

Elizabeth Richards
*Canadian Institute for
International Peace
and Security*

**Christopher Hodgkinson &
John J. Jackson**
University of Victoria

Peace Education in the Schools

Abstract

What do we tell the children? The question, on matters of peace and security, could never have been asked with more concern than it is today. There is no doubt that the young are affected by these issues – either directly through the media, or indirectly through the attitudes and behaviours of their elders. The primary concerns for educators centre on finding ways to sensitize, and not traumatize, ways of educating without advocating, or propagandizing. A further concern is the particular area in which peace education belongs. Is it identified as values education, or moral education, or ethical education? The solutions to these concerns and answers to these questions help identify the content and methodology of peace education.

Elizabeth Richards
Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security

The Debate About Peace Education

Attitudinal studies in recent years indicate that the threat of nuclear war is a major source of anxiety for young people (Goldenring, 1984; Goodman, 1983; Parker, 1986). Partly as a result of these studies, and more directly as a result of public concern about nuclear weapons, peace education is being introduced into the formal education system. This development is accompanied by considerable controversy.

There is no clear consensus regarding the focus, content, and methodology of peace education. The *word* peace has a number of possible

definitions. For some it is the notion of order – the Latin word *pax*. For others peace means tranquility as embodied in the Sanskrit word *shanti*. And then there is the notion that peace is simply the absence of war. Even if a definition of peace is confined to the prevention of war, there is no one accepted means to achieve that end. Some argue that military deterrence has been and remains the best means to prevent war; "if you want peace, you must prepare for war." Others say with equal conviction that if you prepare for war, you will get it, and the way to prevent war is to reduce armaments.

Given this disagreement over basic values and assumptions, peace education is bound to raise more controversy than the teaching of mathematics and grammar. Some parents are suspicious of views advocated in the name of peace education, and teachers find themselves in a particularly difficult position. Students ask questions about issues that are complex and baffling even to the "experts". The fact that over 50,000 nuclear weapons are deployed around the world elicits an astonished reaction from students. Their questions, ranging from 'How did it happen?' to 'How can we get rid of nuclear weapons?' are difficult to answer. Some teachers choose not to broach the subject in the classroom. Others are compelled to address the issues, often without knowing where to begin or where to find educational resources that will assist them in leading an informed discussion.

The Terminology

Terms such as peace research, peace studies, and peace education can be confusing. Peace education is a general term which refers to teaching and learning about peace however it is defined, both within the formal education system and in society at large, although it is usually associated with education at the secondary and elementary school levels. Peace researchers work at the post-graduate level, creating analytical frameworks for the field of peace studies, which in turn refers to programmes and courses at the university level.

Although the focus differs from one institution to another and often from one educator to another, the unifying theme in peace research, peace studies, and peace education is an explicit set of assumptions: that the study of peace is broader than the study of war; that the study of **peace-making** is as important as the study of **peace-keeping**; and that arming ourselves is not the preferred method of preventing war. Peace studies are often interdisciplinary, sometimes combined with other fields to create hybrids such as peace and conflict studies, peace and development studies, and feminism and peace studies.

Some educators and peace researchers include traditional courses on arms control, international diplomacy, and negotiations, within the broad

category of peace studies. Many scholars who teach such courses disagree with the assumptions held generally by peace researchers, and eschew any direct connection between their subjects and the field of peace studies. Because the field is inter-disciplinary and value-laden, a number of controversies have arisen within the field which have resulted in the criticism that peace studies lack clarity. Although the critics claim that this warrants the exclusion of peace studies as a credible academic discipline, others claim that disagreements over definitions and boundaries are characteristic of any new field of study.

