CATALYST
A SOCIAL JUSTICE FORUM
Volume 1 | Issue 1 | 2011

EDUCATING FOR PEACE AND JUSTICE IN AMERICA'S NUCLEAR AGE

IAN HARRIS AND CHARLES F. HOWLETT

Abstract

The emergence of peace education as embodied in the context of peace studies, which emerged during the post-World War II ideological struggle between capitalism and Communism, the nuclear arms race pitting the United States against the former Soviet Union, the Vietnam War, and the civil rights movement in America, met with considerable criticism. There were many within and outside the academic community who argued that peace studies had very little to offer in terms of "real scholarship" and were primarily politically motivated. Some went so far as to insist that this new area of study lacked focus and discipline given the complexities associated with war and peace. It also became fashionable to attack those teaching and studying peace issues as anarchists, communists, and pacifists. They were ridiculed as subversives for challenging the hegemony of the U.S. military establishment. Over time all that would change as the early years of experimentation resulted in programs more rigorous in academic content and serious in focus. Although there are many who still question the viability of peace education/peace studies among schoolchildren and undergraduates, the historical record of the last fifty years or so provides a far different picture. It presents a progression of peace education/peace studies in our society today from an antidote to the science of war to a comprehensive examination of the causes of violence and related strategies for peace. The evolution of peace education in the United States since the 1950s is characterized by four developments: (1) disarmament schemes of international law in reaction to the horrors of World War II; (2) the civil rights movement and opposition to the Vietnam War; (3) response to President Reagan's ramping up the arms race in the 1980s; and (4) a holistic form of peace and justice studies marked by efforts on peer mediation, conflict resolution, and environmental awareness. Clearly, in the last fifty years, marked by debate and evolution, peace education—citizen-based and academically sanctioned—has achieved intellectual legitimacy and is worthy of historical analysis.

Recommended Citation:

Ian Harris and Charles F. Howlett, "Educating for Peace and Justice in America's Nuclear Age," *Catalyst: A Social Justice Forum* 1, 1 (2011): 20-51.

Online Access: http://trace.tennessee.edu/catalyst/

Corresponding Author Information:

Charles F. Howlett, chowlett@molloy.edu

Malloy College
Department of Graduate Education

©Catalyst: A Social Justice Forum

University of Tennessee
914 McClung Tower
Knoxville, Tennessee
37996-0490

EDUCATING FOR PEACE AND JUSTICE IN AMERICA'S NUCLEAR AGE

IAN HARRIS AND CHARLES F. HOWLETT

"Nationally the peace education movement is growing — some say surging — because of the continued failure of military solutions in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the belief that alternatives to violence do exist."

- Colman McCarthy[1]

The purpose of this article is to trace the historical development of peace education from the Cold War to the present. The development of peace education and peace studies as we know it today actually began after World War II and its influence and respectability as a serious academic discipline continues to grow. Prior to World War II private citizens both on their own and through international nongovernment organizations (INGOs) like the Women's League for International Peace and Freedom used educational means – speeches, pamphlets, rallies, and books--to educate citizens about the dangers of war.[2] Such efforts on the part of citizen activists have been the predominate mode of peace education. Towards the end of the twentieth century some of these activists and professional educators started to initiate the study of how to achieve peace in schools and colleges.

In response to concerns about war and other forms of violence teachers infused peace themes into their regular classes and developed curricula for elementary students

---

[1] Colman McCarthy, "Teaching Peace: As the Peace Studies Movement Grows Nationally, Why are Educators so Reluctant to Adopt it? *The Nation* (September19, 2011, p. 21).

[2] For an overview of historical perspectives on this issue consult, Charles F. Howlett & Robbie Lieberman, *A History of the American Peace Movement from Colonial Times to the Present* (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2008), pp. 1-2. See also, Charles F. Howlett & Glen Zeitzer, *The American Peace Movement: History and Historiography* (Washington, D.C.: American Historical Association, 1985) *passim* and Charles F. Howlett, "Studying America's Struggle Against War: An Historical Perspective," *The History Teacher* Vol. 36, No. 3 (May 2003):297-330.

that would provide them with peacemaking skills. At the same time, high school teachers were introducing peace concepts into their curricula, e.g. imperialism in World History, conservation in biology, and texts like *Hiroshima* by John Hersey in literature.

On college campuses professors concerned about the Vietnam War developed peace studies courses and programs on college campuses that had an anti-colonial focus. In the 1980s the threat of nuclear war stimulated educators all around the world to use various peace education strategies to warn of impending devastation. In the first decade of the twenty-first century university professors concerned about climate change are using various peace education strategies to teach their students about how to live sustainably on planet earth.

The development of peace education during the post-World War II ideological struggle between capitalism and Communism encountered considerable criticism and skepticism. There were many within and outside the academic community who argued that peace studies had very little to offer in terms of "real scholarship" and were primarily politically motivated. Some went so far as to insist that this new area of study lacked focus and discipline given the complexities associated with war and peace. It also became fashionable to attack those teaching and studying peace issues as anarchists, communists, and pacifists. They were ridiculed as subversives for challenging the hegemony of the U.S. military establishment.[3]

Peace is more than the cessation of war. The interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary nature of this subject incorporates traditional disciplines in the humanities, social sciences, and life sciences. Peace educators aim to educate students about peacemaking and the nonviolent strategies to create a more just world. The subject blends academic objectivity with a moral preference for social justice and global awareness. Teaching peace seeks "to provide alternatives to the status quo in personal and social relations, in the conduct of economic and political affairs, and in the nature and structure of international affairs."[4]

---

[3] A. Stomfay-Stitz, *Peace Education in America: 1828-1990: Sourcebook for Education and Research* (Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, 1993).

[4] Joseph Fahey, "Peace Studies," in *International Encyclopedia of Peace*, edited by Nigel J. Young (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 491-493.

In the last fifty years, characterized by debate and evolution, peace education—citizen-based and academically sanctioned—has achieved intellectual legitimacy. Peace educators have developed a sound pedagogy and methodological approaches to evaluating the effectiveness of peace initiatives.[5] As a discipline it has a close relationship to peace studies.

PEACE EDUCATION AND PEACE STUDIES

Peace education differs from peace studies in that peace educators focus on ways to teach about the threats of violence and the promises of peace, while peace studies, as an academic discipline, provides insights into why the world is so violent and suggests strategies for managing conflict nonviolently. 'Peace studies' implies understanding issues about violence and peace; whereas 'peace education' implies teaching about those issues. Peace educators strive to provide insights into how to transform a culture of violence into a culture of peace and justice. They try to build consensus about what peace strategies work best to remedy problems caused by the use of violence.

There exists a Hegelian relationship between peace education efforts and the types of violence they address, kind of a thesis—antithesis. Peace education efforts respond to concerns about violence in different contexts. For example, a concern about the first U.S. invasion of Iraq in 1991 spawned an organization, MoveOn.org, that rose up out of a virtual reality provided by the Internet to urge people to lobby against U.S. military invasion in Iraq. In the 1980s with widespread fear about the threats posed by nuclear war, many teachers started to search for ways to use their professional training to stop the threat of annihilation posed by the threatened use of nuclear weapons. In the 1990s, there was a spate of school shootings in the United States. A concern about the safety of youth in schools urged members of the Committee for Children, an organization based in Seattle, to develop curricula teachers could use to promote nonviolent communications and conflict resolution strategies. Likewise, concern about environmental devastation lead to an Earth Charter initiative in 1995 that stated: "to promote the global dialogue on common values

[5] Ian Harris and Mary Lee Morrison, *Peace Education 2nd Edition* (Jefferson, NC: MacFarland & Co., 2003)

and to clarify the emerging worldwide consensus regarding principles of environmental protection and sustainable living."[6] The distinguished U.S. peace educator, Betty Reardon, has argued that ecological violence be included in peace education lessons. Peace educators concerned about the destruction caused by armed conflicts should point out how structural violence causes harsh environmental problems for the poor and oppressed.[7]

There exists an interdependent relationship between peace activists, peace researchers, and peace educators. The activists put into play various strategies to promote peace and nonviolence; the researchers evaluate those strategies and propose alternatives; the educators teaching about peaceful strategies help people understand the causes of violence and methods that can be used to reduce violence.

