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The Heritage of Peace:  
The Importance of Peace Museums for the  
Development of a Culture of Peace

Peter van den Dungen

When surveying the heritage of war and peace, the observer, at least in the Western world, seems to be confronted by a stark contrast: while war is everywhere, peace is hard to find (Gittings 2012). This was already the finding of Erasmus of Rotterdam 500 years ago. In what can be regarded as the first classic in the literature on peace in modern times – The Complaint of Peace (1517) – he deplored the absence of peace, concord and harmony, and the overwhelming presence of war, violent conflict and bloodshed in the world around him. A devout Christian and humanist, he never ceased to condemn as barbaric, immoral, irrational and un-Christian the practice of war and the profession of the soldier which made it possible. ‘No one thundered more eloquently against the evils of war than did the great Erasmus … perhaps the most famous of the humanists’ (Hirten 1946, VI). Sometimes referred to as the first European, he witnessed war and the aftermath of war during his many travels through devastated villages and countryside, meeting beggars, cripples, orphans and widows whose lives had been destroyed or made much more precarious through war (Vanden Branden 1996, 30). He expressed his anger and fury in many writings, including in his extensive correspondence with prominent members of the ruling elite of the time, whom he tried to persuade of the necessity to keep war at bay, and thus preserve their subjects’ happiness and prosperity. Rejecting prevailing views, Erasmus argued that there was nothing glorious or heroic about war, and that rulers should forsake the ‘arts of war’ and learn the ‘arts of peace’ instead (Jardine 1997). Five hundred years later, his complaint and appeal remain as valid as ever. Indeed, the persistence of the practice of war, the military profession and the incessant development of instruments of death and destruction have brought the world perilously close to the extinction of life on earth. As US President John F Kennedy said at the height of the Cold War, ‘If we do not put an end to war, war will put an end to the human race.’ At about the same time, another prominent American, Martin Luther King Jr expressed the same idea thus: ‘The choice is no longer between violence and nonviolence; it is between nonviolence and nonexistence.’ In his campaign for racial justice and equality in the US, King demonstrated the power of nonviolence, just as his teacher Mahatma Gandhi had done in India decades before.

Even if it were granted that human history was driven and shaped by war, today war – waged with weapons of mass destruction, which deliberately target civilians and would cause untold damage to an already frail environment – can only herald human history’s collapse. Henceforth, society must be driven by peaceful forces, and the transformation of what in many ways is a culture dominated by war and violence into a culture dominated by peace and nonviolence is an
imperative of our time. History, which is always constructed, is taught, projected and promoted in many different ways – from lessons in schools and textbooks to public ceremonies and anniversaries, the commissioning and display of statues, the naming of important streets and squares, the depiction of historical events and figures on coins and banknotes and so on. An analysis of these various ways of presenting history easily confirms the traditional and almost universal prevalence of war over peace (and anti-war, nonviolence) in the collective consciousness of at least the Western world. How little, if anything at all, society has learnt from the wars of the past is suggested by the many programmes around the world to commemorate the centenary of World War I. Sentimentality and symbolism seem to prevail – as shown, for instance, in the planting of 888,246 ceramic poppies at the Tower of London in 2014 to honour each of the British and Empire soldiers who lost their lives in that war. They are invariably referred to as ‘the Glorious Dead’ or ‘the brave dead’. Afterwards, the proceeds of selling the poppies were donated to six service charities, such as Help for Heroes. While it would be churlish to deny the many instances of courage and heroism in World War I (and in other wars), to associate the deliberate slaughter of millions of working-class men, who had little reason to mutually exterminate each other, with glory and heroism suggests a simplistic and naïve view of that bloodbath, even 100 years after its occurrence. Such a view also overlooks the many issues which allow a leading contemporary critic of war to argue persuasively that ‘Warriors are not heroes’ – the title of a chapter in his study deconstructing war (Swanson 2011, 131–67). At the same time, the exclusion from virtually all official World War I commemorations of any consideration of preparations for World War III (if not by design, then by accident or miscalculation) suggests a frightful, schizophrenic inability, or unwillingness, to learn from the past.

