

Give Peace a Chance: The Diminution of Peace in Global Education in the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada

Sharon Anne Cook
University of Ottawa

This study surveyed the literature on peace and global education in secondary schools to explore the position of peace education within the global education field. To create a database from Canada, the United States, and Britain, this article includes secondary studies from professional and peer-reviewed periodicals, articles in published collections, monographs, and textbooks. The results demonstrate that peace education over time has occupied progressively less space. The nature of both peace and global education in the school curriculum has changed. The reduction of peace education within the global education rubric has negative consequences for everyone committed to the principles of global and peace education.

Key words: peace education, global education; school peace curriculum

Cette étude fait le point sur la littérature à propos de l'éducation à la paix et de l'éducation planétaire dans les écoles secondaires en vue de cerner la place occupée par l'éducation à la paix dans le domaine de l'éducation planétaire. Voulant créer une base de données issues du Canada, des États-Unis et de la Grande-Bretagne, l'auteure inclut des études secondaires provenant de périodiques professionnels et avec comité de lecture, des articles dans des collections, des monographies et des manuels. Les résultats démontrent que l'éducation à la paix occupe de moins en moins de place. La nature de l'éducation à la paix et de l'éducation planétaire dans les programmes scolaires a changé. La diminution de la place accordée à l'éducation à la paix au sein de la rubrique éducation planétaire a des conséquences négatives pour toutes les personnes attachées aux principes de l'éducation à la paix et de l'éducation planétaire.

Mots clés : éducation à la paix, éducation planétaire, notion de paix dans les programmes scolaires.

Peace education is currently considered to be both a philosophy and a process involving skills, including listening, reflection, problem-solving, cooperation and conflict resolution. The process involves empowering with the skills, attitudes and knowledge to create a safe world and build a sustainable environment. The philosophy teaches nonviolence, love, compassion and reverence for all life. Peace education confronts indirectly the forms of violence that dominate society by teaching about its causes and providing knowledge of alternatives. (Harris & Morrison, 2003, p. 9)

This definition of peace education by one of the field's leading author teams provides evidence of the close alignment of principles behind peace and global education, as it is termed in North America. Other popular sources on global education at the school level also emphasize the importance of peace education (Goldstein & Selby, 2000). Both collections define peacemaking as mainly an interpersonal experience, resulting in personal conflict, racism, gender and sexual exclusions, and environmental degradation. The focus is placed on the local and the personal, rather than the international, despite ongoing concern with what Galtung (1975) called structural violence. This waning of interest in the school curriculum in the international and structural dimensions of peace studies rather than the personal uses of peace-making has clear instrumental value for the classroom and schoolyard. However, the general effect of narrowing peace education's focus to the local has been to further marginalize it. In fact, it has been persuasively argued that school-based peace education struggles for legitimacy even within its own field: peace education vs. peace research; knowledge vs. praxis of peace education (Burns, 1996). Aspeslagh (1996) notes that peace education is "condemned to the waiting room of society," where the only thing left for its proponents is to "tap at the window looking into education and the public, hoping to attract some attention" (p. 392). Not all researchers in this field would agree with Aspeslagh's assessment, but most would acknowledge the fluid relationship between peace and global education in the school system, and the difficulties of peace education to find its place. On the other hand, global education, the larger framework into which peace education is now commonly inserted, has much more often developed a broad, international scope with local applications. The relationship between peace and global education was not always defined in this way. In fact, peace education has a deeper history than does global education, having developed a pedagogy with distinc-

tive qualities, and has provided a means for women to exercise a public role long before they were accorded civic rights through the franchise.

PURPOSE AND METHOD

This article reports on research that surveyed the literature on peace and global education for secondary schools. The goal was to explore the historical analysis and position of self-defined peace education within the broader global education field. Peace and global education were considered both for their spatial and discursive positions. We¹ surveyed all available literature on peace, and what has come to be termed global education, from the 1970s to about 2000. In so doing, we created a database of materials on peace and global education for Canada, the United States, and Britain. This literature included articles in professional and peer-reviewed periodicals, articles in published collections, monographs, and textbooks intended for classroom use. In all these secondary sources, the relative space devoted to, and the importance of peace education was weighed against the other strands in global education.² This article reports on the results of the investigation into the literature supporting peace and global education in the United States, Britain, and Canada. It offers a brief history of peace and global education and presents conclusions reached. It argues that as a field, school-based global education has progressively redefined itself, broadening its scope each time. On the other hand, school-based peace education has narrowed. Recast in ever more personal terms, peace education is less likely to engage the structural sources of systemic inequities and violence.

PEACE EDUCATION DEFINED THROUGH THE LITERATURE - PAST AND PRESENT

As with the global education movement (most researchers agree peace education has become a part of global education), current school-based peace education encompasses a wide variety of aims and approaches, depending on the audience and socio-political and ideological context. And like global education, too, peace education overlaps and shares theoretical and practical ground with other types of "progressive educations" (Toh & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000, p. 368). These include development education, environmental, human rights, and multi-cultural education. Hicks (1988) notes that peace education shares a concern of contemporary problems with global education as the basis of its content and a belief in participatory and active learning strategies (see also Perkins,

2002). Hicks (1988) also distinguish between negative and positive peace, as well as direct and indirect (structural) violence (Galtung, 1975). Peace education has been identified as sharing common ground with citizenship education through beliefs in the interdependency of the world's citizens (Harris, 2002; Toh & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000), and through its faith in tolerance, respect for difference, and an appreciation of the rights of others as productive of peace (Mahrouse, 2006).

Within these shared frameworks, therefore, peace education has been defined as education that promotes concepts of non-violence, human rights, social justice, world-mindedness, ecological balance, meaningful participation, and personal peace (Carson & Lange, 1997; Hicks, 2004). Others define peace as all those times when a nation is not actively at war, and peace education as everything supporting that condition (Thompson, 1987, p. 29). In *Peace Education*, an important source on this topic, Harris and Morrison (2003), who define the field as comprised of diversity education, violence-prevention, conflict resolution, and civic education, propose attacking violence on three levels: peace-keeping, peacemaking, and peace-building (p. 11). Reardon (1993, 1996, 2001) defines peace education as supported through a culture of peace at home and abroad. Hers is one of the few definitions to build a feminist perspective into her analysis.³ Finally, human rights and disarmament education figure prominently in some models of peace education (Roche, 2003).

