



Original Article

ISSN 3084-7516 (Online)

Received: 05-11-24

Accepted: 08-01-25

Online: 17-01-25

Peace as a human right and universal values: weaving a path toward sustainable human dignity

Jesús Alfredo Morales Carrero^{1,a} , Kristopher Johann Arias Barrios^{1,b} , Alfonso José Fernández^{2,c} 

¹ Universidad de Los Andes, Mérida, Venezuela.

² Universidad Nacional Experimental de los Llanos Occidentales Ezequiel Zamora, Barinas, Venezuela.

^a Doctorate in Anthropology.

^b Lawyer.

^c Licensed Professional in Agroecological Tourism.

ABSTRACT

Learning to live and coexist are tasks that are not only recognized worldwide by international human rights agendas and treaties, but are also goals associated with building a better world. The objective of this research was to analyze the close link between peace, as a human right, and universal values, as global requirements that are necessary as means by which to weave the path toward sustainable human dignity. It was developed using a qualitative approach and was based on a review of documents; content analysis was also used as a technique. Lasting peace, as a categorical imperative for the construction of a functional world system, requires global agreement on the praxis of axiological and legal references that vindicate the sense of community and common security which, together with fruitful dialogue, allows for the cultivation of both planetary and civic and cosmopolitan vocations. Achieving perpetual and sustainable peace as a human right requires promoting shared responsibility in the management of inherited and emerging conflicts and controversies, in an attempt to guarantee peaceful coexistence where complementarity and interdependence prevail as universal values, which allow for deep understanding and sustainable reconciliation between individuals.

Keywords: *mutual understanding; functional coexistence; human autonomy; moral sensitivity; civic attitudes.*

La paz como derecho humano y los valores universales: entretejiendo un camino hacia la dignificación humana sostenible

RESUMEN

Aprender a vivir y convivir constituyen cometidos no solo mundialmente reconocidos por las agendas y tratados internacionales de derechos humanos, sino que además son propósitos asociados con la construcción de un mundo mejor. Esta investigación tuvo como objetivo analizar la estrecha vinculación existente entre la paz, como derecho humano, y los valores universales, como requerimientos globales que se precisan en tanto que medios en función de los cuales entretejer el camino hacia la dignificación humana sostenible. Se desarrolló bajo un enfoque cualitativo y se basó en la revisión documental; así mismo, como técnica se utilizó el análisis de contenido. La paz duradera, como imperativo categórico para la edificación del sistema-mundo funcional exige el acuerdo global en torno a la *praxis* de referentes axiológicos y jurídicos que reivindique el sentido de comunidad y de seguridad común, que, junto al diálogo fecundo, permita el cultivo de la vocación, tanto planetaria como cívica y cosmopolita. Lograr la paz perpetua y sostenible como derecho humano exige promover la corresponsabilidad en la gestión de conflictos y controversias heredadas y emergentes, en un intento por garantizar una convivencia pacífica en donde prime la complementariedad e interdependencia como valores universales; las cuales permiten una comprensión profunda además de una reconciliación sostenible entre individuos.

Palabras clave: *entendimiento recíproco; convivencia funcional; autonomía humana; sensibilidad moral; actitudes cívicas.*

Cite as

Morales Carrero, J. A., Arias Barrios, K. J., y Fernández, A. J. (2025). Peace as a human right and universal values: weaving a path toward sustainable human dignity. *Revista jurídica peruana Desafíos en Derecho*, 2(1), 51-64. <https://doi.org/10.37711/RJPDD.2025.2.1.7>



©The author.
This is an article under the
Creative Commons license, CC-BY 4.0

INTRODUCTION

Peace, as a universal value and a human right, fundamentally seeks the construction of a climate of security and trust, in which a sense of community prevails (Bauman, 2006), through the praxis of rational civism, upon which depend the recognition of the other, respect for their moral integrity, and the eradication of the implications derived from both intolerance and discrimination (Aguilera, 2009; Zaldívar, 2024).

Thus, in a world permeated by chaos, crisis, the absence of coexistence—both full and positive—human confrontations, the promotion of peace as a human right and of universal values becomes necessary as the catalytic force of transcendental changes. These not only seek to organize life according to parameters of functional sustainability, but also to reconfigure it from a transcendental perspective that allows reclaiming life in common as the way to recover the social fabric (Camps, 2000a; Cortina, 2002; Galtung, 2009; Morales, 2024a).

In this sense, it is important to form good people and to presume institutional action oriented toward overcoming the climate of distrust and insecurity, as a requirement on the basis of which daily life can be made an opportunity to reach a state of fullness that guarantees not only the coherent performance of personality, but also the emergence of virtuous conduct upon which the strengthening of universal values depends, such as “integrity, solidarity, respect, cooperation, trust; values that are not only invoked as elements of a common heritage of humanity, but as inherent axes of good living” (Camps, 2019, p. 14).

For her part, Cortina (2013) states that human coexistence within pacifism requires bringing humanity together around common objectives that provide greater collective benefits, for which it is essential to promote the moral minimums that, together with personal commitment, result in the construction of a world-society in which a sense of community prevails. All of this, as part of the references upon which perpetual peace is sustained (Kant, 1975), is likewise defined as the guaranteeing value to maximize human happiness; likewise, it derives from the exercise of unrestricted initiatives, such as the harmonization of wills around common purposes (Diez, 2024).

