DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 451 449 CG 030 820

AUTHOR Harris, Ian M.
TITLE Challenges for Peace Educators at the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century.
PUB DATE 2001-04-00
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA, April 10-14, 2001).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conflict Resolution; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; History; *Human Relations; International Relations; *Interpersonal Communication; Prevention; *Problem Solving; Violence
IDENTIFIERS Nonviolence; *Peace Education; Peace Studies

ABSTRACT

This paper provides a description of the history and advancements made in peace education during the past century. By the end of the 20th century, 200 colleges in the United States had peace studies programs and approximately 1 in 10 of the public schools had conflict resolution programs. The paper focuses on four challenges faced by peace educators today, including: (1) how to replace a military culture with a nonviolent culture; (2) how to convince policymakers and educators to put resources into supporting peace education; (3) how to produce research that demonstrates the value of teaching young people how to behave peacefully; and (4) how to develop peace building strategies in schools. At the beginning of the 21st century, peace education is being used to challenge stereotypes where there is a long history of humiliation, victimization, and ethnic, racial, and religious hatred. Peace educators concerned with violent behavior of youth use violence prevention strategies to help students learn how to avoid weapons, bullying, crime, and drugs. Peace educators need to help convince legislators, school boards, administrators, and general citizens to put resources into peace-building approaches to violence prevention. (Contains 43 references.) (JDM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 451 449

CHALLENGES FOR PEACE EDUCATORS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

Ian M. Harris

Department of Educational Policy and Community Studies

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

P.O. Box 413

Mil. WI

53201

(414) 229-4724

imh@uwm.edu

Paper presented at AERA annual meeting in Seattle, April 10, 2001

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

I. HARRIS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

2

030820

ERIC

CHALLENGES FOR PEACE EDUCATORS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

During the twentieth century there have been unparalleled instances of destruction—wars, and environmental damage, but at the same time there has been an accompanying growth in peace education. As the twenty-first century begins many people are looking to peace education as a way to create a new world order based on mutual respect, nonviolence, justice, and environmental sustainability. The hope is that education can help pave the path for a more tolerant and less bloody future.

At the same time that there have been great strides in peace education during the past one hundred years, this nascent academic field is not universally acclaimed and faces key challenges in the future in order to grow and find a place on the main agenda of every educational institution and government in the world. This article will briefly describe the advancements made in peace education during this past century and then focus on four challenges faced by peace educators as the new century begins:

- How to replace a military culture with a nonviolent culture?
- How to convince policymakers and educators to put resources into supporting peace education?
- How to produce research that demonstrates the value of teaching young people how to behave peacefully?
- And, how to develop peacebuilding strategies in our schools?

Brief History of Peace Education

Europeans and Americans at the beginning of the twentieth century formed peace societies and lobbied their governments against the saber rattling that eventually led to World War I (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993;Thelin, 1996). In the Interbellum period social studies teachers started teaching international relations so that their students would not want to wage war against foreigners. Peace education became part of a general education reform where schools were seen

as a means to promote social progress. International studies could help draw citizens of the world together and contribute towards a more cooperative peaceful world.

At this time Maria Montessori (1946/1974) was traveling throughout Europe urging teachers to abandon authoritarian pedagogies, replacing them with a dynamic curriculum from which they could choose what to study. She reasoned that children who did not automatically follow authoritarian teachers would not necessarily follow rulers urging them to war. She saw that peace depended upon an education that would free the child's spirit, promote love of others, and remove the climate of compulsory restriction. She hoped that peace education could provide an antidote to fascism.

Fifty years ago Herbert Read (1949) argued for the marriage of art and peace education to help provide images that would motivate people to promote peace. The first academic peace studies program was established in 1948 at Manchester College, Indiana. The Vietnam War stimulated more university and college programs that had a unique international focus, and the threat of nuclear war stimulated educators all around the world to warn of the impending devastation. In Japan such concern spawned a unique hybrid, "Atomic Age Education," that was introduced into all schools.

In 1974 in the United States the Quaker Project on Community Conflict in New York published *The Friendly Classroom for a Small Planet*, a curriculum for teachers of young children who wanted to enable students to develop a sense of self-worth, build community, and acquire the skills of creative conflict resolution. Since that time the curriculum has gone through 25 editions and been translated into seven different languages. It is being used extensively in schools in El Salvador, as well as in many other countries. Its goals are:

> (1) to promote growth toward a community in which children are capable and desirous of open communication; (2) to help children gain insights into the nature of human feelings and share their own feelings; and (3) to explore with children the unique personal ways in which they can respond to problems and begin to

prevent or solve conflicts. (Prutzman, Stern, Burger, & Bodenheimer, 1988, pp. vi-vii)

This curriculum attempts to deal with the roots of conflict as they existed within the psyches of young children and teach young children to be open, sharing and cooperative.

