

2020

Reflections on Peace Education and the Philippines

Patricia M. Mische

Lloyd Professor of Peace Studies and World Law, Antioch College (retired), geapatmische@aol.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/social_encounters



Part of the Anthropology Commons, Catholic Studies Commons, Christianity Commons, Ethics in Religion Commons, International Relations Commons, Islamic Studies Commons, Peace and Conflict Studies Commons, Politics and Social Change Commons, Race and Ethnicity Commons, Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons, Social Psychology and Interaction Commons, and the South and Southeast Asian Languages and Societies Commons

Recommended Citation

Mische, Patricia M. (2020) "Reflections on Peace Education and the Philippines," *The Journal of Social Encounters*: Vol. 4: Iss. 2, 78-89.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.69755/2995-2212.1055>

Available at: https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/social_encounters/vol4/iss2/7

This Additional Essay is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Journal of Social Encounters by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@csbsju.edu.

Introduction to Special Section on Peace Education in the Philippines

*Note from the editors: Dr. Joseph Okumu and I are very pleased and honored to have Dr. Patricia Mische on the editorial board of the JSE, and we want to thank her very much for organizing this special section on Peace Education in the Philippines. We also thank Drs. Castro and Nario Galace for their contributions to this issue. Dr. Mische is a globally respected pioneer in peace and global education who has educated and inspired many. As a student I (Ron Pagnucco) adopted a more global framework of thinking after meeting Pat and her husband Jerry and reading their book *Toward a Human World Order*. For that I offer a note of profound personal thanks as well. -- Joseph Okumu and Ron Pagnucco, co-editors.*

Reflections on Peace Education and the Philippines

Patricia M. Mische*

Lloyd Professor of Peace Studies and World Law, Antioch College (retired)

Abstract

This essay, written at the request of JSE editors as an introduction to its special section on Peace Education in the Philippines, discusses the meaning and importance of educating for peace in a globally interdependent but fractured world; shares reflections from the author's personal journey as a learner/teacher/researcher engaged in peace education, with special attention to her experience in peace education in the Philippines from 1979 to 2020; and introduces two very accomplished Philippine peace educators and their work.

It is a joy and privilege to accept the invitation of JSE editors to introduce this special section on Peace Education in the Philippines by sharing some perspectives on peace education in general and the Philippines in particular, including some historical context and a little of my own story as a peace educator who has connected with peace educators in the Philippines for more than 40 years. I am also delighted to introduce two very accomplished Filipino peace educators and authors whose work appears in this issue. A combined review of two of their books on peace education in the Philippines also is included in the book review section of this issue.

What does it mean to educate for peace and why is it important?

Peace education is vital in a world that is globally interdependent, but fractured with fear over political, economic, ecological, racial, gender, cultural, and religious divisions. The differences may seem like fault lines that tear us apart, but when bravely bridged and welcomed in inclusive communities, diversity enriches and better enables us to resolve many challenges facing an interdependent world community. Peace education is a vital to bridging the differences and fosters the development of whole human beings able to contribute to healthy and inclusive communities within the larger community of life.

*Special Section:
Reflections on Peace Education and the Philippines*

From the ashes of WWII, the world's nations established the United Nations' Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) with an educational vision and mission aimed at ending more bloodshed and devastation. That mission is currently worded:

Since wars begin in the minds of men and women, it is in the minds of men and women that the defences of peace must be constructed.

A shorter version on UNESCO's website reads: "*Building peace in the minds of men and women*"

Seventy-five years ago it was a breakthrough when, in UNESCO's constitution, nations broadened their vision of international peace and security and underscored the important role that education plays in their achievement. Since then UNESCO has made enormous contributions to peace and global education and deserves applause and support. But there is a shortfall in its vision of peace education. It is not only that, after 75 years, most member states have yet to act on this vision and make education for peace a true priority. Also, this vision of what it means to educate for peace is a limited, if not actually erroneous, understanding of how humans learn.

In a rationalist age, pre-eminence was given to the human mind and cognitive forms of knowing. Descartes' dictum "I think, therefore I am" held sway in pedagogical philosophy and methods. Other modes of knowing, such as through the physical senses, intuition, emotions, empathy, faith and spirituality, were ignored, even discredited. But now there is a better understanding of the human learning process. True peace education engages not just mind, but also body, heart and spirit—the whole person.