Accordingly, Bauman (2006) and Maalouf (1999) indicate that peace as a human right seeks not only the establishment of the possible world, but also the establishment of guiding principles that make coexistence perfectible; an ideal that fundamentally depends on the construction of bridges of reconciliation among humanity. Added to this is the expansion of real possibilities to build bridges of understanding that reclaim living with dignity in any context of the planet.

Achieving these purposes suggests as a task the eradication of discrimination, as part of a world in which the feeling of harmony without conditions is reclaimed, the construction of a common civilization in which particular identities are integrated into a deep dialogue that makes possible the definition of a real future for all; in which the responsibility of weaving bonds that place self-perception as a principle prevails, recognizing, from a civic ethics, that which strengthens peace, such as affective ties and human development within the framework of sustainability.

In these terms, the enjoyment of full peace, as part of the common heritage of humanity, is understood as the process through which inherited exclusion and discrimination are overcome, which must be eradicated through the redimensioning of the collective sense (Rey, 2021).

Living and learning to coexist according to these parameters underlying fundamental rights aims to promote a new culture in which global serenity prevails, which, together with reflection, makes it possible to preserve the interests and traits associated with the diversity

that permeates each belonging; and does so until achieving a positive social climate, in which all human beings direct their efforts toward the management of their own susceptibilities, tensions, and problems, resulting in reaching a dynamic state of sentient-thinking interaction.

This research aimed to analyze the close linkage existing between peace, as a human right, and universal values, as global requirements that are specified as the means through which to weave the path toward sustainable human dignification.

METHODS

This documentary research, with a qualitative approach, undertook the review of classical works on peace as a human right or on the hierarchization and identification of underlying purposes in universal values, with the aim of specifying human coexistence, both functional and future (original texts), as well as the assessment of complementary sources (scientific and specialized journals).

The criteria assumed in the selection of sources were: relevance, credibility, currency, importance, authenticity of the contents, and their linkage with the educational dimension. Content analysis was used as the research technique, with the purpose of specifying theoretical and epistemic contributions, as well as practical elements, on the basis of which to sensitize the citizen of the present and the society of the future.

As criteria of analysis, direct references or those focused on situations of inclusion and indirect proposals applied to other realities were considered. The criterion of complementarity was used to specify theoretical and conceptual connections, as a result of the contrast between main texts and secondary sources, in an attempt to establish a theoretical-conceptual and epistemic dialogue that would reveal the concretization of actions linked to the construction of a global, planetary, critical, and legal consciousness regarding the implications of coexisting in a functional peace, as the real possibility to build reciprocal recognition and dignified coexistence in the future.

This made it possible to establish coincident patterns among authors with respect to the following aspects: full coexistence, operationalization of actions and strategies, institutional commitment, synergistic safeguarding of moral integrity and human dignity, as well as the full exercise of human rights and individual freedoms.

Analysis of the Information

Learning to live as a global requirement associated with human dignity implies the elimination of violence, in order to guarantee the superposition of a peace that allows full coexistence and the building of healthy, functional, and safe contexts (Morales, 2024c).

Thus, understanding life within these parameters implies the construction of a system of balanced coexistence, in which the will of all human beings revolves around achieving the dynamic state of cohabitation that, together with justice, allows for the vindication of reciprocal recognition and the overcoming of dividing lines (Bauman, 2006).

What has been referred to is specified as one of the complex challenges of the present time, which invites the renunciation of hostile and individualistic attitudes in an attempt to bring healing to the wounds caused as a result of experiences of exclusion, discrimination, xenophobia, intolerance, and harassment of the diversity of belongings that coexist on the planet (Maalouf, 1999). According to Morín (2011), facing this challenge places the interaction between worldviews and pluralisms as a universal requirement that urges humanity to determine horizons associated with fraternal encounter, sensitive reconciliation, and the reconstruction of vital bonds (Delors, 2000; Galtung, 2009), and that eradicate any humiliating action against the most vulnerable (Morales, 2024b).

This section presents the analysis of two of the constructs addressed in this research; in the first instance, a theoretical review was carried out on peace as a human right and, subsequently, a review and characterization of universal values was conducted, in order to determine their contributions to human coexistence, both in the present and in the future.

Peace as a Human Right

Peace, as a value recognized by international conventions on human rights, seeks the construction of a climate of active tolerance in which the sense of co-responsibility emerges, not only as a real possibility to confront the scourges historically left by war and global conflicts, but as a principle by virtue of which to cope with the crises of conviviality through which the entire world is passing (Zaldívar, 2024).

Understanding peace in these terms is nothing more than the way to ensure the prevalence of collective security, which invites the strengthening of the bonds of fraternal unity and mutual respect, as an alternative to guarantee human transcendence within the framework of equity, democracy, and inclusive social justice (Ibañez, 2016).

Therefore, access to and enjoyment of real possibilities of life, both harmonious and peaceful, are understood as part of the universal parameters that, together with solidarity and critical tolerance, are assumed as requirements of the human right to peace, whose implications in the construction of functional coexistence constitute a way of vindicating sustainable dignification.