In the 1980s three books were produced that represent the highlight of an era acutely concerned about the threat of nuclear annihilation. They are: *Education for Peace* by a Norwegian, Birgit Brocke-Utne (1985), *Comprehensive Peace Education* by Betty Reardon (1988) and *Peace Education* by Ian Harris (1988)—both citizens of the United States. Brocke-Utne pointed out the devastation that militarism, war, and male violence wrecks upon females and argued that feminism is the starting point for effective disarmament. Reardon argued that the core values of schooling should be care, concern, and commitment and the key concepts of peace education should be planetary stewardship, global citizenship, and humane relationships. Harris stated that the ten goals of peace education should be:

> to appreciate the richness of the concept "peace"; to address fears; to provide information about security systems; to understand violent behavior; to develop intercultural understanding; to provide for a future orientation; to teach peace as a process; to promote a concept of peace accompanied by social justice; to stimulate a respect for life; and to end violence. (p. 17)

He also emphasized that a peaceful pedagogy must belong to any attempt to teach about peace. The key ingredients of such a pedagogy are cooperative learning, democratic community, moral sensitivity, and critical thinking.

At the beginning of the nineteen nineties the globalists lost some of their hold on the domain of peace education and the humanists took over. Peace educators tried to heal some of the wounds of their pupils who have been raised in violent cultures. Based upon the work of Carl Rogers (1942), a popular psychology movement known as "new age healing," has swept throughout the world somewhat on the wings of older indigenous traditions. The goal is to heal wounds that create huge pools of rage in the psyche. Peace education became a kind of

"survivalist education" more concerned about helping young children both survive and thrive within civil, domestic, cultural, and ethnic forms of violence.

Johnson and Johnson (1991) started to teach the skills for peacemaking to teachers who in turn would instruct their children into some of the more sophisticated aspects of civilized behavior. Lantieri and Patti (1996) build upon the work of the resolving conflict creatively approach to school violence to urge teachers to wage peace in the schools. They added to the mix crucial components dealing with anti-bias and multicultural education. At the beginning of the new millennium conflict resolution education is one of the fastest growing school reforms in the West. Conflict resolution educators provide basic communications skills necessary for survival in a postmodern world. Peace educators are promoting the teaching of affective skills so that children will be more cooperative (Cohen, 1994; Kagan, 1992). Feminists have urged schools to change their curriculum away from a competitive to a caring focus that emphasizes domestic skills (Martin, 1985; Noddings, 1993).

Modern Peace Education

At the end of the twentieth century peace educators provided insights about the origins of violence and alternatives to violence. At the national level, they deliberate about defense and the effects of militarism. How do countries provide for the security of their citizens? What military arrangements contribute to peace and security? In a postmodern world peace educators are attempting to supplement concepts of national security based upon peace through strength with concepts of ecological security based upon reverential relationships to the natural world. At the cultural level, peace educators teach about social norms, like sexism and racism, that promote violence, leading to efforts to teach tolerance for different minority groups. Classes in multicultural and antiracist education often include presentations on human rights. At an interpersonal level, they teach nonviolent skills to resolve conflicts. At the psychic level, they help students understand what patterns exist in their own minds that contribute to violence. Peace educators go right to the core of a person's values—teaching respect for others, open mindedness, empathy, concern for justice, willingness to become involved, commitment to

human rights, and environmental sensitivity. A student in a peace education course acquires both theoretical concepts about the dangers of violence and the possibilities for peace, as well as practical skills about how to live nonviolently.

At the beginning of the twenty-first century peace education is being used in various parts of the world to challenge stereotypes where there is a long history of humiliation, victimization and racial, ethnic, or religious hatred for others perceived as enemies. In Northern Ireland themes in a curriculum for "Education for Mutual Understanding" are attempting to promote self-respect and a spirit of mutual acceptance and respect. In Israel there are "initiatives aimed at eliminating prejudice" and "encounter projects aimed at strengthening Israeli-Palestinian understanding" (Klein, 1997, p. 4). In South Africa empathy is included among human relations skills and workshops on discrimination are being conducted in schools. These approaches to peace education are concerned with the tendency to label enemies and oppose or fight them. Peace educators in these contexts attempt to transform enemy images and break through denial about atrocities committed.