Aside from definitions including disarmament and perhaps human rights, the burden of these definitions falls on the side of personally experienced conflict management. To explore but one of the justifications for peace education, that of Harris and Morrison (2003), peacekeeping is argued to be important "to create an orderly learning climate in schools" (p. 11), while peacemaking can often result in conflict resolution. Peacebuilding strategies, although too rarely engaged, should "create in children's minds a desire to learn how non-violence can provide the basis for a just and sustainable future" (Harris & Morrison, 2003, p. 11). As important as all these approaches to violence-prevention and management undoubtedly are, few encourage an examination of social or economic structures and the failures within these that create inequities. Thus, the meaning of *peace education* has become for many a form of community safety. Peace education is currently focused on anti-bullying and conflict resolution strategies (Harris & Morrison, 2003; Holden, 2000; Toh & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000). Beyond this relatively narrow, personally exper-

enced programme, peace education in schools has been judged to be in sharp decline (Holden, 2000; Toh & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000).

The contemporary peace education movement dates from the late nineteenth century when peace societies in Europe and North America encouraged internationalism through educational programmes. Founded in 1901, the Société d'Éducation Pacifique set out to create a network of teachers who would incorporate peace into the curriculum. Peace societies appeared in France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, Britain, and Scandinavia. Most had the objective of educating youth to the dangers of the international system and suggesting alternatives (Cooper, 1987). In North America, peace organizations adopted an analysis of violence as rooted in both individual actions and systemic societal failures, and as changeable through education (Boutilier, 1988; Crowley, 1980; Williamson & Gorham, 1989).

By the First World War, an international network of both women's and gender-integrated peace groups had been established, and these too ultimately depended on education to further their principles. To chart women's particular involvement, the International League for Peace and Freedom (Boutilier, 1988; Cambridge Women's Peace Collective, 1984; Page, 1972; Pierson, 1987; Vellacott, 1987), the Woman's Peace Party (Degen, 1972; Gorham, 1987), and the 1915 International Conference of Women for Permanent Peace (Costin, 1982; Gorham, 1987; Vellacott, 1988) all turned to education as a critical force for change (Toh & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000). In many cases, these international associations also worked through national groups promoted by women and men to lobby for peace education, such as the American School Peace League (Toh & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000), the Canadian League of Nations Society (Strong-Boag, 1987), the 1932 Disarmament Conference, which promoted moral disarmament, and the International Peace Committee, which approached peace through action-oriented methods (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996). As noted by Strong-Boag (1987):

For all their differences, internationally-minded women of many persuasions shared both a conception of their sex's particular sensitivity to the costs of armed conflict and an essential optimism about the power of education and the limitations of prejudice. By instructing children and adults in the follies of war and the ways of peace, women could prepare the way, as surely as any diplomat, for a better world. (pp. 171-172)

But this is not to say that men were uninterested in peace education. Both men and women widely recognized that education was an important vehicle for encouraging peace (Burns & Aspeslagh, 1996; Cumming, 2001).

Peace societies for much of the past century have depended on education to alert young and old, men and women, to the international structures and systemic inequities that encourage militarism and discourage peaceful solutions. Peace education was understood to be furthered through international cooperation, and by a pedagogy that emphasized active global citizenship. Central to this pedagogy are (a) values clarification and values analysis (Reardon, 1996), (b) critical thinking strategies to uncover assumptions rooted in racism, patriarchy, and post-colonialist structures, (c) the development of an ethic of caring for others, the environment, and structures supporting justice (Toh & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000), and (d) skills associated directly with conflict management and resolution (Harris & Morrison, 2003). Despite its promising history as a separate area of study, however, by the 1970s peace education was been incorporated into the broader rubric of global education (Hanvey, 1975), to which the article now turns.

GLOBAL EDUCATION AND GLOBAL PEDAGOGY DEFINED IN THE LITERATURE

Almost from its inception in the 1970s, the reach of school-based global education (as it is termed in North America) covered a lot of territory, both in terms of the content and perspective it urged students to adopt. It is generally accepted that the first articulation of the field was offered in the 1970s by Hanvey in the United States and by the World Studies Project in Britain. Hanvey (1975) set out five elements of global education:

1. *perspective consciousness* in which individuals hold views, often unconsciously, according to our own cultural framework;
2. *knowledge of world conditions* including economic patterns, population growth and movement, natural resources and use, science and technology, political movements, law, health and security and peace;
3. *cross-cultural awareness of* the world's diverse value systems and societal frameworks;
4. *global systems dynamics* including economic, political, ecological and social systems; and
5. *knowledge of choices* or alternatives to current management patterns, including foreign aid, consumption patterns and security systems.

Heater, in 1980, outlined the needs of a World Studies course in Britain. A few years later, Kniep (1986) redefined the field in America, distinguishing four features:

1. the study of *human values*, especially those that are universal rather than particular to a region or nation;
2. *global systems* including economic, political, ecological and technological;
3. *global issues and problems* emphasizing persistent, transnational, and interconnected problems of security systems, the environment, and human rights;
4. *global history* in which the sources of both universal and particularist human values and experiences would be engaged (see also Tucker & Cistone, 1991).

In these foundational definitions of global education, *peace* was defined in terms of interlocking global systems buttressed by cultural values, and occupying an important place.

Since these early renderings, there has been much reordering and updating in response to new challenges, and quiet jettisoning of features of global education that have proved to be especially difficult to act upon or as threatening to divide a delicately constructed and maintained community. Case (1993) proposed a strengthening of the “perceptual dimension” towards increasing open-mindedness, anticipation of complexity and empathy, and resistance to stereotyping and chauvinism in understanding and decision making. In comparing various national definitions, Pike (2000) argued for “common threads” (p. 65): (a) the *interdependence* of all people within a global system, (b) the *connectedness and diversity* of universal human attributes, values and knowledge, curriculum subjects, aspects of schooling, humans and their environment, and (c) the privileging of *multiple perspectives* before reaching a view. Blackburn (1988) and Lamy (1987) identified the importance of the role of non-governmental organization in global economic and educational systems and Bigelow and Peterson (2002) noted the continued record of social injustice. In addition, the importance of *indigenous peoples’ views* (Lamy, 1987) and the emphasis of holism over particularism (Kolker, Ustinova, McEaney, 1998) have also been forwarded as themes within global education since the late 1980s. In her synthesis of the literature by end of the twentieth century, Merryfield (1997) added the importance of analytical, evaluative, and *participatory* skills in private and public life (see also Kirkwood, 2001; Lapayese, 2003; Willinsky, 2005). During this period as

well, anti-racism (Merryfield & Subedi, 2001) and multiculturalism (Toh, 1993; Zachariah, 1993) became strong features of global education.

