DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 195 SO 021 830

AUTHOR Bjerstedt, Ake
TITLE Education for Peace as Liberation vs. Indoctrination: Do We, in Fact, Need Some "Unbalanced Teaching" To Achieve a "Balanced Learning?" An interview with Hilary Lipkin and Richard Yarwood. Reprints and Miniprints No. 693.
INSTITUTION Lund Univ. (Sweden). Malmo School of Education.
REPORT NO ISSN-1100-3391
PUB DATE Mar 90
NOTE 31p.; Sponsored by "Preparedness for Peace" project.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Development; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Environmental Education; *Ethical Instruction; Foreign Countries; *Global Approach; Higher Education; Moral Values; *Peace; Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Peace Education; *United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

As part of Sweden's Malmo School of Education's "Preparedness for Peace" project, this paper presents interviews with Hilary Lipkin and Richard Yarwood. Lipkin has served as national coordinator for "Teachers for Peace" and Yarwood ran the Peace Education Project at the Peace Pledge Union in London (England). Both of the interviewees discuss their interpretations of the term "peace education", and such related terms as "disarmament education" and "education for peace." They discuss differences between peace education for older and younger children and examine how schools can contribute to peace education. The document also includes notes about Richard Yarwood and lists some of his publications. (SG)

reprints and miniprints
from
Department of Educational and Psychological Research
Malmö School of Education - University of Lund
No. 693

EDUCATION FOR PEACE AS LIBERATION VS. INDOCTRINATION

Do we, in fact, need some "unbalanced teaching" to achieve a "balanced learning"?

Hilary Lipkin
Richard Yarwood
and
The Project "Preparedness for Peace"

March 1990

EDUCATION FOR PEACE AS LIBERATION VS. INDOCTRINATION: DO WE, IN FACT, NEED SOME "UNBALANCED TEACHING" TO ACHIEVE A "BALANCED LEARNING"?

Hilary Lipkin
Richard Yarwood
and
The Project "Preparedness for Peace"

Lipkin, H., Yarwood, R. & The Project "Preparedness for Peace". Education for peace as liberation vs. indoctrination: Do we, in fact, need some "unbalanced teaching" to achieve a "balanced learning"? Reprints and Miniprints (Malmö, Sweden: School of Education), No. 693, 1990.

The project "Preparedness for Peace" at the Malmö School of Education studies ways of helping children and young people to deal constructively with questions of peace and war. As part of this work, experts with special interest and competence in areas related to peace education are interviewed.

This publication presents such interviews with two Londoners who have had a long-time involvement in peace education: Hilary Lipkin (who has worked as national coordinator for "Teachers for Peace") and Richard Yarwood (who ran the Peace Education Project at the Peace Pledge Union in London). - Interviewer: Åke Bjerstedt.

Keywords: Aims of education, curriculum development, environmental education, global approach, history, non-violence, nuclear war, peace education, teacher education, the United Kingdom, values.

PEACE EDUCATION IN SCHOOL: A CONVERSATION WITH HILARY LIPKIN, TEACHERS FOR PEACE, LONDON

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

HL: I am a primary school teacher, and I have been very interested in teaching about ecology. Because of this I am concerned about the proliferation of nuclear weapons. I would like to see total nuclear disarmament. The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament has this aim. Because of the concern, the CND received lots of enquiries about nuclear weapons from school children and teachers. I didn't know much about peace education at first, but I answered a lot of the enquiries, and I became national coordinator of Teachers for Peace. I got to know more and more about peace studies and about the United Nations resolutions. I found out about what our Department of Education and Science was doing about it. We made several links with people from other professions who were against nuclear weapons - doctors, lawyers, scientists and so on. There are about 12 professional groups of this type. Basically we tried to find out about materials for peace studies, peace education, and also we looked at these issues in the wider field - involving human rights, respect for oneself, respect for others, etc. I was really learning at the same time as I was giving out information.

AB: Is Teachers for Peace here a national organization and part of CND?

HL: Yes, it is a national organization, and it is related to CND, but it's got a very difficult relationship with CND, because we are primarily a professional group like the doctors. I often say: Well, I am a member of CND, but of course I teach professionally, and the children I teach should know all points of

view so that they can come to an informed opinion of their own. CND doesn't put much resources into the education side. But we find that there are many different resources any way. In Britain, education is organized by local education authorities. There are many education authorities that have curricula for peace education. For example Avon, Newcastle, Nottingham, Sheffield, Manchester. Of course, they are actually following on from the UNESCO Recommendation of 1974 which was circulated to the education authorities by our government. Even though our country is no longer in UNESCO it is still government policy, I believe.