Peace educators concerned about the violent behavior of youth use violence prevention strategies to create street safe kids who know how to avoid bullying, weapons, crimes, alcohol, drugs, and pregnancy. There are many risk factors for violent behavior—family patterns of behavior, violent social environments, negative cultural models and peers, alcohol and/or drug abuse, and availability of weapons. Addressing some of these factors directly in school can help inoculate children against risky behaviors. Concern about the impact of these risk factors has led to a form of education known as "resilience education" whose goals are to develop "decision-making and affective skills within each person and connectedness between people in the context of healthy democratic learning community" (Brown, D'Emidio, & Benard, 2001, p. 27). Educators following the principles of resilience education encourage the exploration of emotions related to adversity.

Recent concern about escalating levels of civil violence has stimulated a variety of peace education called conflict resolution education that helps individuals understand conflict

dynamics and empowers them to use communication skills to build and manage peaceful relationships. Conflict resolution educators teach children basic skills such as anger management, impulse control, emotional awareness, empathy development, assertiveness, and problem solving skills. Research studies conducted on conflict resolution education in the United States show that it has a positive impact on school climate (Jones & Kmitta, 2000). Studies have reported a decrease in aggressiveness, violence, dropout rates, student suspensions, and victimized behavior (Sandy & Cochran, 1999). Conflict resolution education results include improved academic performance, increased cooperation, and positive attitudes toward school (Crawford & Bodine, 1997). There is a tension in this field between controlling children and teaching values to children. Most of its emphasis is upon creating safe schools.

Now, at the end of the twentieth century, 200 colleges and universities in the United States have some kind of peace studies program (Harris, 1999). Approximately one tenth of the public schools have conflict resolution programs (The FourthR, 1998). On a world-wide scale UNESCO is trying to build "cultures of peace" in countries to avert the scourge of war. The Universidad de la Paz in Costa Rica is engaged in teaching peacemaking skills to adults. A body of peace research in most academic disciplines points out alternatives to violent behavior. The Talloires declaration endorses peace education at universities throughout the world. A budding field of alternative dispute resolution is trying to seek nonviolent resolution of conflicts in civic society. The Seville Declaration (Adams et al. 1987) signed by a group of scientists that asserts that human beings aren't intrinsically violent. And an encyclopedia of nonviolence tells the glorious struggle of humans using nonviolent strategies to achieve peace (Powers & Vogele, 1997).

At the beginning of the twenty-first century people are clamoring for peace education to help build a more peaceful future, a task that obviously failed during this last century of holocausts, nuclear weapons, environmental destruction, species extermination, and ethnic cleansing. In that peace education is slowly starting to emerge as an academic field, there is much to celebrate, but peace educators will have to directly confront various challenges that

continue to support militaristic solutions to conflicts. The first of these is to replace faith in peace through strength as a suitable way to solve conflicts.

HOW TO REPLACE A MILITARY CULTURE WITH A NONVIOLENT CULTURE?

Actually a military culture and a peace culture exist simultaneously vying for support and allegiance. Kenneth Boulding (1976) has pointed in his book, *Stable Peace*, how many humans lead on a daily basis peaceful lives. Most people in advance technological societies go to work, or shop, travel around, and do not experience violence. This seeming tranquility is overwhelmed by headlines of violent events, where on this globe specific wars and bloody skirmishes dominate the news—the Middle East, the Balkans, Northern Ireland, tribal warfare in African countries, etc. For those people living in violent areas their lives are being destroyed and their psyches traumatized by the conflict around them.

At the nation state level individual countries, with the exception of Cost Rica and Iceland, arm to protect their citizens and provide national security. The United States spends an obscene amount of money to support its military apparatus, over $250 billion a year. History books, politicians, and the media all glorify peace through strength strategies used to impose order on civil society and international relations.

In the cultural area various images of war and violence dominate the news and popular entertainment, legitimizing the use of violence. James Garbarino (1999) has argued that youth are being raised in a socially toxic culture. At the institutional level managers use top heavy administrative practices to control workers. Schools, for example, are institutions that are developing peace through strength strategies to deter youth violence by having police prowl the halls, installing metal detectors, and adopting zero tolerance policies. How can this culture be changed to promote peacemaking and peacebuilding strategies that empower youth to address successfully the many sources of violence in their own lives?

Universities and colleges teach a military history of the world and support officer candidate training programs for the military. Why don't they also fund conflict resolution education that would provide students with nonviolent ways to resolve conflicts?

At every level people receive social scripts that promote the use of violence. Residents of modern societies receive powerful images of violence that bombard their minds and beings. Peace educators need to learn how to supplant these destructive images with dynamic images of peace that will make the pursuit of nonviolence dramatic and heroic, as it is. The challenge for peace educators is to use their professional skills to fill young people's heads with attractive images of peace, so that when they are faced with decisions about how to behave, how to vote, how to defend themselves, how to raise their children, they will choose nonviolent alternatives. Earlier in this century William James (1910/1966) wrote an essay, "*The Moral Equivalence of War*," on this topic. Peace educators have a hard task to make peace as dramatic as war so that people will struggle hard to replace the dominant militaristic images that dominate human existence.