Several characteristics of this burdened definition are noteworthy. First, the parameters of global education are so diffuse, and the objectives so grand, that the field has been criticized for conceptual imprecision (Lamy, 1987). Case (1993) noted that global education operates as an educational slogan rather than as a coherent framework, "a positive emotive label that creates a unity of feeling and spirit about the tasks to be confronted by schooling" (Popewitz, 1980, p. 304, as cited in Case, 1993). Although some global educators welcome the freedom to shape global education to the diversity of students' and regional interests (Lapayese, 2003; Le Roux, 2001), others argue that this much-decried "wishy-washy" nature of global education must be clarified, and that failure to do so could easily hasten withdrawal of support for its many laudable goals (Case, 1993). Second, in comparison with the founding statements, the successive redefinitions of global education at best subsume peace within discussions of value systems or multiple perspectives. However, this is not to suggest that peace and global education are at odds: the compatibility of the two strands were clear into the late 1980s when Reardon published companion volumes in the same year on global and peace education (Reardon, 1988a, 1988b) and Pike and Selby (1988) could include Peace and Conflict as one of seven objectives for global education.⁴ But since that time, with a few major exceptions, peace education as a separate but interconnected topic within global education has received less and less attention (Burns, 1996).

Pedagogically, global education bears testimony to its social activist and progressive roots. It arose at the same time as experiential learning and values clarification, open schools, and child-centred education (Hendrix, 1998). Part of this tradition has been the claim that content and process should be fused or at least interdependent (Le Roux, 2001). As the field has developed, strategies have emerged to encourage activity-based learning (Selby & Pike, 2000) and especially perspectivistic analysis (Pike & Selby, 1988; *Teach Magazine*, 2005), cooperative learning and role-playing (Holden, 2000), story-telling (Calder, 2000; Moore, 2003), simulations (Gautier & Rebich, 2005), student projects and community surveys, (Tye & Tye, 1993) community service (Willinsky, 2005), and web-based research (Risinger, 1998). New approaches to assessment encompass cognitive, affective, and participatory domains (Diaz, Massialas, Xanthopoulos, 1999). At its most radical, strategies rooted in post-

modernism and the democratic pedagogy of Aronowitz and Giroux (1991) stressing power differentials, the disabling authority of hegemonic structures, as well as the possibilities of empowering discourse (Preece, 2002; Wells, 1996) have offered much-needed emancipatory approaches to give the field renewed direction and edge.

GLOBAL EDUCATION IN THREE SITES

The literature survey carried out for this study illustrates both the distinctive forms of global education in specific national settings and the process by which peace education has been nudged to the margins. Further, the literature showed that national preoccupations have caused certain themes to be dropped in some sites from the global educational agenda (more commonly termed "world studies" in Britain), and others to be added. In all cases, however, the literature survey demonstrates that the peace constituent has become increasingly diminished. The implications of this loss are more than cosmetic; rather, they are fundamental to the issues considered important in global and peace education, and are important to the teachers and students of global education, and to society generally.

The American Case

However one defines the field of global education, Sutton (1999) asserts that its origins are found in post-World War II American experiences. Exposed to other national and ethnic combatants and world views, the loss of European colonial control, and the bracing effect of Allied military might, the United States developed markedly more interest in the international community and in the 1950s encouraged international education for its school children. Despite the challenges of McCarthy-era anti-communism and the competitiveness sparked by Sputnik for educators seeking a more internationalist focus, the communist and scientific threats also encouraged learning about the world on the principle, "know thy enemy" (Sutton, 1999, p. 10). American support for the fledgling United Nations and its specialized agencies, particularly the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) with its dissemination of teaching materials in favour of world-mindedness, also profiled peacemaking as a worthy topic in Social Studies and Civics courses. The horrific bombing of Nagasaki and Hiroshima brought a new urgency to demands for disarmament, a movement that continues today (Toh & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000).

Hendrix (1998) points to the important stimulus of the 1963 Second World Food Congress in Washington, D.C. for American global education. Hosted by President Kennedy, the conference positioned the United States as a leader in ending global hunger and poverty and emphasized the role of education in preparing a populace able and willing to participate in the campaign. By the late 1960s, the American Civil Rights movement, the protest against the war in Vietnam, the student riots at Kent State, the race riots in Detroit, McLuhan's notion of the "global village," and the second-wave women's movement all encouraged the reconsideration of old certainties. "International education," which referred to area studies, languages, and "hot" international topics, (Bruce, Podemski, & Anderson, 1991) became more "global" with the report by Becker and Anderson's (1969), *An Examination of Objectives, Needs, and Priorities in International Education in United States Secondary Schools*. Commissioned by the U.S. Office of Education, the report's main arguments found expression and support in a wide variety of official documents and monographs, including most importantly, Hanvey's (1975) *An Attainable Global Perspective*. As noted, Hanvey's re-articulation of internationalist into global education provided the first blueprint for this new curriculum area in North America.

