

peace education at the crossroads¹

a. michael washburn

Suddenly, peace education is the thing, after twenty years of resistance and indifference on the part of the education establishment. Peace courses and programs have begun or are being planned in many parts of the country, in colleges of all sizes. As they become more widespread, the inevitable questions are beginning to be asked: How big is this movement? Who is behind it? What are its origins? How are students reacting? What do they actually study in a peace course? Those who study political trends in this country will also want to know: How likely is it that the peace education movement will achieve great stature and wide adherence in the academic world? How significant a political factor could it become?

In the wake of academic upheaval and the emergence of peace research in the Sixties, many universities are establishing peace education programs. The director of the World Law Fund's University Program warns, though, that if this new movement is to become more than a passing fad it must develop a cohesive sense of purpose.

Unfortunately, at the present time my own answers to these last two questions must be: "Not very likely; not very significant, unless. . . ." Why? For peace people, the barriers to recognition and power are formidable because peace courses are often viewed as a direct challenge to traditional world affairs courses. In addition, what is taught in these courses can be highly critical of American foreign policy since 1945, indeed of the nation-state system itself. In short, peace education calls into question the prevailing institutionalization of our country's thinking and teaching about international problems. Largely without prospect of significant financial support and with no leaders having the political influence or stature of a Henry Kissinger, a John Kenneth Galbraith or even a Paul Ehrlich, the peace education movement must rely for the moment

on sheer, brute intellect. It can only achieve power through the force of its analysis and the strength of its prescriptions for changes in policies and institutions.

Herein lies the source of my pessimistic assessment of the movement. It simply does not yet have the unity, clarity and forcefulness of vision to take on the academic foreign policy/international relations establishment issue by issue, research design by research design, recommendation by recommendation and come out ahead.

Although no actual surveys have been conducted to measure the extent of peace education programs on the college level, it is estimated that a minimum of 150 institutions have courses related to peace. Perhaps most indicative of the rising interest in peace education are the rapid growth of the Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development (COPRED)² and the increasing demand for the services of the University Program of the World Law Fund, a privately supported foundation engaged since 1961 in a program of peace research, materials production, educational consultancy and teacher training. The Fund seeks the introduction of the subjects of world order and peace into the courses of all major educational systems of the world—on the graduate, undergraduate and secondary school levels.³

The purposes of COPRED are to stimulate and support peace research and education activities and to perform a variety of clearinghouse, synthesis and contact functions for all people in the field. Its first meeting was convened in May, 1970, by Kenneth and Elise Boulding. Just one year later the number of member organizations had reached 54, including 43 university research and teaching institutes or programs, and six professional associations such as the International Studies Association and the Conference on Peace Research in History.⁴

Other organizations service peace education, too. The American Friends Service Committee has long made this a major thrust of its work, and the World Without War Council is developing curricular materials, largely in the context of adult and religious education programs. Especially useful are its compilation of relevant films and its book-length annotated bibliography, *To End War*.⁵ The Center for Teaching About Peace and War, at Wayne State University, directs its attention primarily, but not exclusively, to secondary education.

Workshops Popular

In the last year staff members of the World Law Fund's University Program visited close to 50 campuses, sometimes at the invitation of the schools and at other times on its own initiative to stimulate interest in peace education. The Fund also cosponsored workshops last summer for faculty members and students at Colgate University and Pacific University. These meetings elicited three times as many applications as there were spaces available. In addition, 300 peace related courses are using

World Law Fund materials, and almost 2,000 faculty members are receiving the Fund's *Progress Report*. Especially interesting is the small but rising number of university administrators and officials who are requesting Fund materials and counsel.

The peace education movement is part of the larger trend toward the acceptance of courses in social problems as necessary and legitimate components of the college curriculum. Its strong emergence is one culmination of the turmoil of the Sixties: Vietnam and students' disgust at the close ties between the academic community and the military-foreign policy establishment; the depersonalization, overspecialization and insensitivity to value questions of much of American education; the emergence of the counterculture with its emphasis on community-building and rebellion against individual competition and achievement; and finally, the struggle to find workable strategies for effecting fundamental change in important American institutions.