Consequently, building peace as a human right implies strengthening fruitful dialogue, in the search for a common good that motivates global society to dismantle the foundations of discrimination, violence, and exclusion (Cortina, 2021b). This emphasis, as a mediator of peaceful life in society, implies a process of reconciliation that promotes interaction among diverse belongings, who value fair and equal treatment, toward inclusive ends that not only raise quality of life, but also the configuration of a world open and flexible to acceptance.

According to Bauman (2006), universal values are like the core foundation of human reconciliation, within which lies the unanimous hope of eradicating the implications of human misery; around the building of the common good and the consolidation of an equitable society, in which both the exercise of freedom and inclusive social justice give way to a conviviality interwoven with the aim of overcoming intolerance and generalized exclusion (Berlín, 2022).

This scheme of coexistence results from a progressive construction, called a shared vision of the world, in which principles and mechanisms of understanding are integrated that vindicate respect for autonomy and reciprocal recognition, so that, as a human right, it is superimposed on the task of organizing realities sustained on tolerance, and whose conduct reflects respect for the plurality of forms of life and human perspectives (Aguiar, 2020).

Thus, the search for a peace founded on the reconciliation of humanity and on overcoming the historical affronts experienced by humanity during global armed conflicts constitutes an ideal upon which global hopes have been placed to establish a state of harmony, in which pacifism and dialogue re-dimension trust and the warm fraternal closeness demanded by current conditions (Aarón et al., 2017; Camps, 2010b; Cortina, 1999; Rey, 2021).

In this sense, peace emerges as a catalytic force of positive changes and achieves its realization in the advances made by different generations, in which it becomes necessary to build a climate of security and mutual trust (Galtung, 1984) that makes possible the realization of the highest human aspirations.

This lays the foundation for the development of society and human performance, as a result of overcoming violence, interwoven with manifestations of justice and solidarity, to

confront global discrimination and systematic exclusion, not only of present generations, but also of future ones.

Likewise, we must consider peace as a bridge by virtue of which to strengthen bonds of closeness that vindicate the common commitment to establish a new order, in which the core element is the preservation of coexistence through understanding; as the universal value upon which the configuration of life in a community in which reciprocal treatment prevails depends (Cantero and Gutiérrez, 2023).

Therefore, peace, as a process in permanent construction and upon which the consolidation of the full state of human understanding is sustained, has its foundation in the permanent search for conditions of dignified coexistence, as an inherent basis of global democratic society (Rodríguez, 2009); a dynamic state in which reciprocal understanding and respect function as the modulators of positive attitudes toward the eradication of racial discrimination, intolerance of diversity, pluralisms, and worldviews that make up the world system (Camps, 2002; Pizarro and Méndez, 2006).

In these terms, peace, as a human right, is understood as the critical overcoming of conflicts and the adoption of a rational path that allows the validation of symmetrical dialogue to prevent the proliferation of violent actions that are abusive or degrading to human dignity (Russo, 2001). Thus, it is necessary to emphasize the construction of solidarity, brotherhood, and friendship. This allows for the generation of a relationship among human beings that becomes an opportunity to interweave a climate of functional harmony, as an antidote for creating the society of the future.

A review of Rey's (2021) approaches indicates that peace is the necessary antidote to prevent the imposition of global terrorism; a response to war, within whose content the consolidation of a collective security that makes possible the superposition of essential guarantees is considered. These are two important aspects for peaceful coexistence: on the one hand, safeguarding and strengthening mutual respect; on the other, orienting human conduct toward tolerance founded on reciprocity (Barragán et al., 2020; Loys, 2019).

For Giner de San Julián and Camps Cervera (2020), these components of living in peace aim to make human existence a compatible process, in which common interest prevails or the praxis of universal values is assumed as a priority, values that drive virtuous conduct, as well as the search for a lasting peace that gives rise to the emergence of positive attitudes, such as "respecting the other, tolerating the different, responding for what one does, caring for the most vulnerable, coming to the aid of those who are calling for it" (p. 16).

Thus, the right to peace can be understood as the focus on safeguarding and building harmonious conditions that allow the individual to perform coherently in any context; but also to provide it with a functionality in which the bonds of understanding are interwoven, and to which the common safeguard of humanity is attributed: dignified treatment among and for all (Camps, 2006).

All of this is understood as part of the new scheme of solidarity that humanity demands in the building of a possible and just world, which involves the establishment of order and the prioritization of common priorities, and is added to the shared conviction of choosing the path of rationality as a response to address historical conflicts.

From the perspective of Maalouf (1999), peace as a human right is understood as the result of historical conquests; in his own terms: "as full citizens on earth without suffering any persecution or discrimination; the right to live with dignity wherever they may be; the right to freely choose their life, their loves, their beliefs, while respecting the freedom of others" (p. 63). Subsequently, the author adds other important elements, for example, "the right to access knowledge, health, and a dignified and honorable life without obstacles" (p.

64). This signifies the universalization of coexistence within sustainable harmony, in which ideological hegemony is blurred and special importance is given to the search for unanimity (Camps, 2011a; Galtung, 2003c).