Hanvey's (1975) analysis stressed an apolitical, ecologically inspired, culturally relativistic order. The perspective of the learner was as a neutral world citizen, not as one constituted with race, ethnic, class, or even gendered qualities. If national divisions were to be ignored as much as possible, so were differences created by biology, history, or culture. This perspective included progress towards peace that was rooted in national and even international crises. This ahistorical view fit easily with progressive educational pedagogy in which child-centredness trumped national educational prescriptions. Hence, with the release of the report, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (1983), in which academic excellence was proposed "to foster economic competitiveness" (National Commission on Excellence in Education), rather than global understanding and tolerance, proponents of global education found their ability to fit into the new paradigm limited. Post-Hanvey prescriptions for global education did little to quell a rising tide of criticism. Cunningham's 1986 report for the Federal Department of Education, *Blowing the Whistle on 'Global Education,'* alleged that global educators "indoctrinated" children with pacifism in the face of Soviet threats, "moral relativism," "free-market economics," and "redistribution" of wealth to the

developing world (as cited in Sutton, 1999, p. 21). The influential *Readers' Digest*, which took particular exception to global education's promotion of "pacifism" (Ryerson, 1987), called into question the peace component of global education. By the late 1980s, Secretary of Education Bennett (1989) surveyed six global education textbooks and curriculum materials, finding their approach both "relativistic" and "anti-rational." Ravitch (1989) wondered if American students exposed to global education should be "encouraged to accept political, social, and economic systems and behaviors in other countries uncritically" (p. 3) or encouraged to apply the same critical standards to global education as to their own national history. Others questioned priorities and implementation strategies in times of financial constraint and evaluation methods.

Once a brave new field of holistic education dedicated to better understanding the world and its cultures, global education was accused of being witlessly uncritical, amorphous, and even un-American. Peace education in particular came to be seen as unpatriotic (Harris & Morrison, 2003, p. 166) as somehow siding with America's many enemies by poisoning children's minds. Assertions of this magnitude were not easily thrown off, and the result was for global educators to avoid controversy, and seek balance. One way to achieve balance was to reduce divisive discourse, including that which encouraged peace. What was recommended, Tye (2003b) avers, was teaching "about other peoples and countries, but do[ing] it 'patriotically'" (p. 165).

To buttress the field, global educators have made the connection of global education to school reform, claiming the general reform orientation of global education as an indication of its general utility to all who have a stake in the American educational system (Haakenson, Savukova & Mason, 1998-1999; Harris, 2002; Kolker, Ustinova, & McEneaney, 1998-1999). But despite such attempts to find a route back into mainstream educational discourse, global education has never fully recovered its status in the United States. Since the attacks of September 11, 2001, and the War in Iraq, peace education, especially, has been at low ebb (Westheimer, 2007).

The British Case

Similar emancipatory echoes, as in the American context, influenced the global education movement in Britain, featuring the construction of Palestine and struggles in South-east Asia, idealism of the post-colonial Commonwealth and United Nations, and the slow but gradual recovery

of Europe and Britain herself after the Second World War. The Council for Education in World Citizenship, established in 1939, provided firm ground for the development in the 1960s of the world studies movement (Heater, 1980.) In the late 1960s and 1970s, world studies fused the active learning movement of Rogers and Bruner (World Studies Project, 1976) with the social activism of Freire into a holistic, if informal, model promoting “knowledge, attitudes and skills that are relevant to living responsibly in a multi-cultural and interdependent world” (Fisher & Hicks, 1985, p. 8). In the same period, peace education made huge strides throughout the United Kingdom with system-wide changes in teacher education, in school organization (Toh & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000), and very importantly, in the curriculum which identified as important learning outcomes “peace and conflict, development, human rights and the environment” (Fisher & Hicks, 1985, p. 8). Key resources, such as Haavelsrud’s (1976) *Education for Peace: Reflection and Action* and Hicks’ (1988) *Education for Peace* helped to sustain the focus on peace education. As well, Heater’s (2006) role in world studies provided essential leadership for the broader field, continuing even today with his championing of, in his words, “multiple citizenship.” The Centre for Global Education (CGE) at York [St. John University] (Pike & Selby, 1988) is credited with maintaining the movement’s momentum, as did the World Studies 8 - 13 Project in Lancaster.

Pedagogically, world studies became a model in its promotion of “experiential and participatory learning,” including discussion, debate, reflection, and critical thinking (Hicks & Steiner, 1989). Other pedagogies favoured were small-group discussions and collaborative research, Brunerian-style problem-solving, role-play, and simulations, and the use of a broad range of cultural artifacts rather than print in the decision-making process (Holden, 2000). By the mid-1980s, over half the teachers in England and Wales were actively involved in world studies and many more used parts of the curricula and pedagogical approaches to supplement other curricula (Holden, 2000, p. 76). This included peace studies.

As in the American experience, the backlash began to gather strength from the early 1980s when global education was criticized for avoiding divisive political issues and power differentials (Mullard, 1982; Huckle, 1983). Self-esteem building and interpersonal cooperation were criticized for capturing too much attention and systemic inequities receiving too little attention (Steiner, 1992). The rich pedagogical approach came under attack as well, with claims that process overshadowed content (Lister,

1987). The implicit leftist ideology offended many (Scruton, 1985). Official unflattering assessments of the British world studies curriculum found their mark with the introduction of the *National Curriculum* (Department of Education, 1988). It defined 10 compulsory subjects with mandated knowledge, an Anglo-centric focus on the past rather than the future-orientation of most global education, and a centralized testing and evaluation component, with the results published and schools ranked. Whole-class instruction was recommended, disciplinary boundaries reinscribed, and authorized knowledge privileged over student-generated understandings. Content and pedagogy took a dramatic turn to the right, relatively marginalizing as well the strong programme of peace studies.

Long-range assessments suggest that teachers continued to use active learning pedagogies, especially those who learned their profession within the progressivist framework. However, issues such as peace and conflict, human rights contraventions, or racism and environmental education seem to have been cut back (Holden, 2000, p. 78). Further, the moral agency that underlay much of this approach to learning was at first side-stepped for academic excellence, and then reintroduced in the new citizenship curricula of 2002. Here, the pedagogical demands to create active citizens, able and willing to make informed and intelligent decisions about civic life and seeming to care about civic institutions, has recreated a space for the old strategies of debate, role play, and community-based research. What is missing, we found in this survey, and strikingly so, is much recognition of peace education as more than solving personal conflicts rather than systemic injustice. Where the American global education movement attempted to "hitch its cart" to the school reform horse, the British linked its reform to the new citizenship education. Learning to have "morally and socially responsible behavior" (QCA [Qualifications and Curriculum Authority], 1999, as cited in Holden, 2000, p. 77) was one of three primary goals of the new curriculum. Nevertheless, of all three countries, it could be argued that global education remains the strongest in the United Kingdom with new publications supporting theory and practice (Hicks & Holden, 2007).