HOW TO CONVINCE POLICYMAKERS AND EDUCATORS TO PUT RESOURCES INTO SUPPORTING PEACE EDUCATION?

Currently, peace education is a sideshow in the big educational circus. Peace education programs compete with other units on campuses and schools for funds. In the eyes school administrators providing access to the Internet and rehabbing the chemistry lab are more important than teaching the next generation of citizens to be peaceful. Teachers are more worried about getting their students to pass standardized tests than they are in teaching young people to resolve their conflicts nonviolently. All public educational institutions in this country are facing budget cuts and tighter demands on resources. Peace educators need to argue convincingly to put resources into peace education when parents are more interested in programs for the gifted and talented. How can they enter into the political arena and create a space for peace education? That is a great challenge.

Daniel Goleman (1998) in his latest book, *Working with Emotional Intelligence*, states emphatically that those people who are most successful in life have learned and use well conflict resolution skills. He estimates that one third of the training that successful people receive in schools comes from academic preparation. The other two thirds of skills acquired by successful

people come from what he calls socio-emotional literacy—how to relate to other human beings. Instead of raising academic standards, why don't we broaden them to include what the educational philosopher, Jane Roland Martin (1985) refers to as domestic skills? She makes the point that so much of our education is geared towards helping people achieve in a competitive marketplace. Why aren't we educating the youth of our nation to create nurturing homes and supportive workplaces?

The argument in support of peace education goes like this: Students who are distracted by violence in their lives cannot master the cognitive material teachers are hired to teach. The work of parents and teachers consists in getting young children from one side of the ocean, where they are born helpless and dependent, to the other side where they can be independent, stand on their own two feet, and make a contribution to society. That ocean going vessel, call it the Titanic, often gets undermined by icebergs of violence that lurk under the surface of the lives of children who are overwhelmed by violent events in their lives.

How can children learn in school, until and unless adults help them deal with the overwhelming feelings they have related to violence in their lives? Children who are at risk in our schools are not stupid. They are doing poorly in school, not because they lack intellectual capacity, but rather because they are so distraught by violence they can't focus on their lessons. Studying for the future makes no sense to a young person trying to survive from day to day in a violent world, as so many of our youth are.

Many of these children have been neglected, which is a form of abuse. Students of the latest brain research know that such abandonment can permanently stunt a child's ability to develop essential neural connections that will produce a human capable of mastering the intellectual challenges we place before our youth in schools. Academic performance in schools will not improve until educators address issues of violence that make it impossible for young people to focus on school lessons. All the attempts to reform schools are like rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic. Unless we address the sources of violence both structural and interpersonal that thwart our attempts to teach youth the curricula we so much value, we are not going to

improve academic performance in our schools. Peace education is not peripheral to school endeavors. It is central and educators have to be convinced of this. The next challenge is closely related to this:

HOW TO PRODUCE RESEARCH THAT DEMONSTRATES
THE VALUE OF TEACHING YOUNG CHILDREN TO BE PEACEFUL?

Taxpayers want to know justifiably, "Does peace education work? Show me the results." There already exists a solid body of literature that supports this approach to the problems of youth violence. Research studies (Eckhardt, 1984; Harris, 1995) show that college students who take peace studies classes tend to address issues of daily conflict in their own lives more than they try to address the complex causes of wars and militarism. They feel that the problems of international violence and violence perpetrated by their own government are out of their reach, and tend to direct their peacemaking towards events in their own lives, over which they feel they have some control.

There has been considerable research conducted on conflict resolution education (Sandy, Bailey, & Sloane-Akwara, 2000). From this we have learned: Conflict resolution education supports the development of resilience in young people and offers alternatives to traditional discipline systems that punish children in schools. It improves students' social and emotional competency, conflict behavior, and academic performance. It contributes to a healthy school climate by reducing vandalism, violence, school absence, and failure. Students who are empowered to solve their own problems and are given many opportunities to exercise positive leadership were less violent than students in the control group. Kids who received this form of peace education were less aggressive and more pro-social. These positive results held up equally well for both boys and girls in low and high risk neighborhoods.