Universal values and pertinence in the actuality

In a world subjected to profound and significant changes, strengthening the axiological dimension constitutes not only a possibility to build the society of the future within the framework of sustainable functionality, but a way to revitalize the social fabric in which mutual recognition and intentional dialogue provide meaning to the experience of living in peace (Cantero and Gutiérrez, 2023). These purposes, widely considered by values education, entail a way of reclaiming the commitment of ethics around the strengthening of global society, as the fertile ground in which to cultivate the hope of a possible world, more just and sensitive.

Motivating the attitudinal conduct of humanity around these universal parameters is understood as an invitation to overcoming both injustices and irrational actions; in the face of which, the global antidote continues to be the promotion of reconciliation, seen as the opportunity to renounce a past interwoven with suffering and humiliations through the adoption of what is known as peaceful human cohabitation (Cárdenas et al., 2024).

Living together and learning to live together, as purposes associated with the construction of the possible world, fundamentally constitute the intentionality of universal values. Coexisting within these principles not only entails a way of guiding attitudinal and behavioral conduct, but also of re-dimensioning virtuous conduct that urges humanity toward the development of moral sensitivity, as the antidote by means of which to appropriately exercise the purposes of global citizenship (Camps, 2007).

It is necessary to indicate that these universal principles entail as their purpose the consolidation of a world in which democratic practice prevails, as well as the realization of the social cohesion that humanity requires to order life around a sense of community. In convulsive times, such as those the entire world is currently experiencing, this means granting special importance to certain values that make existence compatible and dignify the progress of democracy (Cortina, 2021b).

Therefore, it is possible to view universal values as guiding principles of life in global community, which entail the repeated adherence to the duty to respect the other as a requirement whose “mission is to move toward the more just society, where freedom and equality become increasingly real” (Camps, 2019, p. 13). For the author, these values, in essence, seek to shape social relations, as well as to correct the historical deficiencies that have led to the superposition of selfishness and individualism, which threaten to reduce the possibilities of living both in peace and in full harmony con reducir las posibilidades de vivir, tanto en paz como en armonía plena.

In the same line of thought, Giner de San Julián and Camps Cervera (2020) propose that peace should not only be understood as a strategic mechanism for full and sustainable human coexistence, but that it should also involve an “enormous amount of effort, every day of our lives, to overcome conflicts, harmonize wills, reach agreements, make concessions, subordinate our will to that of other people, or impose it upon them” (p. 15).

According to Maalouf (1999), universal values, as catalytic principles of functional coexistence, have the purpose of “weaving bonds of union, dispelling misunderstandings, bringing some to reason, moderating others, smoothing, reconciling (...). Their vocation is to be links, bridges, mediators between the different communities and the different cultures” (p. 6).

This human approach, which seeks to elevate the conditions of full understanding, reveals universal values as principles associated with the strengthening of civic virtues, as well as with the configuration of actions consistent with the current requirements of a world that threatens to collapse, as a result of confrontations derived from desires for power, domination, and the superposition of individualisms, or as attitudes recognized as resulting from moral insensitivity.

Therefore, it is possible to affirm that universal values are defined as imperatives, both ethical and rational, that invite humanity to assume the path of what ought to be, that is, the horizon of well-being for all, of inclusive social justice, of equity and of freedom; as maxims upon which not only the functional character of society is sustained, but also the maintenance of cohesion which, united in a synergistic relationship, gives way to the recovery of conditions of harmonious and dignifying coexistence for all.

Thus, the construction of a world woven by a sustainable, lasting, and perpetual peace is nothing more than the result of the consolidation of a life in common, in which the referential axes revolve around seeking a compatibility that guarantees not only the flourishing of human virtues, but also the conditions of trust and security that guarantee every subject of rights their autonomous performance, as well as the full development of their personality.

This emphasis is understood as the fundamental pillar upon which to build a dignified human existence, as a universal requirement that urges international organizations, as well as the State, to assume the common and synergistic task of ensuring the construction of peace, thus managing to configure a climate of sustainable functionality in which not only present generations, but also future ones, manage to strengthen bonds of fraternity, solidarity, friendship, and encounter, which allow them to repair the damages historically caused; but, moreover, to build new bridges of reconciliation that reclaim mutual respect and recognition within the parameters of reciprocity.

Sustainable human dignification through peaceful coexistence and the practice of universal values

Global society is currently experiencing one of the challenges that is not only decisive for living in peace, but also for achieving understanding mediated by fruitful and enriching dialogue of diverse possibilities, which weave the path toward the replacement of irrational attitudes with actions of fraternal warmth, which also minimize the effects of discrimination, intolerance, xenophobia, and global exclusion (Battistessa, 2018; Camps, 2001a; Cortina, 2017).

Faced with this destructive panorama of human dignity, the common task, both of the institutional apparatus and of society, begins in the repeated search for sustainable peace, as the human right that urges the enjoyment of a full life in which the moral imperative leads to the configuration of harmonious spaces in which understanding mediated by fair and dignified treatment prevails. According to Camps (1999), universal values are understood as principles that modulate human character; but, in addition, they stand as links around which to bring together wills toward the construction of the possible world, in which perverse positions and attitudes outside rationality fade in order to reach coexistence with real hope.