The commemorations also largely ignore the fact that in most countries that participated in World War I there existed an anti-war and peace movement the origins of which go back to the end of the Napoleonic Wars, a century before the start of another Great War that would convulse Europe and also affect much of the rest of the world. This movement was initiated mainly by Quakers and other dissenting religious groups in Britain and the US, partly as a revulsion against the wars of Napoleon. During the course of the long 19th century (1815–1914), a steadily growing (although, relatively speaking, still small) number of individuals in many countries – mainly men, but also women – rejected the prevailing views regarding war and peace and strove to bring about a system in which war was no longer an acceptable means for countries to settle their disputes (Cooper 1991; Cortright 2008). The successful peaceful resolution, through arbitration, of a series of disputes between Britain and the US arising from the American Civil War demonstrated that war was not inevitable and that international grievances could be addressed and resolved without bloodshed and the great expense involved in fighting (Chancellerie d’Etat 2004). By the turn of the century the organised international peace movement could justifiably claim that it had pioneered new ideas, approaches and institutions for the peaceful resolution of international conflict which were gradually making inroads into officialdom. It was increasingly recognised that war was neither necessary nor inevitable, nor glorious or heroic, and that people could work for its abolition, just as slavery and the slave trade had been abolished. It was precisely to recognise, honour and encourage the efforts of courageous, creative and determined individuals that Alfred Nobel instituted his annual prize for ‘champions of peace’, first awarded in 1901 (Abrams 2001; Heffermehl 2010). Not long afterwards, the Scottish–American entrepreneur Andrew Carnegie instituted his ‘Hero Fund’ to honour those who had saved, rather than taken, lives on the battlefield. In the opening paragraph of the deed of trust establishing the Fund, its creator wrote: ‘Not
seldom are we thrilled by deeds of heroism where men or women are injured or lose their lives in attempting to preserve or rescue their fellows; such the heroes of civilization. The heroes of barbarism maimed or killed theirs’ (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace 1919, 110). A fervent opponent of war, Carnegie financed the construction of the Peace Palace in The Hague to provide a suitable home for the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA), the first permanent institution for the peaceful resolution of disputes between states which had been the main result of the First Hague Peace Conference (1899). Opened in 1913, the Peace Palace is today also the seat of the International Court of Justice of the United Nations. At the start of the 20th century Carnegie also financed the construction of two other ‘temples of peace’: the Pan American Union Building in Washington DC, now the seat of the Organisation of American States (OAS), and the Central American Court of Justice in Cartago, Costa Rica (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace 1919, 271–88).

While during the current centenary commemorations of World War I the sacrifice of millions of soldiers is honoured, the valiant efforts of those who strove to avert or shorten this disaster are seldom remembered or celebrated. There is virtually no mentioning of ‘peace heroes’ – those who struggled against war and the many things that make for war – and the very concept often meets with incredulity, if not worse. While some peace heroes, in times of war, may have been conscientious objectors, they encompass a much broader range of attitudes, activities and accomplishments (DeBenedetti 1986; Josephson 1985). As Karl Holl, the doyen of German peace historians, has noted, ‘much of the information about the historical peace movement will show sceptics how much suffering Europe would have been spared, had the warnings of pacifists not fallen on so many deaf ears, and had the practical initiatives and proposals of organised pacifism found an opening in official politics and diplomacy’ (Donat and Holl 1983, 14). If, as Holl rightly suggests, an awareness of the existence and achievements of the organised international peace movement before World War I should inspire its critics to a measure of humility, it should at the same time also provide encouragement to the successors of that movement today. To quote Holl again: ‘The assurance to be standing on the shoulders of predecessors who, despite the hostility or apathy of their contemporaries, resolutely held firm to their pacifist convictions, will make the peace movement of today better able to withstand the many temptations to become dejected’ (Donat and Holl 1983, 14). It is symptomatic that the person who, more than anyone else, accurately predicted the nature of World War I – when it was still 20 years in the future – and who, moreover, did more than anyone else to prevent such a war from taking place, remains virtually unknown (Reynolds 2013; van den Dungen 2015, 7–15). Jan Bloch, the ‘king of Polish railways’, was also a pioneer of peace research and peace education who conceived and financed a peace museum opened in 1902 in Lucerne, Switzerland, in order to instruct and warn its visitors of a great catastrophe that should be avoided at all costs (van den Dungen 2006). Until recently the existence (until 1920) and history of this remarkable institution had been forgotten, even in Lucerne, despite the fact that in the years preceding World War I the city had become a mecca for peace activists from around the world precisely because of the presence of the museum. Today, that mecca is Hiroshima, where the mission of the city’s Memorial Peace Museum – founded, of course, in very different circumstances – is not unlike that of Bloch’s museum.

Just as the peace movement of the past pioneered ideas and approaches – such as the notions of arbitration, simultaneous and mutual disarmament, federal union, European union, international law, international organisation, decolonisation, women’s emancipation – that would come to fruition often only after war, so the peace movement of today can claim credit for many of the
most hopeful and progressive developments in matters of peace and war (Cortright 1993; Stassen and Wittner 2007). They have come about following grassroots initiatives involving the mobilisation of concerned individuals and the successful building of coalitions among civil society actors, frequently in cooperation with a number of progressive governments from around the world. Well-known examples in recent decades are the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Legality of Nuclear Weapons (1996), the International Mine Ban Treaty (1997), the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998) and the Arms Trade Treaty (2013). To this should be added the courageous acts of whistleblowers who draw attention to the abuse of power of State authorities that results in the undermining of democracy and the erosion and violation of human rights. This includes, most seriously, the fabrication and manipulation of evidence resulting in decisions to go to war.

The same pattern mentioned above – namely, the dominance of war and invisibility of peace in society – is also evident in another important domain of the cultural industry: the world of monuments and museums. Those dedicated to war and the military are numerous, whereas peace monuments and peace museums are relatively few. The pervasiveness of military structures and symbols in many societies cannot but teach their citizens to accept war as a given. It is therefore encouraging that, according to a leading authority, ‘more peace monuments and museums are being constructed today than ever before. In fact, we live in a golden age of peace monument construction’ (Lollis 2013, VI; Lollis 2010, 416–21). Museums, especially, play a central role in the educational and cultural life of many countries, certainly in the developed world. Increasingly, countries and cities aspire to house and attract museums that can confer fame and prestige – as well as income and profit – through the tourism industry. As the repositories of significant artefacts hailing from all dimensions of human life (including the arts, social and political history, the natural and life sciences, sport, transport and so on), museums are prime locations for education and entertainment – as well as, of course, for the preservation, restoration and interpretation of such artefacts.

War and military museums are as prominent and popular as they are numerous, and there are few countries without at least one such museum. Hundreds of such museums exist in the US and UK alone, including those dedicated to the various branches of the armed forces (army, navy, air force) as well as regimental museums and museums concerning aspects of war (e.g. in England the Cabinet War Rooms in central London and the military intelligence and code-breaking installations such as Bletchley Park in Milton Keynes). To this can be added buildings and structures such as arsenals, armouries, bunkers, fortresses and fortifications. Yet another important category to mention here are the sites of battlefields (frequently with monuments and museums). A comprehensive guide to sites of military interest in Britain and Ireland identifies more than 750, consisting of over 250 museums, 400 fortifications, castles, bastions and airfields, and 100 battlefields (Evans 2004; Adkin 2006). All these museums, structures and sites are testimony to the pervasiveness of war and preparation for war in society, as well as the care taken to preserve its many physical legacies. A special category comprises the many buildings, sites and structures that are a legacy of the Cold War, the preservation of which is a matter of continuing debate (Barnwell 2003). Together, these places constitute an important part of the museum infrastructure in many countries, attracting a large number of both domestic and international visitors. The overall impression conveyed by these museums and other visitor sites is frequently of the exciting and heroic nature of war, of its necessity and inevitability.

The heart of war and military museums typically consists of a display of a great variety of the instruments of war, with relatively little attention paid to the consequences of their use. The
visitor is therefore often presented with a rather sanitised picture of war from which the human and social consequences are largely absent. Neither do these museums convey the nature of warfare today, or the perils involved in the continued deployment of weapons of mass destruction, or the need for their abolition – on grounds of legality, morality, prudence and politics. These museums hardly display or discuss the reality of a war waged with nuclear weapons, as experienced in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945. There are very few large and permanent exhibitions on this subject in the world’s many war and military museums, including those of the nuclear weapons countries. Indeed, the plan to organise such an exhibition (even a temporary one) in the Smithsonian Institution in Washington DC in 1995, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, was strenuously opposed by US veterans’ organisations, as well as by members of the US Congress, resulting in not only the cancellation of the plan but also the dismissal of the Smithsonian’s director (Harwitt 1996). Only in Japan, the sole country to have suffered atomic warfare, are its nature and consequences the subject of museums, first and foremost those inaugurated by the two cities ten years after their destruction. The sensitivity of this issue (outside Japan) was also highlighted a few years after the Smithsonian debacle when the Indian government tried to prevent the release of a major documentary film, Anand Patwardhan’s War and Peace, about the danger of nuclear war between India and Pakistan (Phillips 2002).

Even in countries regarded as leading democracies information about nuclear weapons and nuclear war is deliberately withheld from citizens who otherwise, when more fully informed, might be encouraged to join the movement for the abolition of nuclear weapons and thus jeopardise the continuation of the policy of nuclear deterrence. The sensitive nature of the issue, and the resulting policy of secrecy, lack of openness, manipulation and censorship, can be observed not only in museums and displays (as illustrated in the examples above) but also in the way in which leading broadcasting media (such as the BBC in the UK) have dealt with the issue, almost from the start of the nuclear era. A famous example is the blocking by the British government in 1965 of the television broadcast of The War Game. The BBC had commissioned Peter Watkins to produce a docudrama on life in Britain during and after a nuclear war. Following consultations with the government, the BBC decided not to show the powerful and moving film on television, as this ‘might well have a significant effect on public attitudes towards the policy of the nuclear deterrent’ (in the words of Lord Normanbrook, a former Cabinet secretary and at the time chairman of the BBC). Moreover, the BBC prevented its television broadcast anywhere in the world. British officials kept the film off television until 1985. As Lawrence S Wittner, author of the acclaimed trilogy The Struggle Against the Bomb, has written, ‘For the British government, as for others, the battle for public opinion was not only against its Cold War rivals’ (Wittner 1997, 357–8). This deliberate manipulation of information can be advanced as one of the reasons why the nuclear disarmament movement has not attracted wider support and achieved greater success.

Apart from this kind of censorship, what is clear from the above is the overwhelming dominance of images of war, destruction and violence in the cultural as well as physical landscape of entire societies, not least as a result of the two world wars, as well as the Cold War, of the 20th century. The opening decades of the 21st century are making their own dismal contributions. Visitors to war museums and sites of military significance are typically presented with artefacts and narratives which endorse and reinforce the status quo. This includes the notion that armed force and the military profession are the only guarantee of a country’s defence and security against a host of potential threats, now and in an uncertain future. This suggests that visitors
come away with the view of the precariousness and impermanence of peace and the need for perpetual vigilance through armed force. The ancient dictum *si vis pacem, para bellum* – if you want peace, prepare for war – continues to reign supreme and any attempts to discredit or refute it are dismissed as being unrealistic, utopian, naïve, dangerous and unpatriotic (Rotblat 1996). Despite much evidence to the contrary, namely that war has become counterproductive and preparations for war frequently bring it about, the traditional mindset continues to prevail. One of the reasons for this, it may be suggested, is the ‘invisibility’ of the opposite view and, indeed, its oppression (Trautman and Turetzky 2010, 248–52).

The ‘invisibility’ of peace in the museum world, and especially the absence of peace museums, is in stark contrast to the existence of many war museums, as indicated above. It may be thought surprising that the idea(l) of world peace – one of humanity’s most ancient and lofty goals – is hardly celebrated anywhere in peace museums. Peace and nonviolence are proclaimed by all the world’s great religions and their founders, and by virtually all countries of the modern world. The pursuit and organisation of peace is also the main purpose of the United Nations. Every year, exemplary efforts for the promotion of peace are rewarded by the Nobel Peace Prize, which the whole world knows about and which is widely regarded as the highest honour available in the modern world, and several of whose recipients are universally admired (Abrams 2001).

The cause for surprise is all the greater with the recognition that the establishment of world peace has become an imperative of human survival. With the invention of weapons of mass destruction, the persistence of the practice of war – and of the profession which is dedicated to its pursuit – puts into jeopardy the future of humanity and its precious heritage. Despite international conventions for the protection, also in wartime, of important sites of national heritage, numerous contemporary examples demonstrate that museums, libraries and similar repositories of the cultural heritage of a society are frequently deliberately targeted and ruthlessly destroyed. Given the fact that war is one of the greatest enemies facing the museum world and heritage industry, it may occasion surprise that greater effort has not been undertaken by the collective museum world to promote a world peace museum.

What appears an anomaly – namely, the prominent, high-profile role of all kinds of museums in the cultural life of the developed world and, at the same time, the virtually complete absence of museums dedicated to a goal with universal resonance (world peace) – can be explained in a number of ways. This discrepancy can be seen as a manifestation and consequence of the fact that the contemporary developed world is characterised by a culture of war and violence, rather than one where peace and nonviolence are the norm. The existence of many war museums is, of course, prima facie evidence for the validity of this interpretation. Peace education is a vital element in the construction of a culture of peace and nonviolence; its marginalisation (and sometimes even demonisation) means that traditional and destructive ways of dealing with conflict are being perpetuated, instead of critically interrogated. Education for war has, of course, a long and honoured tradition, as reflected in the existence of war and military academies; the development of doctrines to wage and win wars; the growth of a military profession and of armies numbering tens of millions of soldiers worldwide; and the proliferation of weapons and arsenals as diverse as they are numerous – all of this at an annual cost which in 2014 was estimated at US $1776 billion (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute 2015).

The contrast with peace education – consisting of such components as anti-war and disarmament education, nonviolence education and peaceful conflict resolution education (as well as, in a wider interpretation, education in such fields as human rights, development and environment) – could not be starker. Although the notion of peace education (if not the precise expression)
can already be found in the writings of philosophers of antiquity, this terminology has come to the fore only in relatively recent times. The development of teaching and training programmes and their institutionalisation, the emergence of a profession of peace educators, the growth of a literature (including manuals) – these and similar developments had to wait until the 20th century and, more particularly, until the birth of the atomic age. Ironically, emerging at a time of great need when humanity found itself confronted for the first time with the prospect of a nuclear war, peace education had to contend with the fear and suspicions engendered by the Cold War and was therefore widely regarded as an ill-conceived and dangerous (and even treacherous) venture. Given the prominent role played by museums today in educating a broad public, the lack of support for peace education in society at large can be seen as one of the reasons for the absence of peace museums. By the same token, the opportunity to provide much-needed peace education for a broad public is lost through the absence of peace museums.

An important aspect of peace education, not least in the context of museums and heritage, is peace history. As briefly mentioned above, the various ways in which history is taught and memories are preserved is highly selective, and both are often dominated by narratives of war, conquest, victory, national glory and honour. It is only too easy to form the impression that the history of humanity is largely steeped in blood and violence, and that this is likely to remain the case. History textbooks used in schools have traditionally concentrated on such themes as wars and revolutions, the rise and fall of empires (through violent conquest) and the reigns of tyrants and dictators. That there is another side to history, less spectacular and less violent, but no less interesting and important, and much more encouraging and uplifting, is hardly mentioned. Peace and nonviolence have their history, too, and familiarity with it should be seen as an essential component of peace education. Like peace education, peace history – as an organised, institutionalised enterprise – is relatively new. The two world wars of the 20th century, and the Vietnam War, Cold War and the attendant threat of nuclear war, as well as (on the positive side), the creation, for the first time, of a world organisation tasked with preventing future war in the aftermath of world war (the League of Nations following World War I and the United Nations following World War II), have stimulated the emergence and growth of a hitherto rather neglected aspect of history: documenting and analysing individual and collective efforts to prevent war and lay the foundations for a world without war (van den Dungen and Wittner 2003).

The importance of peace history for the conceptualisation of peace museums is obvious. Museums are traditionally associated with objects and artefacts, mainly from the past – often a lost, unknown or forgotten past – which are significant and meaningful, and whose preservation and display in museums allows the communication of information and knowledge in a more direct and engaging manner than would otherwise be the case. An artefact that can appear only as an illustration in a book can be presented in a museum as ‘the real thing’ and sometimes also experienced through its handling or use. Moreover, artefacts displayed in museums often have characteristics or associations that make them special and unique, thereby enhancing both their significance and value. A knowledge of peace history (as defined above) will reveal a long and rich tradition comprising many fascinating personalities and groups, ideas and approaches, institutions and organisations, campaigns and movements and cultural practices and traditions. They have frequently left a material legacy that can be found, for instance, in the archives of peace movements from around the world (van den Dungen 2014a).