A massive study on the Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP) in New York City public schools (Roderick, 1998) involving over 1,000 students found that all children in the study became more violent during the two years the study was conducted, (which reinforces an earlier point that children raised in violent environments are being negatively influenced by

popular presentations that glamorize violence), but the children who received the RCCP training were not as violent as their peers who had no conflict resolution education. Teachers who received the most training produced the best results in their students. In the many schools that received this training 20% of the teachers taught 80% of the lessons, even though all teachers in participating schools were trained in the RCCP curriculum. This finding has been corroborated in Milwaukee where this author has evaluated various approaches to peace education (Harris, 1995). Even though the whole school receives training, only a small percentage of the teachers use it. An important research question is: Why is this so? Why don't all teachers embrace peace education strategies when exposed to them?

Even in schools that have received extensive training in peace education, not all teachers are convinced of it value. This author has conducted a small unscientific study on professionals who have taken a peace education course (Harris, 2000). They rank ordered factors at school that influenced whether or not they did peace education. These were in order:

- administration
- faculty
- role models
- support staff
- resources

Teachers need administrative support in order to carry out innovations. These same respondents indicated that feelings of urgency, knowledge of subject matter, religious faith, and past peace education success also motivated them to become peace educators. They also indicated that they feared being seen as "soft" on their pupils for using peace education strategies in their classes.

There are many obstacles to peace education research: How to conduct follow-up studies? In the above study with my own students, I only got a 45% return rate. This was with educated professionals, many of whom couldn't be found five years after they had completed a peace education course. How do we track students, whose lives are much more unstable?

Professional ethics require that researchers get permission from parents in order to conduct research on school age children. It is hard to get permission from parents of students to participate in such evaluations. An ideal study of a peace education program would track a group of students over a period of time and compare its behavior with a control group, but in the real world, I fear that such studies may be impossible.

Even if such a study were conducted, the aggressive behavior of any particular participant is always subject to many different stimulants that are outside of the control of teachers. For example, take the case of an eleven young girl in my city who was selected to present a gift from her class to Archbishop Desmond Tutu, when he visited Milwaukee. She was chosen for this honor because she was a leading peacemaker in a school that had a very strong peace education curriculum (Harris & Jeffries, 1998). On her way home that night she was threatened by another student. She went home (to an empty house) got a gun out of her father's nightstand and took it to school the next day to protect herself. A student who knew of her weapon told an administrator and this girl was expelled from school immediately. Here is an outstanding peacemaker from a school that is committed to peace education. Are we to say that that school's peace education program is a failure because she was expelled for bringing a weapon to school?

There are many environmental factors that promote violence. Since these factors are outside a school's control, evaluating the behavior of students may not be the best way to demonstrate the value peace education (because of the influence of out of school factors). Peace is a complex learning. How do we evaluate it? Peace education researchers are not evaluating whether or not a student can do simple mathematical calculations, like 2 + 2 = 4. Learning to be peaceful is complicated. It includes learning how to be tolerant, patient, compassionate, kind, and generous. Can peace educators evaluate their students' empathy, persistence, and confidence? Can graduates of these classes maintain self-control? Are they flexible, calm and reflective? Can they identify both their own feelings and the emotions of others? Are they assertive? Can they open up channels of communication, negotiate, lead group discussions, communicate clearly, hear emotions, interpret other people's body language, etc. etc. etc?

Peaceful people have knowledge of alternatives to violence, a concern for justice, a willingness to get involved, and an awareness of perspective. These are extremely hard things to evaluate.

Michael Van Slyck (Van Slyck, Stern, & Zak, 1996), a leading researcher in the field of conflict resolution education, says that you can measure students' attitudes about conflict, but once again how can you determine that these attitudes remain positive over time? We might be able to determine whether or not a student has learned a particular historical fact about nonviolence, but how can we determine if that person has acquired a disposition and will to behave peacefully in the future, maybe even making a positive contribution to building the beloved community? How can we be sure at time T that someone we are educating about peace has learned what we have hoped he or she has learned? Because peace education has a longitudinal nature, that learning may be manifested some time in the future.

The good news is that researchers have shown that during the past decade when educators have pretty much on their own been implementing peace education in schools in a somewhat helter skelter manner, a violence prevention program here, a conflict resolution program there, that gun use and fights among youth have been decreasing in schools, in spite of the gruesome headlines about school shootings in places like Littleton, Colorado; Jonesboro, Arkansas; Pearl, Mississippi; Peducah, Kentucky; and Springfield, Oregon (Brener, Simon, King, & Lowry, 1999; Grossman, Neckerman, & Koepsell, 1997). The bad news if that researchers have not been able to demonstrate that those reductions are due to peace education efforts, but peace educators can claim to have contributed to these declines.

HOW CAN WE DEVELOP PEACE BUILDING STRATEGIES IN SCHOOLS?

Peace educators look to peace theory that states that there are three ways to promote peace—peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peacebuilding (Berlowitz, 1994). Traditionally, schools have relied upon a peacekeeping response to the problems of youth violence, trying to intimidate children from committing acts of violence by threatening them with severe punishments—expulsion from school, metal detectors, weapons searches, hiring security guards, and bringing

police into schools to maintain order and conduct DARE programs. Six percent of schools in the United States have police stationed in them (NCES, 1998).

In conjunction with this peacekeeping approach, a peacemaking approach has been developed where teachers and psychologists have been teaching conflict resolution skills in school settings. This strategy for dealing with the problems of youth violence began twenty years ago through the Community Boards program in San Francisco and has gone international, being implemented in schools through out the world. Peer mediation programs try to resolve conflicts between parties that may not be overtly violent. They use a third party, a mediator, to help the parties resolve their differences. Proponents of conflict resolution also teach positive communication skills to young people. These two approaches (peacekeeping and peacemaking) are similar to safe sex techniques taught in schools. As valuable as these programs are, in the height of passion young people may not use the safe sex techniques they have learned in schools.

Likewise, with conflict resolution techniques, in the midst of an argument or a fight, a young person may not use sophisticated communication skills and may resort to more primitive use of force to settle disputes. Why would an angry youth choose peace at all? Adults who use these approaches see the problems of violence as residing in young people and hope to solve these problems by providing youth with skills that help them avoid violent behaviors.

A third approach to the problems of youth violence is a peacebuilding strategy that tries to teach youth how to live peacefully on this planet. Peacebuilding assumes that the problems of violence reside in the culture surrounding youth. The goal is to give young people insights into the sources of this violence and empower them to avoid and transform it. Whereas most approaches to school violence attempt to put out fires, a peacebuilding approach to the problems of youth violence tries to keep the fires from starting in the first place. It's a question of the will. In the midst of violent cultures that not only promote violence, but also glamorize it, how can peace educators motivate children to be peaceful? How can they inspire them to live up to standards of justice? How can they encourage them to live sustainably on this planet? How can they help young people deal with the trauma of violence in their lives?

There are three essential components to peacebuilding:

1) Addressing the sources of violence

2) Filling young people's heads with positive images of peace, so peace will be attractive to them

3) Help young people recover from violence

Peace education includes concepts of care, compassion, and connectedness. Peace educators teach respect for cultural diversity. Their goal is not just to stop the violence, but also to create in children's minds the conditions of positive peace. Peace education implies drawing out from people their instincts to live peacefully and emphasizes peaceful values upon which society should be based (Harris, 1988).

1) If young people are going to grow into adults who appreciate and promote nonviolence, they must understand the negative impact of violence upon their lives. Children in the advanced technological societies live in violent cultures where they are exposed constantly to images of violence in entertainment, dysfunctional role models of parents who don't resolve conflicts well, and national leaders who rely upon force and militaristic solutions to solve problems. Peace educators teach youth about the roots of violence. Why is our society so violent and what can they do about it? They emphasize the evils of a militaristic social order and question structural inequalities that lead to violence. This peacebuilding approach is controversial because it calls for disarmament and challenges traditional curricula where history is a series of violent events.

2) Administrators interested in this approach to the problems of school violence must encourage teachers to teach young people about peace (Harris, 1996). Developing a peace consciousness is a sophisticated task, equally as important and difficult as becoming proficient mathematically, but schools tend to neglect this important learning. In the rush to acquire sophisticated academic skills, schools are often ignoring sophisticated human relations skills that make civilized life possible.

Students who are peaceful know about alternatives to violence. Their teachers encourage them to be cooperative and tolerant. They challenge their own prejudices and are respectful of others. They are open minded and empathetic. They have a concern for justice and an understanding of universal human rights. These complex skills require a comprehensive curriculum. Peacebuilding should be taught at every grade level every day, just like mathematics. In fact, what is more important, knowing calculus, or knowing kindness?

3) The cutting edge of peacebuilding in schools is helping young people recover from posttraumatic stress disorders. Coming from homes where they are abused and neglected, many children witness acts of violence in neighborhoods and families. Many adults are in denial about how damaging violent events are for young children. Children are at risk in schools because they experience the devastating effects of violence. How can educators help young people deal with the trauma of violence in their lives?

Trauma circles, peer counseling, and support groups can help young children manage some of the grief, fear, and anger caused by violent events in their lives. Anger management groups in secondary schools help adolescents deal with some of the deep-seated rage children have who come from abusive and/or dysfunctional homes. Such activities can help improve the academic performance of students who are so distracted by violence that they cannot focus on cognitive lessons. Adults who listen and show concern to the problems caused by violence in young people's lives can help heal some of the wounds that often lead to hostile aggressive behavior. Under this model schools provide services and support to high risk families, exhibiting a caring relationship to the parents of the children attending that school.

Peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peacebuilding strategies are all necessary. The problem is that school personnel over emphasize peace through strength in our schools, further alienating troubled youth from educational institutions. This punitive approach blames youth for the dysfunctional behaviors they have adopted from the environment that surrounds them. Peacekeeping strategies are necessary when adults have to break up fights, but getting tough should not be the only approach to troubled youth who act out in school.

At the end of the twentieth century there are hundreds of curricula in tens of different languages that provide lessons on how to teach children about nonviolence. Brain research has emphasized how crucial it is to nurture infants(Karr-Morse & Wiley, 1997). There are many excellent peace education curricula, appropriate for all levels, including a nurturing peace program that is being developed for comprehensive use in K-12 classes (Bavolek, Dravage & Elliot, 1992). How can peace educators convince their colleagues to invest in teaching alternatives to violence in our schools? In a competitive educational climate the emphasis is upon raising school standards, not funding conflict resolution education programs. Educational leaders in modern technological societies value more the learning of calculus, chemistry, and physics, than the acquisition of peacemaking skills. The challenge for peace educators is to convince their professional colleagues of the value of teaching about peace.

Conclusion

This is a dynamic time in which to be doing peace education. In November 1995 the 186 members states of the 28th General conference of the UNESCO stated that the major challenge at the close of the 20th century is the transition from a culture of war and violence to a culture of peace. In November 1998 the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution for the culture of peace and another declaring the year 2000 the International Year for the Culture of Peace and the years 2001-2010 to be the "International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence for the Children of the World." From that mandate UNESCO has developed eight areas of action necessary for the transition from a culture of war to a culture of peace. The first of these is "Culture of Peace through Education." A manifesto written by the winners of the Nobel Peace Prize and published in *Le Monde* on July 2, 1997 states that the best way to fight violence with nonviolence is through education.

Throughout all the different forms of peace education that have arisen during this past century, peace educators attempt to warn people about the dangers of violence and instruct them into how nonviolence can be used to resolve differences and promote peace. Peace educators provide information about different peace strategies that people can use to address the various

forms of violence that concern them. Because there are so many different forms of violence, both international and domestic, the specific educational strategies differ within different contexts. "Peace" is a dynamic concept that has different meanings within different cultures, as well as different connotations for the spheres in which peaceful processes are applied. Peace educators have to be clear about their goals and convince their students about the value of peace strategies if they are to succeed in replacing a faith in militarism with trust in a culture of peace

Peace educators will have to more effectively convince legislators, school boards, university presidents, and the general citizenry to put resources into peacebuilding approaches to violence, while most policy makers are firmly committed to a peace through strength approach to resolving conflicts. While some research supporting peace education exists, further research will have to be developed that spells out clearly how it effectively deals with problems of violence. If peace educators can effectively address these challenges, their methodologies and content might find itself in the center of educational debate about how to improve school performance and how to best use education to create a better future. If they ignore these challenges, peace education will remain peripheral to mainstream educational endeavors.

Bibliography

Adams. D., et al. (1987). Statement on violence. *Medicine & War* 3, 191-192.

Bavolek, S, Dravage, K. & Elliot, L. (1992). *Developing nurturing schools: A school-based curriculum for senior high school.* Oak City, UT: Family Development Resources.

Berlowitz, M. (1994). Urban educational reform: Focusing on peace education. *Education and Urban Society, 27*(1), 82-95.

Bodine, R., & Crawford, D. (1998). *The handbook of conflict resolution education: A guide to building quality programs in schools.* San Francisco: Josssey-Bass.

Boulding, K. (1976). *Stable peace.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Brener, N., Simon, T., King, E., & Lowry, R. (1999). Recent trends in violence-related behaviors among high school students in the United States. *Journal of the American* Medical *Association, 282*(5), 440-446.

Brock-Utne, B. (1985). *Educating for peace: A feminist perspective.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Brown, J., D'Emidio-Caston, M., & Benard, B. (2001). *Resilience education.* Thousands Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Cohen, E. (1994). *Designing groupwork: Strategies for the heterogeneous classroom* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Eckhardt, W. (1984) Peace studies and attitude change: A value theory of peace studies. *Peace and change, 4*(1), 6-71.

Fisher, R , & Ury, W. (1981). *Getting to yes.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981.

The Fourth R (1998). *Conflict resolution in U.S. schools, 82,* 2.

Garbarino, J. (1999). *Lost boys: Why our sons turn violent and how we can save them.* New York: Free Press.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Grossman, D., Neckerman, J., & Koepsell, T. (1997). The effectiveness of a violence prevention curriculum among children in elementary school: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of the American Medical Association 77*(20), 1605-1611.

Harris, I. (1988). *Peace education*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland Press.

Harris, I. (1992). The challenge of peace education: Do our efforts make a difference? *Educational Foundations, 6*(4), 75-98.

Harris, I. (1995). Teachers' response to conflict in selected Milwaukee schools. In H. Ledgren (Ed.), *Peace education and human development* (pp. 197-219). Lund, Sweden: Department of Educational and Psychological Research.

Harris, I. (1996). From world peace to peace in the 'hood. *Journal for a Just and Caring Education, 2*(4), 378-395.

Harris, I. (1999). Peace education: Colleges and universities. In *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and Conflict* (pp. 679–689). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Harris, I. (2000). Factors that promote retention of peace education training. In U. Spring (Ed.), *Peace studies from a global perspective: Human needs in a cooperative world* (pp. 399–420). Delhi, India: Maadhyam Book Services.

Harris, I., & Jeffries, R. (1998). Cooling the Climate: Using Peace Education in an Urban Middle School, *Middle School Journal, 30*(2), 56–64.

James, W. (1910/1966). The moral equivalent of war. In S. Lynd (Ed.), *Nonviolence in America: A documentary history* (pp. 135–139). New York: The Bobbs Merrill Company, Inc.

Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (1991). *Teaching students to be peacemakers*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Jones, T. S. & Kmitta, D. (Eds.). (2000). *Does it work? The case for conflict resolution education in our nation's schools*. Washington, DC: Conflict Resolution Education Network (CREnet).

Karr-Morse, R., & Wiley, M. (1997). *Ghosts from the nursery: Tracing the roots of violence.* New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Klein, U. (1997). Peace Research and Peace Education in Israel. *AFB-INFO 2/97: Newsletter of the Peace Research Information Unit Bonn.* Bonn: Arbeitsstelle Friedensforschung Bonn.

Lantieri, L., & Patti, J.(1996). *Waging peace in our schools.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Martin, J. (1985). *Reclaiming a conversation: The ideal of an educated woman.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press

Montessori, M. (1946,1974). *Education for a new world.* Thiruvanmiyur, India: Kalakshetra Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1998). *Violence and discipline in U.S. public schools: 1996-97.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Noddings, N. (1993). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Powers, R., & Vogele, W. (Eds.). (1997). *Protest, power, and change: An encyclopedia of nonviolent action from ACT-UP to women's suffrage.* New York: Garland Publishing.

Prutzman, P., Stern, L., Burge, M., & Bodenheimer, G. (1988). *The friendly classroom for a small planet.* Gabriola Island, Canada: New Society Publishers.

Read, H. (1949). *Education for peace.* New York, C. Scribner's Sons.

Reardon, B. (1988). *Comprehensive peace education: Educating for global responsibility.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Roderick, T. (1998). Evaluating the Resolving Conflict Creatively Program. *The Fourth R, 82,* 3-5.

Rogers, C. (1942). *Counseling and psychotherapy: Newer concepts in practice.* New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Sandy, S. V., Bailey, S., & Sloane-Akwara, V. (2000). Impact on students: Conflict resolution education's proven benefits for students. In T. S. Jones, & D. Kmitta (Eds.), *Does it*

work? The case for conflict resolution education in our nation's schools (pp. 15–31). Washington, DC: Conflict Resolution Education Network.

Sandy, S. V., & Cochran, K. M. (2000). Conflict resolution: From early childhood to adolescence. In M. Deutsch & P.T. Coleman, (Eds.), *The handbook of constructive conflict resolution: Theory and practice* (pp. 316-342). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sharan, S. (Ed.). (1994). *Handbook of cooperative learning methods*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Stomfay-Stitz, A. (1993). *Peace Education in America, 1828-1990: Sourcebook for education and research.* Metuchin, NJ: Scarecrow Press.

Thelin, B.(1996). Early tendencies of peace education in Sweden. In I. Harris (Ed.), *Peace education in a postmodern world* (*special edition of Peabody Journal of Education, 71*(3), 95-110.

Van Slyck, M., Stern, M., & Zak, J. (1996). Promoting optimal adolescent development through conflict resolution education, training and practice: An innovative approach for counseling psychologists. *The Counseling Psychologist, 24*, 433-461.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Challenges for Peace Educators at the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century	
Author(s): Ian Harris	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Ian M. Harris	Printed Name/Position/Title: Ian Harris / Professor
Organization/Address: U. of Wisconsin – Milwaukee P.O. Box 413, Mil. WI 53201	Telephone: (414) 229-4724 FAX: (414) 229-3700
	E-Mail Address: imh@uwm.edu Date: 4/12/01

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)

ERIC