Living together in these terms implies convincing humanity of the preference for weaving common horizons, in which individualism and selfish positions are set aside, thus guaranteeing openness toward a collective life in which enthusiasm for recognition prevails, which sustains human self-realization, as the state of functionality that results from the combination of social integration, the validation of diversity, and the adoption of the challenge of offering the same opportunities that are enjoyed to those who make up their immediate life context (Galtung, 2003b).

These requirements imply harmonizing the wills of all around common ends, for which dialogue serves as the core element to manage historical controversies and to employ the necessary resources in order to build bridges of fraternal encounter that make life in community a shared and reciprocal process.

For Giner de San Julián and Camps Cervera (2020), from an institutional point of view, human coexistence implies the definition of values and the hierarchization of principles that prioritize the common interest or, failing that, promote norms of coexistence that allow society to move toward the consolidation of a dynamic and sustainable state, in which the effort of all results in the understanding that makes life an opportunity to grow fully. Hence the importance of managing arbitrariness, eradicating hostile positions and negative attitudes, which historically have only caused multidimensional destruction (Camps, 2001b; Cortina, 2021a).

In the words of Maalouf (1999), the universalization of values and axiological principles is understood as a worldview in which the aspirations of all, the common interest, and adherence to a coexistence that brings contradictions into fruitful dialogue are reflected. This allows the discovery of a warm human approach, to share contexts that motivate the enrichment brought by sentient-thinking interaction and the multiplication of channels of expression, as well as the diversification of opinions that, integrated into a shared vision, allow the attainment of conviviality with a focus on transcendence.

From the perspective of Morales (2024b), life in global community requires legitimizing, from the praxis of democratic and civic convictions, the transcendence toward a world of peace, as the only way to effectively resolve problems through the insertion of an interdependence and complementarity that strengthen not only the bonds of functional human cohesion, but also the establishment of norms that provide visibility to those who have been subjected to asymmetric schemes contrary to what is established in fundamental rights.

Consequently, achieving the implementation of peace as a universal value represents a way of dismantling the negative conditions that have led humanity to poor living, by systematically causing the deterioration of rationality as the human quality upon which ensuring civic conduct and action in public affairs significantly depends, which support the co-construction of perpetual peace (Kant, 1975).

Ensuring that citizens commit to the construction of lasting peace requires not only forging the character of all through an education that sensitizes (Camps, 2000b; Cortina, 2009), but also that this education break with the interferences that have historically negatively conditioned living in harmony. Faced with all this, the institutional task must revolve around strengthening the compatibility of interests, in which freedom is fundamentally reclaimed, as well as the reciprocal obligation to live and let live, to respect fundamental rights, and to “move toward a more just society, where freedom and equality are increasingly real” (Camps, 2019, p. 13).

This implies fighting for the overcoming of inequality and the true consolidation of a climate of security that provides all of humanity with the real feeling of perceiving itself as accepted.

RESULTS

Building the possible world-system in the midst of global chaos that threatens dignified human transcendence entails adhering society to axiological and legal referents that vindicate the true sense of community, in which the sentient-thinking condition prevails, in order to provoke solidarity-based and fraternal rapprochements among those who hold diverse belongings or worldviews.

In this sense, seeking the compatibility of visions around living in peace in a lasting manner requires advancing toward overcoming historical and emerging conflicts through fruitful dialogue that, interwoven with rationality, allows humanity to weave civic bonds that revitalize the disposition to consolidate reconciliation and the harmonization of interests. This course of action, as a *sine qua non* requirement to grant transcendence to life in a functional society, is understood as a global invitation to safeguard the common heritage of humanity, that is, the safeguarding of its dignity and moral integrity.

Thus, living in peace and learning to live in sustainable harmony involves a series of social and individual challenges associated with overcoming impositions, individualisms, and negative attitudes (Galtung, 2003a). This, as part of the tasks entailed in coexisting within the parameters of functional, perpetual, and sustainable peace, involves discovering the true meaning of respecting the multiplicity of social, cultural, and ideological positions that make up the world, which must be assumed through sensitive dialogue that, in addition to enhancing the sense of openness, reduces the possibilities of confrontations among those who do not share the same worldview (Salinas, 2023).

What has been stated is understood, in a strict sense, as the universal invitation to the practice of nonviolence that, as part of virtuous, civic, and citizen conduct, allows laying the fundamental foundations of a possible world, in which inclusive participation and the sense of reciprocity make existence an opportunity for humanity to be treated according to the parameters inherent to sustainable, just, and democracy-based dignification.

Coexisting within these parameters entails the defense of freedom, self-determination, and autonomy as universal values, assuming that every person has the right to enjoy conditions of full recognition, in view of which the praxis of active and critical tolerance brings together the positive conviviality framework upon which the confrontation of conflicts, wars, and destructive confrontations significantly depends, which threaten to set in motion the most fearsome atrocities and irrational outrages. Such an assertion reveals not only determining elements of the enjoyment of the human right to peace, but also a series of global requirements that invite humanity to coexist with pluralisms, as well as to overcome the historical implications of inequalities and discriminations (Galtung, n.d.), which are classified as burdens inherited from generation to generation, in whose content the search for the irrational imposition of some over others can be observed (Hueso García, 2000; Morales, 2024b).