Evolution of Peace Education

As a subject for study and contemplation, peace is as old as human history. But in the modern context, it was the catastrophies of World Wars I and II, and especially the appearance of nuclear weapons, which prompted various academics to focus on the development of analytical frameworks, methodologies, and theories that culminated in a field of study. Following World War II attention concentrated on the critique of war and violence between states. However, peace research was criticized for its preoccupation with war studies – studying the symptoms of the disease and not possible causes and prevention. Johan Galtung, a Norwegian peace researcher, attempted to address this shortcoming by introducing the notion of 'structural violence' (Galtung, 1969). Galtung, maintained that it is the various political and socio-economic structures which perpetuate injustices within and between states. While hunger, poverty, sexism, and racism are often not manifested in open, direct conflict, Galtung defined them as forms of institutionalized violence that may be root causes of warfare.

Some peace researchers warned that shifting the central focus from the study of war to the study of structural violence may have expanded the field to the point that it lacked a coherent definition. According to Nigel Young, who holds the Chair of Peace Studies at Colgate University in New York, "peace studies became an open-ended free-for-all – anything could be pursued under the label . . . if peace studies were really social change studies, or revolutionary studies, or social justice studies, was the label 'peace' not now redundant – even an embarrassment? Some indeed thought so, and abandoned the term"(Young, 1981). Young does not advocate abandoning the term, but he does insist that the study of war and alternatives to war should again be central to peace studies.

Debates among researchers, however, do not influence the direction of peace studies and education as much as world events and their effect on public opinion. Peace education in the 1960s was decidedly activist and teach-ins became a popular form of protest aimed at ending U.S. involvement in Vietnam, but the popularity of the radical approach to

peace research waned with a de-escalation of the war in Vietnam and the ensuing period of East-West *détente*.

In the middle 1970s fewer than ten North American colleges granted degrees in peace-related studies. Once again the pressure of world events made itself felt and by 1986 this figure had risen to over 100 with an additional 70-80 colleges offering courses (Young, 1981). Much of this renewed interest in peace studies is a result of the current international climate, particularly the increased tension between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. Although the focus varies from one college to another, Robert Elias, Chairman of the Peace and Justice Studies Program at Tufts University in Boston, claims that peace studies have evolved into two basic schools of thought.

The first deals with the geopolitics of nuclear weapons and war, explores nuclear weapons systems and the history of arms control, analyzes regional and national conflict, and seeks alternative security means. The second focuses on a far broader range of issues in the social justice area; economic equality, roots of conflict, racism, sexism, nonviolence, mediation, and citizens' movements. (Roberts, 1986)

A broad, multi-faceted approach may not pose insurmountable problems for post-secondary educators, and as the field continues to evolve it is possible that an integrating sensibility will become evident. But for educators in secondary and elementary schools, the situation is quite different. If peace education attempts to address a multitude of issues and has no clearly defined focus, infusing such material into existing curricula can be a difficult task. Most of those who favour the introduction of peace education materials into school curricula prefer the "infusion model". They maintain that creating a special subject called *peace* is not appropriate; rather, they suggest that information about nuclear issues and conflict resolution be infused into existing curricula. A course in English literature, for example, might include the study of Bertrand Russell's writings; a course on science and technology might include the study of nuclear weapons; a course on religion and society might examine the concept of the just war.

Inherent in this approach is the risk that topics which are highly complex, such as the study of nuclear weapons or arms control, cannot be covered adequately if they fill a relatively minor portion of a full curriculum. Those who favour the infusion model of peace education suggest that this dilemma can be overcome by providing adequate in-service programmes for teachers, as well as teaching aids such as audio-visual materials, background papers, and bibliographies.

Peace education usually involves more than teaching facts and figures relating to the arms race. It also involves the teaching of skills, such

as conflict resolution and critical reading; attitudes, such as cultural tolerance; and values, such as a commitment to world citizenship and non-violence. On the surface, the tenets of peace education do not appear to contradict Canadian provincial government statements regarding the objectives of education in general. The Ministry of Education in Ontario (1984) cites "a sense of personal responsibility in society at the local, national, and international level, of the development of esteem for the customs, cultures, and beliefs of a wide variety of societal groups and the development of values related to personal, ethical or religious groups and to the common welfare society" (Ministry of Education for Ontario, 1984).

The Ministry of Education in Alberta (1983) urges "the development of knowledge, skills, and attitudes at the appropriate local, national and international level; understanding of an active citizenship capable of informed decision making, and the development of a sense of purpose in life as a Canadian citizen and as an integral member of human society" (Ministry of Education for Alberta, 1983).

