chadwick, 1999). The theme of the June 2000 issue of the Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences is "Diversity in the new millennium" (92 (3)). KON devoted several issues of its newsletter, Dialogue, to the issue of diversity (1994, 1995, 1997). The notion of diversity is central to a culture of peace, to peace education, the human family, security, rights, responsibilities and justice, as evidenced throughout this project. It is a central concept for peace (Reardon, 1995). Diversity is also a central component of RHA. Leading with authenticity means facing reality as it is, looking for common ground among diversity and embracing the fact that life can be difficult and full of uncertainties (Andrews et al., 1995). The synergy is obvious!

Strive for Balance Between Rights and responsibilities

Peace education has been concerned with human rights since its inception as a field of study. Some scholars in the peace education field are now becoming concerned with the lack of focus on responsibilities leading to an inability to achieve rights for human beings. Some family and consumer scientists are also concerned with the excessive focus on rights in our consumer society and are calling for a shift to balance rights with responsibilities (McGregor, 1999a,b). One of the core components of the reflective human action theory is responsibility for dialogue, a component of authenticity. We cannot lead with authenticity if we are not responsible for our actions! The work done to date on reflective human action provides a concrete foundation for gaining insights into the nuances of rights versus responsibilities. Both peace and FCS educators can legitimately join the global movement towards holding people and institutions responsible for their actions, thereby better assuring human rights, security and justice - enhanced well-being and quality of life.

Concerned with Quality of Life and Well-Being

Quality of life and well-being are central concepts in both fields of study. Quality of life refers to one's *perception* of their level of satisfaction or confidence with their conditions, relationships and surroundings relative to the available alternatives. Well-being is a state of being or one's *actual reality* where all members of a community have economic security; are respected, valued and have personal worth; feel connected to those around them; are able to access necessary resources; and are able to participate in the decision-making process affecting them (McGregor & Goldsmith, 1998).

Currently, both professions are reconceptualizing their notion of human well-being knowing that how "well" one is, along all dimensions of well-being, reflects strongly on their perception of the quality of their daily life. The peace community is now advocating the adoption of the notion of human security to augment the current focus on national security. Human security of citizens is now seen to embrace environmental, cultural, political, social, economic and personal aspects of well-being as well as physical and sovereign security of the government and country (Nye, 1999). Security is being expanded to include the personal well-being of individuals and their ability to feel secure in the basic needs that affect their day-to-day existence: food, health, employment, population, human rights, environment, education, etc. The family and consumer sciences profession is expanding its understanding of well-being to include environmental, political and spiritual as well as economic, social, personal and physical well-

being (McGregor & Goldsmith, 1998, see Table 1). KON has published two monographs on well-being, calling for an expansion of our current conceptualization of well-being (Henry, 1995; Mitstifer & Smith, 1997; Mitstifer, 1996). RHA leadership is action on behalf of the well-being of the earth and its inhabitants (Andrews et al., 1995). Again, the synergy is obvious - well-being and peace go hand-in-hand and ever expanding understandings of their meaning and application are necessary.

Sensitive to Issues Framing and Impact on Expectations and Actions

Snare (1994), a peace educator, says we make sense of the world around us by framing events. The way one frames things effects what one expects from a situation and from the people involved. The way one frames an event will have a definite impact on actions taken. Consider the following examples. Some people see the glass half full (optimistic) and others always see it half empty (pessimistic). The collection of people who tried to express their voice at the World Trade Organization meeting in Seattle were called *protestors* rather than *supporters* of rights. Any media that reports non-neoliberal, anti-capitalistic perspectives of the world are framed as *alternative* news rather than *mainstream* news. Families are currently seen to be *in crisis* rather than *in transition* as a social institution. People use the word *peace* rather than the word *non-violence*. Some people say *human security* while others refer to *human insecurity*. Some people speak of the *peace movement* and others say *movement for peace*. Where we once referred to *outer peace*, more and more we now say *inner and outer peace* and even *eco-peace*. Some people use the term *consumer* while others are starting to say *citizen as consumer.* People see the *environment as a separate thing* that can be managed rather than seeing *themselves as part of the environment*. Peace educators advocate taking special steps to define others and situations in such a way that human values are respected and assured rather than defining the situation as one necessitating the reduction or mitigation of violence (Snare). This paper suggests the concept of the *human family* to replace or augment *the family*. Some peace advocates propose moving away from seeing peace as *an intermittent presence between conflict* towards *sustainable, participatory peace* (Gail Stewart, personal communication, June 8, 2000). She also suggests that we frame *violence as the aberrant condition* rather than *violence as a inevitable* part of humanity. A common phrase used in every day language that captures the concept of framing is "*put another way...* ".