Thus, the task of mobilizing human will around overcoming these destructive phenomena implies promoting the use of reason, as a resource that, placed at the service of conviviality, demands the definition of the most beneficial horizon for all, that is, the path that allows significant improvements around “good living.” In this regard, Camps (1999) reiterates that the construction of this climate of functional interaction among human beings requires the transfer of ideals such as fraternity, friendship, and equal treatment into everyday life.

Thus, living together in peace, as a process underlying the right to enjoy harmonious conditions, does not in any way entail the eradication of conflict, but rather the establishment of limits that make coexistence in the world a more livable, dignified, and just process (Galtung, 2009; Sandoval, 2023); but also an enriching experience that sets civility in motion and allows operating within the parameters of global citizenship (Camps, 2010a). Among these parameters are mentioned: the management of differences through deepening in belongings or the recognition of tolerance, which admits dialogue with diversity and pluralisms, as well as the decline of individualistic interests in favor of community tasks that vindicate the true meaning of recovering universal values, such as justice and equity (Battistessa, 2018; Fisas-Armengol, 1998).

Faced with this global challenge, the human right to peace is specified as a hopeful element, associated with the building of democratic, just, and trustworthy societies, in which the project of living based on the praxis of reciprocal understanding consolidates another

possible world (Cortina, 2013). This means delving into particular beliefs and the ideals of the other, in an attempt to specify common elements that not only justify the synergistic construction of a peaceful society, in which its members manage to weave bridges of deep and empathetic understanding, as a categorical imperative to change the world (Arango, 2007; Calderón, 2009; Galtung, 1998).

This emphasis on strengthening human will around the need to transform current adverse conditions requires adopting, in an operative sense, “ethical judgments, moral values, solidarity, tolerance, and respect for the other (...), as aspects through which to raise hope around a more human coexistence” (Camps, 1999, p. 74). This entails learning to live together through the adoption of the commitment to identify common elements among the other belongings that make up the world.

These elements, as the operative supports of the human right to peace, are understood as requirements to weave the construction of an authentic democracy, in which all citizens achieve, through rational participation, the consolidation of collective interests that result in achieving living in function of the common good, leaving aside mean, individualistic, and exclusionary positions that threaten the moral integrity of humanity.

Thus, fundamentally, the consolidation of human networks that vindicate coexistence in society requires forming more supportive subjects, whose disposition is oriented toward sustaining a global community, in which its members deeply self-perceive themselves with the transformation of the sufferings and injustices of the other into opportunities to strengthen bonds of full trust, thereby achieving that a climate of peace provides functional balance to society (Maalouf, 1999).

This search for social balance provided by sustainable peace that the world requires to achieve transcendental conviviality demands bringing diversity into dialogue, as the antidote to eradicate virulent attitudes. Materializing these conditions of coexistence also requires promoting the sense of continuity with respect to the praxis of sensitive, open, flexible, and supportive recognition, as the foundation of building a sentient-thinking world, in which all assume co-responsibility and critical awareness that help overcome the hostile past. And this is possible to achieve through the specification of the common aspects that harmed or violated moral integrity and human dignity, causing enmity, as well as the hatred that has distanced any possibility of strengthening bonds of reconciliation (Galtung, 2009).

According to Camps (2019), achieving this state of fullness, founded on sensitive and fraternal encounter, requires turning human formation at the global level toward core values for society, such as the exercise of critical solidarity, reciprocal respect, the establishment of cooperation parameters, the adoption of integrity that allows the subject to participate in public affairs without becoming involved in acts outside ethics; and all of this is assumed as the universal guarantee upon which to sustain the enjoyment of freedom to act, decide, and consolidate functional performance, allowing every person to achieve full realization.

For international conventions and treaties, the enjoyment of peace, as the foundation of existence in global community, requires a series of duties correlated with safeguarding personal integrity, human dignity, and morality (Morales, 2024c). This demands orienting individual and collective conduct according to norms that, by motivating the establishment of limits of action among subjects with diverse belongings, plural positions, and in conditions of disagreement, manage to decline their particular and individualistic interests, until assuming a possible world, in which inclusion, respect, and positive freedom prevail (Arango, 2007; Rey, 2021).

For his part, Morin (1999) proposes that peace reaches its functional state provided that citizenship adheres to the commitment to address antagonisms through rational dialogue,

which is specified as the instrument through which to establish coexistence agreements that provide vitality to global society; in other terms, that recognize freedom of opinion, expression, and decision.

In summary, achieving sustainable peace, as a human right associated with the building of the possible future, requires humanity to direct its thinking toward the praxis of negotiation, as a mechanism by which to reduce the effects of destructive tensions and irrational actions. All of this, in an attempt to generate profound changes that eradicate inherited injustices, intolerances, and discriminations, until generating real agreements that vindicate the tasks of truly inclusive social justice.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the foregoing, we can give perpetuity to confrontations for social, ideological, and cultural reasons that underlie all universal conventions on human rights. This approach seeks to strengthen structural peace that raises levels of conviviality through the reconstruction of bonds of fraternal unity.

Thus, living together in peace as a universal underlying task seeks, in the first instance, that the building of the world be centered on the strengthening of understanding, agreement, and negotiation; consequently, on the construction of new schemes of conviviality that vindicate recognition of the diversity of worldviews and pluralisms that permeate the world.