But we received a lot of opposition from some right-wing academics and also from the right-wing press. They implied that we were teaching propaganda. They said that we might say that we were giving all points of view, but they thought that in actual fact we were more than likely teaching what they called "sinister lessons" in order to convert young people.

There is one organization, called the "British Atlantic Committee", which supports the notion that nuclear weapons act as a deterrent, but yet BAC endorses peace studies. They have a side wing called "Peace Through NATO", which emphasises that young people should discuss the nuclear issues in schools. So with them and under the auspices of the "Council for Education in World Citizenship", which is an educational charitable trust, we are getting together. That is, Teachers for Peace and the British Atlantic Committee are getting together with other like-minded organizations to produce an information pack for schools which presents many points of view and includes notes on how lessons can be introduced and how the notes can be used in teaching. It is hoped that school students will be enabled to study the subject and have a debate.

AB: Is Teachers for Peace a large organization?

HL: No, it is like a network. Because education is

organized locally, we are organized locally. We find that we might be in touch with somebody in each locality. Teachers for Peace has been fairly widespread. But I couldn't quote a figure. I used to send newsletters nationwide regularly but now there are local newsletters going out. There are a lot of newsletters with news of conferences and so on. There is now so much happening that you can't put it all in one national newsletter.

2.

AB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

HL: Quite a few teachers in Britain are frightened of using these words. Usually I tell them: Well, I think all good education is peace education: teachers have to sort out quarrels in the playground, and they obviously teach about becoming responsible citizens - that is responsible world citizens. And they teach about how we can develop better international relationships.

AB: Could you specify some of the things that you would like peace education to achieve? What would be the aims?

HL: My main aim would be that young people could grow up understanding how their thoughts and their actions can be manipulated. To me that is the most important thing at this time in history, because they are subject to so many influences, especially from the media. I hope that they become aware of how some negative influences affect them and how they are actually being manipulated. I also think it is important that they are able to feel themselves living in other people's shoes - that they imagine what it's like to be in other people's positions in the world. For instance, the black South Africans - to understand how they feel. Role playing and drama are, I think, useful methods in this context.

3.

AB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

HL: I was actually educated in a convent school, although my parents aren't Catholics. It was a very conservative Catholic school. I think there was quite a lot of emphasis on the moral aspects of behaviour. But because I wasn't a Catholic, I could look at the role of religion dispassionately. There were no direct attempts dealing with peace education.

4.

AB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

HL: I think there are quite a few that do. A local education authority might have a programme for peace education, or there might be an interested head teacher. In Britain, the government used not dictate to the local education authority, although this is changing with the introduction of the National Curriculum. The local education authority leaves it to the head teacher and staff of a school to devise their own curriculum following general lines so the situation differs a lot from school to school. In Britain, a teacher is in "loco parentis", that is, in the parents' place, and your duties as a teacher extend right up to the time the child is home. So even if you see pupils in the street misbehaving or in need of care and it's not in school hours, it is your duty to do something about it. This means then that teachers are not only responsible for the transmission of knowledge, they are also in "loco parentis".

AB: Would you say that there are presently many schools that are not concerned about peace education at all?

HL: Yes, there are; there are some dreadful schools in Britain - very competitive and not mindful of the

children's individual needs. To my mind, secondary schools should learn from primary schools. In primary schools we teach through projects, and we teach with the child at the centre. I am really very worried about the secondary school's emphasis on examinations. I am not opposed to exams, but everything now seems to be geared to them in secondary schools.

5.

AB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

HL: Yes, it is possible. If the head teacher thinks that the school should do something about peace education, that is a good starting-point. I have visited some schools where the head teacher looks at the whole syllabus and involves all the class and subject teachers - the teachers of history, science and so on - in looking at the way that each can teach their subject and how it relates to peace.

If the head teacher doesn't introduce peace education, single teachers could teach for peaceful understanding giving ideas to the rest of the staff. I think that to try to get a staff meeting at first without actually having some concrete evidence about what you mean by peace education probably isn't effective. But if you teach yourself and then try to involve the other staff, you will have a better chance of being understood.

AB: If you think of steps and measures to be taken in the classroom with the children, what would be some of the most important things to do?

HL: It is essential for the pupils to see themselves as individuals, as playing an important part in the class. They should spend a lot of time on who they are, their own family history. They should be involved in projects where they can choose what they want to pursue, and then, of course, be aware of their

relationships with each other. In one primary school the older children observed the playground of the younger children to see how they were playing together and did a study of that to sharpen their awareness of relationships.

6.

AB: What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools?

HL: The young children might not have thought beyond their own country. However, if you are fortunate enough to have children from other countries, you may use them as resources and also ask them to bring things in from their homes. The older students can more easily think about other countries. They have role model exercises they can play. For example, several schools have got together to hold a United Nations Model Assembly where the students represent different countries. They find out about the countries' policies by contacting their embassies beforehand.

AB: Has there been some opinion that peace education should not be dealt with in contacts with young children?

HL: Yes, there has been. If you point out that young children need to learn to get on with each other, the critics say: Well, you are just talking about good manners which you should teach anyway, and, they say, this is not peace education. Then when you say: Children can learn about other countries, the critics say: Well, they are too young to understand all the complex problems involved in this.

There has been a lot of criticism about world studies as well. Actually, some people phoned me - I am sure that they were really the critics - and asked me to give them information on nuclear education for five-year-olds. Were they critics trying to catch me out? But I explained that nuclear education is not

appropriate for five-year-olds. I adviced them to get a book called "Winners All", which is about cooperative games.

7.

AB: If you were an upper secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

HL: I did study history, so I suppose I would talk about history. I think first I would get my pupils to look at how the history books are written, and from which point of view. For example, when describing the Armada, try to look at it also from the Spanish point of view. I think we need a sort of comparative world history.

Actually how to teach history is quite an interesting subject at the moment, because our present ministers of education have wanted to set a new syllabus for history; that is, history of th "great" people and events. There has been a lot of controversy about this. I think they were hoping that through history pupils would develop a more nationalistic feeling. But this was very controversial with history teachers.

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

HL: I don't think I do. I tend to use the terms which I think communicate best with the people I talk to. If I use "education for international understanding", and some people might say: "Well, what's this, it sounds a bit nationalistic - international understanding", so I say: "Well, let us talk about global peace." I do not want to argue about language.

AB: Are "Teachers for Peace" using peace education as the main term?

HL: Not necessarily. Peace education has been used quite a bit, but it also is sometimes avoided as something controversial.

AB: What about the expression "education for peace"?

HL: That is the most popular term at the moment. You go to conferences and you say "peace education" by mistake, and then they jump at you and say: No, "education for peace".

AB: The term "disarmament education" was used by UNESCO some years ago. Is that used in Britain much?

HL: Not much.

9.

AB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you anticipate any difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

HL: There certainly has been opposition. This varies from place to place according to whether there has been active opposition by local politicians. There has been a big lobby in Parliament against peace studies. A bill was introduced in Parliament against peace studies, although it did not get beyond the third reading, because it was too controversial even to the conservative government. But where I teach the majority of parents would endorse peace studies.

AB: When parents are critical, what would they say, and what would you answer?

HL: Usually the criticism is general without much detail as to what exactly worries them. The criticism centres around what certain right-wing politicians have told them. They think peace education means twisting children's minds. They think it's a bit like witch-craft. The key word for them is "indoctrination".

My answer is: I may be a member of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament with the opinion that we should work for nuclear disarmament in Britain. And I also have other political opinions. All teachers have different political opinions and belong to different political parties. Having an opinion on nuclear disarmament is no different. Teachers are not indoctrinating their pupils. They would be very bad teachers if they were, and the children would soon sense that. One of Her Majesty's Inspectors, who has studied these problems, stated that he had actually not found any case of indoctrination in this area, and that there was absolutely no evidence to show that teachers have handled peace studies unprofessionally. He was criticized by the right-wing conservatives for saying this.

AB: When there is opposition among parents or the local community members, how should the teacher handle that?

HL: I would say: Come to the class. Come to a class and I'll show you the material and what we do. And I would quote the UN resolutions as well.

10.

AB: <u>What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"</u>?