Such statements imply that the inclusion of educational materials pertaining to war and peace, cultural understanding, and world citizenship is a non-controversial issue. That is not the case however. Dozens of school boards across Canada have set up task forces and committees to examine the issues raised by peace education, soliciting the advice of parents and specialists (Brouwer, 1986). When controversy results, it turns on two central issues. The first is the question of balance and political bias, centreing on the content of peace education material. The second issue concerns methodology and the underlying goals of peace education.

Peace Education/Peace Politics

In a paper entitled *Peace Studies: A Critical Survey*, British authors Caroline Cox and Roger Scruton argue that peace education curriculum materials are not balanced and that they advocate political views that are "damaging to the national interests... and favourable to the Soviets" (Cox & Scruton, 1984). In reviewing peace studies in British schools, for example, they state that most of the material criticizes the British government and rarely mentions anything about the Soviet Union except to state that Soviet people want peace as much as anybody else. Cox and Scruton suggest that education be restricted to subjects in which there is "a communicable body of knowledge," such as mathematics, science, or geography, because young people do not possess the experience or cognitive ability to distinguish education from indoctrination.

Peace educators say in reply that the present educational system is not balanced because textbooks tend to promote nationalism. In a 1981 review of peace research over a twenty year period, Hakan Wiberg cited

studies suggesting that the discipline of history as taught in the U.S., for example, is far from neutral (Wiberg, 1981). The studies indicated that history texts glamorize war and the national leaders who participate in them, and rarely make any reference to the human, social, and cultural costs of war, or to the possibility of non-violent alternatives for resolving conflict.

Peace education advocates say that, by referring to credible sources and soliciting the advice of experts, ministry officials responsible for curricula can ensure that peace education materials present a variety of viewpoints and do not make unsubstantiated claims. Thus, the issue of balance should not pose insurmountable problems.

John Mack, a psychiatrist at Harvard University, suggests that it is a balanced treatment which those who resist peace education fear (Mack, 1984). With regard to teaching students about the Soviet Union, "such instruction might include, together with available facts about the Soviet political system, some account of how the Soviet leadership and people see the nuclear danger, their view of security, and their fears of U.S. and Chinese military power." Mack concludes that opposition to peace education stems from the desire to "resist educational materials that stimulate questions about the basic assumptions of the society as a whole."

Mack may be exaggerating however. Arguments over balance tend to obscure a more central dilemma concerning the content of peace education. Although Cox and Scruton would like to see any reference to the arms race removed from school curricula, most critics do not resist the questioning of basic assumptions about authority and national security. What they do fear is that opening the door to peace education invites the temptation to advocate particular solutions to world conflict.

In the effort to achieve a balanced approach to peace and security issues, proponents of peace education say that it is important to include the study of non-governmental approaches to conflict resolution, in addition to the approaches taken by governments and international organizations such as the United Nations. Some critics worry that teaching about the peace movement is the same thing as advocating student protest against the arms race. While that is not true, there have been instances when the distinction has been blurred and the resulting controversy has created problems for both school officials and peace education groups (Sweet, 1986).

Another issue that may be contentious is the view held by some peace education advocates, that the study of conflict resolution can be simplified and made accessible to young people by drawing parallels between conflict that takes place at an international level, and conflict at a community or even family level. Although it can be argued that similar patterns of behaviour function at many levels of human relations, people

involved in negotiating an international dispute have to deal with many more factors and complications than people negotiating a family dispute. In addition, negotiations at the international level take place between sovereign states, while negotiations within a state are subject to laws and norms governing the behaviour of its citizens, and to some extent determining the pattern and results of the negotiations. It is one thing to teach conflict resolution skills on an interpersonal level, and another thing to suggest that the same skills can be applied successfully by negotiators of an arms control agreement, or by parties to a regional war. Some peace education materials fail to make that distinction clear.¹