Norris (1996) and Mitstifer (1996) clarify that events are open to multiple interpretations but Norris notes that some frames become the conventional way to see and treat an event or development. Norris notes that the essence of framing is the selection to prioritize facts, events or developments over others thereby promoting a particular interpretation of the event. This is the same as positioning an issue using certain facts, etc., in order to lead people in a certain direction and to particular conclusions and assumptions (Peter McGregor, personal communication, June 7, 2000). Andrews et al. (1995) suggest that reflection before, during and after an action is a powerful way to frame events. Using RHA as the framing instrument enables people to suggest a leadership strategy based on ethics, spirituality and authenticity and the assumption that order will come of chaos if one stays with one's commitment to sharing information, developing relationships and gaining consensus of vision. Both peace educators and family and consumer scientists appear to be ready for an alternative approach to framing issues related to peace and the human family.

Share Congruent Value Systems

Neither family and consumer sciences or peace education are value free. In fact, they are both in favour of certain values! Figure 15 provides a summary of the human values that are often reflected in both family and consumer sciences and peace education literature. This list was compiled simply by rereading this document and the citations in the reference list. A congruent value system sets a solid foundation from which to bridge peace education and family and consumer sciences. As a reminder, if we can create a world culture that values peace, then future generations will be born into a world that will be committed to socializing its children to value peace. This culture would be based on values and underlying assumptions about a peaceful, daily reality desired by the collective whole - the whole human family would want peace so it would socialize its members to be peaceful. The value system profiled in Figure 15 represents the core of peace education and the universal values of home economics (Bubolz & Sontag, 1988). Human

Figure 15 - Values Espoused by both Family and Consumer Sciences and Peace Education

Justice	Diversity	Fairness
Equity	Equality	Responsibility/accountability
Common good	Human Condition	Ecosystem and sustainability
Ethics	Dialogue	Trust
Trustworthy	Dignity	Respect
Rights	Empathy	Faith
Self Determination/freedom	Self-honesty	Well-being
Quality of life	Global Awareness	Power relationships
Holistic, systems perspective	Collaboration	Listening
Caring	Civility	Citizenship
Peace	Security	Intergenerational equity
Spirituality	Morals	Non-violence/conflict management
Courage	Passion	Hope
Reflection	Community/solidarity	Life
Tolerance	Solidarity	Share information
Education	Democracy	Human development

action that is reflective involves stepping back from the immediacy of the situation and examining ones's beliefs, attitudes, **values** and behaviour in a dispassionate manner (Andrews et al., 1995; Jackson, 1990). People leading from a RHA perspective, whether in peace education or family and consumer sciences, will inherently be involved in value clarification and both fields seem to be based on the same value system. Anyone concerned with the process of assessing one's value system appreciates that value clarification is a process that involves: (a) determining what is important to us, (b) publically and internally affirming that importance, (c) continually considering and reforming the values we hold to date in life relative to other things we have learned, and (d) living out the values we profess we hold to be important (our actions are reliable measures of our values) (Jackson). Possessing the same core values is a powerful synergy between peace educators and family and consumer scientists who want to lead from an RHA perspective.