HL: Teachers should look carefully at the way that they teach, and I think that in teacher training it should be coming more from the students what they want. They need to discover for themselves, and they should not be spoonfed with facts. Peace education should be a two-way process.

AB: What about in-service training? Would that be needed for peace education? Is that done at present?

HL: Yes, it would be needed. It is done in some places. There has been some one-day conferences. Saturday conferences, for example, here in London at the Institute of Education.

AB: Does Teachers for Peace as an organization organize workshops for in-service training?

HL: No, we do not organize any in-service training. We might be part of those workshops or explaining resources or something like that in our role as an information service. We have held joint meetings with other professions and we have spoken to groups of teachers about peace education.

AB: Do you think that there is enough material (books and manuals) in this area to give to a teacher so she or he could study this area for herself or himself?

HL: Yes, there are some good materials. My favourite one is from Avon County Council. In Avon, that is in the Bristol area, they had two part-time peace education coordinators. For three years they were invited into schools to discuss peace education, and then the County Council put together a curriculum and they used teachers' ideas. There is a special section with teachers' ideas using their practical classroom experience. It's very good. Other useful material has been developed in Newcastle-upon-Tyne (focusing on nuclear issues) and in Nottingham. More materials and more exchanges of ideas are needed, however.

11.

AB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

HL: Well, I hope that peace education comes to be an accepted fact of life. In this country we've now got comprehensive schools, and it took several years to overcome all the doubts and prejudices but now even many conservatives support comprehensive education, because they see that it's best for their children. I hope that peace education comes to be accepted in the same way that comprehensive schools have been.

I also wish that education was more important to all people, even to people in the peace movement. I wish that people in the peace movement would begin

working with a long term view. Many have a very short term perspective; they say that tomorrow we'll be dead if we don't do something now and that it's too late for education. But they have said that it is too late for education because of the nuclear threat for at least 40 years now ...

Address:

Hilary Lipkin
42 York Rise
London NW5 1SB

PEACE EDUCATION IN SCHOOL: A CONVERSATION WITH RICHARD YARWOOD, PEACE EDUCATION PROJECT, LONDON

1.

AB: As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of "peace education"?

RY: I initially started off as an individual, working voluntarily in development education; I travelled abroad to the third world, and as you do when you come back from those trips, you try to look for how best you can fit in to create change. Being a pacifist I found it difficult working in the fields of development education or multicultural education, because a lot of the people I met there used, at that time, a methodology which was very different from my own preference, so I felt increasingly uncomfortable and moved into work with peace and justice.

I think that education really has to consider the future more than it has done. Visions are crucial to education, and that is one reason why I feel that peace education is something worth being involved in. It seems that young people have a very depressing vision of the future, seeing the nuclear umbrella and the social problems of unemployment, poverty, homelessness, so it's very difficult to try to get kids motivated to form life plans. This is a very crucial area of work for me at the moment.

The Peace Pledge Union as a campaigning organization wants to challenge the fact that violence is inevitable. Some years ago the Peace Education Project was set up by the Peace Pledge Union to concentrate on looking at this problem within the teaching field.

AB: Is this supposed to be a permanent activity or is it a project limited to a specific number of years?

RY: It's a permanent project. In our country, about eight or nine years ago, the only paid employees who were concentrated on peace education were attached to

education projects related to political pressure groups or non-governmental agencies. Mainly they responded to request by schools to come and give talks, and it was very uncoordinated. Soon it became obvious that the most effective ways to increase that kind of peace education input was either by working through the education system itself to get policy statements and recommendations, or by working directly with teachers and teacher training in order that they can learn the skills, the methods and the content so that they can do it themselves.

Projects attached to groups like ourselves, Pax Christi and The Quakers have been at the forefront of pushing peace education in those ways. It has been most successfully carried out with those local education authorities with a socialist majority.

There has been an interesting discussion over teaching about the nuclear issue. Some argue that the nuclear issue should not be dealt with in schools because it's far too complicated to understand and anyway it is something that frightens students and that's a reason not to have it in the curriculum. At the same time we know that young people at 18 are expected to vote and make decisions related to nuclear issues. I think that we underestimate the ability of teachers to put issues into a form which young people can understand. Anyway, increasingly young people are asking questions about those issues in school, and teachers need to know how to respond in a responsible manner. Originally, the advise given was that teachers should avoid showing their own position; they should be neutral and wherever possible invite organizations to give different sides. A lot of work has been done during recent years on teaching about controversial issues, and the recommendation now is often that in fact teachers can give their personal opinion and there is advice and recommendations on how they could do that for example, in texts issued here in London (ILEA).

AB: Could you say a little more what you are doing here on your particular project?

RY: The aim of the project is to provide advice, training and resources for teachers or others in education who believe that conflicts can be resolved in a non-violent way. Essentially, we deal with three levels of conflict: the personal conflict, the community conflict (which is where the -isms come in: racism, sexism etc.), and the international conflict. How we would actually integrate with various schools depends on what they want us to do, but this year we have concentrated on producing resources and doing training courses for teachers.

We have recently finished a course called "Coping with conflict in schools". Here we looked at how teachers should respond to conflicts in school, not only pupil-teacher conflicts, but teacher-teacher conflicts and teacher-government conflict. Conflicts in school seem to be increasing all the time, and the roots of the conflicts actually often come from outside of the school, that is, they are community-based conflicts. When using this material in teacher courses, we want to make the teachers aware of such facts and to feel that they couldn't be expected to solve all the problems - that there were other people in the community who could support solutions. We also include various methods for solving conflicts. We emphasize the role of students' own responsibility to resolve conflicts, breaking down the hierarchy that exists between people in schools.

So in general, we develop materials and we make courses and workshops for teachers. We give in-puts at various teacher conferences which are arranged. We sell materials to schools.

At the moment we have two major projects which we are working on. One is a project which deals with young children and it's about peaceful conflict-solving, led by Mildred Masheder.

AB: In fact, I have already interviewed Mildred Masheder about her work and bought her book, "Let's cooperate".

RY: The other thing we are doing is to produce materials - there is a pack coming out called "War, Peace and Justice" - which is about making the links between peace and justice. We have a whole collection of other resources available.

AB: Does your project also involve some aspects of research or systematic evaluation of the material produced?

RY: Not really. We ask for feed-back and evaluation, but I cannot say that we have made any formalized evaluation.

2.

AB: What do you think of first when you hear the words "peace education"?

RY: I think of peace education as having four parts: recognition that a conflict exists; understanding the cause of the conflict; searching for alternatives, hopefully non-violent solutions to the conflict; and the implementation of those alternatives. If peace and justice are to be achieved, educational forces are crucial to that happening. We have two related expressions: "peace education" and "education for peace". One description of the difference between the two is that peace education tends to concentrate on content, whereas education for peace more looks at methods. We have produced a little booklet which deals with these two terms.

3.

AB: If you think back on your own school days, were there some aspects in your schooling that might be considered an attempt at "peace education"?

RY: My grammar school was a very hierarchical, examination-oriented and sports-oriented school. It was terribly authoritarian. There was some attempt to introduce certain political issues into the agenda.

But that was it; and I don't remember talking about nuclear issues at all. We did have a weekend conference on third world developmental issues, characterized by a sort of patronizing attitude. But attention to peace education matters was minimal really, although this was only about 14 years ago.

4.

AB: Do you believe that schools in your country, as you know them today, contribute to a "peace education"?

RY: It is a difficult question because the range of schools in the country is enormous. There is a lot of freedom within the schools to run themselves and structure themselves as they want. Some of the private schools, like Summerhill, are extremely progressive in terms of discipline and decision structure. Harrow, which is one of the top five public schools - part of the backbone of conservatism in Britain - has very progressive sixth-form programs on peace issues, particularly nuclear issues, and yet, its whole structure is very unpeaceful in a way: very hierarchical, competitive, and elite-focused.

Primary schools have many more opportunities, if only it wasn't for the fact that teachers have 30 pupils in the class and then the teacher's function becomes one of control rather than teaching. Secondary schools are much more problematic, since there is the pressure of examinations and consequent use of time.

There is a certain amount that socialist education authorities and projects like ourselves can do, but at the end of the day it's really up to the initiative of individual teachers. All we can do is support them with recommendations of good method and good materials.

AB: But so far there are no central recommendations that peace education should be introduced in your country, are there?

RY: There are certain general recommendations which you could refer to. The real impetus came after the first

United Nations special session on disarmament, where governments and non-government organizations were urged to take steps to develop programs for disarmament education. There have been other recommendations, particular on things like multi-cultural teaching, recognizing that Britain is a multi-cultural, multi-lingual society, and our education need to reflect that. But there has not been any direct, central statement on peace education. The nearest they have got is a recommendation on how to handle controversial issues. Within some local educational authorities there are some very strong statements on peace education, however.

There has been much opposition against peace education from representatives of the present government; "indoctrination" has been the key word. The issues of peace can not be kept out of the curriculum. They are crucial. Authorities can look at the way it's taught and quite rightly be worried about indoctrination and bias.

The problem has been that since there has been no central support or central policy, it might be only the dedicated individual teachers who are doing it. Peace education often involves questioning authority, questioning available information, thinking about alternatives. Very often if you question, and if everybody starts to come out with different answers, then you start giving a shift to status quo, and I think that's the fear of some politicians, which in a way is very anti-democratic because the status quo needs to shift within a democracy.

There was a period of intense criticism of peace education, mainly centered around individual cases of biased teaching. Now the campaign against peace education is being conducted at a much more subtle level. For example, the centralization of the in-service training budget makes it very difficult now to put on in-service courses unless there is central

approval of them.

A lot of the work that was happening in peace education was actually happening through dedicated teachers working above and beyond their contract, either through extra-curricular activities or after-school activities. But the teacher morale is so low now that they are saying: We are not going to do that; during the teachers' strike it was very difficult for organizations like ourselves, and even the Institute of Education in London, which has worked a lot on the nuclear issue, to get teachers to come to courses on weekends. So there are some processes of subtle blocking which have the same effect as a policy which says no.

5.

AB: Do you think it is at all possible for schools to contribute to a "peace education"? If so, what are some of the steps and measures to be taken that you think of first?

RY: Yes, it's not only possible, but I think it's crucial, really. There are all sorts of ways that it can happen, but I suppose a natural first way for an individual teacher is to gain some staff support, so that you actually have a group of teachers in the school who are keen to introduce peace education. - If the curriculum doesn't allow them to introduce a subject around peace education, they can work to set up situations within the school for debate of these issues. In most schools, particular secondary schools, there are opportunities in the sixth form study periods and in personal, social skill sessions to introduce these kind of topics. If there is a sympathetic head teacher, you may try to have it as a properly planned course rather than single inputs.

The people who organize the criticism and resistance against peace education have been working very hard on school governors (governers being parents and people in responsible positions in the community) to

try to make sure that school governors are aware of the peace education "problem" and to get governors voted on who are against peace education. This work could be counteracted to some extent by open discussions about the real meaning of peace education.

AB: Do you think of peace education as something that should be dealt with in a particular peace studies subject, or do you think of it as something that should be part of most subjects in the school?

RY: Pragmatically, we try to fit it in where we can, really, and the easiest way to do it is often within a set course. However, ideally the methods of peace education are as important as the content, and the methods of peace education in my opinion should be integrated into all sorts of subjects. But in terms of specific topics, a specific course has the advantage of demonstrating the holistic nature of the issues, how they interrelate. But this does not mean that you should not take up relevant questions in other subjects, for example, a debate on the moral implications of nuclear power in physics.

AB: At the present time, to what extent are there such specific peace studies courses in British secondary schools?

RY: We have various examination boards covering regions, and there do exist within some of these examination boards, peace study components in courses. I don't know how many there are, but it's really only a handful.

AB: Would these courses always be options or would they be compulsory?

RY: They would be optional courses.

6.

AB: <u>What would be some of the possible differences in peace education approaches among younger and older students in schools</u>?

RY: I think not as many as one might think. Obviously the depth of analysis can increase as you increase in age. But if you are dealing with values and attitudes, then in many ways it is crucial that you catch children young before they are set in their thinking, and I don't think that necessarily he age will affect the quality of that kind of teaching situation. When working with links between the personal area, the community and the international area, with younger children you concentrate more on the personal end of that spectrum, building it up into the international as they develop. In terms of method, there are obviously certain methods which are more appropriate for older children, like debate, but a lot of the methods that I have used anyway are with slight adaption as suitable for late primary as they are for adult groups.

7.

AB: If you were an upper-secondary school teacher in a subject with which you are particularly familiar, how would you like to make the students more conscious of and more prepared for problems of peace, within that subject?

RY: I am actually trained as an environmentalist, and in my opinion the environment is a core area of peace education. I would try to show the links, the interrelatedness of all the environment, and then look at the management of environment as well. I would try to develop some sense of responsibility for the environment in the short and the long term and discuss how you can actually empower yourself to be responsible. This might involve, for example, looking at procedures for making complaints. I would be adding a peace dimension to it by visioning the future, discussing about working to create the future rather than just accepting things as they are.

8.

AB: In international debates, the terms "disarmament education" and "peace education" have been used, in addition to some other related terms ("global education", "education for international understanding" etc.). Do you have any comments and preferences as to this terminology?

RY: It's interesting to think about why these words have been chosen. A lot of people have very deliberately gone away from the term "peace", because it has "political" associations, and some people feel that it's just not worth the bother to push through all that, but it's much better just to change the term.

However, I think it's important to stick with the term peace, because I think it's important that you define its meaning rather than having its meaning defined elsewhere. For example, we have had peace in Europe for 40 years now according to one definition of peace, but one could argue that it is a partial peace, but not proper peace. So I think that it's important that we stick to the word peace as well, and if it's made into a political debate, I think we can be confident that we are doing things in a proper professional way and that we display good arguments for our cause. But I do understand people who prefer to use other terms in order to get away from that controversy.

Disarmament education is a very specific part of peace education - it's a core topic area. I think it is reasonable to give topic areas specific terms.

AB: Is that term used much in this country?

RY: I think it was popular at one stage, but what happened was that people realized that if you are going to look at why we need disarmament, you have to go back and back and back and start looking at other things, and then you suddenly realize that disarmament is

only a function of many other things, and that disarmament is a part of peace education. Peace education to me is a holistic term, similar to global education, I suppose. It's interesting that the World Studies Teacher Training Center, which is a very prominent teacher training establishment in York, has changed its name to Center for Global Education.

Education for international understanding again means slightly different things to me. It focuses on multicultural and international issues. David Hicks in one article tried to identify the key issues of some of these contemporary subjects. The key issue for peace education is conflict, whereas in development education or world studies it's power!

9.

AB: In many countries, questions related to disarmament and peace are highly controversial. Would you expect some difficulties, for example with parents or other members of the community, when introducing peace education in schools? If so, what kind of difficulties? Do you see any way out of such problems?

RY: It depends on the age. I think that in upper secondary school, the ages of 16 to 18, it's very unusual for a parent to complain about disarmament education or peace education being taught in that school per se. As you go down the age range, you increasingly find parents who are concerned that their children shouldn't really be dealing with these issues. Part of this I think is because it is very unsettling for a parent who has never thought much about these things to be challenged by an 11 year old son or daughter asking why do we have nuclear weapons.

Otherwise, what most of the controversy seems to be about is balance, bias, and propaganda. Since it is not a recognized practice and it has often been introduced by individual teachers, there is seen to be a political tint to it. And, of course, if the

teacher is against nuclear weapons, parents might suspect indoctrination of their children. Children often go through an altruistic or idealistic phase or a rebellious phase, and they may come home from school suddenly very anti-nuclear and that can be very disturbing to a parent.

Much of the controversy really is about fears of bias and onesidedness, and I think that any good teacher is very aware and sympathetic to that charge and would not like to be seen as biased. In this situation, we have really been on the defensive and a lot of people are now saying: We in peace education should stop being on the defensive, we must start being much more assertive about our work and arguments. But in order for teachers to teach in a balanced way, they need support, they need training and they need resources and material. All this has been lacking.

Then there is this whole interesting question of balanced teaching and balanced learning. You have a balanced learning situation when you have learnt about all sides. But in order to accomplish that, it might be necessary to have unbalanced teaching. An example of that might be that in the debate about defence, the options put up are often either to have a nuclear defence or a non-nuclear defence. But as a pacifist, I could argue that in fact these two positions may very well be seen as representing the same side of the spectrum in terms of violence, and that the real spectrum to be looked at when discussing defence is from violent defence to non-violent defence. If a teacher were sympathetic to that point of view, they might invite me or some other pacifist in for a one-time input to put our point of view across. It might not be necessary to have another teacher in for another input with, say, the NATO point of view, because there is so much information and propaganda available anyway. But then it could be argued that because nobody went in to balance the "pacifistic" argument, the

teaching was biased.

I think that, in general, the way out of the problems in this area is really just keeping parents informed and encourage feedback about what's going on, and most of them will very soon realize that the teacher handles this in a admirable way. Certainly if parents are naive about certain issues there, their contribution to the debate is nevertheless important, and the outcome may in fact be peace education also among adult community members.

10.

AB: What needs to be done in teacher training in order to prepare future teachers more adequately for the area of "peace education"?

RY: A lot. One of the major problems in teacher training is, I think, a function of the time and nature of the one-year course, the "conversion" course that converts graduates into teachers (there is more potential in the longer B.Ed. course to do things). This one-year course is how the majority of our teachers are trained. The problem in this country is that it's a 30-week course. There is so much to pack in in that short space of time, and it's quite a tense situation for a young person to be in, who might not ever have taught before; there is really no capacity for the person being trained to ever question really what the objectives of the training were or the methodology or anything. They are just pleased to get through the course!

One then has the problems of going as a young teacher into a class of 30 children and it's really about control. In this situation the climate for introducing peace education into school is not the best one. New training techniques like simulation games are rarely looked at in teacher training except in a token way.

Hence, a major problem is timing - I think the teacher training should be two years basically,

allowing the individual teacher the opportunity to express her or his personality in their teaching and giving them time to be trained in new and exciting methodology.

AB: Do you see any ways of making up for these difficulties in the in-service training? What can in-service courses mean to peace education?

RY: In-service training is crucial, really, as new techniques and new materials are coming up all the time. As I said, the new centralized method of in-service training makes it very difficult for anybody to get much such training, especially together with colleagues. It is important to realize that a teacher is learning all the time and that the in-service is the way that they are encouraged to learn. This is the way groups like ours come in. We will take part in in-service training situations, partly because we've got the expertise and have been concentrating on our particular area, but also unfortunately because we are the only resource available.

There are all sorts of training schemes for teachers. The standard one is that the local teacher center or an advisory teacher arranges a one-day session. It is my experience that most teachers feel that it's such a nice thing to get away from school one day and to meet people who have got so many common problems that you find it very difficult to stop them talking, so we've built in that support function into the training, which is about teachers' own confidence level and empowering. One problem in in-service training in our present system is that it is so infrequent.

11.

AB: Is there anything else that you would like to add about the school and peace education?

RY: In general, I think that at this moment in time morale among teachers is at an all-time low and violence in school is at an all-time high (particularly in

the inner cities), and really, something has to be done about it. Perhaps peace education is actually a way of approaching the issue, which is really about getting back to the recognition that the school is there for the pupil's benefit rather than it being a compulsory thing, that the teacher is a facilitator of learning rather than a disciplinarian or a controller. I think value and attitude dilemmas that come up in peace education are the same dilemmas that education as a whole faces. I can only see peace education increasing all the time in schools, whatever it's called, and I hope that with that comes the recognition of the support and training that need to accompany a new field.

In terms of this project, what we were doing seven years ago is different from what we are doing now, partly because seven years ago we were almost the only people pushing for peace education. Now we are beginning to be able to concentrate on particular topics and particular problems, which makes us more specialized and more useful in training opportunities, because we will have more particular experience which we can share.

NOTES ON THE INTERVIEWEE

Richard Yarwood. Address: 3a Digby Crescent, London N4 2H5. - Richard Yarwood worked on a mobile community development education project before travelling in the Far East. He supplemented his income by freelance design work and writing. He has been on the Peace Education Network Steering Group and Treasurer of the National Association of Development Education Centres. He is particularly interested in the theory and practice of non-violent direct action and has run the Peace Education Project at the Peace Pledge Union in London (Peace Pledge Union, 6 Endsleigh Street, London WC1H 0DX).

Examples of publications:

Yarwood, R. et al. Coping with conflict in school. (PEP Talk, Nos. 13-14.) London: Peace Pledge Union, 1987.

Yarwood, R. & Weaver, T. (Eds.) Peace education and education for peace: An introduction. (PEP Talk, No. 11.) London: Peace Pledge Union, 1986.

Yarwood, R. & Weaver, T. War. In: Hicks, D. (Ed.) Education for peace. London: Routledge, 1988. Pp. 87-101.

ISSN 1100-3391