What has been referred to constitutes an institutional commitment to the transformation of the global social structure through the strengthening of rationality and human sensitivity, as antidotes to confront the warlike culture responsible for the fragmentation of bonds of critical solidarity and tolerance, required to recover the social fabric from sustainability. This, as part of the principles universally recognized by international conventions on human rights, has as its purpose the consolidation of a world-system with a deep sense of community, guided by virtuous conduct, that allows putting an end to violence, confrontations, and wars.

This project implies ensuring that citizens assume, as part of their attitudinal repertoire, contributing to weaving bonds of fraternity, of synergistic cooperation, and reciprocal maintenance of respect, from a universal vision; a process that likewise means deploying commitment to inclusion and integration, to fruitful dialogue and peaceful coexistence, as well as to an interaction that builds bridges of coexistence free of prejudice..

Therefore, it is possible to affirm that the construction of a culture of sustainable peace requires efforts mediated by tolerance with a focus on building a functional human community within which collective ethical commitment to justice, equity, and human dignity are assumed as fundamental elements to consolidate truly democratic relationships. In this sense, education for peace emerges as an indispensable tool to uproot historical prejudices and foster attitudes of tolerance toward the plurality of worldviews, whose common focus is living together, in full harmony and from the praxis of empathy as a common project aimed at cultivating planetary vocation.

Authorship contribution

JAMC: conception and design of the article, data collection.
KJAB: statistics, data analysis and interpretation.
AJF: drafting of the article, discussion, and final review of the article.

Funding sources

The research was conducted with own resources.

Conflict of interest statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

- Aarón, A., Milicic, N., Sánchez, M., y Subercaseaux, J. (2017). *Construyendo juntos: claves para la convivencia escolar*. Agencia de Calidad de la Educación.
- Aguiar, A. (2020). *El derecho humano a la paz*. Jurídica Venezolana.
- Aguilera, R. (2009). *La enseñanza de los derechos humanos*. CECYTE, N.L.
- Arango, V. (2007). *Paz social y cultura de paz*. Panamá Viejo.
- Barragán, F., Maćkiewicz, J., Szarota, Z., y Pérez, D. (2020). *Educación para la paz, la equidad los valores*. Octaedro.
- Battistessa, D. (2018). Johan Galtung y el método transcend: experiencias y prácticas de resolución de conflictos con métodos pacíficos en América Latina. *Cuaderno Jurídico y Político*, 4(2), 60-72. <https://doi.org/10.5377/cuadernojurypol.v4i12.11120>
- Bauman, Z. (2006). *Comunidad. En busca de seguridad en un mundo hostil*. Siglo XXI.
- Berlín, I. (2022). *Sobre la libertad y la igualdad*. Página Indómita.
- Calderón, P. (2009). Teoría del conflicto de Johan Galtung. *Revista Paz y Conflictos*, 2(2), 60-81. <https://revistaseug.urg.es/index.php/revpaz/article/view/432/477>
- Camps, V. (1999). *Paradojas del individualismo*. Crítica.
- Camps, V. (2000a). *Qué hay que enseñar a los hijos*. Nuevas Ediciones de Bolsillo.
- Camps, V. (2000b). *Los valores de la educación*. Anaya.
- Camps, V. (2001a). *Una vida de calidad. Reflexiones sobre la bioética*. Crítica.
- Camps, V. (2002). Principios, consecuencias y virtudes. *Daimon Revista Internacional de Filosofía*, (27), 63-72. <https://revistas.um.es/daimon/article/view/12201>
- Camps, V. (2006). *Historia de la ética. La ética moderna*. Crítica.
- Camps, V. (2007). *Educar para la ciudadanía*. Fundación ECOEM.
- Camps, V. (2010a). *Manual de civismo*. Ariel.
- Camps, V. (2010b). *El declive de la ciudadanía. La construcción de la ética pública*. GP Actualidad.
- Camps, V. (2011a). *Crear en la educación*. Quinteto.
- Camps, V. (2019). *Virtudes públicas*. Espasa.
- Camps, V. (2001b). *Introducción a la filosofía política*. Crítica.
- Cantero, M. y Gutiérrez, F. (2023). Interculturalidad del derecho humano a la paz en México. *Desafíos*, 14(1), 46-55. <https://doi.org/10.37711/desafios.2023.14.1.387>
- Cárdenas, R., Cárdenas, K., Coronel, T., y Cárdenas, D. (2024). Desafíos de los derechos humanos en la actualidad. *RECIMUNDO*, 8(1), 377-384. <https://recimundo.com/index.php/es/article/view/2195>
- Cortina, A. (1999). *El quehacer ético. Guía para la educación moral*. Santillana.
- Cortina, A. (2002). *Educación en valores y responsabilidad cívica*. El Búho Ltda.
- Cortina, A. (2009). *Ciudadanos del mundo. Hacia una teoría de la ciudadanía*. Alianza.
- Cortina, A. (2013). *¿Para qué sirve realmente la ética?* Paidós.
- Cortina, A. (2017). *Aporofobia, el rechazo al pobre*. Paidós.
- Cortina, A. (2021a). *Ética cosmopolita. Una apuesta por la cordura en tiempos de pandemia*. Paidós.
- Cortina, A. (2021b). *Los valores de una ciudadanía activa en educación, valores y ciudadanía*. Organización de Estados Iberoamericanos para la Educación, la Ciencias y la Tecnología; Fundación SM.