Hold Common Concern for Community

Human society is increasingly segmented leading to disconnection from the larger society. People are differentiated by race, color, ethnicity, age, gender, income, social class, abilities, even family types (Gentzler, 1995). The 1995 special issue of KON's Forum deals with building communities and one of the positions expressed in this issue is that the profession has to maintain a professional community in order to collaborate with other groups (in this case, peace educators) to fulfill our mission, the well-being of individuals and families in community settings. People involved in the UNESCO Culture of Peace initiative will be looking for partners to help contribute to efforts to produce a more promising tomorrow for the human family. Peace educators are also concerned with building community, a community for the human family. Jackson (1990) holds that a major concept to work towards in the field of peace and social justice is a *community of care* that includes the entire human family (p.492). If family and consumer sciences is already concerned with families in community settings, it is logical to move in the direction of a community of care for the entire human family! Jackson extends this idea to include the concept of a *community of conscience* indicative of a mind that is alert to the conditions of the human family (security, rights, justice, dignity etc (see Figure 7)). Andrews et al. (1995) hold that leaders will be better equipped to deal with injustice, insecurity, indignities and oppression if they engage in reflective action. Individual reflection leads to collective reflection which can evolve to a community of care and peace. If community means sharing a common space and being united in a common cause (Brown, 1993), then it is obvious that peace educators and family and consumer scientists have the potential to be a community and to work together to build a culture of peace. As well, both fields are striving to develop a communicate community of critical inquirers engaged in rational dialogue about peace (Adelson, 1999) and family well-being (Mitstifer, 1996). RHA could be a tool to bring the two fields together to share dialogue about peace and the human family.

Embrace Critical Reflective Practice

Both peace educators (Weigert & Crews, 1999) and family and consumer scientists (Andrews et al., 1995) call for a critical, reflective approach to their practice, research, education and theory. Jackson (1990) describes reflection in the study of peace and social justice as the ability to step back from the immediacy of the situation and examine ones's beliefs, attitudes, values and behaviour in a dispassionate manner. *Critical thinking* entails: (a) identifying values and environmental factors related to the context of the problems caused by our consumption and production decisions; (b) considering global consequences of alternatives to current management decisions; (c) evaluating the adequacy and reliability of information we use to make family and production resource management decisions; and, (d) analyzing the moral acceptability of solutions to a problem caused by our consumption decisions. This mode of thinking should be applied to the processes of consumption, production and labour decisions affecting our natural environment, future generations, and the quality of life of families (Crawford, 1993).

Critical *reflective* thinking means we (both peace and family educators) must employ critical reasoning, value judgements, and ethical practices as we strive to enable families to understand and to help themselves be empowered and autonomous; this approach rather than doing things based on habit, custom or fear. We must respect different values and support empowerment and autonomy of the individual and family during different points in time and within their context and resource constraints and opportunities. We can no longer assume that

what worked before will work again since both the family and the world context will have changed. We have to move beyond the "taken for granted" and habitual to the realization that we do have choices and these should be well reasoned and thought out, in full awareness of short and long term consequences on ourselves, our communities and the global village (McGregor, 1997a,b).

Andrews et al. (1995) developed an entirely new approach to leading and taking actions as human beings based on *reflection.* They married the work on authentic leadership by Terry (1993) with the work on the new science (chaos theory, quantum physics and the science of living systems) by Wheatley (1994) into the Reflective Human Action theory. Practitioners from both the peace and FCS fields can take direction from each other, resulting in a powerful, reflective approach to bringing peace to the human family.