No institution has been more shaken by these upheavals than the university. The resulting fluidity in course requirements and offerings has finally made it possible to start peace programs on many campuses.

Still, there is an enormous distance to go before even a significant minority of American undergraduates will have an opportunity to confront in the classroom the problems of global survival and to work out solutions to what they can and will do about them. Resistance from the existing academic disciplines is still quite strong on most campuses. The peace education courses that exist are not always well publicized and are often understaffed. Every institution is critically short of money and torn by budgeting arguments. Information about peace education is scarce and fragmentary; the major publishers are only beginning to take this potential market seriously enough to publish and promote new teaching materials. Training opportunities for interested faculty members are practically non-existent.

None of these difficulties is insurmountable, however. Ironically, the major obstacle to the establishment of peace education as a significant force in American education and politics is the peace educator himself. A fair evaluation of peace education as it exists today would have to concede that a widely accepted definition of the scope, content and purposes of the field does not yet exist. Peace educators do not yet share a minimum understanding of what constitutes an exciting and responsible program. In fact, this question is rarely raised in the fraternity. A *laissez-faire* attitude prevails, on the assumption that all peace efforts are positive.

These are some of the various goals that have been articulated for peace education:

- To prepare students for peace research careers.
- To prepare people and ideas for the governmental policy-making process.

To give some sense of world problems to all American undergraduates.

To feed and serve a "revolutionary" movement in America.

To stimulate mass involvement in the invention and implementation of a new world political system.

My own view is that very few programs already in existence encompass more than a very narrow combination of these purposes. Many programs, for example, are either too research oriented and traditionally academic or are very unstructured and ideologically parochial. Too many have no clear purpose at all.

In this age of high-flying fads, I would estimate that peace education has less than five years to get itself together. That requires the development of an approach to world problems that is cohesive and comprehensive, that has intellectual and moral power. Peace education must transform itself from a momentarily attractive answer to the problem of academic irrelevance into a pervasive factor in American life and thought.

The future of peace education depends on whether there is inherent in the current diversity of approaches the seeds of a major advance in our understanding of the problem of creating a minimally just and peaceful world system. I believe the potential is there, and recent developments in several branches of the field seem to be pointing toward an exciting synthesis. Before drawing these strands together, let me review some of the major approaches to peace education and research.

Basically, the differences among approaches derive from different ideas of the nature of peace, from different conceptions of the kind of changes in people and in institutions that will be necessary to make peace possible, and finally from differences in what is considered an adequate strategy for bringing the required changes about.

The international politics approach, the one for which I have least sympathy, takes existing courses on the U.N., the history of international law and world politics, adds to them seminars on arms control and conflict management and a semester abroad, and calls the composite a peace program. At its worst, this approach amounts to the appropriation of the rhetoric of relevance. Usually it is simply the creation, 10 years too late, of an adequate undergraduate program in international affairs.

Beyond International Politics

Of course, there are many scholars who believe that such a program constitutes the most scholarly and responsible approach to the problems of peace. They have much evidence and an enormous body of literature and opinion on their side. I would argue, however, that other forms of peace education and research raise serious questions about the adequacy of this approach. The international politics approach to peace education can best demonstrate its legitimacy not by continuing simply to dominate undergraduate international education but by taking seriously in a re-

organized curriculum some of the questions and policy alternatives developed by other peace educators.

I have seen encouraging signs in the past year that just such a trend of reassessment is developing. In fact, a number of solid international relations people have joined COPRED and have made important contributions to its self-definition and development. Political science research, particularly in the area of trans-national organizations, seems to be converging with peace research. Joseph Nye at Harvard and Chadwick Alger at Ohio State are among those who are doing exciting research and teaching along these lines. Northwestern's international relations program is the first I know of that is focusing on "global society."