- Delors, J. (2000). *La educación encierra un tesoro*. Santillana; Ediciones UNESCO.
- Diez, J. (2024). In Memoriam Johan Galtung (1930-2024). *Revista Española de Ciencias Sociológicas*, (187), 3-6. <https://doi.org/10.5477/cis/reis.187.3-6>
- Fisas-Armengol, V. (1998). *Cultura de paz y gestión de conflictos*. Icaria.
- Galtung, J. (2003a) *Paz por medios pacíficos. Paz y conflicto, desarrollo y civilización*. Gernika Gogoratuz.
- Galtung, J. (1984). ¡Hay alternativas! 4 caminos hacia la paz y la seguridad. Tecnos.
- Galtung, J. (1998). *Tras la violencia, 3R: reconstrucción, reconciliación, resolución. Afrontando los efectos visibles e invisibles de la guerra y la violencia*. Red Gernika.
- Galtung, J. (2003b). *Violencia Cultural*. Guernika-Lumo; Gernika Gogoratuz.
- Galtung, J. (2003c) *Trascender y transformar. Una introducción al trabajo de conflictos*. Transcend; Quimera.
- Galtung, J. (2009). *Paz por medios pacíficos: paz y conflictos, desarrollo y civilización*. Gernika Gogoratuz; Working Papers Munduam Paz y Desarrollo.
- Galtung, J. (s/f). *Violencia, conflictos y su impacto. Sobre los efectos invisibles e invisibles de la violencia*. <https://red.pucp.edu.pe/wp-content/uploads/biblioteca/081020.pdf>
- Giner de San Julián, S., y Camps Cervera, V. (2020). *Comprensión de Textos II: ES409* [Guía de asignatura, Semestre II, 2019–2020]. Universidad Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah, Facultad de Letras y Ciencias Humanas, Departamento de Lengua y Literatura Hispánicas. https://www.fldm.usmba.ac.ma/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/ES409-Comprens%C3%B3n-de-textos-II-S.AKIF_.pdf
- Hueso García, V. (2000). Johan Galtung. La transformación de los conflictos en medios pacíficos. *Cuadernos de Estrategia*, (111), 125-159. <file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/Dialnet-JohanGaltung-595158.pdf>
- Ibáñez, E. (2016). Sen y los derechos humanos: la libertad como objeto material de los derechos humanos. *Pensamiento, Revista de Investigación e información filosófica*, 72(274), 1119-1140. <https://doi.org/10.14422/pen.v72.i274.y2016.003>
- Kant, I. (1975). *La paz perpetua*. Tecnos.
- Loys, G. (2019). *Derechos humanos, buen vivir y educación*. UNAE.
- Maalouf, A. (1999). *Identidades asesinas*. Alianza.
- Morales, J. (2024a). Derechos humanos y educación en ciudadanía global. Alternativa para un mundo posible. *Revista Telos*, 26(1), 240-258.
- Morales, J. (2024b). Derechos humanos, cultura de paz y educación en ciudadanía global: triada de una política pública garante de la convivencia humana. *Revista DYCS VICTORIA*, 6(2), 38-52. <https://doi.org/10.29059/rdycsv.v6i2.207>
- Morales, J. (2024c). Una política pública sobre cultura de paz, pluralismo y libertad positiva basada en Johan Galtung e Isaiah Berlin. *Ius Comitiālis*, 7(14), 158-181. <https://iuscomitialis.uaemex.mx/article/view/24585>
- Morín, E. (1999). *Los siete saberes necesarios para la educación del futuro*. UNESCO.
- Morín, E. (2011). *La vía para el futuro de la humanidad*. Paidós.
- Pizarro, A., y Méndez, F. (2006). *Manual de derecho internacional de los derechos humanos. Aspectos sustantivos*. Universal Books.
- Rey, S. (2021). *Manual de derechos humanos*. EDUNPAZ.
- Rodríguez, M. (2009). *Educación para los derechos humanos, para la democracia y para la paz*. Coordinación Educativa y Cultural Centroamericana, CECC/SICA.
- Russo, E. (2001). *Derechos humanos y garantías. El derecho al mañana*. Eudeba.
- Salinas, B. (2023). Educación para la paz desde Galtung. *Análisis*, 55(102), 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.15332/21459169.7634>

- Sandoval, B. (2023). Teoría de la paz de Johan Galtung en la educación. *Revista de Investigación y Praxis en Cs Sociales*, 2(3), 171-176. <https://doi.org/10.24054/ripcs.v2i3.2392>
- Zaldívar, S. (2024). La reflexión bioética como particularización de la visión antropocéntrica en la filosofía del derecho. La función meridional de los derechos humanos. *Revista Jurídica Peruana, Desafíos en Derecho*, 1(1), 46-55. <https://doi.org/10.37711/RJPDD.2024.1.1.6>

Correspondence

 Jesús Alfredo Morales Carrero

 lectoescrituraula@gmail.com