Each peace education effort is embedded in a context, a set of circumstances that give rise to the violence and related strategies used to reduce the violence. Whether an advocacy for peace arises or not depends upon spiritual agency,[8] where various concerns people have about a form of violence motivate them to become peace educators. A sort of zeitgeist in the culture urges people to get involved in reducing the threat of violence.

In tracing the history of peace education efforts in the United States in the last half of the twentieth century, the Cold War provides an example of spiritual agency. Some people who heard about the devastation caused by nuclear weapons, felt frightened by the Cold War rhetoric that threatened a nuclear exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union, and decided to organize workshops, classes, college courses, teach-ins, and protests, etc. to change the stated policies of the US government. Spiritual agency explains the process of blending inner faith with outer intent to become a change agent. It is a reflexive process for finding deep concern that leads to activism, along the lines of the "Arab spring" of 2011. (Teaching about the problems of violence and proposing solutions to those problems in a public forum, be it a newspaper, a village square, a classroom, a church basement, or a labor hall, is a form of activism.) Spiritual beliefs provide motivation for

---

[6] Earth Charter International Secretariat, *The Earth Charter Initiative* (San Jose: Costa Rica, 2000), 22.

[7] B. Reardon & E. Nordland, *Learning Peace: The Promise of Ecological and Cooperative Education.* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1994).

[8] C. Howlett and I. Harris, *Books not Bombs: Teaching Peace since the Dawn of the Republic*. (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Press, 2010), 194-196.

ordinary people that they can create change together by mobilizing inner resources, as well as material resources.

The various peace and social justice organizations that appeared in the last decades of the twentieth century provided a forum for challenging government policies and actions that supported first the war in Vietnam and second the Cold War and third low intensity conflicts in Central America. International nongovernmental organizations, like Amnesty International, known as INGOS, grew phenomenally during the twentieth century from under 200 at the beginning of the century to over 25,000 by the end of the century.[9] They created an infrastructure for citizen based peace education and put pressure or teachers to cover topics that held such urgency.

People found that by practicing peace education they could influence others and gain a sense of accomplishment in a scenario that seemed so helpless. Malcolm Gladwell, a popular public intellectual in the first decade of the twenty-first century, explained how these efforts can impact people's thinking and public policy:

> If you wanted to bring about a change in people's belief and behavior, a change that would persist and serve as an example to others, you needed to create community around them, where those new beliefs could be practiced, and expressed and nurtured.[10]

In the last half of the twentieth century, there were four waves of peace concern spurring different types of peace and justice education.[11] Each one of these periods grew out of a different context and had different strategic goals. The first wave in the 1950s consisted mostly of intellectuals, lawyers and professors who hoped to create through the United Nations and through international law a legal framework to outlaw war. The second wave in the 1960s and 1970s were concerned mostly with the Vietnam War and the low intensity conflicts in Central America. The third wave that began at the end of the last

---

[9] Elise Boulding, *Building a Global Civic Culture: Education for an Interdependent World*. (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988).

[10] M. Gladwell, *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference* (New York: Little Brown & Company, 2002), 173.

[11] Barbara Wein, introduction to *Peace, Justice, and Security Studies: A Curriculum Guide* (Boulder, CO: Lynn Reinner Publishers, Inc., 2009).

millennium focused on the threat of nuclear war. The fourth stage in the 1990s saw tremendous diversification in the field of peace education. Teachers incorporated the techniques of conflict resolution. Professors from a wide variety of disciplines from history to sociology began to do peace research and teach courses that addressed how to overcome problems of violence.[12] This diversification was reflected in coursework made available to college students majoring or minoring in peace studies as well as graduate students interested in developing advanced level peacemaking skills.

FIRST WAVE

The first wave in the 1950s, though short in duration because of its embryonic nature, promoted disarmament and the rule of international law. Interest in international law arose after the Nuremberg Trials, where war criminals from the Third Reich were tried for their crimes against humanity. Included in this surge of interest in the ways of peace were members of the World Federalist Association and supporters of the United Nations who were inspired by the Declaration of Human Rights passed by the General Assembly in 1948.

This declaration became the springboard for applying the concepts of justice and peace to international order. Various statements pertaining to human rights derive from concepts of natural law, a higher set of laws that apply to all people and supersede governmental laws.[13] The study of human rights is thus the study of treaties, global institutions, and domestic and international courts. This approach to peace, known as "peace through justice," rests on the notion that humans have certain inalienable rights that governments should protect. The United Nations condemned all violations of human rights:

> There can be no genuine peace when the most elementary human rights are violated, or while situations of injustice continue to exist; conversely, human rights for all cannot take root and achieve full growth while latent or

[12] See Timothy McElwee, B. Welling Hall, Joseph Liechty, and Julie Garber, *Peace, Justice, and Security Studies: A Curriculum Guide* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2009).

[13] Richard A. Falk, Robert C. Johansen, and Samuel S. Kim, *The Constitutional Foundations of World Peace* (Albany, NY: The State University of New York Press, 1993).

> open conflicts are rife…..Peace is incomplete with malnutrition, extreme poverty and the refusal of rights of people to self determination…..The only lasting peace is a just peace based on respect for human rights. Furthermore a just peace calls for the establishment of an equitable international order, which will preserve future generations from the scourge of war.[14]

People persecuted by their governments for political beliefs can appeal to provisions of international law to gain support for their cause. Abuse of rights and the struggle to eliminate that abuse lie at the heart of many violent conflicts. Human rights institutions champion rights against discrimination based upon gender, religion, disability, and sexual orientation.

The decade of the 1950s was an incipient period for peace research. The field of peace research developed in the 1950s to counteract the science of war that had produced so much mass killing earlier in the twentieth century. An early manifestation of this interest in a "science of peace" was the Pugwash conferences in the village of Pugwash, Nova Scotia, Canada, the birthplace of Cyrus Eaton, who hosted the meeting. The first Pugwash conference was held in 1957. The stimulus for that gathering was a Manifesto issued in 1955 by Bertrand Russell and Albert Einstein and signed by other distinguished academics. The signators called upon scientists of all political persuasions to assemble to discuss the threat posed to civilization by the advent of thermonuclear weapons.[15] These conferences are still held annually and deal with topics like nuclear technology, weapons of mass destruction, and strategies for disarmament.[16]

In 1959 the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) was founded in Norway under the leadership of Bert Roling. Johan Galtung, a Norwegian who has become a leading figure in the field of peace research, was active in PRIO. This organization publishes two academic journals, *Journal of Peace Research* and *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, that have helped develop the field of peace research. In Britain, the Lancaster Peace Research Center, later

---

[14] UNESCO, *Recommendation Adopted by UNESCO General Conference*. (18th session, November 19, 1974), 62.