Moreover, words like "building," and "constructed" in UNESCO's mission statement suggest a highly mechanistic, hierarchical, model of teaching/learning. It seems to assume that the human mind is an empty machine. Educators simply open the lids on students' heads, insert prefabricated units of knowledge, then close the lid and send the student into the world to make peace prevail. In this view the student is an object and the teacher a subject who acts upon the student and gives them knowledge.

But the root of the English word "education," which comes from the Latin, *educare*, turns this mechanistic and hierarchical view on its head and offers a totally opposite vision. *Educare* means "to draw out that which lies within." This is a more organic, integral, and interactive view of human learning and the role of peace educator. In this vision, peace is not something alien and apart from human nature that needs to be inserted in them, but rather an inherent capacity, which can be affirmed, nurtured, and guided toward full development with the active participation of the learner as subject of their own learning. It also changes the view of best methods of teaching/learning from hierarchical, mechanistic models to more learner-centered,

interactive, and collaborative ones. In this view, the role of peace educator is to guide learners in letting go of fears and opening pathways to discover and further develop the inherent capacities for peace in themselves and in the communities of which they are a part--from their family and local communities to the whole Earth community.

With this organic, interactive view, peace education might be defined as an interactive process of teaching/learning through which people develop the knowledge and understandings, values, attitudes, skills, and behaviors that enable them to live in harmony with themselves, with others, and with the whole community of life and to contribute meaningfully to a global culture of peace characterized by ecological integrity, economic and social justice, respect for human rights, democratic participation, and nonviolent resolution of conflicts.

In establishing the Decade for a Culture of Peace (2000-2010), the United Nations defined a culture of peace as a “set of values, attitudes, modes of behaviour and ways of life that reject violence and prevent conflicts by tackling their root causes to solve problems through dialogue and negotiation among individuals, groups and nations” (UN Resolutions A/RES/52/13: Culture of Peace and A/RES/53/243, Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace).

The UN program of action to develop a culture of peace called for promoting peace education, sustainable economic and social development (including poverty eradication; food security; solutions to debt problems; empowering women; and environmental sustainability), respect for human rights, gender equality, and democratic participation; the abolition of war and violent conflicts through the development of tolerance and solidarity among peoples and cultures; the free flow of information and knowledge; disarmament and ending trade in armaments; and humanitarian solutions in conflict situations.

Where is learning for peace to be found?

Learning for peace can and does go on in many places and spaces--within us as we seek equilibrium and equanimity in the midst of internal tensions and battles, and between us and all around us, not just through formal education in schools, but through nonformal learning in families, communities, churches, temples, mosques, and synagogues, in organizations, social movements, sports requiring team work, diplomatic negotiations, businesses, factories, unions, and more. Despite violent conflict in some hot spots, there is more peace and nonviolence than violence in most of the world, most of the time. What kind of learning makes this possible and sustains it? If we can examine what peace learning has already happened that makes some people, some societies and some time periods more just, peaceful and ecologically sustainable than others, we will be better able to guide new generations in the understandings and best practices needed to develop and sustain systems and cultures peace.

*Special Section:
Reflections on Peace Education and the Philippines*

My journey: How did I become a peace learner/educator?

It was never in my life plan to become a peace educator. It was never in my life plan to engage in research and peace education in the Philippines. It was not in my life plan to undertake a journey that would be so full of surprise, joy, hope, love, humanity and learning from some of the best educators anywhere.

When I look back now, I see that I was being led on this journey by a search for meaning. I was being led by the spirit of history, by the questions history was putting before me, and by a need to find an adequate response in the way I would live my life. And I was led by attraction to a wondrous world and inexplicable opportunities that arose at just the right time in my quest for meaningful answers.