Teaching for Peace

Concern about content is only one aspect of the peace education controversy; there is also a debate over methodology. Inherent in the pedagogical approach known as **educating for peace** is the view that the present educational system, with its emphasis on grades, standardized testing, and competition, reinforces values which are antithetical to this concept of peace and which inhibit the ability of students to learn effectively. Robin Burns, of La Trobe University in Australia, suggests that students in Western society are confronted with "a picture of dual morality" (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1984). "In theory, values like fairness, trustworthiness, truth and solidarity are maintained. In practice, we educate according to the morality of achievement, competition, envy and individualistic assertion. What is thus learned, is hypocrisy." Burns and others describe the prevailing culture as a "culture of violence" and argue that the most important role of peace educators is to counteract that culture (Peace Education Coalition of British Columbia, 1986). They suggest that filling students' minds with content alone is not enough, and that educational structures and methods must be changed to encourage peaceful behaviour. The method of teaching for peace includes encouraging students to discuss openly their fears concerning the prospect of nuclear war, as well as encouraging them to feel they can **make a difference** by organizing extra-curricular events like forums, conferences, and student exchanges.

Peace education groups in Canada conduct training workshops for teachers which include instruction on mediation and conflict resolution, on noncompetitive dialogue, and on creating a classroom atmosphere which is conducive to cooperative behaviour (Brouwer, 1986). Although peace education is a relatively new phenomenon, the objectives of peace educators, including the move towards a more democratic classroom setting, away from standardized testing and individual competitiveness, sound very much like those of the "alternative education movement" that reached its zenith in the early 1970s. And one of the reasons for a resurgence of interest in alternative teaching methods can be traced to the evolution of peace research and peace studies. The concept of structural violence and the notion that

peace is more than the absence of war leads many educators to conclude that peace is not possible without critically analyzing various social institutions, including the formal education system.

Conclusion

As long as there is conflict and war there will be ample justification for researching peace, however it is defined and understood. Arguments over definitions and approaches are not unique to the field of peace research. Virtually every social science and interdisciplinary field is subject to dispute, and such dilemmas serve a positive function; that is, they compel researchers to continue to assess and refine the field, with a view to developing a more clearly delineated focus.

The debate about peace education is qualitatively different from the debate about peace studies, for the simple reason that universities are attended by adults while secondary and elementary schools are attended by children. It is in the latter settings that accusations of political indoctrination are taken more seriously. There is undoubtedly a tension between the necessity to apply academic standards and the sometimes idealistic and changing demands of a popular movement. The danger is that academic standards will be diluted in the attempt to promote a particular political viewpoint; while peace educators acknowledge that risk, they argue that it is worth taking. They say that ignoring the threat of nuclear war is inappropriate because young people are asking questions that should be addressed. And they add that providing facts alone is wrong because such facts tend to horrify students, encouraging them to believe that the situation is hopeless.

For those who are unfamiliar with the issues raised by peace education, it must appear ironic that the issues are so contentious. On the surface, peace is an innocuous and universal aspiration. When people attempt to turn aspirations into reality, however, disputes often arise. And if peace education is perceived to be part of a political movement which includes the advocacy of disarmament and social change, controversy is inevitable.

Critics like Cox and Scruton would like to see peace education materials removed from schools entirely, because, they argue, that young people do not possess the cognitive ability to understand issues pertaining to peace and security. Their approach fails to address the central issue: nuclear war. As long as the belief persists that nuclear war is imminent, the peace education movement is here to stay. And as long as there is a shortage of teaching aids and resources pertaining to issues of peace and security, teachers will continue to face questions which they feel ill-equipped to answer. Many school boards and most provincial ministries are aware of the

problem and are developing policies and approaches to the issue of peace education. Non-governmental organizations, meanwhile, are developing materials and lobbying school officials to authorize their use in the classroom. The approach of the peace education movement may appear too radical to some, but it is possible that public debate will aid in the development of policies and materials that are acceptable both to school officials and to peace education advocates, with the result that students will be encouraged to discuss the issue of nuclear war in the classroom, and teachers will be prepared to facilitate such discussion in an informed and responsible manner.