The world order approach, which is closely related to the political science and international law traditions described above, grew out of the breakthrough work of Harold Lasswell and Myres McDougal at the Yale Law School and of Grenville Clark and Louis Sohn, the authors of *World Peace Through World Law*. World order has been pushed forward by Richard Falk of Princeton and Saul Mendlovitz of the Rutgers Law School. The World Law Fund has sponsored and published much of Falk's and Mendlovitz's work and is now working with a broader group of world order scholars in this country and abroad. Princeton recently received a substantial grant from the Fund for Peace to develop a world order research program within its Center of International Studies. The Fund for Peace is also in the process of establishing a consortium of universities doing world order research and offering graduate training in this field.

The world order approach does not have tightly defined boundaries, but its central concerns are identified in this statement about the Princeton program: "The term 'world order' refers to the development at the level of the international or global system of stable institutions designed to regulate large-scale violence and to achieve a just distribution of values." (A two-page outline of the world order subject matter and methodology is available from the World Law Fund.)

World order is policy oriented, first and foremost. This means that the development of theory and the highly sophisticated data gathering and analysis which characterize most contemporary social science have been given a lower priority than the invention and implementation of institutions, rules and procedures for improving very rapidly the world's capacity to deal with the problems of war, social injustice, poverty and ecological imbalance. This emphasis on institution-building also distinguishes world order from those approaches which stress the importance of changes in attitudes and life-styles and focus on individual human beings as the creators of worldwide social change. The world order approach offers a framework of analysis which links international law and organization with a radical value imperative and places both in a global futuristic context.

The establishment of university centers, institutes and courses on non-violence is another generally happy trend. Such programs as the ones established recently at Syracuse University, Kent State and Notre Dame should make important contributions to peace education because they deal directly with the following critical issues: values as the basis for policy and individual action, the role of individuals in the social change process, and the importance of justice in any conception of peace. The nonviolence approach also presents a coherent, strongly argued alternative to the present system of national defense.

Nonviolence is, of course, a moral and political movement with a compelling history. This accounts for much of its campus appeal but also for its major weakness as an educational approach. It does not always happen, but courses and programs in nonviolence can be too narrowly focused. Careful analysis of alternative strategies for dealing with conflict are sometimes not adequately covered. Perhaps more important is the tendency of these programs to concentrate on community and national problems while failing to connect them directly with world problems. The emphasis on the individual in the nonviolence approach can also obscure the key role of institutions and the necessity of fundamental changes in them. Such changes may be possible before large numbers of people around the world become supporters of nonviolent alternatives.

Conflict Resolution

Another major approach to peace research and education, the conflict resolution approach, began in the 1950's at the University of Michigan and has produced a significant body of literature and a large number of excellent scholars and political activists. Despite the unfortunate recent closing of Michigan's Center for Research on Conflict Resolution, this approach, which focuses on conflict at all levels from interpersonal to international, will continue to be the core of programs in all parts of the country. Institutes or programs in conflict studies already exist at the University of Wisconsin, the University of Washington, Michigan State University and Stanford, and there are probably several hundred psychology and sociology departments that cover some part of the subject in their courses.

Conflict resolution scholars have been far more concerned with research than with undergraduate teaching. The field grew up at the time of the quantification of the behavioral sciences and now boasts an impressive methodology, a specialized language of its own and an array of data banks and massive studies. The enterprise is based on the assumption that it is possible to identify causal relationships or patterns of events, conditions and behavior that produce violent conflict and that it is possible, therefore, to predict outbreaks of violence and devise strategies for preventing them.

Despite continuing theoretical advances and steadily improving data

collection and analysis, a comprehensive, practical set of war prediction and prevention concepts still seems a long way off. As a result, conflict resolution teaching at the undergraduate level is difficult, often being too traditionally academic for many of today's students. (Interestingly enough, conflict resolution scholars have themselves been prominent in a variety of activist enterprises such as the formation of Students for a Democratic Society, the Vietnam teach-ins and the university reform movement.)