[15] Howlett & Harris, *Books Not Bombs*, 164.

[16] "Pugwash Conferences," accessed August 30, 2011, http://www.pugwash.org/.

to become the Richardson Institute, was also formed in 1959. That same year Elise and Kenneth Boulding and others helped found the Center for Research on Conflict Resolution at the University of Michigan. This center championed the notion of an interdisciplinary approach to peace.

Kenneth Boulding published a theoretical analysis of conflict resolution entitled *Conflict and Defense*.[17] Basically a work of statistical compilation, Boulding's study was the first of its kind in America to analyze social and international conflicts by means of formal analytical models, derived from a large number of disciplines. These inchoate efforts become the foundling infants of a new academic field, peace studies, that blossomed during the 1960s, an era when the world was focused on the atrocities of the U.S. war in Vietnam.

This center reflected three major beliefs of its founder: humanity is good, the war system is evil, and more powerful knowledge is necessary to transform the system, thus it represented an unusual alliance between humanistic wisdom and social science data. The primary purpose of the Center was to apply quantitative knowledge to social forces in order to build upon the premise that the national state is obsolete and that reliance on research, statistics, and information represents a way out of reliance on military force. In terms of peace education, Boulding's efforts were significant. What he and the center did was give academic credence to peace education as a research discipline worthy of serious examination. A major effort was underway to transform perceptions regarding justifications for increased expenditures for arms in the name of national security. What the Center attempted to explain was that tax dollars for arms meant less money for domestic social development. Thus, the initial thrust in peace education was to utilize social science data in support of economic social reconstruction rather than a military-industrial complex thereby reinforcing mutually assured destruction between the world's two greatest superpowers.

These peace researchers established theories, data, and methodological evaluations of different approaches to peace. Some common themes of early peace research were disarmament, causes of war, conflict theory, international relations, and military

[17] K. Boulding, *Conflict and Defense: A General Theory* (New York: Harper, 1962).

spending.[18] Their logic was that huge investments had been made in developing the science of war. Why not make similar investments in peace research to advance the science of peace?

Kenneth Boulding's wife, Elise Boulding[19] was instrumental in founding the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) in 1964. This organization, divided into twenty different commissions, holds bi-annual conferences that allow researchers from all over the world to share insights in peace. The largest commission, Peace Education (PEC) has allowed scholars from the United States to learn from peers in Argentina, Australia, Austria, India, Israel, Japan, the Philippines, Spain, Turkey, Uganda and many other countries that were making similar forays into peace education. PEC has been instrumental in promoting discussion and evaluation of peace education projects around the world. It produces a *Journal of Peace Education* published by Routledge that first appeared in 2002.

The first wave was a seedbed for nurturing an interest on the part of teachers in the study of peace. Concerns about nuclear testing and the civil rights movement became issues that would be an important part of the nascent field of peace studies. Commenting on the first wave that was an inchoate period for peace studies, Barbara Wein has said:

> Even though a small number of pacifist colleges such as Manchester College (Church of the Brethren) and Quaker schools included perspectives on racial inequality, nonviolence, and social justice, peace studies in the 1950s was in large measure a top-down, Western, white blueprint for world order. Absent were voices from the Global South, feminist scholars or vast nonviolence movements for revolutionary social change.[20]

---

[18] P. Wallenstein, *Peace Research: Achievements and Challenges* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998) pp. 9-22 & passim.

[19] See Mary Lee Morrison, *Elise Boulding: A Life in the Cause of Peace* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co., 2005).

[20] Barbara Wein, introduction to *Peace, Justice, and Security Studies*, 2.

SECOND WAVE

The second wave of peace studies grew out of the civil rights movement and opposition to the U.S. war in Vietnam. This wave during the 1960s and 1970s included and adopted many aspects of the sixties counterculture that permeated popular culture in the United States. It was cool to be for peace in these decades! During this time professors began to offer peace studies courses in response to student's demands for relevance.

Leaders of the civil rights movement were being trained in nonviolence by pacifists inspired by the victory over British rule achieved by Mahatma Gandhi in India. Although African-Americans, in general, focused their energies in the struggle for racial justice and not peace education, in particular, Martin Luther King Jr.'s, philosophy of nonviolence played a seminal role in the crusade for full equality. To this date King's philosophy of nonviolence holds sway in many inner city parishes in violent neighborhoods.[21]

In many respects, the legacy of King's philosophy, as expressed in the civil rights movement, served as an important example of how conflict resolution curricula were implemented after his tragic death in 1968. In the 1970s and 1980s educators began to take stock of the strong nonviolent message provided by King. People were seeing that nonviolence might help with inner city violence, gangs and unruly behavior that plagued urban schools. They began to search for nonviolent solutions to counteract a police state approach to youth violence.[22] King observed that peace within societies is not just the absence of overt violence, which he labeled, as well as other peace and justice activists of his time, "negative peace." What he counseled in his many sermons, writings, and speeches is that peace must involve constant and sustained efforts to build a harmonious community leading to greater social justice, namely "positive peace." Scholars teaching about the civil rights movement brought to their classes a concern about structural violence, the poverty and economic exploitation of minority groups within the dominant culture of the United States.[23]

---

[21] Kristin Bender, "Saying No to Violence," *Contra Costa Times*, (September 19, 2011), 1.

[22] Laura Findley. *Building a Peaceful Society*: *Creative Integration of Peace Education* (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Press, 2011).

[23] Ian Harris, "History of Peace Education," in *Handbook on Peace Education*, edited by Gavriel Salomon and Ed Cairns (New York: Psychology Press, 2010), 11-22.

In the 1960s noted peace educator Betty Reardon worked with Richard Falk of Princeton University at the Institute of World Order.[24] The organization had its roots in the post-World War Two movement of moderate internationalists who hoped to avoid war through legal and social means. Betty Reardon, herself an elementary school teacher, was asked to develop a human rights/ peace education curriculum.[25] Reardon saw that war came not just from political and social institutions but also from a way of thinking that could be transformed by education. The Institute for World Order became the World Policy Institute in 1982 to reflect a shift from primarily an education institute to a strong policy thrust. Reardon went on to become the director of a graduate program in peace education at one the nation's most prestigious schools of education, Teachers College at Columbia University.

By the end of 1970s, several dozen colleges and universities in the United States had peace studies programs. As a response to the Vietnam War, Manhattan College began a peace studies program in 1968, while Colgate University initiated a peace studies program in 1969. At this time, several universities in Sweden established peace research institutes. In 1973, Bradford University in England established its peace studies program focusing on peace and security studies, conflict resolution, and social change. That same year the Lutheran college, Gustavus Adolphus, in St. Paul, Minnesota and the Brethren College, Juniata, in Huntington, Pennsylvania, established minors in peace studies.[26] Many campuses like the University of Wisconsin and Kent State experienced massive antiwar protests some of which led to violence.

Courses about peace, human rights, and global issues began to proliferate on American campuses in the late 1960s. Some of the courses had the following titles: "Approaches to World Order" at Columbia University, "Towards a Just Society" at Tufts University, "Global Issues: Energy, Food and the Arms Race" at Millersville State College, "Conflict and Violence in American Life" at Catholic University, "The Literature of

---

[24] Chuck Howlett and Ian Harris, *Books Not Bombs*, 176-177.

[25] Betty Reardon, *Militarization, Security, and Peace Education: A Guide for Concerned Citizens* (Valley Forge, GA: United Ministries in Education, 1978).

[26] I. Harris and A. Schuster, *Global Directory of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution Programs* (San Francisco: Peace and Justice Studies Association, 2006).

Nonviolence" at Manchester College, "Conflict Resolution: Theory and Techniques" at Earlham College, and "International Development Education" at the University of Connecticut.[27] The professors who taught these courses were pioneers striking out in unchartered waters. Often traditional disciplines did not reward such innovations, so it took courage to become a teacher of peace in the academy.

In addition to formal courses, students on college campuses were staging teach-ins on various campuses to inform people about the latest events, like the bombing of Cambodia in 1970. The first major teach-in was organized by Students for a Democratic Society at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor on March 24-25, 1965. Close to 3,500 people attended the event, which consisted of debates, lectures, movies, and musical events aimed at protesting the war. These teach-ins were spontaneous examples of peace education called for by students skeptical that they were not getting the whole truth on the 6:00 p.m. news. More recently environmental educators have used teach-ins to promote ecological literacy. Such teach-ins try to establish civil discourse about building a culture of peace.

The antiestablishment culture of the nineteen sixties that spread through civic society had its impact upon teachers at the elementary and secondary level. In 1970, science teachers throughout the United States participated in the first Earth Day urging their students to live more sustainably on planet Earth. Teachers were looking for ways to apply the theory and practice of nonviolence to raising children. The hope was that children taught the skills of nonviolent conflict resolution at an early age, might be less violent later in their lives.

An example of this type of peace education can be credited to the efforts of Priscilla Prutzman. She received a grant from the New York Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends in 1972 that enabled her to develop a peace curriculum and to found a center, the Children's Creative Response to Conflict (CCRC) housed at the Fellowship of Reconciliation offices in Nyack, New York. In the early nineteen seventies, she and others helped create environments in schools where young people would choose cooperation,

---

[27] Barabara Wein, *Peace and World Order Studies: A Curriculum Guide* (New York: World Policy Institute, 1984).

open communication, and share feelings to explore creative ways to prevent or solve conflicts. In 1974, that center produced a curriculum, *Friendly Classroom for a Small Planet*, which has been translated into nineteen different languages and is used in all the schools in El Salvador. The name was shortened to Children's Creative Response to Conflict in the 1990s. This organization is international in its scope in that its curriculum is followed in many different parts of the world; it is also regional in that its staff conducts many training sessions in schools in the New York City metropolitan area.

In addition, peace at the grassroots level was exhibited in Miami, Florida when Fran Schmidt and her sister Grace Contrino Abrams published in 1972 a curriculum for secondary students, *Learning Peace: Ain't Gonna Study War No More*.[28] Two years later, these spiritual agents published a second curriculum, *Peace is in Our Hands*, for elementary children. In the 1970s, the Dade County School System's Department of Social Studies asked Fran Schmidt and Grace Abrams to write several more curricula for elementary, middle, and high school students. After Grace Abrams died in 1979, Fran Schmidt with the help of her friends set up the Grace Contrino Abrams Peace Education Foundation in 1980 as a nonprofit organization to promote peace education. She describes peace education

> ...as a process of interaction on all levels of relationships towards a common goal. This process is based on a philosophy that teaches nonviolence, love, compassion, trust, fairness, cooperation, and reverence for the human family and all life on our planet….Peace education is a celebration of life. It is a holistic approach to human interaction. It embraces the physical, emotional, intellectual, ethical and social growth deeply rooted in traditional values.[29]

The Peace Foundation, as it later became known, published a series of kid friendly booklets on the topic of Fighting Fair. In the ten years between 1983 and 1994, the Peace Foundation produced curricula such as "Creative Conflict Solving for Kids" and "Peacemaking Skills for Little Kids", which was translated into Spanish, French, and Creole.

---

[28] Grace Abrams, *Learning Peace, Teaching Peace* (Philadelphia, PA: Jane Addams Peace Association, 1974).

[29] F. Schmidt, "My Journey as a Peace Educator." *Peace Education Miniprints No.100* (Malmo, Sweden: School of Education, 2000), 6.

By the end of the second wave of peace studies teachers in a few elementary and secondary schools were infusing peace and justice themes in their teaching. Peace studies at the college and university came mostly from political science departments, specifically from faculty in international relations concerned about an international order that fostered war. The subject matter dealt with imperialistic exploitation, alliances to provide security and the role of treaties and international institutions like the World Court, in reducing the risk of war.

THIRD WAVE

The third wave of peace studies came in 1980 with the election of Ronald Reagan as president of the United States. This expansive wave lasted until the end of the twentieth century and was marked by the institutionalization of peace studies courses and programs on college campuses. This wave started in response to President Reagan's ramping up the arms race in the Cold War and ended with highly publicized school shootings.

This section will describe the growth within this era on college campuses of peace studies programs in response to the nuclear threat. Schoolteachers and concerned citizens formed many diverse community based organizations to engage the public in efforts to challenge expensive government policies engaged in Star Wars competitions with the Soviet Union. It will briefly describe how seven of these organizations in diverse parts of the United States developed curricula and lobbied to get a variation of peace education, conflict resolution education, established in schools. Finally, this discussion of the third wave of peace education will close with a discussion of peacemaking reforms adopted in schools to address problems of school violence.

PEACE EDUCATION FOR A NUCLEAR FREEZE

When Ronald Reagan stated that the U.S. could win a nuclear war, people in northern industrial countries demonstrated against the production of nuclear weapons and nuclear power. International teams of scientists showed that a nuclear war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union could produce a "nuclear winter." The smoke from vast fires started by bombs dropped on cities and industrial areas would envelop the planet and

absorb so much sunlight that the earth's surface could get cold, dark and dry, killing plants worldwide and eliminating food supplies. This became more apparent after Robert McNamara, the Secretary of Defense in the early 1960s, put forth the doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD) as the deterrence policy of the United States. In a nuclear war scenario, each superpower continued to build up its first strike capabilities to make sure that the other could not retaliate with a second strike. Local peace organizations organizing against this MADness allowed citizens to share their fears and to take action to address the source of their fears.

In the 1980s, this threat of nuclear war stimulated educators all around the world to warn of impending devastation. Three books were produced by peace educators in the United States that effectively and compellingly highlight an era acutely concerned about the threat of nuclear annihilation: *Building a Global Civic Order* by Elise Boulding, *Comprehensive Peace Education* by Betty Reardon, and *Peace Education* by Ian Harris.[30] At the same time, massive antinuclear demonstrations in the 1980s led to a rapid growth in peace studies programs on college campuses (in June 1982 over 800,000 people demonstrated in New York). In 1986, there were over 100 peace studies programs in the United States and thousands of courses on the nuclear threat on college campuses and high school classrooms:

> Broader support from the mainstream—religious leaders, lawyers, and other professionals—meant that the response to peace education on campuses met with much less resistance than had the teach-ins of the Vietnam War. Momentum grew in 1982, when 400 social scientists gathered at New York City to discuss "The Role of the Academy in Addressing the Threat of Nuclear War" with high-level sponsorship from the Rockefeller Foundation and other establishment organizations.[31]

---

[30] Interestingly, all three works were published in the same year, a reflection of the growing concern in the wake of the renewed arms race during the Reagan years. Elise Boulding, *Building Global Civic Culture* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988); Betty Reardon, *Comprehensive Peace Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988); and Ian Harris, *Peace Education* (Jefferson, NC: MacFarland & Co., 1988).

[31] Wein, *Peace, Justice and Security*, 4.

After wide scale protests for a nuclear freeze to stop the cold war throughout the developed world, professors in different departments as divergent as philosophy, communications, and psychology became peace educators to provide students insight into the multifarious forms of violence and peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peace-building strategies to address those forms of violence.

GRASSROOTS RESPONSES TO VIOLENT EVENTS

During the 1980's many U.S. citizens became spiritual agents on many different fronts, including a solidarity movement against the US aid in suppressing peasant movements in Central America named Pledge of Resistance and the nuclear freeze movement, that mobilized against the wholesale destruction of life. Most movement organizations take the form of voluntary associations in which citizen actors engage in peace activities as volunteers. Some of these organizations like SANE/FREEZE: Campaign for Global Security founded in 1957 as the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy had paid staff carry out the work of the organization. In 1987 SANE/FREEZE had over 240 local groups, 24 state organizations, and 170,000 national members. It is now known as Peace Action and conducts education for the public about the three wars in which the United States is currently engaged.[32]

Consequently, during the 1980s a wide variety of conflict resolution programs appeared. These ranged from neighborhood centers to resolve marital conflicts, to public hearings for environmental disputes, to university based training and research programs, to peer mediation programs in primary and secondary schools, and to the development of national and international organizations promoting conflict resolution. Equally significant, in the late 1970s neighborhood justice centers established by the Jimmy Carter

---

[32] M. S. Katz, "SANE: National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy," in *Protest, Power and Change: An Encyclopedia of Nonviolent Action from ACT-UP to Women's Suffrage*, eds. R.S. Powers and W. Vogele (New York: Garland Publishing, 1997), p. 460. See also, Michael Bess, *Realism, Utopia, and the Mushroom Cloud: Four Activist Intellectuals and the Strategies for Peace, 1945-1989* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993); Robert Kleidman, *Organizing for Peace: Neutrality, the Test Ban and the Freeze* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1993); John Lofland, *Polite Protestors: the Peace Movement of the 1980's* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1993); Sam Marullo & John Lofland, eds. *Peace Action in the Eighties: Social Science Perspectives* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990); and Robert D. Holsworth, *Let Your Life Speak: A Study of Politics, Religion, and Antinuclear Weapons Activism* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989).

administration had previously become involved with school systems, offering new strategies for managing conflicts within schools. Community Boards in San Francisco led this effort to help students deal with school violence and neighborhood conflicts.

Community Boards has been a leader in an important aspect of peace education, the training of mediators and conflict resolution experts. In 1982, Community Boards introduced its Conflict Manager Program, one of the oldest peer mediation in the United States. It maintains an active pool of more than one-hundred and fifty volunteer community mediators drawn from a pool of over four hundred long-term mediators, serving two thousand San Francisco residents, nonprofits and businesses a year it offers dispute resolution services in English, Spanish and Cantonese.[33] Community Boards is credited with bringing peer mediation to schools.

Peer mediation is one peacemaking tool that teachers have been using to establish norms for how conflict in a school can be resolved nonviolently. Peer mediators attempt to get young people to resolve their conflicts without using force or relying upon adults to impose order. Peer mediation allows youth involved in a conflict to work out a solution that is agreeable to the parties in conflict. It depends upon a third party, one or more peer mediators, to sit down with the aggrieved parties, to get them to state their grievances, and to search for an agreeable solution to the conflict. The role of the mediator is to keep the conversation going between the parties who have the conflict. Thus, the mediator attempts to identify positions and interests, to get the parties to listen to each other, to brainstorm possible solutions to the problem, to eliminate solutions that are unacceptable, to choose a solution that meets the interests of everybody involved, to make a plan of action to resolve the conflict, and, finally, to get the conflicting parties to agree to that plan.

In a culture where so many youth learn dysfunctional violent ways to solve conflicts, peer mediation empowers young people to resolve their conflicts nonviolently. In most schools, select children are trained to be mediators. However, as Linda Lantieri and Janet Patti point out in *Waging Peace in our Schools*, the process works best when all people in

[33] Community Boards, accessed February 15, 2010, http://www.communityboards.org/.

the school, adults and children, are trained in peer mediation.[34] Mediation programs in schools around the United States have been shown to resolve conflicts between parties that may not be overtly violent. Approximately 10% of the 86,000 K-12 schools throughout the country have such programs.[35] Research studies show that in schools where peer mediation is administered correctly, fights and suspensions are lowered because mediation provides a means for lowering aggressive behavior.[36] These programs are popular with teachers. Less aggressive behavior can improve the learning climate in school.

During the third wave of peace studies elementary and secondary teachers became interested in the field of conflict resolution. Peacemaking depends upon interpersonal communications. Although it was not called peace education at that time, various advances were being made in the philosophy and practice of conflict resolution in schools by Morton Deutsch, a professor at Teachers College, Columbia University.[37] In the 1950s, he studied the difference between a cooperative classroom where pupils were learning from each other and a competitive classroom where they competed for grades. He found that in the cooperative learning context students took responsibility for mutual problems and worked together to resolve them. Ashley Montague has extolled the value to human communities of cooperation:

> It must never be forgotten that society is fundamentally, essentially, and in all ways a cooperative enterprise, an enterprise designed to keep men in touch with one another. Without the cooperation of its members, society cannot survive, and the society of man has survived because the

[34] Linda Lantieri and Janet Patti, *Waging Peace in Our Schools* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996), 27-42.

[35] V. S. Sandy, S. Bailey, and V. Sloane-Akwara, "Impact on Students: Conflict Resolution - Education's Proven Benefits for Students." in *Does It Work? The Case for Conflict Resolution Education in Our Nation's Schools*, edited by T. S. Jones & D. Kmita (Washington, DC: CREnet, 2000), pp. 12-18.

[36] N. Burrell, C. Zirbel, and M. Allen, "Evaluating peer mediation outcomes in educational settings: A meta-analytic review," *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* vol. 21, number 1 (2003): 7-27.

[37] Peter Coleman and Morton Deutsch, "Introducing Cooperation and Conflict Resolution into Schools." in *Peace Conflict and Violence: Peace Psychology for the 21st. Century*, edited by Daniel Christie, Richard Wagner, and Deborah Winter (Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 2001), 223-239.

> cooperativeness of its members made survival possible—it was not an advantageous individual here and there who did so, but the group.[38]

Cooperative learning situations, based on positive interdependence among group members, teach individuals to care for other group members and provides them with valuable communication skills that can foster good working relationships throughout their lives. Deutsch's work has been carried forward by two of his students, Roger and David Johnson, professors at the University of Minnesota, who have established a cooperative learning center in Edina, MN, that produces and maintains resources for teaching peacemaking techniques. They also have developed training programs at the University of Minnesota, in school districts and colleges, and in summer institutes.[39] Among their other contributions to the field of peace education, the Johnson brothers ran a program, "Teaching students to be Peacemakers," where students who serve as peer mediators learn the basic skills of conflict resolution. Evaluations showed that the program created a peaceful school culture and resulted in improved academic achievement.[40]

This shift of interest in the focus of peace education away from international threats of violence towards interpersonal violence is reflected in the work of Educators for Social Responsibility (ESR), a non-profit organization founded in 1982 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. It developed chapters around the country, trained teachers, and held workshops on various ways to teach young people about the nuclear threat. It has developed community action/education projects to end the arms race, to foster mutual respect among people with diverse opinions and different cultural backgrounds, and to prepare students to be participating citizens in a democracy. In the 1980s, it started to think of itself as a peace education organization but the ESR board found out to its surprise that funding agencies, foundations and local school boards, would not fund peace education.