REFERENCES

- Brouwer, Wytze. (1986). *A survey of peace education in Canada* (pp. 13-17). Ottawa: Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security.
- Burns, Robin, & Aspeslagh, Robert. (1984). 'Objectivity', values and opinions in the transmission of knowledge. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 5(2), 139.
- Cox, Caroline, & Scruton, Roger. (1984). *Peace studies: A critical survey*. Occasional Paper No. 7. London: Institute for European Defence and Strategic Studies.
- Galtung, Johan. (1969). Violence, peace and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 3.
- Goldenring, J.M., & Doctor, R.M. (1984). Adolescents' concerns about the threat of nuclear war, pp. 61-66. Prepared statement before the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, US 98th Congress, 1st Session, House of Representatives, Washington, DC., GPO.
- Goodman, L., Mack, J.E., Beardslee, W.R., & Snow, R.M. (1983). The threat of nuclear war and the nuclear arms race: Adolescent experience and perception. *Political Psychology*, 4, 501-530.
- Mack, Andrew. (1985). *Peace research in the 1980s*, (pp. 81-82). Australia: Peace Research Centre, The Australian National University.
- Mack, John. (1984). Resistance to knowing in the nuclear age. *Harvard Educational Review*, 54(3).
- Marquand, Robert. (1986, January 31). Teaching for peace. *The Christian Science Monitor* (special supplement).
- Ministry of Education for Alberta. (1983). Curriculum guidelines – Social studies. Edmonton: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education for Ontario. (1984). Curriculum guidelines – Social studies. Toronto: Ministry of Education.
- Parker, K. Ross. (1986). *Canadian children's concerns about their future* (pp. 21-40). Hamilton, Ontario: Departments of Family Medicine and Pediatrics, McMaster University.
- Peace Education Coalition of British Columbia. (1986, Spring). *Teaching Peace*, 5.
- Sweet, Lois. (1986, January 10). Why won't boards of education promote peace? *Toronto Star*.
- Wilberg, Hakan. (1981). JPR 1964-1980 – What have we learnt about peace? *Journal of Peace Research*, XVIII(2).
- Young, Nigel. (1981). Educating the peace educator. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 12(2), 129-135.

NOTE

1. See, for example, *Dialogue: A teaching guide to nuclear issues*, Educators for Social Responsibility, Cambridge, 1982.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boulding, E. *et al.* (1979). *Bibliography on world conflict and peace*, Second Edition. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Boulding, E., & Vayrynen, R. (1981). *Peace research: The infant discipline*. Finland: Poliitiikan Tutkimuksen Laites.
- Burns, R. (1981). Continuity and change in peace education. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 12(2), 103-104.
- Clarke, R. (1972). *The science of war and peace*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Curle, A. (1975). *The scope and dilemmas of peace studies*. Bradford, UK: Bradford University, School of Peace Studies.
- Dedring, J. (1976). *Recent advances in peace and conflict research: A critical survey*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Durke, B.W., (Ed.). (1969). *Bibliography on peace research in history*. Santa Barbara: ABC-Clio.
- Galtung, J. (1975). *The specific contribution of peace research to the study of the causes of violence*. Norway: University of Oslo.
- Galtung, J. (1985). Twenty-five years of peace research: Ten challenges and some responses. *Journal of Peace Research*, 22(2), 141-158.
- Haavelsrud, M., (Ed.). (1981). *Approaching disarmament education*. Guilford, UK: Westburg House.
- Howard, M. (1982). The concept of peace: On its illusions and achievements. *Encounter*, LXI(4), 18-24.
- International Peace Research Newsletter* (Special issue: Peace education), II(1-2).
- Johnson, L.G. (1976). *Conflicting concepts of peace in contemporary peace studies*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Kelman, H. (1981, Spring). Reflections on the history and status of peace research. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 5(2), 95-111.
- Lopez, G.A. (1985). A university peace studies curriculum for the 1990s. *Journal of Peace Research*, 22(2), 117-128.
- Reford-McCandless International. (1985). *Introducing the world, a guide to developing international affairs*. Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs.
- Thee, M. (1981). *Armaments, arms control and disarmament: A UNESCO reader for disarmament education*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Wein, B.J., (ed.). (1984). *Peace and world order studies: A curriculum guide*. Fourth Edition. New York: World Policy Institute.
- Young, N. (1984). Some current controversies in the new peace education movement: Debates and perspectives. *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, 15(2).