Also, when I look back on that journey now, it seems that all along the way, I was learning from people who guided my search and helped me find answers to those questions. They opened pathways and learning opportunities in justice and peace. That learning began in my family. My parents were ordinary but extraordinary people who upheld and exemplified these values. My father, the oldest living son in a family of thirteen children, left the 8th grade to support his mother and siblings when his father died of lung disease from breathing foundry dust. There was no social security, no unemployment insurance, no labor union protection then. So my father gave up his young dreams of being a forest ranger and became a child laborer in the same foundry that killed his father. He would become a lifelong believer in the importance of labor unions and an advocate for laws to protect human rights and ensure health care and adequate livelihood for all. My mother, the second oldest in a farm family of 15 children, was sent from home after the eighth grade to work as a maid for a wealthy city family. She sent her scant earnings back home to her family. She remembered being hungry most of the time, allowed only leftovers from the table of the rich. Later, both of my parents were deeply engaged in community services that assured people in our small town would not be hungry or destitute. They did this without fanfare or expectation of reward, but as the simple duty of being good, contributing members of a community.

My parents were also of different faiths, and the struggle to bridge the differences was a source of frequent tension. I was told in Catholic schools to pray every day that my mother would convert before she died so that she could go to heaven. I lived in fear that my prayers would not be good enough. On the other side, my mother sometimes scolded me for bad behavior by saying, "I can't believe that we are paying to send you to that Catholic school and you are still so bad!" It was not until near the end of their lives that my parents found a way to bridge the religious divide and accompany one another to their places of worship. But living through the religious divide gave me the desire to bridge it and later engage in interfaith dialogue and education.

I look back on schools and teachers, especially the College of Saint Benedict, which not only offered scholarships and financial aid that made possible an otherwise unaffordable college education, but whose teachers awakened me to the social gospels and the social justice teachings of my church. It inspired in me the search for a way to live a life of service and meaning in the world community. During my college years I was given various campus jobs as part of the college's financial-aid package. These jobs seemed to be on a track of downward mobility as far as skill requirements. In my freshman year I worked in the library, cataloguing books. By my senior year I was sweeping floors in the administration building. One day, in my senior year, as I was sweeping floors in front of the president's office, Sr. Remberta, the president, came out very excitedly waving a letter and shouting, "Come here, Pat. I have something that is meant for you." (The college then had only a few hundred students. There is some benefit in going to a small college, where everyone knows your name and reads your heart.) She had a letter from US international aid offices that went to all college presidents to solicit teachers for a new program called Teachers for East Africa. She showed it to me and insisted again, "This is for you." My heart skipped. My body knew before my mind. There and then, in one intuitive leap, I decided to apply for this program and knew I would be accepted and go. Only later, after being accepted, did I think about reasons to go. I don't remember now what reasons I made up. But very soon I was taking classes at Makerere University in Uganda and then appointed to teach near Kakamega in western Kenya, at Mukumu Girls Secondary School, newly opened and in need of teachers. My African students and teacher colleagues, and the people in the surrounding villages, expanded my worldview and enriched my experience beyond anything I could have reasoned or anticipated. The learning I experienced while immersed with Africans in educational development efforts changed my life, my very sense of identity, who I was as a human being and who I could become. It touched me to the core of my humanity. In the years that followed I returned often to work in partnership with African women and their community development efforts.

I look back on the learning and pathways opened from an incredible, loving husband, who was also soulmate and partner in life and work. Jerry Mische had been deeply engaged in international development work, primarily in Latin America. Together we founded Global Education Associates (GEA) to foster global dialogue and efforts for more equitable and just global systems and to promote education for peace, justice and ecological integrity. At the time, the US was enmeshed in the war in Vietnam and besieged by racial strife at home. Jerry and I joined civil-rights and anti-war protestors marching in the streets. Having recently returned from teaching in East Africa, and concerned about the paucity of understanding about Africa in a country whose policies were so dramatically affecting the lives of Africans, I wanted to do something more, and focused on the need for teacher training for peace and global education. Eventually I found a venue through Seton Hall University, where we could offer accredited courses in peace and global education. Through GEA and Seton Hall we launched one of the first teacher training programs for peace education in the US. For these efforts we received some

*Special Section:
Reflections on Peace Education and the Philippines*

hate mail (peace education in a time of war was seen by some as part of a communist plot and anti-American rather than pro-human), but also much support. Soon we were invited to replicate these training programs at other universities and institutes around the US and beyond.

Then, Jerry and I co-authored *Toward a Human World Order*, analyzing global systems and the need to develop more just, and peaceful alternatives. To our surprise, it was translated into a number of languages and brought invitations to speak and lead seminars and training programs in many countries around the world, including India, Korea, Japan in Asia, and countries in Africa, Latin America and Europe. It was a condition for our seminars and programs that the learning be interactive and include presentations and input by thinkers and doers in the host countries, and that the seminars and trainings include fun. Participants usually included leaders in education, business, youth and religious networks, i.e., people who could have a multiplier effect by promoting education for justice, peace and ecological education through their respective networks. At the same time, we were learning more about justice, peace and ecological integrity from Hindu, Buddhist, Islamic, and other religious and cultural perspectives, and the network of cooperation was growing stronger.

Attending one of the programs we offered in India was a quiet visitor from the Philippines. Some months later we received an invitation from Father Ernesto Javier, SJ, then president of Xavier University in the city of Cagayan de Oro in Mindanao, to offer a similar program in the Philippines in early 1979. Little did we know when we accepted that invitation what surprises and new learning opportunities awaited.

Peace Learning in the Philippines

Each place, community, culture, and period of history has special challenges and opportunities for peace learning, special stories that if gleaned, add dimensions to worldwide peace learning, and to developing a global culture of peace.

The Philippines, an archipelago comprised of more than 7,000 islands and home to hundreds of ethnolinguistic groups, has a rich history in which diverse cultures have struggled for democratic participation, social justice, peace and ecological sustainability. Throughout more than 30,000 years of human history on the islands, shifting educational processes – whether informal learning in familial and kinship groups, or the structured learning in modern schools – played a role in the advancement or suppression of peace values and practices. Filipino societies and cultures include indigenous peoples and descendants of successive waves of Malay, Chinese, Spanish, American, and other immigrants. The Christian, Islamic and traditional religions around which diverse cultures have formed have enriched, but also frequently divided people from one another and contributed to clashes of culture that have sometimes taken violent turns as people struggled for identity, participation, and economic well-being. Philippine history has included wars of independence to end 300 years of Spanish, then decades of American, colonial rule. It has

included peasant rebellions, communist insurgencies, and Japanese occupation in WWII. It has included indigenous and Moro (Islamic) revolts against political and economic encroachment by dominant cultures and multinational economic forces. And it has included the 1986 People Power Revolt that overthrew authoritarian rule by Ferdinand Marcos through largely nonviolent action. In all of these cases formal and nonformal education, whether in aid of violence or nonviolence, played a role in conflict dynamics and outcomes.

As in many cultures and countries facing unjust and conflicting forces, a major question inevitably arises about how best to obtain equality, freedom and human rights, whether through violent or nonviolent means. Philippine history abounds in the tension and challenges for human learning that surround such a choice. In the nationalist struggle for independence from Spain, when formal education was controlled by Spanish rule, the choices and attendant learning were largely undertaken in secret. The Katipunan, a militant nationalist society founded by Andres Bonifacio, met secretly to plan, educate, and prepare Filipinos for rebellion and self-rule. Modeled somewhat on the French Revolution, it espoused the use of armed insurrection and violence, if needed, in its strategies. In contrast, the nationalist hero Jose Rizal, a poet, essayist, novelist, as well as ophthalmologist, used the power of the written word to fire nationalist fervor and espouse nonviolent political reform through official channels.

I am fascinated by this juncture between powerful historical forces on the one hand, and human agency on the other – what do individuals choose to do in the face of the challenges history puts before them, and why? How do their choices and actions affect and sometimes alter them and those around them? And how do the collective choices of hundreds or thousands of individuals interact and alter cultures and the course of history? As an educator, I am particularly interested in how the choices of educators make a difference.

When Jerry Mische and I went to the Philippine for the first time in early 1979, the Philippines was under martial law, with human rights suppressed, and education systems and the press tightly controlled. Opposition leaders were being killed, imprisoned or placed under house arrest. We were thus impressed by the courage of the group of people who gathered at Xavier University for that week-long seminar. They included several bishops, university presidents, heads of research institutes, leaders in social change movements and base-Christian communities, human rights advocates, and political opposition leaders. Among them were some of the most illustrious names in open opposition to the Marcos regime and to human rights violations under martial law, including Senator Jose Diokno, a human rights and opposition leader; Dr. Lourdes Quisumbing, then president of Miriam College; and Bishop Francisco Claver, SJ, a member of the indigenous Bontoc tribe and a trained anthropologist as well as Jesuit priest who had been appointed Bishop of Malaybalay, Bukidnon. Bishop Claver had had a radio station and tower erected in his diocese from which he was promoting civil rights and active nonviolence. His radio tower had twice been blown up (he believed once by the military,