---

[38] Ashley Montague quoted in David W. Johnson and Roger T. Johnson, *Learning Together and Alone* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1975), 24.

[39] "Cooperative Learning Center at the University of Minnesota," accessed February 23, 2010, http://www.co-operation.org/.

[40] D. W. Johnson and R. T. Johnson, *Teaching Students to be Peacemakers* (Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company, 1991).

Potential funders thought peace education was a holdover from the nineteen sixties and associated it with radical causes. ESR, realizing that its future depended upon a clever marketing campaign, originally did trainings and workshops on what it called "anti-nuclear" education not "peace education." It used a different name to market their materials but the content was similar to what other peace educators were doing around the country. It promoted itself as an organization that could help teachers with cultural and interpersonal conflicts—curricula on racism, multiculturalism, and peaceable schools. Staff at ESR offers K-12 violence prevention, social and emotional learning, diversity education, character education, and conflict resolution programming to teachers in schools. It works on violence prevention with elementary and secondary educators, early childhood educators and with staff in after school programs.

One of ESR's most important chapters was in New York City. That chapter developed a Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP) that has helped tens of thousands of young people learn better ways to deal with conflict and cultural differences. It teaches children and adults skills in conflict resolution and intercultural understanding, critical thinking, and social awareness. Two people closely associated with the work of RCCP have said the following about how this program addresses youth violence:

> Schools have an essential role to play in preventing this senseless violence and mean spiritedness that is robbing young people of their childhood. Schools must take the responsibility to educate the heart along with the mind. To participate as citizens in today's pluralistic world, to really embrace the notion of world peace, young people need to learn about the diversity of its peoples and cultures—and they need to develop their thinking about how to approach conflict, handle emotions, and solve problems.[41]

Another of the leading organizations in the United States that promoted teaching children about peace was the Committee for Children in Seattle, WA. This program originated from research conducted by cultural anthropologist Dr. Jennifer James to

[41] J. Patti and L. Lantieri, "Peace Education: Youth." in *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace & Conflict*, edited by L. Kurtz (San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1999), 705-718.

identify the risk factors in the lives of children who turn to prostitution. Dr. James's research established that early sexual abuse was linked strongly to later prostitution. As a response, Dr. James founded Judicial Advocates for Women to promote child sexual abuse prevention. In 1981, the group produced the *Talking about Touching* program, a personal safety and sexual abuse prevention curriculum that is still in use today.[42]

The name "Committee for Children" was adopted in 1986, the same year the *Second Step* curriculum was published. The *Second Step* program expanded on concepts explored in the *Talking About Touching* program by going beyond the explanation and identification of abuse. *Second Step* provides easy to use resource materials to teachers so that they can teach their pupils about emotional intelligence. The name "Second Step" comes from a two-part process observed by those working at Committee for Children. The first step was the sexual abuse prevention curriculum, *Talking About Touching*. The Second Step involved the creation of a program that stressed development of empathy, impulse control, problem solving, and anger management to help children avoid violent behavior. This grass roots nonprofit organization has grown into a peace organization with international scope, reaching with their curricula over nine million children in twenty-six countries and 25,000 schools.

This interest in teaching peace to young children developed a new advocacy, violence prevention. Deborah Prothrow-Stith, who was a professor at Harvard's School of Public Health, developed an anger management curriculum, *Violence Prevention Curriculum for Adolescents*[43] and wrote a book, *Deadly Consequences*[44] that discussed the consequences of youth violence and provided steps that could be taken to reduce youth violence. Subsequently, a variety of school-based programs emerged to teach young people constructive ways of managing their anger. Studies have confirmed that when young

[42] "Committee for Children," accessed February 17, 2010, http://www.cfchildren.org/about/history/.

[43] Deborah Prothrow-Stith, *Violence Prevention: Curriculum for Adolescents* (Newton, MA: Education Development Center, 1987).

[44] Prothrow-Stith, *Deadly Consequences*. (New York: HarperCollins, 1991).

people are taught prosocial skills at an early age that they are less likely to commit violent crimes as adults.[45]

Sadly, despite such noble efforts, the 1990s saw a frightening rise in child-on-child violence, most notably school shootings at places like Heath High School in Paducah, Kentucky (1997), Westside Middle School in Jonesboro, Arkansas (1998), and Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado (1999). These horrifying incidents where one student fired into classrooms at his own school and killed classmates drew attention to school safety and bullying in the United States. Studies revealed that the consequences of bullying were wide-ranging, including psychological harm to bystanders and declines in academic achievement.[46] In response, the Committee for Children developed a third program, the *Steps to Respect* curriculum, designed to reduce bullying. The organization recognized that rather than asking students to shoulder the burden of bullying prevention, all members of a school community should work together to create a safe and respectful school environment.

Another educational initiative working on violence prevention was Alternatives to Violence Program (AVP). This Quaker inspired initiative was developed in upstate New York. This community-building experience that began in prison settings, engages "inside" trainers (inmates who have been trained in AVP) and "outside" trainers (volunteers from the community who have been trained), to address, in a 15 hour format for each workshop, the root causes of violence, oppression and injustice, seeking to transform oppressive structures, beginning with each individual's experience with violence. AVP was begun several decades ago, and has proved successful, both for inmates and volunteer trainers and participants. AVP is now used internationally in peacebuilding efforts, including workshops in Bolivia, Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Uganda, and Colombia.

Help Increase the Peace Project (HIPP) is the youth version of AVP. Conceived in Syracuse, New York and modeled after AVP, the format of the workshops is essentially

---

[45] R. Hammond and B. Yung, "Preventing Violence in At-Risk African-American Youth." *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved.* Vol. 2, (1990): 359-373.

[46] R. Matthew Gladden, "Reducing School Violence: Strengthening Student Programs and Addressing the Role of School Organizations," in *Review of Research in Education,* edited by W. G. Secada (Washington, D.C. American Educational Research Association, 2002): 263-299.

identical, although some activities used are different, based on HIPP's serving a younger population. HIPP is used in schools and in community settings, mostly in the U.S., but there is growing international interest in HIPP[47]. Since it began in 1991, it has expanded to nineteen states. Based in Baltimore, Maryland, staff at this regional organization teach young people and adults nonviolent communication skills. It confronts prejudice and teaches positive social change skills. The training introduces alternatives to violence and bullying and allows participants to practice various options by modeling and role-playing. Exercises include self-affirmation and discovery of how insensitivity can magnify problems. Dialogue, a key component of the principles of peace education, is an integral part of the experiential nature of HIPP. Its workshops emphasize concepts of peacebuilding, including the explicit values of compassion, justice, equity, gender-fairness, and hope.

The community based organizations described here have survived for over twenty years. They have allowed ordinary citizens to work for their deep seated dreams of living in a peaceful world. They represent the tip of the iceberg. Numerous other peace education organizations have folded since the Vietnam era and the highlight of anti-nuclear organizing in the nineteen eighties. But perhaps more importantly, many peace educators who act as spiritual agents promulgating peace education act independently. Most cities in the United States have peace educators, most of whom are women, who do trainings and in-services for teachers on various aspects of peace education—anti-racist education, multicultural education, conflict resolution education, and anti-bullying education.