Christopher Hodgkinson & John J. Jackson
University of Victoria

Peace Education: A sophisticating approach

Values education and peace education in the public school system are in a state of confusion and disarray – conceptual confusion largely. We simply do not have the names straight when it comes to values education, when we discriminate between values, morals, and ethics. The content in values education changes, but the values education itself does not. Fifty years ago it was a value to be willing to die for your country, and many did, in World War II. Now, it is more likely that we would be indoctrinated the other way around.

Since World War II, racial, religious, and ethical conflicts have resulted in more violent deaths than have the confrontations between the Communist and the non-Communist worlds – including the Korean and Vietnam wars. This fact says something about the human condition, and is illustrative of the dialectical tension which maintains a very difficult and taut equilibrium between two sets of social forces: centripetal forces and centrifugal forces.

Centripetal forces create systems inter-dependency. Everything is connected to everything else. Some examples are the ecological movement, massive international trading blocks and cartels, and, in the political sphere, a multiplicity of federations and supranational entities. Centrifugal forces, much older and more fundamental, create divisions. These forces arise in the polarities that form in the areas of gender, age, wealth, race and nationality, and religion and ideology. The problem of the resolution of the dialectic between these two forces is a problem of morality.

This has direct implications for education. It means that the problem of peace education is a problem of moral education. The latter subsumes the former. This is based, of course, on an interpretation of morality as *inter alia* concern for others and the subjection of lesser interests to greater ones (McIntyre, 1973). To be more general, it is correct to say also that peace education is a subset of values education, the latter being that part of the curriculum concerned with concepts of the desirable and undesirable as its basic subject matter (Hodgkinson, 1979). Consequently, any realistic assessment of the state of peace education must depend on the overall assessment of values education in the schools.

These problems are not confined to this country. They are widespread and international. Central to them is a basic confusion about the concept of value itself which we shall seek to elucidate below. Central also is the difficult distinction between indoctrination and education (Woods & Barrow, 1975). The former presupposes some sort of authoritative impress or coercion (drilling, training, programming, conditioning, propaganda) and is generally considered not to constitute moral education. Moral education, on the contrary, is presumed somehow to lead the learner to increasing autonomy and responsibility (another very difficult concept [Hodgkinson, 1982]), culminating finally in the product of a morally autonomous and free individual. Such an individual, be it noted, would be at least potentially capable of choosing war over peace. However the current orthodoxy is such that it is difficult to conceive (certain existentialist ethics notwithstanding) of such a person opting for an all-out preemptive thermonuclear strike.

In contrast to this educational philosophy, there is that which argues, essentially, that right and wrong are absolute *a priori*. Propaganda, then, is justified in the interest of morality (that which is known to be right). So too is programmed training as opposed to the cult of individual conscience. There is moreover an overriding duty to inculcate those values which are "true" or "correct." Such a duty would be reinforced, when, for example, it is believed that the learner has inherent tendencies to error (as in Christianity), or to false consciousness (as in Marxism). Nor is propaganda, for example, to be confined to the young or non-educated. It is even more appropriate and necessary for the adult and the intelligentsia. Smith defines propaganda as "the deliberate manipulation by means of symbols . . . of other people's thoughts and actions with respect to beliefs, values, and behaviors which these people (reactors) regard as controversial" (Smith, 1968). Lenin defined it as the "reasoned use of historical and scientific argument to indoctrinate the educated and enlightened" (Smith, 1968), going farther still with the notion of "agitprop" (agitation propaganda), or the "propaganda of the deed," to refer to the use of slogans, parables, and action itself to exploit the fears and grievances of educated and uneducated alike. This leads one authority to remark that: "Information about nuclear threat, and peace movements, is so thoroughly permeated with propaganda that further conceptualization is important for policy development" (Card, 1985). The questions he poses are:

- To what extent are peace movements in Canada using "agitprop" for the salvation of children, survival of the species, or other all-encompassing goals?
- To what extent should children and schools be used to obtain the goals of movement-inspired-and-directed campaigns for peace (Card, 1985)?

The suggestion here is that not only are the values associated with peace problems in contention, but also the motives of groups, organized

about particular value positions, are themselves suspect and, hence, a further complicating factor in the overall educational problem.

We confront, then, a constellation of difficult issues having to do with the nature of humankind, the reality constraints of contemporary life, the motives (sublime, hypocritical, devious, absurd, self-interested) of this or that "movement," and the conceptual difficulties embedded in the language of education – peace education – namely morals, ethics and, preeminently, value itself. To the last of these we now turn for a more concentrated scrutiny.

The Value Paradigm

A first step in dealing with value complexity is to treat the concept of value itself in an appropriately analytical manner. This in turn permits a more logically defensible and sophisticated approach to the general problem area.

The chief difficulty with getting the names straight about value is that the central term is itself profoundly ambiguous. One can usefully define value as a conception of the desirable with motivating force. But "desirability" conceals a fundamental distinction: the difference between good and right, between what we merely like and what ought to be. The great question then becomes: how do we know (or ground) both what is good and what is right? It is the philosophical wrestling with this question that has led to the value paradigm illustrated in the diagram below (Hodgkinson, 1983).

Value Type	Grounds of Value	Psychological Faculty	Philosophical Orientations	Value Level
I	Principles	conation willing	religion existentialism intuition	I
IIA	Consequence (A)	cognition reason thinking	utilitarianism pragmatism humanism democratic liberalism	II
IIB	Consensus (B)			
III	Preference	affect emotion feeling	behaviourism positivism hedonism	III

RIGHT

GOOD

The paradigm reveals a hierarchy of types or levels of value. In general, the principal fallacy in the debate about peace education is the tendency to treat all the critical values of the debate as if they were homogeneous, that is, as if they were of the same ontological status. Thus, to illustrate, it is an almost universal *disvalue* that nuclear holocaust would be evil. Yet it is not specific as to whether this means that it is evil because one (as an individual) does not like the idea (Type III); evil because everyone is conditioned (unthinkingly and unfeelingly) to the negative imaginations associated with this prospect (Type IIB); evil because of the logical consequences, rationally extrapolated and analyzed from the putative event of nuclear holocaust (Type IIA); or evil as a manner of principle, principle to which there is absolute commitment and with which there can be no argument, rational or otherwise, and for which if necessary one (as an individual) is prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice (Type I).

It should be clear from this that there is an *a priori* analytical requirement to discriminate, in any complex value issue, between the three levels: subrational or pre-rational affect (Level III); rationalized affect (Level II); and transrational affect (Level I). These three levels can also be understood as discriminating respectively between the domains of values, morals, and ethics. All sentient creatures have values; man shares this emotional-affective domain with the animals. Only man, however, so far as we know, engages in that symbolical interaction, discourse, and dialectic which can give rise to ethical systems. It is at this highest of levels of abstraction that the individual can again distinguish himself from the mass of his species by asserting his moral autonomy and subscribing by an act of faith or will to some special set or subset of values which he then makes his own. We identify, therefore, the ethical as the highest (and rarest) level of hierarchy and distinguish it from the more ordinary level of morality which contains the usual substance of values education.

Implications for Peace Education

The schools are clearly focused and organized about the Level II modality of values education. With respect to the ethical Level I, it is submitted that the most schools can do is to teach about ethics; they cannot teach ethics. It is, of course, a normal function of history and the humanities, and a liberating and civilizing one at that, to teach about the great warmakers and peacemakers of tradition, from Genghis Khan and Christ to Hitler and Gandhi – but this is a passing on of culture and a vicarious treatment at best of the grand passions and over-subscription to value which characterize Type I experience and behaviour. What can be done, and what ought to be done at this level, is to seek to sophisticate the student about the perils of religion and ideology of all sorts both at the leader level (Himmler and Loyola) and also at the follower level (the SS and the Inquisition). At the very least they should come to the understanding that no man is evil to himself.