The Canadian Case

It is a truism to assert that Canadian norms, educational and otherwise, owe much to both the American and British examples. So it is with the case of global education. Falling heir to both the reformist impulse of American civil rights, anti-racism, and feminism, and to the especially

close alignment of women with the peace process found in both the United States and Britain, Canadian global education has developed as something of an amalgam of these national models, with strong links to the British.⁵ In fact, in both Canada and Britain, Pike (2000) asserts, peace education has traditionally ranked as a valued field. In this, it shares common ground with development, environmental, human rights, and multicultural education (p. 67).

The first expression in Canada of what would come to be called global education followed in the late 1960s and the early 1970s on the publication of a series of educational Royal Commission Reports of which the so-called *Hall-Dennis Report* (1969) in Ontario was the most influential (Gidney, 1999). Widely acclaimed for their championing of progressive education principles, including holistic rather than discipline-based curricula, Brunerian discovery-based pedagogy, values clarification strategies, and resource-based research and decision making, the educational climate in most Canadian provinces in this era provided an accepting context for some version of global education, including peace education. Despite education being a provincial jurisdiction, by the 1970s there was an enormous expansion in the Federal Government's support for development aid and expertise through generous funding of the Canadian University Service Overseas (CUSO), the Pearson government's establishment of the Company of Young Canadians (CYC) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). By the 1980s, the latter group was funding global education, professional development centres across Canada, which in turn, placed effective pressure on provincial ministries of education to formally sanction global education topics in the mandated curriculum. Peace education also thrived; one observer described peace education as having "an almost evangelical fervor" in that period (Hargraves, 1997, p. 109). Inevitably, such enthusiasm also generated controversy.

As retrenchment occurred in Britain and the United States throughout the 1980s, so too did Canadian global education begin to lose ground by the mid-1990s, a period generally regarded as one of conservatism in Canadian education (Gidney, 1999). By 1995, most local professional development centres had been closed, and what global education remained was transferred to post-secondary institutions (Tye, 2003a, pp. 19-20). Even here, however, funding was tight and activity much reduced. Yet, the moral component of global education did find strong official support through the widespread recognition that schooling must support appar-

ently flagging citizenship training (Gidney, 1999; Willinsky, 2005). Along with several other jurisdictions, Canadian provincial ministries of education identified character and citizenship training as goals for the new millennium, resulting in such developments as a separate Civics course in Ontario, launched in 1999. As global education had linked its programme in other places and times to school reform or citizenship training (Calder, 2000; Hendrix, 1998; Lapayese, 2003), so too in Canada, global educators sought to shore up sagging support by redefining global education as global citizenship (Reed, 1996). One result of this redefinition was the further marginalization of peace education, now transformed almost exclusively into conflict management and resolution in aid of citizenship skills (Toh & Floresca-Cawagas, 2000). Further, to criticize foreign policy in a post-9/11 world carries with it particular dangers. In a period of perceived vulnerability by many Western governments, peace talk, which is local rather than internationally positioned, is both more welcome, and in many ways, simpler for educational purposes (Cook, 2007). As well, peer pressures resulting in bullying is a major current preoccupation with most educational and many civic authorities, lending peace education as conflict resolution a renewed utility.

CONCLUSION

Peace education as personal violence prevention has a number of weaknesses. First, it tends to ignore or at least mute the structural roots of violence and war – to understand peace as a goal only for one classroom or school or community. This understanding results both in a more manageable problem, but also in one that is removed from its sources of persistent conflict, and only superficially open to resolution. Second, by narrowing the range to local community issues, the alliance between peace and global educational resources and personnel is weakened, with the field of peace education left isolated. Third, this pale and instrumental definition for peace studies has no apparent history or constituency beyond those who crave peace, and who among us does this not include?

Born in the radical 1970s, and tied to social and economic issues that surfaced in that decade, it should not be surprising that global education (or “world studies”), as a field, has remained under-theorized and heavily reliant on a political culture that has become increasingly less respectful and perhaps hostile to its fundamental principles. One way in which global education has struggled to survive in the face of growing demands for practical educational skills rather than global justice has been

to regularly reinvent itself, jettisoning those elements that have the potential to weaken its political acceptability. But a global curriculum that takes on the divisive and most difficult issues – many of which are closely associated with the implications of peace and governance in conflict settings – would breathe new life into a field still struggling to find a place in the broader mainstream curriculum.

I want to underscore the fact that this article is concerned primarily with the nature and interrelationships of peace and global education in schools. At this level, peace education draws heavily from and is enriched by an increasingly robust post-secondary educational sector. This sector could, and I would argue, should influence peace and global education more at the school level in all three countries examined. These post-secondary programmes in peace studies typically combine interpersonal and structural conflict studies with international conflict resolution. The analysis and critique presented here does not apply to the post-secondary sector. However, a closer alignment of these two domains might well present a solution to the problems identified through this research. The sites were chosen because they represent different national and political systems as well as different educational systems. Nevertheless, the same general process has occurred in all three systems: peace education has incrementally lost ground to global education. Hence, a solution for one might well serve others well.

Having surveyed the literature on the history and current position of global and peace education in the United States, Britain, and Canada, it is clear that, although the specific national experience has differed to some degree in these settings, there has been a common experience of peace education's diminution in its uneasy relationship with global education or world studies. As educators survey a world rent by many of the same problems in evidence when the field first developed in the 1970s, and reflect on the capacity of the educational system to reinvigorate youth to fight as once their elders fought, we might reasonably hope that global education, with a strengthened peace education component within global education, could better inform this struggle than it is now capable of doing.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research for this article was supported by the University of Ottawa Prize for Excellence in Education, which the author received in 2005-2006, and by the sleuthing and research skills of Emily Addison who has also read and commented on this manuscript, and by the Global Classroom Initiative, CIDA, which

has financially supported the Global Perspectives Programme in the Faculty of Education at the University of Ottawa. I wish also to thank Tracy Crowe, Lorna McLean, Gada Mahrouse, Ken Montgomery, Blodwen Piercey, Penny Sanger, and Monica Waterhouse, all of whom provided valuable suggestions on an earlier draft of this article. I particularly thank our then-graduate student who carried out the initial literature search on which this project rests: Emily Addison.