The United States has a decentralized educational system with the authority for education lying with each of fifty states that delegate the task to local school boards. (The King of Norway in his 2007 state of the union speech endorsed the work of the Committee for Children. Subsequently, the Second Step curriculum was used in Norwegian schools.) Without any centralized education authority in the United States, there exists a grass roots approach to teaching the concepts of peace education in public and private schools. The CBOs highlighted in this essay have had to repackage their products to keep drawing in teachers as different issues of violence come to the forefront. They do this by providing

[47] Mary Lee Morrison, Carol Shaw Austad, and Kate Cota, "Help Increase the Peace, a Youth focused Program in Peace Education," *Journal of Peace Education*. Vol. 8. No 2 (2011): 177-192.

curricula that provide insights into the violent challenges teachers face in their attempts to educate the nation's youth. These spiritual agents have to produce products that teachers want.

PEACE EDUCATION RESPONSES TO SCHOOL VIOLENCE

Increased interest in peace education at the elementary and secondary levels in the last decade of the twentieth century can be traced to increases in school violence. In addition to school shootings, the United States Department of Education indicated that in 2001 two million students aged 12-18 have been the victim of a crime in school. Most of these (62%) have been thefts. During the 2001-2002 school year, there were 32 school associated violent deaths, of which 24 were homicides and eight were suicides.[48] Six percent of students in the United States have threatened the use of a gun. Three percent of sixth through 12th graders, approximately 800,000, carried a gun to school in the last year.[49] In 1998, more than 250,000 students experienced such serious crimes as rape, sexual assault, or aggravated assault. In that same year, 31 of every 1000 teachers were victims of violent crimes.[50]

These statistics indicate the more serious violent crimes reported to the United States Department of Justice. Other forms of violence in school include bullying that affects over five million elementary and junior high students a year and has played a role in most school shootings.[51] In a recent national study 81% of students reported being sexually harassed by a peer.[52] These more subtle forms of violence create a hostile climate in schools that has a severe impact upon students' participation in school activities. On any

---

[48] Joseph Sheley, "Controlling Violence: What Schools Are Doing," in *Preventing School Violence: Plenary Papers on the 1999 Conference on Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation—Enhancing Policy and Practice through Research,* Vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Office of Justice Programs, 2002).

[49] National Center for Educational Statistics, *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2003*. (Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, 2003).

[50] K. Miller, "Effectiveness of School-Based Violence Prevention Programs" *American Family Physician*, 67(1) (2003): 161.

[51] J. Burlach and J. Penland, "Bullying Behavior: What is the Potential for Violence at Your School?," *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 30(2) (2003).

[52] S. Fineran, "Sexual Harassment Between Same-Sex Peers: Intersection of Mental Health, Homophobia, and Sexual Violence in Schools," *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 30(2) (2002).

given day one of twelve students who stays home does so because of fear.[53] As alarming as these statistics are, it should be noted that schools are relatively safe places for youth. More young people are injured or attacked at home or in the streets than in school.

To address these threats, especially since the 1990s, school personnel have adopted a wide variety of measures, strategies delineated in the three categories—peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peacebuilding. Peacekeeping involves getting tough with kids. Peacekeeping approaches to school violence reflect national defense policies based upon peace through strength. Schools escalate punishment to deter young people from engaging in risky behaviors—assaults, drug abuse, alcohol consumption, gang membership, and promiscuous sexual activity. Getting tough with kids has increased suspensions, added security aids and/or police to patrol the corridors of urban schools, and relies upon technological strategies—metal detectors, X-ray machines to screen book bags, identity cards, surveillance cameras, magnetic door locks, lighting policies, closed circuit television, personal security systems, and telephones in classrooms.[54] Educators employ such peacekeeping efforts to try to protect students from the violent behavior of a few "deviant students." Estimates are that approximately 40 percent of student discipline referrals are given to 5 percent of students.[55] This is the hard approach to school violence. Schools with tough peacekeeping approaches to violent behavior resemble prisons.

Peacemaking and peacebuilding are softer approaches. Conflict resolution falls into the peacemaking categories of responses to school. Conflict resolution educators try to resolve conflicts in school and do not necessarily probe into out of school sources of conflict. Instead of attempting to redress structural sources of school violence, conflict resolution educators focus on youth behavior in their attempts to make schools safe. By paying attention only to students as the source of violence, schools neglect how the school environment inhibits or exacerbates the chance of violence and leads to "blaming the victim." Minority youth disproportionately suffer from these policies. They are

---

[53] National Center for Education Statistics, *Violence and Discipline in US Public Schools: 1996-97* (Washington, DC: US Department of Education, 1998).

[54] D. Firestone, "After Shootings, Nation's Schools Add to Security," *New York Times*, August 13, 1999.

[55] G. Sprague Sugai, R. Horner, and H. Walker, "Preventing School Violence: The Use of Office Discipline Referrals to Assess and Monitor School-Wide Discipline Interventions. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders* Vol. 8 (2000): 94-101.

represented in greater rates of suspension and expulsions.[56] Advocates of peacekeeping policies in schools see "deviant" youth as the source of the problem and seek to redress problems of school violence by changing the behavior and attitudes of the most vulnerable sector of the population.

Peace educators use peacebuilding strategies to respond to school violence. They try to figure out why conflicts erupt. They see students as victims in a racist world that glamorizes violent behavior in popular culture. Peace educators take a broader look at a conflict that may exist between two. They realize that there are structural factors, like poverty, that cause young people to be anxious and angry. Thus, a peace educator in a school when confronted with an angry student may try to figure out what happened at that young person's home that night, what may have provoked the anger and hence try to stop the fire before it breaks out. In contrast, a conflict mediator would address the situation by figuratively applying a fire extinguisher to a conflict, trying to put out the fire without probing into its outside of school origins or inside of school origins if systemic inequities are part of the problem. In addition to promoting peacemaking techniques, peace educators teach about nonviolence and various alternatives to violent behavior.

FOURTH WAVE

Unfortunately the 21st century began with a bang in the attack on the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon in Washington, DC on September 19, 2001. Peace educators have written curricula to promote a less aggressive response to these acts of aggression than the path chosen by the United Sates government (waging war for ten years in Afghanistan and seven years in Iraq at this time of writing).[57] Federal Legislation (No Child Left Behind) has put enormous pressure on teachers to teach basic subjects so that their pupils pass standardized tests and they can keep their jobs. Such accountability pressures have made it hard to introduce new subject matter that would allow pupils to

---

[56] A. C. McFadden, G. E. Marsh, B. J. Price, and Y. Hwang, "A Study of Race and Gender Bias in the Punishment of Handicapped School Children," *Urban Review,* Vol. 24 (1992): 239-251; J. A. Browne, D. J. Losen, and J. Wald, "Zero Tolerance: Unfair with Little Recourse," in Z*ero Tolerance: Can Suspension and Expulsion Keep School Safe? New Directions for Youth Development,* Vol. 92 (2001): 73-99.

[57] Edith King, *Meeting the Challenge of Teaching in an Age of Terrorism* (Denver, CO: Thomson Publishing, 2004).

speculate about their preferred future and appreciate the power of nonviolence. Peace education should be given a primary place in the secondary curricula but it is not. School administrators prefer to offer advanced placements courses so that their students make become part of the chosen few rather than provide them with a serious understanding of the complications of peace. However, peacemaking strategies have gained acceptability and are being widely used in elementary schools at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

An example is provided by a most recent reform. Teachers have been bringing into classrooms a variation of peace education known as "forgiveness education" to help relieve enmity that exists in the psyche as a result of various violations experienced by young people growing up in violent cultures.[58] This reform allows peace educators to help heal wounds that create rage in the psyches of their students and has the potential to improve poor academic performance of students who have been traumatized by personal and structural violence.