At the lower levels of paradigmatic value (III and IIB) the aim is to sophisticate the student about his own negative emotions and aggressive impulses, and the multitude of ways in which he himself is continuously and inevitably indoctrinated by his peers and his elders. For example, the propaganda of nuclear warfare should be critically scrutinized.

The primary and essential thrust of values education *qua* peace education should occur at Level IIA. The object here is to comprehend rationally the values of peace and war in the light of our knowledge of human nature and the world conditions within which that nature seeks to express itself. To the extent that there is an ideal principle here it is revealed by the *cliché*, "cold light of reason." The cool of logic is to be applied to the heat of passion, not with the aim of extinguishing that passion, but rather with the aim of allocating to it its proper due and place within a rationally ordered and sophisticated world view. This should lead the student to acknowledge, among other things, that, while thermonuclear or global warfare on a large scale is now no longer tolerable on moral and rational grounds, still there is the necessity to prosecute, with energy, the search for moral equivalents for war.

Conclusion

From the foregoing discussion it can be seen that we comprehend the problem of peace education to be a special subset of the general problem of values education. Further, it will be understood that whereas values education, in school or out, is not automatic, values indoctrination, in school and out, is. What administrators, policy makers, and values educators have therefore to consider are three questions: (1) What indoctrination is going on anyway? (2) What indoctrination (both formal and informal) ought to be going on in schools? (This necessitates both values clarification and values commitment on the part of the system leadership); (3) What progress, incremental or otherwise, can be made towards the institution of authentic ethical education?

The answer to the first of these questions implies, as a minimum, some sort of analytic socio-psychological investigation of the school context. What movements exist? What are the motives of their spokesmen? What is the extent of propaganda? To what extent is there agitprop? What are the dominant community value orientations? Are there deviant and variant orientations which are politically or ethically potent? How are these values to be classified in terms of the paradigm? Are there any Type I values, active or latent, in the field of education, or the field of politics of education? Is the affect generated around these values no more than Level III?

Answering the second question also raises a central issue. This is that indoctrination is inevitable within the school curriculum and not necessarily undesirable. In any event, what kind of indoctrination should be condoned or promoted? This is a fundamental question of educational philosophy. An answer cannot be dictated here but it can be suggested that, regardless of whether one subscribes to an authoritarian or *laissez faire* position, the largest possible input to the formulation of policy be sought, both *a priori* and *a posteriori*. This principle would apply to both sacred and secular, public and private educational organizations, because the value paradigm lends it theoretical support.

As for the third question one can only recommend much closer and much more sophisticated scrutiny of the curriculum than has yet been the norm. We are a very long way off understanding the truth about the moral nature of man, much less the ways and means by which moral-ethical-spiritual gains might be accomplished. Yet there is a very minimal condition to which we can and must aspire. This is simply that, at the very least, all teachers in both the pre-service and in-service phases of their vocation should be introduced to the problems of values education and encouraged to become as sophisticated as they can about this most profound of all the educational domains. Their training should ensure comprehension of the value paradigm, and make them sensitive both to the hierarchy of values and to the fallacies which can so seduce in the absence of this conceptual understanding.

REFERENCES

- Card, B.T. (1985, September). Developing policy for peace education. *Canadian School Executive*, 5(3).
- Hodgkinson, Christopher. (1979). Moral education from a non-Aristotelian standpoint. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 4(2).
- Hodgkinson, Christopher. (1982). *Towards a philosophy of administration*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hodgkinson, Christopher. (1983). *The philosophy of leadership*, p.38. Oxford: Blackwell.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. (1973). *Ethics*. New York: MacMillan.
- Smith, L. (1968). Propaganda. *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 12, 579-589.
- Woods, R.G., & Barrow, R. (1975). *Philosophy of Education*. London: Methuen.