Conceptualize Peace and Well-being as Outer, Inner and Eco Oriented

There is a movement within the FCS profession to conceptualize well-being as including spirituality (inner peace) (Henry, 1995; McGregor & Goldsmith, 1998). The peace education field has evolved in the 90s to include inner peace as well as outer peace (Groff & Smoker, 1995; Jackson, 1990; Kawada, 1997). A central component of RHA is spirituality (Andrews et al., 1995). Jackson advises that spirituality demands a *communal consciousness*. Groff and Smoker concur, explaining that inner peace involves understanding the patterns and relationships between people which were not understood before. A collection of people experiencing this kind of inner peace will contribute to Jackson's notion of communal consciousness. Groff and Smoker also offer the insight that the collective external (material) world of outer peace is in some way a reflection of the collective inner world of spiritual peace. Leaders embracing RHA could readily see the synergy between these approaches to practice and the power of leading for a culture of peace. Jackson also suggests that separating the immoral behaviors exhibited by someone from the actual person is required if we are to help people gain inner peace. We can learn to respect someone while discouraging their behaviors and actions thereby moving towards a peaceful existence. RHA is a useful tool to achieve this balance.

Conclusion

Within the current trend of curriculum integration, peace education is spreading across the curriculum providing numerous perspectives to examine families, peace and humanity (Johnson, 1998). Interdisciplinary approaches to peace education parallel the historical interdisciplinary approach brought by home economics to the study of individuals and families in communities. This project has demonstrated the powerful synergy between peace education, family and consumer sciences and a reflective human action approach to leadership. Both peace education and home economics have consistently been concerned with improving the condition of human society. Peace educators have focused on the absence or presence of violence in society while home economists have focused on the quality of the daily life of individuals and family units and of family as a social institution (the former more so than the latter). Bringing the two fields together, or at least initially bringing the peace education field to family and consumer sciences, provides a powerful approach to expanding the understanding of peace and family. This new arrangement or coalition enables us to study and influence the inherent web of relationships and structures shaping daily life such that the human family can co-exist in global and local peace characterized by personal and societal security, respect of human rights, accountability for choices and actions, a healthy, sustainable environment and social justice for all.

Our role in contributing to a global culture of peace is clear - we must nurture and maintain the synergy demonstrated in this paper using a reflective human action approach to leadership. This approach respects ethical sensibility, authenticity and spirituality and assumes that order will come of chaos if one stays with one's commitment to sharing information, developing relationships and gaining consensus of vision. The common vision is security of the human family in a global culture of peace through reflective leadership.

References

Adelson, A. (1999). Toward a culture of peace and the evolution of human beings [Online]. Available: http://www.csudh.edu/dearhabermas/cultofpeace.htm

Alger, C.F. (2000). Challenges for peace educators and peace builders in the twenty-first century. International Journal of Peace Studies, 5(1), 1-14.

Anderson, C. (1999). Shape and design the future. Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 91(5), 3-4.

Andrews, F., Mitstifer, D., Rehm, M., & Vaughn, G. (1995). Leadership: Reflective human action - A professional development module. East Lansing, MI: Kappa Omicron Nu. (Also available at http://www.kon.org/leadership)

Andrews, F., Paschall, G.T., & Mitstifer, D. (1993). Leadership for a culturally diverse society. East Lansing, MI: Kappa Omicron Nu.

Arias, O. (1997) Some contributions to a universal declaration of human obligations [Online]. Available: http://www.asiawide.or.jp/iac/speeches/ariasUDHO.htm#

Aull, B.F. (1985). A holistic approach to peace [Online]. Available: http://www-tech.mit.edu/V105/N50/aull.50o.html

Ayala-Lasso, J. (1996, October 1-4). Human security and sustainable development: Paper presented at the United Nations University Global Seminar [Online]. Available: http://www.unu.edu/unupress/planet.html

Babiuk, G. (1996). The holistic principal [Online]. Available: http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/~gbabiuk/holispr.html

Baldwin, E.E. (1991). The home economics movement: A "new" integrative paradigm. Journal of Home Economics, 83(4), 42-48.

Bannister, R., & Monsma, C. (1982). Classification of concepts in consumer education [Monograph 137]. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western at http://www.emich.edu/public/coe/nice

Bolton, G. (1998). Writing as a reflective practitioner with wisdom [Online]. Available: http://www.shef.ac.uk/uni/projects/wrp/rpwrite.html

Boulding, K. (1990). Foreword. In N. Myers (Ed.), The Gaia atlas of future worlds. NY: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Brown, M.M. (1993). Philosophical studies of home economics in the United States: Basic ideas by which home economists understand themselves. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Brown, M., & Paolucci, B. (1979). Home economics: A definition [mimeographed]. Washington, DC: American Home Economics Association.

Bubolz, M., & Sontag, S. (1988). Integration in home economics and human ecology. Journal of Consumer Studies and Home Economics 12, 1-14.

Canadian Centres for Teaching Peace. (1998a). Problem identification topics [Online]. Available: http://www.peace.ca/problem.htm

Canadian Centres for Teaching Peace. (1998b). UNESCO Culture of Peace Program [Online]. Available: http://www.peace.ca/unesco.htm

Canadian Human Rights Foundation. (1986). Manual of major human rights instruments. Montreal, QU: Author.

Canadian Voice of Women for Peace. (1999). Creating a culture of peace workshop kit. Toronto, ON: Author http://www.interlog.com/~vow/workshop_kit.html

Center for Economic and Social Justice. (n.d.). Defining economic justice and social justice [Online]. Available: http://www.cesj.org/thirdway/economicjustice-defined.htm

Chadwick, A. (1999). The family of man. Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 91(5), 6-8.

Christiansen, D., Garet, R., Hollenbach, D., & Powers, C. (1974). Moral claims, human rights and population policies. Theological Studies, 35, 102.

Clay, R. (1997). Our human family series . Woodbridge, CT: Blackbirch Press.

Connell, R.W. (1993). Schools and social justice. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Covey, S. (1992). Principle-centered leadership. NY: Simon and Schuster (Fireside).

Crawford, G. (1993). Developing student global perspectives through undergraduate family resource management. Journal of Home Economics, 85, 9-15.

Declaration on the role of religion in the promotion of a culture of peace: UNESCO conference. (1994). [Online]. Available: http://www.socialissues.godzone.net.nz/statements/decpcp.html

de Acosta, M. (1995). Journal writing in service-learning. Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning, 2, 141-149.

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think. NY: Heath and Co.

Engberg, L. E. (1993). Home economics and environmental issues - A discussion paper. Canadian Home Economics Journal, 43(1), 10-12.

Fisk, L. (2000). Shaping visionaries: Nurturing peace through education. In L. Fisk and J. Schellenberg (Eds.), Patterns of conflict, paths to peace (pp. 159-193). Peterborough, ON: Broadview.

Fleck, H. (1980). Toward better teaching of home economics (3rd ed.). NY: Macmillan.

Fraser, Hon. M. (1998, March). A declaration of human responsibilities? Speech delivered at UNESCO conference [Online]. Available: http://www.theage.com.au/daily/980331/news/fraspeech.html

Gentzler, Y.S. (1995). Guest editor's message. KON FORUM, 2(8), 2-4.

Gove, P. (Ed.) (1969). Webster's seventh new collegiate dictionary. Toronto, ON: Thomas Allen & Sons.

Gregor, T.A. (Ed.). (1999). A natural history of peace. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Groff, L., & Smoker, P. (1995). Creating global-local cultures of peace [Online]. Available: http://www.gmu.edu/academic/pcs/smoker.htm

Halloran, H., & Bale, L. (1997). Toward a viable global ethos [Online]. Available: http://astro.temple.edu/~dialogue/lsb_an.htm

Heinbecker, P. (1999, May). Human security [Online]. Available: http://www.peacemagazine.org/9907/humsecur.htm

Henry, M.I. (1995). Is well-being the focus of home economics? A report on an Australian study. Proceedings of the Home Economics Institute of Australia conference (pp.79-84). Fremantle, Australia: Home Economics Institute of Australia.

Henry, M.I., Mitstifer, D., & Smith, F.M. (1997). Towards a theory of family well-being II. East Lansing, MI: Kappa Omicron Nu.

InterAction Council. (1997). A universal declaration of human responsibilities [Online].

Available: http://www.peace.ca/univdeclarticle.htm

Jackson, O.R. (1990). Dignity and solidarity: An introduction to peace and justice education. Chicago, IL: Loyola University Press.

Johnson, M.L. (1998). Trends in peace education [Online]. Available: http://www.indiana.edu/~ssdc/peaceed.htm (ERIC Digest).

Kawada, Y. (1997, July). From inner peace to eco-peace. Soka Gakkai International Quarterly [Online]. Available at http://www.sgi.org/quarterly/9707/feature.html

Kieren, D., Vaines, E., & Badir, D. (1984). The home economist as a helping professional. Winnipeg, MB: Frye (available from sue.mcgregor@msvu.ca)

Kolb, D.A. (1984). Experiential learning. Toronto, ON: Prentice Hall.

Kung, H. (2000, September). Global order - global values. Paper presented at the Human Survival in the New Millennium Conference, Geneva. Available http://www.humanvalues-is.org/~wpmgva/sept2000/papers/kung.pdf

Lind, J.M. (1995). Metaphors from chaos theory for leaders of organizational change. The Journal of Graduate Liberal Studies, 1(1), 69-79.

Marullo, S., Lance, M., & Schwartz, H. (1999). Study, act, reflect and analyze: Service learning and the program on justice and peace at Georgetown University. In W. Weigert and R. J. Crews (Eds.), Teaching for justice: Concepts and modules for service-learning in peace studies (pp.47-54). Washington: American Association of Higher Education.

McGregor, S.L.T. (1997a). Envisioning our collective journey into the next millennium. Journal of Home Economics Education, 35(1), 26-38.

McGregor, S.L.T. (1997b). The impact of different paradigms on home economics practice. Journal of the Home Economics Institute of Australia, 4(3), 23-33.

McGregor, S.L.T. (1999a). Globalizing consumer education: Shifting from individual consumer rights to collective, human responsibilities. Proceedings of the 19th International Consumer Studies and Home Economics Research Conference (pp.43-52). Belfast, Ireland.

McGregor, S.L.T. (1999b). Towards a global mind set for family/consumer economics and resource management educators. Proceedings of the Western Region Home Management Family Economic Educators Conference (pp. 2-7). Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba, Human Ecology Faculty.

McGregor, S.L.T., & Goldsmith, L. (1998). Expanding our understanding of quality of life, standard of living and well-being. Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 90 (2), 2-6,22.

Mitstifer, D. (1989). Ethical dimensions of the scholar: A professional development module. East Lansing, MI: Kappa Omicron Nu.

Mitstifer, D. (Ed.). (1996). Toward a theory of family well-being. East Lansing, MI: Kappa Omicron Nu.

Nef, J. (1999). Human security and mutual vulnerability (2nd ed.). Ottawa, ON: International Development Research Center.

Norberg-Hodge, H. (1997, April). Buddhism in the global economy. Resurgence. Also at http://www.gn.apc.org/resurgence/home.htm and http://www.gn.apc.org/resurgence/articles/norberg_hodge_buddi.htm

Norris, P. (1996). Gender in political sciences: Framing the issues. Paper presented at the British Political Studies Association annual conference [Online]. Available:

http://www.soton.ac.uk/~psd/1996/norris.html

O'Mahony, D. (1993). Justice, peace and ecology talk: Part 2. [Online]. Available: http://www.ofs.it/doc/ef93enp1.htm

Peace Education Network of the British National Peace Council. (1999). Towards a culture of peace [Online]. Available: http://www.ppu.org.uk//ed/pe_cur.html

Reardon, B.A. (1995). Educating for human dignity. Pennsylvania, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ryan, M. (1999). Moral principles of social justice for human rights [Online]. Available: http://www.stthomasu.ca/research/AHRC/RYAN.HTM

Schneider, R. (1994). Ideology and family change. Canadian Home Economics Journal, 44 (1), 5-7.

Schön, D.A. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Shanahan, H., & Ekström, M.P. (1998). Capturing ecological dimensions of everyday life. In K. Turkki (Ed.), Proceedings of the International Household and Family Research Conference (pp.102-110, Vol 2). Helsinki, Finland: University of Helsinki, Department of Home Economics and Craft Science.

Smith, G., & Peterat, L. (1992). Developing global/development perspectives in home economics education. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Home Economics Association.

Snare, C.E. (1994). Defining others and situations. Peace and Conflict Studies, 1(1). Http://www.trenton.edu/~psm/pcs/manuscripts/pcs0002m.html

Terry, R.W. (1993). Authentic leadership: Courage in action. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

The human family. (n.d.). [Online]. Available: http://www.austheos.org.au/human.htm

Thomas, P. (1997). Education for peace: Some initial thoughts [Online]. Available: http://www.iteachnet.com/aug97/philthom_edforpeace.html

Thompson, J. M. (1997). Justice and peace. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Thoughts on responsibility. (1998). [Online]. Available: http://csf.colorado.edu

Turkki, K. (1998, May). Introduction to the conference theme - new approaches to the study of everyday life. In K. Turkki (Ed.), Proceedings of the International Household and Family Research Conference (pp.3-8, Vol 1). Helsinki, Finland: University of Helsinki, Department of Home Economics and Craft Science.

Ulstrup, G., Cumming, J., & Ebert, L. (1997). Report from the Australian Curriculum Studies Association peace education workshop [Online]. Available: http://www.acsa.edu.au/projects/workshop.htm#peace and http://www.acsa.edu.au/networks/netpages/peace/penpage.htm

University of Massachuset. (1999). Social justice education doctoral program [Online]. Available:http://www.umass.edu/education/academics/graduate/sdpps/justice_doc.htm

Vaines, E. (1990). Philosophical orientations and home economics: An introduction. Canadian Home Economics Journal, 40(1), 6-11.

van Manen, M. (1995). On the epistemology of reflective practice. Teachers and teaching: Theory and practice, 1(1), 33-50. (see http://www.ualberta.ca/~vanmanen/epistpractice.htm)

Vienna NGO Committee on the Family. (2000, February). International Day of Families (pull out section). Families International Bulletin, 35.

Weigert, K.M. (1999). Moral dimensions of peace studies: A case for service-learning. In

W. Weigert and R. J. Crews (Eds.), Teaching for justice: Concepts and modules for service-learning in peace studies (pp.9-21). Washington: American Association of Higher Education.

Weigert, K.M., & Crews, R.J. (Eds.). (1999). Teaching for justice: Concepts and modules for service-learning in peace studies. Washington: American Association of Higher Education.

Weiss, C. (2000, May 23). Peace, disarmament and security. Paper presented at the United Nations Millennium Forum, New York.

West, D. (1990). Globalism in perspective. In S. Williams, D. West and E. Murray (Eds.), Looking toward the 21st century: Home economics and the global community (pp. 187-199). NY: McGraw Hill.

Wheately, M. (1994). Leadership and the new science. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Williams, S. (1990). Global education: Implication for home economics. In S. Williams, D. West and E. Murray (Eds.), Looking toward the 21st century: Home economics and the global community (pp. 1-13). NY: McGraw Hill.

Williams, S., West, D., & Murray, E. (Eds.). (1990). Looking toward the 21st century: Home economics and the global community. NY: McGraw Hill.

World Economic Forum. (1997). Davos experts call for human responsibilities declaration [Online]. Available: http://weforum.org/publication

Zukav, G. (1989). The seat of the soul. NY: Simon & Schuster (Fireside).