At this time it is possible that a young person would be introduced to peacemaking through a nonviolent communications exercise done in the first years of schooling. That young person could learn more about peacemaking by participating in a peer mediation program at school. S/he could study various peace topics infused into the high school curriculum and go on to college to major in peace studies. There are even graduate programs in peace studies, so that such a person could become a professor of peace.[59]

On college campuses the fourth wave of peace studies appeared with the new millennium. This wave further diversified peace studies from a field dominated by political scientists to a multidisciplinary field. The path to peace was no longer seen simply as having the correct international institutions, but rather was seen as having a complex series of peace strategies that would help an individual become aware of factors that cause social oppression and keep members of that society from reaching their full potential. This modern (or should we say 'postmodern') version of peace studies includes peer mediation,

---

[58] E. Gassin, R. Enright, and J. Knutson, Bringing Peace to the Central City: Forgiveness Education in Milwaukee. *Theory Into Practice*, (2005) 44, 303-318.

[59] Here, being a 'professor of peace' has two meanings. 1) one who speaks positively about peace and hence promotes peace; 2) having a paid position as a professor of peace studies.

multicultural education, conflict resolution, and environmental studies. As Colman McCarthy has pointed out, there are many different problems caused by violence:

> military violence, economic violence, environmental violence, corporate violence, racial violence, structural violence, street violence, religious violence, legal or illegal violence, video game violence, (and) violence towards animals. [60]

This is a rich subject for young people to study.

The Consortium for Peace Research, Education, and Development (COPRED) in 2000 published the sixth edition of the *Global Directory of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution Programs*[61] that chronicled the growth of peace studies up to that point. Three hundred eighty one colleges and universities in 31 countries had some kind of peace studies program. It indicated that 46% of the 230 peace studies programs in the United States are in church related schools; 32% in large public universities; 21% in non-church related private schools; 1% in community colleges; 76% undergraduate; 14% graduate; 10% both.[62] Most of these programs are interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary. They strive to offer students a combination of theoretical courses and practical, "hands-on" skills, and a fieldwork course where they can put some of what they are learning into practice.

The academic peace education community was once again studying carefully the work of the peace activists striving to build a culture of peace to avert violent catastrophes like what happened in Rwanda in 1992. In secondary schools, teachers were trying to build peaceable school cultures, while diplomats at the United Nations were trying to figure out how to respond to crises in a peacebuilding way that would see conflict as a source for positive change. Diplomats and citizen peace promoters know that cooperation can resolve differences and transform power relationships, whether in a families or neighborhoods. Studies of nonviolent revolutions in places like Egypt, the Philippines, Serbia, or South Africa highlight the power of peace paradigms.

---

[60] Colman McCarthy, "Teaching Peace," *The Nation*, September1, 2011, accessed September 9, 2011, http://www.agenceglobal.com/article.asp?id=2630.

[61] Daniel O'Leary, *Global Directory of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution Programs* (Fairfax, VA: Consortium on Peace, Research, Education and Development, 2000).

[62] O'Leary, *Global Directory of Peace Studies*, 10-14.

The military commands in Iraq and Afghanistan are learning that nonviolent methods, like building schools or development projects, are more effective in persuading an adversary to change perceptions than a tactical military strategy that kills innocent victims. Such peace through strength tactics create a blowback effect based upon resentment that prolongs hatreds that degenerate for many centuries as has happened in the Balkan states. Likewise, after a particularly bloody coup truth and reconciliation commissions have helped build new societies, like what happened in Argentina (1984) and Chile (1991). Violent responses can be more costly and harmful to the parties than nonviolent approaches. Has the American invasion of Iraq really helped the Iraqi people? It has bankrupted the citizens of the United States. Lessons about the power of peace are there to be learned but are continually ignored in an American culture that worships the power of the gun.

In the fourth wave, faculty members from communications, history, philosophy, psychology, religion, and sociology are seeking new ways to study and teach about peace. They look to their professional associations for support in their peace education endeavors. In the twenty first century many professional academic bodies established special interest groups related to peace awareness.[63] The American Sociology Association (ASA) created a section, Peace War and Social Conflict. The American Educational Research Association (AERA) created a Peace Education Special Interest Group. The American Historical Association created the Peace History Society. The American Philosophical Association (APA) created the Concerned Philosophers for Peace (CPP), the American Psychology Association (APA) created Division 48 the Division of Peace Psychology, and the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) created a Peace Education Special Interest Group (SIG). These professional associations produce journals that publish research studies conducted by members, distribute newsletters that keep their members abreast of the latest developments in their fields, maintain listservs so their members can communicate with each other and hold special sessions at national conferences where members can network to support peace education.

[63] For a more complete description of these professional associations and their activities see: Harris & Howlett, 2010: 216-221.

While over *two hundred* colleges and universities in the United States have peace studies programs,[64] only a few teacher-preparation institutions, namely Teachers College at Columbia University and the School of Education at the University of Cincinnati, provide comprehensive peace education. The vast majority of teacher-training programs are so full of requirements meant to prepare teachers to teach in their subject area that there is little room for innovative courses that prepare prospective teachers to respond positively to the challenges of violent behavior exhibited by their students. Peace education is seen as "soft" and is not embraced by frightened citizens who fear imaginary or real enemies.

CONCLUSION

As this paper has demonstrated in the past fifty years there has been a steady growth of interest in the field of peace education at all levels of schooling and in community groups dealing with problems of violence. In the second decade of the 21st century, the greatest challenge that peace educators face as we move forward has to do with demonstrating that peacebuilding approaches to conflict work better than peace-through-strength approaches to conflict. The American public through television, news reports, and entertainment is constantly bombarded with messages how peace through strength approaches are the correct way to deal with problems: Get tough with the bad guys. We have a problem with illicit drugs. The solution is seen as waging a war on drugs. We have a problem with crime. Let's get tough with the criminals, hire more police and build more jails. A peacebuilding approach to the problem of crime would argue that unarmed neighborhood block watches work better than armed police. Rather than building jails we should spend that money to provide jobs to rectify the structural violence in society that condemns so many people to poverty where they have to steal in order to survive. Peace educators may point out potential solutions, but activists need to learn how to put pressure on decision makers in order to realize the full potential of nonviolent responses to conflicts.

This description of the origins peace education/peace studies in the United States has shown an evolution from a concern about war to a more holistic view of the problems

[64] I. Harris and A. Schuster, *Global Directory of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution Programs* (San Francisco: Peace and Justice Studies Association, 2006).

of violence that includes racism, structural violence, psychological violence, interpersonal violence, and cultural violence. Grass roots peace education initiatives grew out of the actions of spiritual agents motivated by times of intense concern about violence—massive protests against the Vietnam War and the Cold War with its rhetoric of nuclear annihilation. These people's movements have stimulated millions of U.S. inhabitants to express their desires for peace and think of creative ways to educate others about the promises of peace.

The beauty of peace education is that people can find out that they are not hopeless and can make a difference by speaking out, practicing, and supporting peace education—all activities that can help them feel they contribute to reducing high levels of violence, whether it be nuclear power, street crime, or wars. Hopefully, after studying peace individuals will become as well versed in peace strategies as they are in knowledge about wars and violence. Students can now study peace. The key question that future generations will have to ask is: Will we become more peaceful as a result? Will hostile activities and attitudes towards others become more respectful? Will those who have learned the ways of peace join some of the grassroots organizations described here to work for peace? Will they support politics and parties that support peace? Will the world become more peaceful?