*Special Section:
Reflections on Peace Education and the Philippines*

and once by leftist forces, both of which opposed his nonviolent message). He planned to rebuild it again and again, as often as necessary, as part of his pastoral and education work among the people in his diocese. He was also a prophetic voice and educator of other Filipino bishops, inspiring their later stance in support of nonviolent resistance to Ferdinand Marcos and the use of the church pulpits to advocate and teach on behalf of honest elections. Aquilino (Nene Pimentel), another vocal leader of the opposition, had been imprisoned for his opposition and at the time of our seminar, was under house arrest in his Cagayan de Oro home and could not come to the Xavier meeting, so we often went to his home for his input. After Marcos was ousted, Nene became a Senator and leading voice against nuclear weapons, US military bases in the Philippines, and on behalf of human rights.

The names of all participants were posted on a wall outside the president's office. This was to make it easier for spies to get the names without ransacking the president's office. Every participant at that gathering knew their participation could mean possible arrest or imprisonment or worse. I was impressed by their courage to share their views honestly and openly about efforts for peace and human rights in the Philippines. We were a relatively small group, meeting in an upper room around tables pushed together to form a large rectangle around which we faced one another. My sense was of a learning community such as is seen in depictions of the Last Supper, or better, Pentecost.

Out of that gathering came a decision to establish the Philippine Council for Global Education, as a Philippine partner of Global Education Associates. Dr. Lourdes Quisumbing was elected its first president and under her competent leadership it quickly grew into a consortium that included more than 90 universities and schools dedicated to developing the educational foundations of peace throughout the Philippines. Later presidents included Sr. Luz Soriano, then president of Assumption College, and Loreta Castro, who has an article featured in this issue of JSE. In succeeding years the PCPGE and its member institutions, often in partnership with GEA, sponsored annual conferences and launched numerous training programs and projects promoting peace education throughout the Philippines. After the fall of the Marcos government, and inauguration of Corazon Aquino as the president of the Philippines, Dr. Quisumbing was appointed the Minister of Education and, in that Cabinet position, mandated values education, including education for peace in Philippine schools. She also became a key figure in UNESCO's Associated Schools network and in the ASEAN education networks through which she promoted peace and global education and produced significant teaching materials. An article by Dr. Quisumbing is included in the volume on peace education in the Philippines that is reviewed in this JSE issue.

Beginning in 1979, and for many years to come, I made return visits to the Philippines to conduct workshops or give presentations at peace and global education conferences. Out of these programs came a core of educators who would later play a pivotal role in monitoring and

defending the ballot boxes in the 1986 snap election that ousted Marcos and precipitated the People Power revolt. Teachers not only advocated and taught about the need for honest elections, they also acted to monitor and defend them, chaining themselves to ballot boxes to prevent them from being stolen, switched or stuffed with fraudulent ballots. They also relayed precinct voting tallies by radio to a Quick Count center established at De La Salle University in Manila so that the public would be able to compare actual results with the fraudulent voting counts expected to come from the Marcos government. Some teachers working in the voting precincts were killed or beaten and hospitalized, defending the ballot boxes. At De La Salle, teachers staffing the Quick Count center took turns between work and prayer, with two thirds at a time gathering and collating the voting data, and one third in the chapel praying for the safety of their colleagues facing violence. As an observer at the Quick Count center, I was moved to tears, and still am to this day, by the courage and tenacity of these educators. It did not stop there. A few days later, when Marcos refused to honor the true voting results and to leave office, people, including these teachers, poured into the streets of Manila as part of the nonviolent People Power revolt, holding rosaries and bibles up in the face of tanks, rifles, and guns in the hands of military who were ordered by Marcos to shoot them down. In one of the most incredible events in the history of nonviolence, many soldiers refused to obey these orders. Instead they left their posts, their tanks, and their weapons and joined the protestors, flanked by demonstrators who were protecting these disarmed soldiers from those still holding weapons. Later I would learn that many of the defecting military had gone through retreats where they learned not only about social justice and peace teachings of their church, but also contemplated the true duty of the military to defend the Filipino people.

Over the years of visits to the Philippines, between conducting peace and global education training programs, I interviewed hundreds of Filipinos for a research project I was doing on peoples' images of the future, and later for a MacArthur Foundation funded project on peace and ecological security. The Filipino interviewees included leaders of indigenous, Moro, and Christian communities; educators, students, human rights and environmental advocates; peasant farmers, labor organizers, communist guerillas, housewives, business, health and social workers and people struggling for human dignity as unemployed slum dwellers. I was deeply moved by the stories of the people I interviewed – some in prison for their efforts, others working quietly from within their respective areas of influence. Sometimes I interviewed the same person a few years later, after the People Power Revolt.

One of the most memorable of the double interviews was with Dante (his code name). In the first interview, Dante was a military leader of a so-called communist insurgency group (peasants really, who were less interested in ideology and more interested in having a little land on which to feed their families and live in dignity.) After Aquino became president she undertook long-deferred land-reform efforts and granted 2 hectares of land to all rebels who laid down their arms. Two hectares is very little land on which to do productive farming. In the second

*Special Section:
Reflections on Peace Education and the Philippines*

interview Dante had gathered many of these former rebels into a cooperative where they pooled their two hectares into a jointly-owned 2000-hectare farm. Ironically, the land they were given was once a forest where, as rebels, they had hidden and engaged in guerilla warfare. The forest had been burned by the military to drive them out and the land was now denuded and eroded. The cooperative members first worked together to restore the land. Then, using organic farming methods, they planted enough crops on it to not only feed all of them, but to produce a surplus they sold for good livelihoods.

But the story doesn't end there. This cooperative was not far from Mt. Pinatubo, an active volcano. When Mt. Pinatubo erupted in 1991, it spewed volcanic ash and generated mud slides so high that whole villages were covered under 10-20 feet of mud and debris. The US Clark Air Force base was destroyed. So were thousands of hectares of crop lands and not yet harvested crops. Food shortages threatened hundreds of thousands with hunger. Miraculously, Dante's cooperative was not scathed and had a storehouse full of rice they had not yet taken to market. The cooperative members decided not to profiteer from the rising costs of rice. Instead they sacrificed their livelihood and donated their rice to the Philippine government to distribute to the hungry. I used to think that the prophet Isaiah's vision that people will turn weapons into plowshares and feed the hungry is an impossible dream. Now I know it is possible.

Some things I learned

While I like to think I contributed in some small ways to growing peace and justice education in the Philippines, I know with certitude that I learned far more than I contributed. Among the things I learned from Filipinos engaged in social change efforts was the importance of personal stories and how what may seem an isolated story is interwoven across time and space with the stories of many others to shape culture and history. Inevitably, interviews that were planned to take 30 minutes took three hours or longer because the interviewees' stories seldom began with, or were limited to, themselves. Instead, interviewees began by talking about many generations before their own birth, with the stories of their parents, grandparents and great grandparents and of Filipino heroes and heroines who preceded them. They had a profound sense that they were standing on the shoulders of many others and that their actions were a continuation of that longer, collective story. Another lesson was that very seldom would a Filipino make the story about themselves alone. It was almost always about a "we," about a community of people responding together to meet common challenges. Another lesson I learned was about the ability (in fact, perhaps, a need) to make jokes and laugh and find joy in the midst of adversity. Yet another lesson from the interviewees was the importance of individual values, understandings, and choices. Every interviewee was facing the same set of historical forces within the same political and social setting, but the choices they made about how to respond to these circumstances varied considerably. There was an amazing amount of individual imagination and creativity.

How individuals choose to act or not to act makes a difference not only to their own life journey, but to the collective human journey. Individual human stories matter and intersect and interact with the choices and stories of others to shape future history. As interviews continued and events unfolded in the years leading up to people pouring into the streets in the nonviolent People Power Revolt of 1986, it was clear that this event was not an isolated, spontaneous occurrence, but the cumulative interaction of human choices that had been informed and inspired by uncommon educational efforts for social change, educational efforts that went on in churches, schools, business offices, military retreats, secret meetings, and private homes. And the peace education efforts that followed the 1986 People Power Revolt, some of which are chronicled in the book *Three Decades of Peace Education in the Philippines* reviewed in in this issue, are not a sudden and new breakthrough, but a continuation and building upon all the little breakthroughs that preceded in peoples' hearts and minds.