NOTES

¹ The team of faculty and students engaged in this study were part of the *Developing a Global Perspective for Educators/Developpement d'une perspective global pour enseignants et enseignantes* Initiative, funded by CIDA through its *Global Classrooms Initiative*.

² The themes isolated were peace and security, sustainable development, political systems, citizenship, cultural practices, and environmentalism. They were developed in response to the definitional boundaries of global education set out by Graham Pike (2000) which identify four threads: the interdependence of all people within a global system, the connectedness and diversity of universal human attributes, values and knowledge, curriculum subjects, aspects of schooling, humans and their environment, and the privileging of multiple perspectives (p. 65).

³ In her discussion of "negative peace," one of peace education's foremost authorities, Betty Reardon, agrees with other feminists that "there is a fundamental interrelationship among all forms of violence, and that violence is a major consequence of the imbalance of a male-dominated society. Forms of various types, from the intimidation of rape to the social imposition of dependency, maintain this balance. In itself, the patriarchy is a form of violence" (p. 39). (See Sharon Anne Cook, 2007.)

⁴ Peace researchers at the post-secondary level can choose from a broad range of Master's-level and some Doctoral programmes in departments or centres which include those focusing on "international peace studies" (Notre Dame University, San Diego University), "conflict transformation" (Eastern Mennonite University), conflict analysis and resolution (George Mason University, Nova Southeastern University, Syracuse University, Boston University, Harvard University) and peace and conflict studies (Wayne State University, University of Manitoba, St. Paul's University, Ottawa). This represents but a sample of what is available in North America. I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for having provided this list.

⁵ One of Canada's preeminent global educators, Graham Pike, argues that, based on his conversations with about 120 global educators in the United States, Britain, and Canada, the perceptions of global education in Canada and Britain are closer than those held in America (Pike, 2000, p. 65).

REFERENCES

- Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. A. (1991). *Postmodern education: Politics, culture and social criticism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Aspeslagh, R. (1996). Dreamers appear to be practical realists: Peace education as a 'grand narration.' In R. J. Burns & R. Aspeslagh (Eds.), *Three decades of peace education around the world: An anthology* (pp. 379-395). Camden, CT: Garland Publishing Inc.
- Aspeslagh, R., & Burns, R. J. (1996). Approaching peace through education: Background concepts and theoretical issues. In R. J. Burns & R. Aspeslagh (Eds.), *Three decades of peace education around the world: An anthology* (pp. 25-69). Camden, CT: Garland Publishing Inc.
- Bennett, W. (1989). America, the world, and our schools. In R. English (Ed.), *Teaching international politics in high school* (pp. 1 - 10). Lanham, MD: University of America Press, Inc.
- Bigelow, B., & Peterson, B. (Eds.). (2002). *Rethinking globalization: Teaching for justice in an unjust world*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools Press.
- Blackburn, D. (1998). NGOs: Allies in development education. *Green Teacher*, 57, 32-33.
- Boutilier, B. (1988). Educating for peace and cooperation: The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom in Canada, 1919-1929. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- Bruce, M. G., Podemski, R. S., & Anderson, C. M. (1991). Developing a global perspective: Strategies for teacher education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(1), 21-27.
- Burns, R. J. (1996). Do practical realists appear to be dreamers? Peace educators meeting and acting globally and locally. In R. J. Burns & R. Aspeslagh (Eds.), *Three decades of peace education around the world: An anthology* (pp. 361-378). Camden, CT: Garland Publishing Inc.
- Burns, R. J., & Aspeslagh, R. (1996). Peace education and the comparative study of education. In R. J. Burns & R. Aspeslagh (Eds.), *Three decades of peace education around the world: An anthology* (pp. 3-23). Camden, CT: Garland Publishing Inc.
- Calder, M. (2000). A concern for justice: Teaching using a global perspective in the classroom. *Theory into Practice*, 39(2), 81-87.
- Cambridge Women's Peace Collective. (1984). *My country is the whole world: An anthology of women's work on peace and war*. London, UK: Pandora Press.

- Carson, T., & Lange, E. A. (1997). Peace education in social studies. In I. Wright & A. Sears (Eds.), *Trends & issues in Canadian social studies* (pp. 208-227). Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.
- Case, R. (1993). Key elements of a global perspective. *Social Education*, 57(6), 318-325.
- Cook, S. A. (2007). "Patriotism, eh?" The Canadian version: How does patriotism look north of the 49th parallel?" In J. Westheimer (Ed), *Pledging allegiance: The politics of patriotism in America's schools* (pp. 145-151). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cook, S. A. (2007). "Sisters are doin' it for themselves": The prince of ignoring gender in modern peace education. *Peace Research: The Canadian Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies*, 39(2), 59-74.
- Cooper, S. E. (1987). Women's participation in European peace movements: The struggle to prevent World War I. In R. R. Pierson (Ed.), *Women and peace: Theoretical, historical and practical perspectives* (pp. 51-75). London, UK: Croom Helm.
- Costin, L. (1982). Feminism, pacifism, internationalism and the 1915 International Congress of Women. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 5(3-4), 301-315.
- Crowley, T. (1980). Ada Mary Brown Courtice: Pacificist, feminist and educational reformer in early twentieth-century Canada. *Studies in History and Politics*.
- Cumming, J. (2001). Women, peace activism, and the environment: Rosalie Bertell and the development of a feminist agenda, 1970s-1990s. In S. A. Cook, L. McLean, & K. O'Rourke (Eds.), *Framing our past: Canadian women's history in the twentieth century* (pp. 259-262). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Degen, M. L. (1972). *The history of the Woman's Peace Party*. London, UK: Garland Publishing Inc.
- Department of Education. (1988). *National curriculum*. London, UK: The Author.
- Diaz, C. F., Massialas, B. G., & Xanthopoulos, J. A. (1999). *Global perspectives for education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Fisher, S., & Hicks, D. (1985). *World studies, 8 - 13: A teacher's handbook*. Edinburgh, UK: Oliver & Boyd.
- Galtung, J. (1975). *Essays in peace research*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Ejlers.