Nevertheless, the conflict resolution approach has important things to offer on such key peace subjects as negotiation and bargaining, conflict management, attitude change, misperception and elite decision-making. It is also the source of much that is valuable in the area of simulation, which is an increasingly accepted teaching tool, particularly in peace courses. Conflict resolution is already fairly well integrated with the more quantitative aspects of political science. The task now is to work out the linkages between its findings and the more normative and policy-oriented work of other peace researchers.

In addition to these basic approaches to peace research and education, there are several more general themes or clusters of academic activity which bear on peace education as it is developing today. I shall mention the main themes only briefly, but I do so because each could add an important and powerful dimension to peace education.

The first theme is futurism, which is a subject of great appeal to students. It is a line of inquiry that can add to the peace field a concreteness of vision and a sense of how much could be achieved in the next two or three decades. Elise Boulding has done important work in linking futurism with peace, as have the world order people associated with the World Law Fund. (See *War/Peace Report*, January, 1970, for an article on the Fund's futuristic World Order Models Project.)

Another important factor is the development in recent years of what has been called "radical social science." With regard to peace issues, this has taken the form of active opposition to the Vietnam War along with critical scholarly work on such subjects as the military-industrial complex, the origins of the Cold War, U. S. interventionism and the need for a new China policy. A basic thesis of many in this group is that fundamental changes in American foreign policy, and thus in the international system itself, will first require major changes in our domestic institutions and in the distribution of political power. Despite the emotional and intensely immediate tone of much of this work, it does raise important long-term peace issues. In addition, the study of these materials provides students with opportunities for direct involvement in the subject matter.

The counterculture phenomenon, another influence on peace education, is a constellation of values, theories and random insights which cuts across various fields from education to politics to life-style. Counterculture ideas and perspectives raise questions about the need for funda-

mental social change in the United States, and they challenge traditional academic goals and teaching methods. These are critical questions not just because they are the current political reality of students' demand for relevance but primarily because they cut deeper, challenging accepted notions of peace, justice and human dignity.

Finally, there is the related movement for more participatory, action-oriented forms of education. Films, simulation games, independent study, field work, work-study projects, group activities, and changes in grading, formal requirements and class size are some of the prominent ideas and issues. More important than any single one of these is student participation in decision-making about all of them. Peace education projects at Haverford, Colgate, Pittsburgh, Colorado, William Paterson and St. Louis, to name a few, have had great success in student-faculty planning of peace courses.

Building on these traditions and trends, the transformation of peace research and education into a widespread enterprise with real bite must be pushed forward at two levels. Each college or university which plans to start a program or already has one should challenge itself to be creatively synthetic. At the same time, the leaders of the peace field should intensify their interactions and should devote considerable thought and discussion time to clarifying the parameters and priorities of the field.

At the local level, individual college or university peace studies groups can survey the entire field and devise a list of issues and substantive material that they feel must be covered in peace courses. Each participant in the planning should consciously try to stretch his own knowledge and perception of the peace question and should challenge the perceptions of his colleagues.

The procedure followed by the Colgate faculty in creating first their introductory course and now their full program is a sound model for any university to follow. Basically, the Colgate approach has involved broad participation in all phases of discussion by students and faculty. Involvement of people from several disciplines helped to insure against parochialism. Each participant recognized that he had to learn the peace field basically from scratch. Regular reevaluation of decisions and openness to basic changes in course content were established procedure from the beginning. A large number of people outside Colgate were consulted, and evaluations of syllabus and program ideas have been broadly solicited.

A number of programs designed by interdisciplinary groups actually combine two or more of the approaches described earlier. Manhattan College's peace studies major is a model program of courses in which the perspectives of history, religion, literature, social psychology, economics, international relations and government are brought to bear on the problems of war and peace. Manchester College in Indiana, with the oldest peace major in the country, has built its nonviolence program on a solid base of international relations courses. Haverford has had excellent re-

sults with a program that combines nonviolent and conflict resolution. Kent State University's Center for Peaceful Change has established a three-fold program of academic study, research and public service. Still another variation is evolving at St. Louis University with a program that now involves several disciplines in the study of the structure of nonviolent global and domestic societies. In order to provide information of peace studies activities and programs conducted by colleges and universities, the Center for Peace Studies of the University of Akron publishes an *International Peace Studies Newsletter* with a large circulation.⁶

Signs of Synthesis

At the national or intercollegiate level, several signs of movement toward synthesis, or at least engagement over these issues, appeared during 1971. The formation of COPRED was such an event in itself. COPRED's major accomplishment to date has been the stimulation of self-critical thinking in all of its meetings. The Conference on Peace Research in History has sponsored conferences, put peace research on the programs of professional meetings, and distributed important papers and bulletins of research-in-progress; it is developing a conference on war/peace curriculum in the summer of 1972, is launching an abstract service for peace research, and is seeking funds with which to create a full journal in which questions of scope and priorities could be argued out. One of the purposes of last summer's World Law Fund co-sponsored workshops was to think through the relationship between peace education goals and course content.

Ultimately, peace education is nothing unless it is credible. Despite the encouraging signs noted above, I must remain skeptical about its future precisely because I do not yet sense that there is a widespread understanding in the field of this critical fact. Changing the world must be the core purpose of all peace education. Diagnosing what is wrong with the world system is not good enough nor is simply explaining how it needs to change, as difficult as that may be. Ask three questions of each of the approaches described earlier and you will see what I mean: What does this approach have to say about the transformation of the world system? To what extent have these ideas been implemented and what blocks their further implementation? Is this approach adequate to the problem?

The credibility of the peace approaches does not depend on their ability to develop right now an obviously workable and comprehensive solution to the world's problems. Peace educators must demonstrate, however, that they recognize the full scope of the problem and are mustering all their resources for the hard, step-by-step push into the unknown. I simply do not sense that this is what is going on in the peace education field today. Peace educators show very few signs of becoming responsive to the setting within which political action is being and will be taken.

In keeping with my call for constructive dialogue, I conclude with a summary of my own current view of what would constitute a more comprehensive and powerful peace education program than exists anywhere today.

1. The *purpose* should be to involve large numbers of young Americans in some form of lifetime commitment to shaping a more just and peaceful world order through clarification of value perspectives and development of action strategies and goals.

2. The *key issues and subjects* should include the interrelated values of war prevention, worldwide economic welfare, social justice and global ecological balance; large-scale social change; alternative futures; transnational institutions and processes; tension reduction and conflict management; domestic institutions and processes as they affect foreign policy; and science and technology and their effects on global political development.

3. The *perspective or approach* should be explicitly and critically concerned with values; future time orientated; global and transdisciplinary.

4. The *teaching methods* should encourage student participation and interaction; use a variety of teaching media, and offer possibilities for testing and action outside the classroom.

World Law Fund
New York City

footnotes

1. Portions of this article are reprinted with permission from "Peace Education is Alive—But Unsure of Itself," *War/Peace Report*, XI (November, 1971), 14-18.

2. Inquiries should be directed to Allen Deeter, executive secretary, at Manchester College, North Manchester, Indiana 46962.

3. Inquiries should be directed to the World Law Fund, 11 West 42nd Street, New York, New York 10036.

4. The CPRH is an organization of historians and American Studies teachers committed both to scholarly research and to peace. Inquiries may be directed to the acting secretary-treasurer, Ralph E. Weber, CPRH, History Department, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233.

5. *To End War*, revised edition (New York, 1971); inquiries should be directed to the World Without War Council, 1730 Grove Street, Berkeley, California 94709.

6. Inquiries and information should be directed to the Center for Peace Studies, Warren F. Kuehl, director, University of Akron, Akron, Ohio 44304.