The success of the nonviolent people power revolution fostered the further growth of peace education in the Philippines. Educators were inspired to introduce peace education in their respective institutions and organizations. The two books from the Center for Peace Education that are reviewed in this issue document some of this work. And the articles by Loreta Castro and Jasmin Nario-Galace that follow further detail some of the valuable work by Filipino peace educators.

Introduction to the Authors

Loreta Castro and I have been colleagues in peace education for more than forty years. We first met in 1979 at a two-week training program in New York offered by Global Education Associates, a few months after the 1979 seminar in Cagayan de Oro described above. Loreta, then a young professor at Miriam College, was sent by PCPGE president, Lourdes Quisumbing to participate in the GEA training program with the mission to bring her learning and ideas back to help Miriam College develop peace and global education there. Loreta was a true professional and outstanding participant in that program, and it was a pleasure to work with her many times again at programs GEA and the PCPGE frequently co-sponsored over the next 40 years. One of my favorite memories in the early years of our growing relationship was seeing Loreta and her husband playing with their two sons, then toddlers, during a picnic break on the lawn of Miriam College. I was a mother of three young children myself at the time, and admired how Loreta juggled parenting and teaching with a firm hand, loving heart, and joyful spirit. Gifted and committed, she is a visionary with her feet on the ground and a clear eye for detail. She is also undaunted by organizational and administrative challenges. No wonder she was entrusted by Dr. Quisumbing to help Miriam College infuse peace and global perspectives into its existing courses and to develop new courses to introduce into the college's curriculum. No wonder, too, that a few years later, in a time of tumultuous but creative change in the Philippines, Loreta was made president of Miriam College and further deepened and institutionalized peace education there. Later she founded and was first director of Miriam's Center for Peace Education.

*Special Section:
Reflections on Peace Education and the Philippines*

Additionally, she has been advising and mentoring educators at other institutions in the Philippines and beyond, including in Myanmar, Thailand, Korea, and the University for Peace in Costa Rica, to name only a few. She has also worked on national legislation to mandate peace education as a vital part of the peace process in Mindanao, and she is a leader in multiple organizations guiding their efforts in peace education. She works collegially, sharing leadership with ease, and preparing new generations of students and colleagues to take the reins in peace education. With love and respect, her students have dubbed her “peace personified” and Miriam College has created a peace garden in her honor at the heart of its campus. Loreta chronicles some of her work in her article below that was adapted from her chapter in *Three Decades of Peace Education in the Philippines* (see review in this journal issue), but, in typical modesty, she does not speak of the honors she has so rightly earned, nor underscore the enormity of the contribution she has made to peace education in her country and the world.. After forty years my original admiration and appreciation for Loreta has never waned, only grown.

Jasmin Nario Galace, is someone whose name I have long heard lauded by Loreta, but only recently had the pleasure to meet in person – as chance would have it, at a 40th anniversary seminar of the Philippine Council for Peace and Global Education. The meeting was moved at the last hour to Miriam College after a volcano eruption spewed ash over the original venue, disrupting plans to hold it there.

Jasmine has many credits in her professional career. In addition to being a professor of international studies at Miriam College, she recently served as the Executive Director of the Center for Peace Education at the college, as president of Pax Christi Pilipinas, as chair of the Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines’ Justice and Peace Education Committee, and on the board of the Philippine Council for Peace and Global Education. And she was National Coordinator of the Women Engaged in Action on 1325. These are just a few of the many organizations – national and international in which she is active. She has also authored and co-authored many publications on peace education, conflict resolution, arms control, women, peace and security. (Two of these works are reviewed in this issue of JSE.) She is an amazing peace educator and leader in peace action.

I hope you will enjoy the essays by these two amazing women!

*Dr. Patricia Mische is co-founder and former president of Global Education Associates. She authored or co-authored several books, *Toward a Global Civilization: The Contribution of Religions; Star Wars and the State of our Souls; Toward a Human World Order: Beyond the National Security Straitjacket*; and numerous other works on peace and peace education, human rights, women, economic development, and ecological security.