- Gautier, C., & Rebich, S. (2005). The use of a mock environment summit to support learning about global climate change. *Journal of Geoscience Education*, 53(1), 5-16.
- Gidney, R. D. (1999). *From hope to Harris: The reshaping of Ontario's schools*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Goldstein, T., & Selby, D. (Eds.). (2000). *Weaving connections: Educating for peace, social and environmental justice*. Toronto: Sumach Press.
- Gorham, D. (1987). Vera Brittain, Flora MacDonald Denison and the Great War: The failure of non-violence. In R. R. Pierson (Ed.), *Women and peace: Theoretical, historical and practical perspectives* (pp. 137-147). London, UK: Croom Helm.
- Haakenson, P., Savukova, G., & Mason, T. C. (1998-1999). Teacher education reform and global education: United States and Russian perspectives. *International Journal of Social Education*, 13(2), 29-47.
- Haavelsrud, M. (Ed). (1976). *Education for peace: Reflection and action. Proceedings of the World Conference of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction* (First, University of Keele, England, September 1974). Guildford, UK: IPC Science and Technology Press.
- Hanvey, R. G. (1975). *An attainable global perspective*. Retrieved September 1, 2008, from the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Web site (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 116993). http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/32/bd/24.pdf
- Hargraves, S. (1997). Peace education: Politics in the classroom? In R. Case & P. Clark (Eds.), *The Canadian anthology of social studies: Issues and strategies for teachers* (pp. 109 - 121). Burnaby, BC: Simon Fraser University Press.
- Harris, I. (2002). Challenges for peace educators at the beginning of the 21st century. *Social Alternatives*, 21(1), 28-32.
- Harris, I. M., & Morrison, M. L. (2003). *Peace education* (2nd ed.). Jefferson, NC & London, UK: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers.
- Heater, D. (1980). *World studies: Education for international understanding in Britain*. London, UK: Harrap.
- Heater, D. (2006). *Citizenship in Britain: A history*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hendrix, J. C. (1998). Globalizing the curriculum. *The Clearing House*, 71(5), 305-308.

- Hermon, E. (1988). The international peace education movement, 1919-1939. In C. Chatfiel & P. van den Dungen (Eds.), *Peace movements and political cultures* (pp. 127-142). Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.
- Hicks, D. (Ed). (1988). *Education for peace: Issues, principles and practice in the classroom*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Hicks, D. (2003). Thirty years of global education: A reminder of key principles and precedents. *Educational Review*, 55(3), 265-275. Retrieved September 1, 2008, from <http://www.bathspa.ac.uk/schools/education/global-futures/papers/dh-edreview-2003.pdf>
- Hicks, D. (2004). Teaching for tomorrow: How can futures studies contribute to peace education? *Journal of Peace Education*, 1(2), 165-178.
- Hicks, D., & Bord, A. (2001). Learning about global issues: Why most educators only make things worse. *Environmental Education Research*, 7(4), 413-425.
- Hicks, D., & Holden, C. (Eds). (2007). *Teaching the global dimension: Key principles and effective practice*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Hicks, D., & Steiner, M. (Eds.). (1989). *Making global connections: A world studies workbook*. Edinburgh, UK: Oliver & Boyd.
- Holden, C. (2000). Learning for democracy: From world studies to global citizenship. *Theory into Practice*, 39(2), 74-80.
- Huckle, J. (1983). A trimmed and tamed world studies. *Multi-Racial Education*, 11(1).
- Kirkwood, T. F. (2001). Our global age requires global education: Clarifying definitional ambiguities. *The Social Studies*, 92(1), 10-15.
- Kniep, W. M.(1986). Defining a global education by its content. *Social Education*, 50(6), 437-446.
- Kolker, J. M., Ustinova, H. S., & McEneaney, J. E. (1998-1999). School-university partnerships for global education: Toward a model for educational reform. *International Journal of Social Education*, 13(2), 77-88.
- Lamy, S. (1987). *The definition of a discipline: The objects and methods of analysis in global education*. New York: Global Perspectives in Education.
- Lapayese, Y. V. (2003). Toward a critical global citizenship education. *Comparative Education Review*, 47(4), 493-501. Le Roux, J. (2001). Re-examining global education's relevance beyond 2000. *Research in Education*, 65, 70-80. Retrieved September 1, 2008, from <http://journals.mup.man.ac.uk/cgi-bin/pdfdisp//MUPpdf/RED/V65I0/650070.pdf>

- Lister, I. (1987). Global and international approaches in political education. In C. Harber (Ed.), *Political education in Britain* (pp. 47-62). London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Mahrouse, G. (2006). (Re)Producing a peaceful Canadian citizenry: A lesson on the Free Trade of the Americas Quebec City Summit protests [Special Issue on Democracy and Education]. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(2), 436-453. Retrieved September 3, 2008, from the Canadian Society for the Study of Education (CSSE) Web site: <http://www.csse.ca/CJE/Articles/FullText/CJE29-2/CJE29-2-Mahrouse.pdf>
- Merryfield, M., & Subedi, B. (2001). Decolonizing the mind for world-centred global education. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (Rev ed., pp. 277-290). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Merryfield, M. M. (1997). A framework for teacher education. In M. M. Merryfield, E. Jarchow, & S. Pickert (Eds.), *Preparing teachers to teach global perspectives: A handbook for teacher educators* (pp. 1-24). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Moore, T. (2003). Giving children global views. *Early Childhood Today*, 18(3), 40-49.
- Mullard, C. (1982). The problems of world studies in a multi-cultural society. *World Studies Journal*, 4(1), 13-17.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Retrieved August 15, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html>
- Page, D. M. (1972, March). The development of a Western Canadian peace movement. In S. M. Trofimenkoff (Ed.), *The twenties in Western Canada: Papers of the Western Canadian Conference* (pp. 75-106). Ottawa, ON: National Museum of Man.
- Perkins, D. (2002). Paradoxes of peace and the prospects of peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world* (pp. 37-54). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pierson, R. R. (Ed.). (1987). *Women and peace: Theoretical, historical and practical perspectives*. London, UK: Croom Helm. Pike, G. (2000). Global education and national identity: In pursuit of meaning. *Theory into Practice*, 39(2), 64-73.

