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1. **Introduction**

Here's a question to begin with. There are two SOSE outcomes below - a Core Learning Outcome from Level 1 and a Discretionary Learning Outcome from Level 6. Could they be 'Peace Education' outcomes?

*SRP 1.4 Students describe practices for fair, sustainable and peaceful ways of sharing and working in a familiar environment.*

*D6.4 Students use maps and graphs that interpret data to suggest links between geographic features of places and changes occurring within these places.*

In the Level 1 outcome, the word 'peaceful' is a giveaway. To demonstrate this outcome, students would need to describe how people (perhaps themselves) could work in a familiar setting (school, home, sporting club) sharing (roles, responsibilities, benefits) in ways that are peaceful (as well as fair and sustainable). It's clear that the writers of this syllabus outcome hoped that it would promote a more peaceful world, in however small and local a way.

It would be hard for this outcome not to be approached in a 'peace education' way.

At first, the Level 6 outcome may seem less promising as a 'peace education' outcome. But what if the students and their teacher went in this direction: The 'places' are two inner city suburbs in Brisbane (perhaps Bulimba and Highgate Hill). The 'geographic features' include proximity to the CBD, hilly topography, closeness to the Brisbane River, frequent public transport (bus and ferry), abundance of eminently-renovatable 'old Queenslander' homes, and the presence of reputable private schools. The 'changes' involve the 'gentrification' of the suburbs. This includes an influx of professional people (some single, some two-income partners); increases in house prices, rentals and rates; flourishing of a café and boutique culture; movement out of the area of lower-income, long-term residents (retirees, shift workers, single parents, students); closure of family-owned corner stores; flourishing of franchised cafés, ice cream parlours, bakeries.

Would these students be engaging with issues of 'peace' in such a study?

For a start, let's discard the idea that there is one 'true' definition of peace education. Through this paper, you'll be invited to explore what peace education means to different people, and what it can mean for you. Let's go back to the two outcomes above, to begin the exploration.

The Level 1 outcome seems simple. Here, 'peace education' means encouraging 'peaceful' sharing and working together. You can probably imagine what it might look like when a group of six-year-olds are peacefully working and sharing at a familiar task - perhaps organising an afternoon of games for the class. And you might say that it was peaceful because there were no visible signs of conflict. The teacher might be pleased indeed at facilitating this experience of peace.

But we could 'explore' further. Note that the outcome includes the words 'fair' and 'sustainable'. It's possible that the students' activity can be peaceful in a sense (without visible conflict) without being fair. For example, some particularly quiet children, lacking confidence, may have not had their preferences aired or respected. In the end, they may have gone along with the group, but beneath the surface peace of the afternoon there may have been some anxiety, frustration and resentment bubbling away. It's also possible that the games afternoon was not sustainable: it may have consumed an inordinate quantity of school resources and/or it may have damaged a fragile vegetated area.

Out of this scenario comes a question: Is 'peace' just the absence of conflict, or does peace have wider dimensions, including issues of fairness (justice) and sustainability?

The Level 6 outcome highlights this question, albeit more subtly. Perhaps you can imagine visiting one of the gentrified suburbs. On the surface, the suburb may look peaceful, productive, fun. But again, beneath the surface, there may lurk questions of justice and sustainability: How fair was it for long-term residents to be forced out by market forces? Was the community consulted about changes to the streetscape and culture of the suburb? What stresses have been felt by those displaced, or those remaining in an increasingly transformed place? What stresses are felt by those striving to maintain a 'gentrified' lifestyle? How wise was the use of resources and energy in the physical transformation of the public and private spaces? How sustainable are the lifestyles of the 'gentry'?

From this scenario comes a question: Can there be peace without social justice, democratic process, and ecological and economic sustainability?

**2. Meanings of ‘peace’**

'Peace' is one of the Core Values of the SOSE syllabus, but this paper argues that 'Peace' is inseparable from the other Core Values - social justice, democratic process, and ecological and economic sustainability.

The dramatic and tragic events of September 11 2001 highlighted these connections. In a special edition of the *New Internationalist*, the editors declared that ‘the massacres in America opened up a gaping fissure in the unjust world order’ (2001:1). In similar vein, David Suzuki and Holly Dressel wrote in their recent book *Good news for a change: Hope for a troubled planet*:

This new threat to our survival and way of life became our highest priority. But what September Eleventh has also taught us is that issues of security, stability and freedom are inseparably linked to those of poverty, equity, justice and environmental productivity. This was indeed a new kind of war, and the questions it has raised may include an opportunity to step outside our usual definitions and rhetoric in order to reassess our global priorities: our values and the ways we share – or do not share – the resources provided by the earth. (2002:1)

For much of the twentieth century, human hopes for peace often grew out of the anguish of experiences of war. Memories of past wars, the enduring legacies of those wars, and the fears of future wars all gave impetus to the search for peace. After 1945, the almost unimaginable terror of nuclear conflict brought fresh urgency to that search. Interestingly, the most familiar ‘peace symbol’ of recent times is actually an anti-nuclear symbol, with the lines of the symbol representing a human figure using semaphore to signal ‘n’ and ‘d’ for ‘nuclear disarmament’.

Beginning in the 1960s, those involved in peace research and peace studies began to propose more comprehensive and holistic definitions of peace – definitions that embraced opposition to war but that went much further. The absence of war became defined as ‘negative peace’, while the term ‘positive peace’ was used to describe a range of social, economic, political and environmental conditions. That broader definition of peace grew from a broader analysis of the global condition, summed up by Harris and Synott in these stark words:

In our bloody world, the achievement of peace remains one of the great postmodern dilemmas: We can travel to the moon, but we have not solved the problems of violence that plague the human species. We have learned that we are all related, but we don’t know how to love one another. We’ve created great wealth but do not meet the basic needs of most people. We can travel great distances in short times, but can’t overcome racism and other forms of ethnic hatred. (2002:4)

These words acknowledge the phenomenon of ‘structural violence’ – the suffering, disadvantage and oppression suffered by people because of their race, religion, sex, class, disability, age or other characteristics. Victims of structural violence can be as diverse as a woman denied professional promotion because of her sex; a family refused a rental property because of their race; a paraplegic unable to attend a concert because a building lacks wheelchair access. These examples are personal and immediate, and they reflect the deep, pervasive character of structural violence, whereby large populations suffer institutionalised or de facto injustices. Thus, all women in Britain were denied the franchise until 1919; most or all citizens of some developing countries may suffer impoverishment because of policies and practices of the World Bank or various transnational corporations; masses of Australian teenagers – both female and male – experience anguish as popular magazines and music video clips confront them with unattainable body images.

If the ‘violence’ of discrimination and oppression is to be defined so broadly, then a correspondingly broad definition of peace is needed. UNESCO, for one, has embraced such a definition. Hopeful of a peaceful new millennium, UNESCO published an on-line *Manifesto 2000 for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence*. The manifesto declared an aspiration to share 'responsibility for the future of humanity', 'to shape a world based on justice, solidarity, liberty, dignity, harmony and prosperity for all', wherein a 'culture of peace can underpin sustainable development, environmental protection and the well-being of each person'. People around the world were invited to sign the manifesto, and by June 2002 it had attracted over 75 million signatories, pledged to uphold six powerful principles (http://www3.unesco.org/manifesto2000).

Recently, Californian academic Linda Groff proposed seven aspects of peace, grouped under three broad headings:

## Peace thinking that stresses war prevention

1. Peace as absence of war
2. Peace as balance of forces in international system
3. *Peace thinking that stresses eliminating macro and/or micro physical and structural violence*
4. Peace as negative peace (no war) and positive peace (no structural violence) on macro levels
5. Feminist peace: eliminating physical and structural violence on both macro and micro (community, family and individual) levels

## Peace thinking that stresses holistic, complex systems

1. Intercultural peace: peace between peoples
2. Holistic Gaia peace: peace with the world and the environment
3. Holistic inner and outer peace

(2002:7-9)

Within this idea of peace, it's important to recognise the place of 'conflict'. David Hicks quoted approvingly the claim by Houseman that 'a peaceful world is not necessarily a world without conflict. It is a world which solves these conflicts without recourse to violence' (Hicks 1990:84) … and not just ‘without recourse to violence’, but also ‘justly’, as Martin Luther King Jr emphasised in his claim that ‘peace is not the absence of conflict, but the presence of justice’ (Carter 2002:53). So while peace advocates might aspire to a world in which conflict is minimal, they accept a central role in helping people learn to resolve conflict in ways that respect human rights and democratic process. They also acknowledge that there are complex issues embedded in that lofty ideal. For example, Galtung (1997) claimed that 'a major focus of peace education is to enable and empower people to handle conflicts more creatively and less violently' (emphasis added) - a subtly different position from Hick's emphasis on 'without recourse to violence'. So, for example, peace theorists argue about the notions of justifiable force and a 'just war' - with Galtung describing 'peace enforcement' as 'a very last resort, like a surgeon carrying out an amputation'.

**3. Meanings of ‘peace education’**

Harris and Synott recently provided a definition of peace education that matched Groff’s broad definition of peace. They wrote:

By ‘peace education’, we mean teaching encounters that draw out from people their desires for peace and provide them with nonviolent alternatives for managing conflicts, as well as the skills for critical analysis of the structural arrangements that legitimate and produce injustice and inequality. (2002:4)

If teachers accept this wider definition of Peace Education, it's important to not get caught up in territorial disputes among the so-called 'adjectival educations'. The term 'adjectival educations' is applied to a host of principles and practices that emerged around the 1970s. It embraces environmental education, human rights education, development education, peace education, global education, futures education. The British educators Greig, Pike and Selby in their landmark *Earthrights: Education as if the planet really mattered* (1987) proposed that 'Global Education' was the most apt term to embrace all of these approaches. In 1993, the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna adopted 'Human Rights Education' as the term to subsume Peace Education, Development Education etc. Recently, the Norweigan academic Birgit Brock Utne (2000) proposed 'Peace Education' as the 'generic umbrella' for the adjectival educations.

Rather than arguing about the terminology, perhaps it's most useful if each teacher decides whether s/he is happy to embrace a broad, holistic idea of teaching for peace, justice and sustainability, and then to decide whether it's helpful to adopt one of the available labels of Peace Education, Global Education, Human Rights Education etc. What is important is the practice, more than the name.

**4.** **A brief history of peace education**

David Hicks, a leading peace educator, reminds us that 'the pursuit of peace as a goal in human relationships is as old as humanity itself' (1990:84). But the idea of peace education as a major goal of Australian schooling gained most momentum after 1970. Initially, there were strong British influences, with many Australian teachers becoming familiar with the work of David Hicks, Robin Richardson, David Selby, Graham Pike and Ian Lister. These educators had in turn drawn on the field of Peace Studies, including the seminal work of Johan Galtung and Rachel Sharp. Peace Studies had initially developed as an academic response to fears of global nuclear warfare. As such, it paralleled the 'peace movement' expressed in organisations such as the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. Pioneering work in Peace Studies was done at the University of Bradford in England and at Atlantic College in Wales. However, by the end of the 1970s, peace activists, peace studies academics and peace educators had all moved beyond an anti-war focus to a concern with conflict and peace in their more complex and diverse forms.

This complexity meant that there were rich connections among the various 'adjectival educations' mentioned earlier. Issues of peace and conflict became inseparable from issues of human rights, justice and ecological sustainability. The connections were reflected in key centres established in Britain - the Centre for Peace Studies at St Martin's College in Lancaster, and the Centre for Global Education at York University. Similarly reflecting these connections, David Hick's valuable book *Education for peace: issues, principles and practice in the classroom* (1988) included chapters on war, justice and development, power, gender, race, environment and futures.

That wider concern characterised the peace education initiatives that developed in Australia by the 1980s. Academics and educators such as Frank Hutchinson, John Fien, Jenny Burnley and Ralph Pettman played leading roles at the time. Ralph Pettman's *Teaching for human rights* (1986) was a landmark publication sponsored by the Human Rights Commission. A Red Cross education kit on International Human Rights was also developed.

In 1986, the International Year of Peace [IYP] prompted widespread initiatives including peace education conferences, the formation of peace education networks, and the publication of peace education resources. The 1986 national conference of the Australian Geography Teachers' Association embraced a strong peace and justice agenda, featuring an array of leading British and Australian educators and producing the valuable book *Teaching geography for a better world*. The Catholic Education Office of Melbourne and the NSW Department of Education published *Educating for peace: explorations and proposals.*

In the years following, there were similarly promising moves. In 1988, the Social Education Association of Australia hosted a national conference inspired by Fritjof Capra's 'The Turning Point' and addressed by Robin Richardson, David Selby and Graham Pike. By the early 1990s, there was a network of Development Education Centres around the country, highlighting issues of global peace and justice and offering valuable curriculum materials for teachers.

In 1989, the Australian Education Council (comprising state and federal ministers for education) published the 'Common and Agreed National Goals for Schooling in Australia'. Commonly known as the 'Hobart Declaration', it referred to 'self-confidence', 'respect for others', 'balanced development of the global environment', 'democratic Australian society' and 'respect for … other cultures' - aspects which could all be linked to Peace Education. In 1994, the Australian Education Council approved the publication of the national 'Statement on studies of society and environment for Australian schools'. The statement promoted 'three clusters of shared values' - democratic process, social justice and ecological sustainability. Further, the statement's 'Curriculum perspectives' included 'gender', Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander', 'Multicultural', 'Global' and 'Futures'. Although the word 'peace' did not appear, the national statement drew on many of the concepts, values and practices that characterised the broad field of the 'adjectival educations'.

Now, early in the new millennium, it's difficult to describe the state of peace education in Australian schools. On the ground, the spirit of the 1980s seems somewhat dissipated. In Australia, peace education networks have largely disappeared; there are few publications to mirror the visionary texts of the earlier decades; teacher conferences seldom give centre stage to 'adjectival education' themes; Development Education Centres have struggled, and in some cases closed.

Still, on the global stage, important work is being done by the International Peace Research Association, and significant conferences on peace research, peace studies and peace education are hosted by universities in the USA and Europe. And at the level of UNESCO, there is commitment. In February 2001 the UNESCO Director-General Koïchiro Matsuura spoke of the importance of education 'to encourage peace-building from the foundations up'. He referred to 'a culture of peace' whose essential instruments are 'education for all, as well as research and training, to help forestall conflicts and nurture the values of democracy and pluralism' (http://www.unesco.org/bpi/eng/unescopress/2001/01-19e.shtml).

Readers wanting a detailed history of Peace Education could read *Three decades of peace education around the world*, edited by Robin Burns and Robert Aspeslagh (1996).

In Queensland, the pioneering initiatives of the past decades have left important marks. Perhaps the most telling is the identification of social justice, democratic process, ecological and economic sustainability, and peace as the core values of the Queensland SOSE syllabus. In Queensland, the QSCC added 'peace' to the suite of values promoted in the national statement described above. Put simply, Queensland teachers implementing the SOSE syllabus in the spirit intended will be engaged in peace education.

**5. Peace Education in the SOSE syllabus**

From this point onwards in the paper, the following definition of peace education will be used:

*The term 'Peace Education' describes the principles and practices of teaching and learning to promote personal well-being, convivial relationships, socially just practices, democratic processes and ecologically sustainable livelihoods in local, national and global contexts*.

A scan of the Core Values in the SOSE syllabus reveals how embedded this complex idea of Peace Education is. Here are some key extracts:

### Democratic process

Democratic process applies to the ways in which people relate to each other … including respect for others and a willingness to participate in democratic processes.

*Social justice*

The key value of social justice … is based on a belief that all people share a common humanity and therefore have a right to equitable treatment, support for their human rights, and a fair allocation of community resources.

*Ecological and economic sustainability*

Ecological and economic sustainability involves acting ethically towards the environment by establishing and maintaining social, political and economic structures that are focused on finding quality of life in a world of limits.

*Peace*

The key value of peace is based on the belief that to promote life is to promote positive relations with others and with the environment. This implies the need to foster, maintain and develop hope, spirituality and optimism, a sense of belonging in local, national and global communities, cooperative and peaceful relations with others, and a sense of a shared destiny and stewardship of the Earth.

(QSCC 2000*, Studies of Society and Environment Years 1 to 10 Syllabus*:2-3)

The connections between the four core values are evident if we think of 'peace' as involving 'respect for others' (Democratic Process), 'equitable treatment' (Social Justice), 'quality of life' (Ecological and economic sustainability) and 'cooperative and peaceful relations' (Peace).

Later in this paper, you'll be able to track these connections through other parts of the SOSE Syllabus.

**6. Peace Education: elaborating the aims**

Hicks described the 'overall aim of Peace Education as 'to develop the knowledge, attitudes and skills necessary to resolve conflict peacefully in order to work towards a more just and sustainable world society' (1990:88).

In the remainder of this paper, the aims of Peace Education will be elaborated using four headings:

1. Creating a supportive classroom
2. Practising peace
3. Investigating conflict, violence and peace
4. Visioning peaceful futures

For each, some introductory text will be followed by links to the SOSE syllabus and by suggestions for practical teaching and learning approaches and activities.

**6.1 Creating a supportive classroom**

***6.1.1 Some ideas***

Peace Education makes special demands of teachers to make the 'medium' fit the 'message'.

Frank Hutchinson has made that clear, claiming:

Another important insight for starting journeys of active hope in school education relates to achieving greater compatibility between means and ends in the formal and informal curriculum. It is a contradiction in terms, for example, to proclaim a peaceful end but to attempt to reach this end by culturally violent means in the classroom. To educate for a peaceful future implies doing it in peaceful, friendly and dialogical ways, not authoritarian, unfriendly and monological ways. To educate for an equitable and democratic future implies doing it in non-sexist, non-racist and participatory ways. To educate for an interdependent and ecologically sustainable future implies doing it through co-operative group work rather than individualistically competitive learning environments. (1996:206)

Ian Harris offered an even broader analysis of school cultures, lamenting the tendency in many schools to emphasise ‘peacekeeping’ rather than ‘peacemaking’ and ’peacebuilding’ in their approaches to school order and discipline. Harris claims that the overemphasis on ‘peace through strength’ with its ‘punitive approach’ tends to blame youth for their ‘dysfunctional behaviours’, and alienate them from their schools (2002:30).

Years earlier, Harris had emphasised that 'Education for peace assumes peace in education' (1990:254). He went on:

Creating peace in this world … requires teachers to do more than theorise about peaceful scenarios. It requires them to make sure their own classroom practices promote peace. … According to the principles of peace pedagogy, pupils can learn how to bring peace to the world not only by studying issues of war and peace but also by learning certain skills, behaviours, and dispositions from the classroom climate, which is established by the way a teacher structures his or her lessons. (1990:254, 255)

In describing his vision of 'peace pedagogy', Harris identified five characteristics of 'traditional educational practices' that were violent and anathema to peace education: teachers' claims to possession of the truth; competitive classroom climate; student passivity; student powerlessness; teachers' use of authoritative force. While modern classrooms are much less marked by these five characteristics than those of decades ago, there may be value in teachers thinking about the extent to which remnants of these characteristics may still lurk in their classrooms.

Not surprisingly, Harris advocated five alternative qualities of peace-seeking classrooms: respectful dialogue among teachers and learners; cooperation among learners; problem solving approaches to learning; affirmation of the worth of each learner; democratic boundary setting of classroom expectations.

Writing as a passionate peace educator, South Australian Ann Mason (2000) echoed Harris's ideas, describing her efforts to create 'peaceful and respectful interaction at all levels within the … school community'. Mason depicted Peace Education as 'representative of a consciousness and level of processes that operate constantly within our daily lives'. Recounting US experiences, Rhonda Jeffries (2000) emphasised the need to create 'a welcoming and nurturing environment at the school' as a foundation for effective Peace Education.

Addressing more extreme conditions, Harris had earlier written about the need to address overt violence in US schools. Optimistically, he claimed that:

Although schools themselves cannot change violence in society, many educators are turning to peace education strategies to make their schools safer and to help their students deal positively with violence. (1996:379)

***6.1.2 The SOSE syllabus***

The SOSE syllabus endorses the creation of a supportive classroom environment. For example:

Learning is most effective when it involves active partnerships focusing on students, with collaboration and negotiation with parents and carers, peers, teachers, school and community members. (QSCC 2000:7)

It is important that all students have opportunities to develop awareness of, and appreciation for, the individual value and dignity of each person in his or her learning environment and community. (QSCC 2000:9)

***6.1.3 Practical approaches to creating a supportive classroom***

Harris's ideas could provide a valuable starting point. He encourages teachers to minimise or eliminate five unhelpful characteristics. In their place he advocates five peace-seeking qualities. Teachers could study the following table, thinking about where they would wish to locate their own practice along the continua:

teachers' claims to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_respectful dialogue among

possession of the truth teachers and learners

competitive classroom\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ cooperation among

climate learners

student passivity\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_problem solving

approaches to learning

student powerlessness\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_affirmation of the

worth of each learner

teachers' use of\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_democratic boundary setting

authoritative force of classroom expectations

Clearly, the ways in which teachers present themselves to students are crucial in the creation of classrooms supportive of Peace Education.

Teachers could: avoid setting themselves up as all-knowing gurus; minimise the language of individualistic competitiveness; avoid protracted sessions of teacher-dominated instruction; avoid the imposition of rules and sanctions that have not been discussed with and/or explained to students.

Rather, teachers could: acknowledge the gaps in their own knowledge and promote the idea that the teacher is always also a learner; celebrate diverse abilities and interests among students; encourage cooperative attitudes and activities; emphasise lively, inquiring minds keen to build knowledge; involve students in consultation, negotiation and decision making about the direction of the curriculum and the culture of the classroom.

In the following section, 'Practising peace', these ideas are further developed.

**6.2 Practising peace**

***6.2.1 Some ideas***

It could be helpful to think that ‘practising peace’ begins with a search for ‘inner peace’. The search for 'inner peace' has captured the imagination of many people today, particularly it seems in western societies where alienation and disaffection seem to sit uneasily alongside unprecedented levels of material possession and consumption.

John Hillcoat has highlighted the emptiness that is associated with consumer society, describing the ‘vain attempt to fill up the empty self’ as a ‘fleeting sense of satisfaction’ gives way to a renewed ‘sense of emptiness’ in an ‘endless cycle of aggressive acquisition of consumer goods and experiences’ (Hillcoat 1999:54). In the process, whatever we may call ‘spirit’ or ‘soul’ fails to be nurtured. As David Suzuki warns, we embrace a ‘cultural narrative’ that does not include ‘the idea of wholeness and connection we call spirit’. Impoverished by limited epistemologies, we experience life as ‘stunted, truncated, painful’ (Suzuki 1997:200).

While many people are ‘rich’ in material possessions and commodified experiences, they are ‘poor’ in other ways that are central to meaning making – a binary explored so long ago in Erich Fromm’s *To Have or To Be* (1979). To them Suzuki directed his question: ‘Is making more money, owning a bigger car or possessing the latest technological gadget necessary to fulfill your real biological, social and spiritual needs?’ (1997:212).

Writing for an audience eagerly seeking a sense of meaning, the popular author Thomas Moore listed the ‘emotional complaints of our time’ – ‘emptiness, meaninglessness, vague depression, disillusionment about marriage, family and relationship, a loss of values, yearning for personal fulfillment, a hunger for spirituality’ – and described the ‘attempt to gather … alluring satisfactions to us in great masses, thinking apparently that quantity will make up for lack of quality’ (1994:xvi).

Moore’s ideas, framed by his Christian beliefs, are paralleled by powerful proposals from other sources – the Buddhism of the Dalai Lama (2000) and Joanna Macy (1993); the eco-spiritualism of Thomas Berry (1998); the deep ecology of Arne Naess (1989) and Bill Devall (1988); the bioethics of Peter Singer (1995); the ecofeminism of Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva (1993); the social ecology of Murray Bookchin (1991). All these writers explore the challenge of finding personal meaning in modern life.

From the perspective of educating for peace, the Queensland SOSE syllabus seems to say too little about the issue of ‘inner peace’. In the syllabus explication of the key value of ‘Peace’, there is promising reference to ‘the need to foster, maintain and develop hope, spirituality and optimism’ and to having ‘regard for the spiritual dimension of life’ (QSCC 200:2-3). But the syllabus generally focuses on relations between people and people, and between people and environments, and says little about how inner peace – with its dimensions of ‘hope, spirituality and optimism’ - may be developed in parallel with those relationships. Not one of the Core Learning Outcomes refers to spirituality. In terms of the debates canvassed above about materialism and personal meaning-making, the only encouraging Core Learning Outcome is CI 4.5: ‘Students express how material and non-material aspects of groups influence personal identities’.

Ideas about encouraging hope and spirituality in young people can be found in Erricker 1997, Glazer 1999, Haydon 1996 and Myers 1997. In *Earth education: a new beginning,* Steve van Matre works from a deep ecology perspective to describe practical approaches to developing spiritual relationships with environments.

There's a fine balance involved in 'practising peace'. When David Hicks published his seminal 'Peace Education: A checklist of learning objectives' (1990:90-93), the need for that balance became obvious. His 'Skills' included 'Co-operation', 'Empathy' and 'Assertiveness', while his 'Attitudes' included 'Self-respect', 'Respect for Others', 'Open-mindedness' and 'Commitment to Justice'. While Peace Education encourages young people to be less self-centred, and to be respectful of others, there is the danger that students could lapse into moral relativism - the idea that all ideas, values and attitudes are equal valid, and that they all must be accepted and respected. Still, at the same time, the students are encouraged to be assertive, and to demonstrate a commitment to justice.

Thus, students need to be respectful and open-minded without being uncritically tolerant and accepting. They need to be cooperative and empathetic while still being assertive. Yet they need to be assertive without being aggressive or domineering. They need to develop a commitment to social justice, while realising that justice is a complex value that can have a range of meanings.

All of the above would be central to the project of 'peacemaking in schools' which Harris says 'attempts to provide students with skills to manage their own conflicts nonviolently' (1990).

***6.2.2 The SOSE syllabus***

The SOSE syllabus does address major aspects of 'practising peace'.

Students are encouraged to 'relate to others in peaceful, tolerant and non-discriminatory ways' (QSCC 2000:5) and are reminded that 'participating' includes 'negotiation, tolerance, respect, equality and advocacy' (p.3).

While students are encouraged to 'reflect on the values of democratic process, social justice, economic and ecological sustainability and peace to make decisions about issues', they are also reminded of 'the different perspectives people have of values and value issues' (p.1).

As learners, students of SOSE 'work constructively with others to make decisions, solve problems, and negotiate and enact plans for personal and civic action' (p.5). In doing so, they 'recognise the tentative nature of conclusions' (p.4) and 'develop a willingness to reconsider issues'.

All of these syllabus recommendations should help students to develop commitment without dogmatism, and to be assertive while being open-minded. These dispositions are central to Peace Education.

***6.2.3 Some SOSE outcomes for 'practising peace'***

These selected Core Learning Outcomes reflect a commitment to 'practising peace':

TCC 1.3

Students share points of view about their own and others' stories

TCC 5.3

Students collaborate to locate and systematically record information about the contributions of people in diverse settings

PS 2.3

Students cooperatively plan and care for a familiar place by identifying needs of that place

CI 1.3

Students share an understanding of how diverse families meet human needs of food, clothing, shelter and love

CI 5.3

Students share their sense of belonging to a group to analyse cultural aspects that construct their identities.

SRP 2.3

Students enact a simple cooperative enterprise to identify their own and others' strengths and weaknesses

Together, these outcomes will help students to grapple with such issues as negotiation, cooperation, decision making, diversity and commitment.

***6.2.4 Some practical approaches to practising peace***

'Practising peace' can be promoted through classroom activities that encourage self-esteem, trust, cooperation, empathy, assertiveness and an appreciation of differences and diversities. Many books on classroom practice include examples such as 'Broken Squares' - a group activity in which 'success' for one member can be achieved only with success for all members, and in which 'rules' apply to ensure cooperation and sensitivity. When using group activities in the SOSE classroom, it's helpful to ensure that all members of the group have a valuable role to play, that the outcome/product is a genuine group production, and that the group cannot be dominated by one or more members to the exclusion of others. Some useful references are Doel and Sawdon 1999, Johnson et al 1994, Molyneux 1994, Slavin 1995, Stahl and van Sickle 1992, Sydenham and Golding 1996 and Wilson and Hoyne 1993.

Celebrating 'multiple intelligences' and invoking different styles of learning helps in 'practising peace'. Students can appreciate that success comes in many forms, and that diverse abilities should be valued. In learning, and in expressing their learning, students may work with printed words, with speech, with dramatic action, with visual arts, with music, with creative materials, with bodily expression and athleticism. These activities encourage students to value diversity, and provide opportunities for differently-talented students to achieve, and for those achievements to be appreciated. Ideas about encouraging multiple intelligences in classrooms can be found inBellanca 1997, Campbell 1997, Gardner 1993, Gardner 1999, Jasmine 1996, Lazear 1999, O’Connor & Callahan-Young 1994, Vialle 1995, Wayne 1995 and Wilkins 1996.

The peace-building approaches mentioned above can be matched by specific approaches to conflict resolution. The need for conflict resolution does not signal a failing classroom. Rather, teaching and learning the skills of conflict resolution is an acknowledgment of the continuing presence of conflict in human societies. Peace educators see the 'handling' of conflict as a goal, rather than the total elimination of conflict. Practical approaches to conflict resolution are described in Butterworth & Fulmer 1990, Forcey & Harris 1999, Healey 1995, Janke & Penshorn 1995, Jenkins 1996, Mayer 1995, Perlstein & Thrall 1996, Porro 1996 and Stephen 1993.

In schools, there is a growing use of peer mediation of disputes. Candice Carter (2002) has provided a thoughtful analysis of this trend. While applauding the value of 'structured problem-solving communication that occurs between cooperating disputants and student mediators who guide the disputing students in their search for a mutually acceptable resolution to their conflict (p.49), Carter warns of particular dangers - the fact that conflict mediation is not 'culturally neutral' (p.49) and may disadvantage, for example, students who come from cultures which do not prize assertiveness; and the danger of students resenting 'unproductive agreements, especially those which lack justice' (p.50) that they have accepted because of feelings of powerlessness. Emphasising these dangers, Carter quotes Martin Luther King Jr's statement that 'peace is not the absence of conflict, but the presence of justice' (p.53).

**6.3 Investigating conflict, violence and peace**

***6.3.1 Some ideas***

Conflict, violence and peace can be investigated at several levels. One simple categorisation refers to conflict, violence and peace at (1) the interpersonal level, (2) the structural/institutional level and (3) the level of warfare, both intranational and international.

*Interpersonal*

Interpersonalconflict and violence can occur in everyday personal interaction, whether it be in the family, the school, the workplace or other everyday location. For students, bullying can be obvious and painful, but incidental conflicts can be even more prevalent. In schools, peaceful solutions to these forms of conflict and violence can be sought using conflict resolution strategies, as mentioned in section 6.2 of this paper above.

*Sructural/institutional*

At the structural/institutional level, conflict and violence can often be 'indirect' - the 'structural violence' described in Part 3 of this paper above. It is this form of violence - often framed by issues of class, race, religion or gender - that can be studied profitably using the approaches of the 'critical pedagogies' and the 'socially critical curriculum'.

Advocates of critical pedagogies focus on the ways in which ideologies function in society to serve some people's interests, while thwarting others. Ideological beliefs, it is pointed out, can be so powerful that they are 'taken for granted' and appear 'normal' and 'natural'. When they are so powerful these ideological beliefs take on the status of 'hegemony'. One historical example of a hegemonic belief is the nineteenth century belief that women were intellectually, emotionally and physically inferior, and were thus not entitled to 'normal' civic and legal rights. A current example of a hegemonic belief is the acceptance that it is 'natural' for different people to be paid vastly different salaries or wages for their daily work.

During the 1970s and 1980s, critical educators saw themselves as 'transformative intellectuals' (Giroux 1985) whose role was to 'unmask' oppressive and unjust beliefs and practices, and thereby 'enlighten' and 'empower' their students. This process of 'conscientisation' (Freire 1972) involved subjecting everyday life to critique in the classroom. Critical pedagoues often used probing questions: What is happening here? How has this situation been produced? What deep seated assumptions (ideological beliefs) sustain this situation? Who benefits from this situation? Who is disadvantaged or damaged? What alternatives are possible? Would those alternatives bring benefits in terms of social justice, ecological sustainability and peace? How can change be initiated? What is worth maintaining in this situation?

More recently, advocates of critical pedagogy have conceded that their own work can be ‘oppressive’, if the teacher’s presence in the classroom is too dominant and authoritative, or if the teacher fails to acknowledge the validity of the diverse knowledges and experiences of students. Critical teachers have acknowledged that their own analyses of oppression and injustice may not be the only way of seeing things (and that students may see things differently). They have also conceded that there are not single, undebated meanings for values such as 'peace', 'justice', 'democracy', 'equality' and 'freedom'. Rather, the diverse interpretations of those terms, and the complexity of judging particular situations in relation to those values, need to be opened up in the classroom.

Critical educators have also responded to Lyn Yates' claim that people are 'moved by things other than simply the force of critical analysis' (1992:125). They have acknowledged that rational knowledge is not enough to cause people to challenge existing situations, or to change their own beliefs or daily practices. Rather, the interests, passions, fears and emotional investments of young people have to be taken seriously as part of any curriculum that aims to bring about change - and not simply by invoking 'guilt' in students.

Reflecting this more open spirit, valuable ideas were offered during the 1990s by Australian educators Lyn Yates (1995)and Jenny Gore (1993),and by American educators Henry Giroux (1994) and Peter McLaren (1994, 1995). Central to all their ideas are the processes of analysis, critique, reflection, decision making and taking action.

*Warfare*

As described above, early forms of peace studies and peace education emerged from the shadows of World War 2, and developed under the threat of nuclear war. Until the 1980s, peace education curricula focused on warfare - its causes, course and effects. Simulation games were a favoured teaching and learning approach to help students empathise with those responsible for and affected by warfare - diplomats, politicians, military leaders, propagandists, combatants, pacifists and civilian societies at large. In history courses particularly, the causes and consequences of wars were investigated. In recent times, geography and economics teachers have helped students probe the geo-political and economic origins of international conflicts. These approaches are still important within SOSE classrooms.

One special note needs to be made about the study of warfare. Australian researcher James Page has signalled a potential danger of teachers and students treating war as inevitable in human affairs – a danger springing from the strong emphasis on warfare in history curricula particularly. Page advocates a ‘utopian approach to history, one that recognizes both the openness of history and the openness of our own experience’. He reminds readers that ‘the future is open, and each of us has the opportunity (and responsibility) to help forge a more humane and pacific future’ (2000:448).

***6.3.2 The SOSE syllabus***

The SOSE syllabus supports the involvement of students in of ‘investigating conflict, violence and peace’.

For example, the syllabus states that ‘Learners develop understandings of human experiences in various economic, business, ecological, legal and political systems. Students learn how these systems operate, and how privilege and marginalisation are created and sustained in society’ (QSCC 2000:4) and that ‘Students develop the ability to actively respond to conclusions drawn from investigations of social, natural, economic, legal and political phenomena’ (QSCC 2000:5).

Further, the syllabus states that ‘The Studies of Society and Environment area develops lifeskills in many ways by applying the processes of investigating, creating, communicating, participating and reflecting, which enable students to function in, critique and improve the world in which they live, now and in the future’ (QSCC 2000:7).

***6.3.3 Some SOSE outcomes for investigating conflict, violence and peace***

These selected Core Learning Outcomes reflect a commitment to ‘investigating conflict, violence and peace’.

TCC 2.4

Students describe cause and effect relationships about events in familiar settings.

TCC 4.4

Students critique information sources to show the positive and negative effects of a change or continuity on different groups.

PS 5.5

Students evaluate ideas concerning sustainability to identify who may benefit and who may be disadvantaged from changes to a Queensland industry.

CI 3.2

Students identify stereotyping, discrimination or harassment to develop a plan that promotes more peaceful behaviours.

CI 5.5

Students express how dominant and marginalised identities are constructed by media and other influences.

SRP 1.2

Students create representations that identify and challenge stereotypes about work roles.

SRP 6.5

Students apply understandings of social justice and democratic process to suggest ways of improving access to economic and political power.

***6.3.4 Some practical approaches to investigating conflict, violence and peace***

Ira Shor and Patti Lather have suggested two useful ‘slogans’ to guide teachers and students undertaking critical studies of their world. Shor coined the expression ‘extraordinarily re-experiencing the ordinary’ (1987) while Lather referred to ‘reading against the grain’ (1991). Both writers were encouraging teachers and students to see everyday realities in new ways - to identify the deeply-rooted assumptions that underlie our daily lives, to evaluate these assumptions (asking who benefits and who loses) and to propose possible alternatives that are more peaceful, just and sustainable. These steps complement the ‘reflective inquiry’ advocated in the Queensland SOSE syllabus (QSCC 2000:8).

For example, students might be encouraged to investigate phenomena such as:

* whether boys and girls are encouraged to be different in interests, temperament, behaviour and aspirations
* the types of advertising on television during children’s programs
* the proliferation of large shopping centres and the disappearance of local shops
* connections among young people’s diets, activities and health
* proposals to increase government financial assistance to parents of young children
* proposals to increase the number of immigrants coming to Australia
* laws to limit gun ownership by citizens
* ways in which governments encourage citizens to support wars
* the granting of native title to indigenous people
* increasing Australia’s aid to developing countries.

In each case, students would gather information about the phenomenon, analyse patterns and themes, identify deeply-held assumptions about the phenomenon, evaluate the effects on the well-being of people and the environment, propose alternatives and plan actions to promote those alternatives. Using the earlier definition of peace education, the students would be asking questions and framing proposals about ‘personal well-being, convivial relationships, socially just practices, democratic processes and ecologically sustainable livelihoods in local, national and global contexts’.

In all this, modern media may merit special attention. Richard Slaughter, encouraging critical futures studies with young people, emphasises the need to probe the ‘technology, violence and futures’ that are ‘themes in the text and images of media designed for children and young people’ (1999:95). In these media, he claims, ‘the portrayal of the basic polarities of life, such as good and evil, right and wrong, science and magic’ is problematic because ‘these important categories (are) irretrievably scrambled at the epistemological level … detracting from young people’s attempts to make sense of the world and to feel at home in it’ (1999:121-122).

Practical guidelines and examples of teaching and learning about conflict, violence and peace can be found in Calder and Smith’s *A better world for all* (1991), Fien’s *Teaching for a sustainable world* (1995), Fountain’s***Education for development: a teacher's resource for global learning* (1995),** Hicks and Steiner’s *Making global connections* (1989) Selby and Pike’s *Global teacher, global learner* (1988) andStowell and Bentley’s *New wave geography*(1989).

**6.4 Visioning peaceful futures**

***6.4.1 Some ideas***

Peace Education is futures oriented. It aims to help people create more peaceful lives – personally, socially, globally. It’s not surprising that some of the most significant peace educators are also futures educators. David Hicks, pioneering British peace educator, collaborated with leading Australian futures researcher Richard Slaughter to publish the *World Yearbook of Education 1988* on ‘Futures Education’. Leading Australian peace educator and researcher Frank Hutchinson combined the two fields in his *Educating Beyond Violent Futures* (1996).

Futures Education builds upon the academic field of Futures Studies, whose practitioners have come together in influential organisations such as the World Future Society (WFS) and the World Futures Studies Federation (WFSF). In 1996, in a major achievement of theoretical consolidation, Richard Slaughter produced his edited three-volume publication *The Knowledge Base of Futures Studies* (1996). One contributor, Wendell Bell, described the focus of Futures Studies thus:

Futurists aim to discover or invent, propose, examine and evaluate possible, probable, and preferable futures. They explore alternative futures in order to assist people in choosing and creating their most desirable future. (Slaughter 1996:29)

Futures Education developed in the USA and Canada in the 1970s, as teachers developed valuable classroom applications of the insights and tools developed in Futures Studies. Although Futures Studies has served many interests - including those of government, business and the military – Futures Education in schools has been largely a critical pedagogical enterprise, framed by the transformative values of social justice, peace and sustainability. The title of Hazel Henderson’s seminal book *Creating Alternative Futures* captured that transformative intent.

David Hicks emphasised that when stating that a futures perspective in education must help people:

to identify our own sources of hope and how to use them to clarify our visions of a more just and sustainable society … This needs to become a major focus within education and is essential to any definition of, for example, active citizenship. (Hicks and Slaughter 1998:277)

***6.4.2 The SOSE syllabus***

The SOSE syllabus advocates ‘visioning peaceful futures’. Among its ‘Cross-curricular priorities’ the syllabus lists a ‘Futures perspective’, noting that:

Skills developed through a learner-centred approach provide a sound basis for the critical and creative thinking, problem solving, decision making and strategic planning required to create a preferred future. (QSCC 2000:7)

One ‘Key learning area outcome’ in the syllabus is to ‘participate cooperatively to reflect and act upon ethical and informed visions of possible and preferred futures’ (QSCC 2000:11), while the syllabus elaboration the Key Value of ‘Peace’ refers to a ‘sense of a shared destiny and stewardship of the Earth. (2000:2-3)

***6.4.3 Some SOSE outcomes for visioning peaceful futures***

The following Core Learning Outcomes reflect a commitment to developing visions of peaceful, just and sustainable futures.

TCC 3.3

Students use knowledge of people’s contributions in Australia’s past to cooperatively develop visions of preferred futures.

TCC 4.5

Students review and interpret heritages from diverse perspectives to create a preferred future scenario about a global issue.

PS 2.5

Students express a preferred future vision for a familiar place based on observed evidence of changes and continuities,

PS 6.5

Students make clear links between their values of peace and sustainability and their preferred vision of a place.

CI 6.2

Students develop a proposal to promote a socially just response to perceptions of cultures associated with a current issue.

SRP 6.3

Students advocate to influence Australia’s role in future global economies or environments.

***6.4.4 Some practical approaches to visioning peaceful futures***

Among the ‘adjectival educations’, Futures Education stands out as the field in which the idea of teaching and learning ‘tools’ is prominent. These ‘tools’ are based on those found within the academic field of Futures Studies. They include various tools for analysing, imagining and advocating. Many teachers are already familiar with these – futures wheels, consequences charts, branching time-lines of probable and preferable futures, applied foresight, envisioning activities, scenario building.

Frank Hutchinson has provided a comprehensive set of such activities in his *Educating Beyond Violent Futures* (1996)*.* Sample activities can also be found in Hicks’ *Educating for the Future: A Practical Classroom Guide* (1994), Calder and Smith’s *A Better World for All* (1991) and Dunlop’s *Futures studies in studies of society and environment: a teachers' resource for Band B* (1996).

**7. Conclusion**

This paper encourages teachers to be thinking broadly when planning to teach for peace. It treats peace as a complex ideal, ranging from the quiet of inner personal peace, through the intricacies of interpersonal and institutional peace, to the holistic vision of international and global peace.

A final inspirational message comes from the renowned US educator Elise Boulding who, in a foreword to Frank Hutchinson’s *Educating beyond violent futures*, imagined young people using:

every part of their mind, every one of their senses, to grasp both the present in all its limitations, and to see past the present to the future possibilities that remain bright and undestroyed in spite of all the mistakes of human history.
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