Peace museums may display the whole gamut of the evidence of human culture and creativity when applied to the struggle for a more peaceful, less violent, world: art works, tapestries,
banners, buttons, coins, medals, posters and other printed materials. Outside the Western world, and taking a wider view than the abolition of international war, virtually all societies have developed their own, native traditions to maintain peace and resolve conflict peacefully, or to engage in peacemaking and reconciliation following violent conflict – as is often reflected already in the language and imagery used. Anthropologists and ethnographers have uncovered a wealth of indigenous peacemaking practices and traditions that can be illustrated in peace museums through a similarly rich variety of objects – often products of the human hand, but others relating to the natural world, such as sacred trees, plants or fruits or animals and their products, such as milk or honey (Gachanga 2008). In this way, peace museums are able to demonstrate not only the universality of the deeply rooted desire for peace and peaceful conflict resolution, at all levels of social interaction, but also the necessity of rediscovering and revaluing such vitally important cultural heritage in our own time. To this should be added the power of the human voice and music to move and mobilise people. This is attested to in all cultures and the presence of sound in the museum, whether in the form of speech, song or instrument, will add a liveliness and directness that can have a profound impact on the visitor (Philbin 1983; Urbain 2015).

Peace museums can be distinguished from the wider category of ‘museums for peace’ (Yamane 2008). The latter also include museums that have been founded to remember and memorialise acts of great destruction and violence as a result of human agency and which are frequently located in the places where the events occurred. These ‘lieux de memoire’ concern battlefields, extermination camps, holocaust sites, gulags, prison camps, forced labour camps, torture chambers, slavery sites, sites of terrorism and so on. Many such museums and memorials have come together in the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience. Apart from constituting a physical place for mourning and respecting those who died and suffered, their message is to remember and to learn, so that similar atrocities can be prevented in the future. Visiting such sites of human depravity and suffering is sometimes referred to as constituting ‘dark tourism’. However, the kind of peace museums briefly proposed and described above belong to a different category. They remember and celebrate the history of peacemaking and peacemakers and thereby provide a much-needed alternative depiction of historical reality that shows the triumph of empathy, kindness, nonviolence, understanding, reason and tolerance. They hold before the visitor the prospect of a better, more humane world that provides hope and encourages engagement. Because peace museums, more than any other museums, are created not only to celebrate but especially also to advance the cause of peace their displays and programmes should convince the visitor that peace is possible and that working for peace is promising. The ideal peace museum should thus not only inform but also inspire, empower and encourage.

The heritage of peace can be found not only in monuments and museums but also, more widely and generally, in a growing number of towns and cities that have been designated as ‘cities of peace’. This is the case, for instance, in The Hague and Geneva, where important historic peace conferences have taken place, the memory of which is being kept alive and used today to provide the impetus for the promotion of a culture of peace. Oslo is projecting itself as a city of peace on account of the annual celebrations since 1901 of the award of the Nobel Peace Prize. In order to bring this unique heritage of peacemakers and peacemaking to the attention of a large public the Nobel Peace Center opened in 2005, during the centenary celebrations of the peaceful separation of Norway and Sweden. The precious heritage of Gandhian and Kingian nonviolent peacemaking is preserved in centres, museums and monuments in India, the US and elsewhere. In recent years, a growing number of cities have produced ‘peace trails’ or ‘peace walks’ that
make visible the often hidden, forgotten or repressed history of local peacemaking. One such project, supported by the European Union, has developed peace trails for seven cities in different European countries. Handy booklets have been published in the national languages as well as English, and also online (see www.discoverpeace.eu). They are a valuable instrument for peace education for young and old, combining the past with the present and the local with the global. Such connections are also characteristic of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, leading peace cities of our nuclear age, as mentioned earlier. Developments briefly described above suggest that in today’s world there is a global heritage of peacemaking that has made possible the emergence of a much-needed complement or alternative to battlefield tourism: that is, peace tourism (van den Dungen 2014b, 62–77). This is yet another way to contribute to a greater awareness of the history and heritage of peacemaking. Such an awareness is a vital component of peace education today that can significantly contribute to the building of a global culture of peace.
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