- Pike, G. (2000). A tapestry in the making: The strands of global education. In T. Goldstein & D. Selby (Eds.), *Educating for peace, social and environmental justice* (pp. 218-241). Toronto: Sumach Press.
- Pike, G., & Selby, D. (1988). *Global teacher, global learner*. London, UK: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Preece, J. (2002). The learning of citizenship and governance: A gender perspective. In M. Schweisfurth, L. Davies, & C. Harber (Eds.), *Learning democracy and citizenship: International experiences* (pp. 81-94). Oxford, UK: Symposium Books.
- Ravitch, D. (1989). International studies in the California framework. *Access*, 86/87, 2-7.
- Reardon, B. A. (Ed.). (1988a). *Educating for global responsibility: Teacher-designed curricula for peace education, K-12*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Reardon, B. A. (1988b). *Comprehensive peace education: Educating for global responsibility*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Reardon, B. A. (1993). *Women and peace: Feminist visions of global security*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Reardon, B. A. (1996). Militarism and sexism: Influences on education for war. In R. J. Burns & R. Aspeslagh (Eds.), *Three decades of peace education around the world: An anthology* (pp. 143-160). Camden, CT: Garland Publishing Inc.
- Reardon, B. A. (2001). *Education for a culture of peace in a gender perspective*. New York: UNESCO Publishing.
- Reed, C. A. (1996). Introduction: Points of connection. *Orbit* [Issue title: On Becoming a Global Citizen], 27(2).
- Risinger, C. F. (1998). Global education and the World Wide Web. *Social Education*, 62 (5), 276-277.
- Roche, D. (2003). *The human right to peace*. Ottawa, ON: Novalis.
- Ryerson, A. (1987). Politics and peace education. *Readers Digest*, 133-138.
- Salomon, G. (2002). The nature of peace education: Not all programs are created equal. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concepts, principles and practices around the world* (pp. 3-13). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Scruton, R. (1985). *World studies: Education or indoctrination?* (Institute for European Defence and Strategic Studies, Occasional Paper No. 15). London, UK: Alliance Publishers.

- Selby, D., & Pike, G. (2000). Civil global education: Relevant learning for the twenty-first century. *Convergence*, 33(1/2), 138-149.
- Steiner, M. (1992). *World studies 8 - 13: Evaluating active learning*. Manchester, UK: World Studies Trust, Manchester Metropolitan University.
- Strong-Boag, V. (1987). Peace-making women: Canada 1919-1939. In R. R. Pierson (Ed.), *Women and peace: Theoretical, historical and practical perspectives* (pp. 170-191). London, UK: Croom Helm.
- Sutton, M. (1999). Global education and national interest: The last fifty years. *International Journal of Social Education*, 13(2), 6-28.
- Teach Magazine*. (2005, March/April). The Global Citizenship Project. Toronto: The Author.
- Thompson, D. (1987). Women, peace and history: Notes for an historical overview. In R. R. Pierson (Ed.), *Women and peace: Theoretical, historical and practical perspectives* (pp. 29-43). London, UK: Croom Helm.
- Toh, S. H. (1993). Bringing the world into the classroom: Global literacy and a question of paradigms. *Global Education: Global Literacy*, 1(1), 9-17.
- Toh, S. H., & Floresca-Cawagas, V. (2000). Educating towards a culture of peace. In T. Goldstein & D. Selby (Eds), *Weaving connections: Educating for peace, social and environmental justice* (pp. 365-388). Toronto: Sumach Press.
- Tucker, J. L. (1983). Teacher attitudes toward global education: A report from Dade County. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 8(1), 65-77.
- Tucker, J. L., & Cistone, P. J. (1991). Global perspectives for teachers: An urgent priority. *Journal of Teacher Education* 42(1), 3-10.
- Tye, K. A. (2003a). Globalizing global education to nurture world citizens. *The Education Digest*, 69(4), 18-23.
- Tye, K. A. (2003b). Global education as a worldwide movement. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 85(2), 165-168.
- Tye, K. A., & Tye, B. B. (1993). The realities of schooling: Overcoming teacher resistance to global education. *Theory into Practice*, 32(1), 58-63.
- Vellacott, J. (1987). Feminist consciousness and the First World War. In R. R. Pierson (Ed.), *Women and peace: Theoretical, historical and practical perspectives* (pp. 114-136). London, UK: Croom Helm.
- Vellacott, J. (1988). Women, peace and internationalism, 1914-1920: Finding new words and creating new methods. In C. Chatfield & P. van den Dungen (Eds.), *Peace movements and political cultures* (pp. 106-124). Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.

- Wells, M. (1987). Teaching for peace in the secondary school. In R. R. Pierson (Ed.), *Women and peace: Theoretical, historical and practical perspectives* (pp. 215-224). London, UK: Croom Helm.
- Wells, M. (1996). Bringing a gender perspective to global education. *Orbit*, 27(2), 31-33.
- Westheimer, J. (Ed). (2007). *Pledging allegiance: The politics of patriotism in America's schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Williamson, J., & Gorham, D. (Eds.). (1989). *Up and doing: Canadian women and peace*. Toronto: The Women's Press.
- Willinsky, J. (2005). Keep the whole world at your fingertips: Education, globalization and the nation. *Education Canada*, 45(1), 24-26.
- World Studies Project. (1976). *Learning for change in world society: Reflections, activities and resources*. London, UK: Author.
- Zachariah, M. (1993). Intercultural understanding, some reflections. *Global Education: Global Literacy*, 1(1), 42-44.

Sharon Anne Cook is Professor at the University of Ottawa with a joint appointment to the Faculty of Education and Department of History. Her research interests include the teaching of History, Civics and Democratic engagement, Peace education, the History of moral regulation in formal and informal education, and the gendered and classed meanings of smoking and drinking. She is Coordinator in the Faculty of Education of *Developing a Global Perspective for Educators/Développement d'une perspective globale pour enseignants et enseignantes*, a CIDA-funded project that encourages preservice teachers to include development and peace education in curriculum design.

Contact: Sharon Anne Cook, PhD, Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa, 145 Jean Jacques Lussier, Ottawa K1N 6N5, Ontario Canada. Telephone: (613) 562-5800, ext 4486. Email: scook@uottawa.ca

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK