

PEACE EDUCATION AND THE TEACHING OF HISTORY.

James Smith Page

Abstract

This essay examines the possibilities for peace education through the teaching of history, with a specific focus on the Queensland Senior Modern History Curriculum. An examination is made of the major themes within the Curriculum, namely, nationalism, internationalism, economic history, Asian and Australian history, imperialism, neo-imperialism, racism, and recent social and cultural history, and within each of these it is argued that there are substantive possibilities for teaching the value of peace.

Essay

One of the remarkable social phenomena of recent years has been growth of the current peace movement throughout the world. Undoubtedly, the current peace movement is substantially symptomatic of an angry and disenchanted generation, reflecting the realities of mass unemployment and the regimentation of the computer society. The movement, nevertheless, addresses the moral and ethical issues of war and peace in a widespread way previously not thought possible. The peace movement has been evidenced in Europe and the United States in the late seventies, and, now, peace activism is becoming more established within Australia. There has been undoubtedly a time-delay effect within Australian social consciousness on this issue, although it does seem that the issues of peace and disarmament are now increasingly important to many Australians. Two indicators of this are the increased media coverage of peace issues, and the recent and successful emergence of a nuclear disarmament political grouping in Australian politics. Obviously, there have been always individuals within Australian society concerned over war, and this does explain partially the proliferation and even schismatization of actual peace groups in Australia.¹ There are those interested in peace from religious and political perspectives, and, thus, there will be politically and religiously oriented peace groups. Such a social conscience movement as the peace movement will tend also to attract strong personalities, and thus the leadership of the movement will tend also to be dominated by strong personalities. All this tends to heighten a diversification within the current peace movement, although in no way diminishing the importance of the issue. It is undeniable that the issues of peace and disarmament are amongst the most important now confronting Australian society.

The awakening of interest in peace and the growth of the peace movement has been also reflected in educational concerns, and specifically within the concern for peace education.² Educational literature within Australia contains as yet sparse reference to peace education,³ although this past year there has been a noticeable interest shown by the various teacher associations in Australia, at both local and national level.⁴ There have been various symposia, and peace education committees and networks are not operational in most States. There are also a number of experimental curriculum projects underway, on a departmental or independent basis.⁵ Notably, there are still no such initiatives in Queensland at the present time. The tradition of peace studies itself has indeed been already well-established as an academic discipline overseas, especially in Britain. The present Federal Government has committed itself here to the establishment of a Peace Research Centre at the Australian National University, and a number of Australian Universities are indicating both a teaching and research interest within this field.⁶ Within Queensland some postgraduate research within peace studies is underway at Griffith University, and the University of Queensland Division of External Studies has, for some time, offered a course in non-violent social change. Obviously, it is pertinent to enquire of the boundaries of peace education; and these might be summarized as including (a) nuclear war and disarmament, [42/43] (b) war and militarism, (c) conflict resolution, and (d) non-violence.⁷ The distinction is also sometimes made between peace education, and education for-peace; the one dealing with substantial aspects of warfare and weaponry, and the other dealing with the issues of personal development.⁸ Clearly, peace education is an expansive issue, encompassing also the areas of disarmament education, international education, education for social justice, and development education. Ultimately, the issue of peace education cannot be separated from the above issues, and hopefully this will become, more evident in our discussion of history teaching within Queensland.

It might be argued that peace education itself is relatively straightforward at the tertiary teaching or research level. However, the introduction of peace education into primary and secondary education does seem more problematical. The immediate question is whether such education should be introduced as a separate syllabus and curriculum, or

whether one should attempt peace education through existing curricula. It does seem that the preponderance of educational thought on this issue would tend to visualize peace education as a separate curriculum, and it seems that this is the premise beneath the current research projects in peace curricula.⁹ At the same time there are advantages in the integration of peace education into existing syllabii and curricula. In the following discussion this approach is applied to the Senior Modern History Syllabus for Queensland, introduced from 1982 to 1984, under the Review of School-based Assessment.¹⁰ The Queensland Syllabus does tend to be more thematically centred than comparable Syllabii from interstate, and thus more amenable to the task and challenge of peace education. Within the following discussion we will examine (a) the assumptions and rationale of the Queensland Modern History Syllabus itself, and the extent to which this is amenable to peace education, (b) the content of the Syllabus, and the extent to which this also is amenable to peace education, and (c) the general advantages of peace education through the existing Queensland Modern History Syllabus.

It is well-known that the Queensland secondary education system has been undergoing a process of change during the past decade, essentially centring upon the introduction of internal assessment throughout the State. The Senior Modern History Syllabus introduced under the Radford Scheme was essentially a thematically-oriented one, advantageous to peace education through both the encouragement of student expression, and the encouragement of diversity of opinion. The current Senior Modern History Syllabus comes from the Review of School-based Assessment, written over recent years from a team of both practising teachers and academics. The Syllabus purports to emphasize student skills, and consists of ten Semester Units, of which four must form the foundation of the Modern History Curriculum for any particular School. Additionally, the combinations of various Semester Units is limited according to the content of the Units. However, the overall amenability of the Syllabus to peace education might be best-demonstrated, initially, in the Objectives listed for the various Semester Units. The, Content, Process, and Skills Objectives refer, predictably, to what might be categorized as historical skills. These might be further paraphrased as the skills of data-collection, discussion, expression, and argumentation. However, of most significance are the Affective Skills, and these indeed might be described as coterminous with the skills required for any reasonable peace education programme. For every Semester Unit within the Syllabus, the Affective Skills required include critical assessment, empathy, evaluation of problems, and clarification of personal values. Additionally, a [43/44] number of Semester Units emphasize the importance of understanding between those of different ethnic and national milieux, and between those of different historical eras. Such exit skills of critical assessment, values clarification, and understanding would seem to be of the essence of peace education.

We commence with Semester Units I, II, and III, entitled, respectively, *Nationalism and Internationalism in the Twentieth Century*, *Nationalism and Internationalism: Origins and Development*, and *Nationalism and Internationalism: New Perspectives*. The Senior Modern History Curriculum for any School may include either Unit I, or the expansion of this within Units II and III. The scope of these Units might, be described as similar to that normally covered within Modern History within Australian education, although the geopolitical content is obviously directed towards the specific thematic concerns. The course includes the origins of nineteenth century nationalism, the new imperialism, socialist and diplomatic movements towards internationalism, the global conflict during 1914-1918, co-operation and disunity in the inter-war period, communism and fascism, and neo-imperialism and neutralism within the postwar years. At the outset, there is much common ground between the concept of international education, as evidenced within these Units, and peace education. It does seem that the analysis of nationalism itself is crucial within this course, and that it is important to define nationalism as a relatively recent phenomenon, which has both satisfied historical human needs, and, now, threatens human existence. It does seem important, also, to stress the inevitability of the progression from nationalism to a hegemonistic foreign policy, and, thus, the nexus between nationalism and nuclearism within the postwar era, especially in the belief that national security can be assured through nuclear weaponry.¹¹

These Semester Units might be, indeed, interpreted even more directly in terms of militarism and pacifism, since these world-views can be argued as the logical outcomes of nationalism and internationalism respectively. This is of direct relevance to the concept of peace education, although still faithful to the Syllabus content itself. Internationalism offers further delineation, through what might be termed purposive internationalism, involving various religious and political movements during the past two centuries, and reactive internationalism, involving diplomatic responses to the destructiveness of global warfare. Nationalism, similarly, offers further investigation in terms of the various theories of territoriality and imperialism, and, more recently, in the theories of countervalance and counterforce within the postwar nuclear strategies of the major powers. The issue of nuclear policy, furthermore, offers the opportunity of the examination of various theories of disarmament, including the varieties of unilateralism and multilateralism.

Effectually, these Semester Units offer the opportunity for rigorous international education, which must be the foundation of any programme within peace education.

Semester Unit IV is a separate course entitled *Economic Trends in the Twentieth Century*, and it does seem that this Unit might be interpreted quite validly as an examination of the causes of social and economic injustice within our world,¹² as well as an examination of the potentialities for conflict.¹³ The course might be summarized as centring upon a philosophical study of divergent economic philosophies in modern history, including the role of the industrial and commercial revolutions, depth-study of the modern history of one centrally-planned and one free-market economy, and [44/45] analysis of the impact of economic changes and problems within the postwar era, especially with reference to technological change. The dominant and obvious examples for the depth-study would seem to be the Soviet Union and the United States respectively, especially given the strategic and economic domination exercised by these super-powers in recent modern history. It might be mentioned, prefatorily, that this Semester Unit is one where the understanding of alternate modes of expression is of much importance, and this in itself can be useful in demythologizing the ideological conflict which is often held to exist between the super-powers in recent modern times.¹⁴

The most important and immediate aspect of this Semester Unit for peace education is within the area of education for social justice. It is important to identify the extent to which the industrialization of the now affluent developed world has been dependent upon the possession of agricultural and mineral resources, and that these resources were acquired, invariably, through military conquest. The expansionist history of both the United States and Russia provide excellent studies in this regard. The importance of this historical reality is that it legitimizes the claims of the Third World for a redressing of this historical imbalance of resources. Perhaps the most radical expression of the revolutionary perspective is to be found in the Leninist interpretation of imperialism, wherein imperialism itself is the highest stage of capitalism, and the colonized peoples of the world form a global proletariat. One might not concur with this thesis, although cognizance must be given to the extent to which the notions of domination and exploitation shape global economic debate. Any notion of peace education must recognize that the current affluence of the industrially-developed world has been attained substantially through colonial domination, and thus through actual or potential force. A notion of structural violence is sometimes used to explain a situation of injustice which has been established, or is maintained, through force. It is clearly inconsistent for those within affluent western nations to advocate peace without a simultaneous commitment to social justice; towards a redressing of the current maldistribution of both natural and capital resources in our world. Peace education must come to terms with the realities of structural and inherited violence.

The secondary aspect of this Semester Unit of relevance to peace education is the problematical role of military expenditure and warfare itself in industrial and economic development. This issue becomes most contentious within the depth-studies within the Unit, and also within discussion on postwar economic problems. The contentious aspect of this issue is the extent to which military expenditure is a stimulus to economic development. This becomes most immediately evident within United States economic history, wherein the American Civil War and the World Wars are argued often as the stimulus of industrial growth within that nation. Similarly, the technological advances of the 1939-1945 conflict are argued as evidence of the indirect technological and economic advancement which warfare provides. The significance of this mode of historical explanation is that it does work, tacitly, to soften the natural condemnation which logically should fall upon any endeavour seeking the systematic destruction of human life. The tacit suggestion within such historical argumentation is that war and the military should be accepted as a necessary evil.

It seems that there are two faults with the above mode of historical [45/46] explanation. One is the logical fallacy of *post hoc ergo propter hoc*, namely, that economic growth may be due to factors extraneous and even co-incidental to actual military expenditure. Such non-military expenditure would include, expenditure on reconstruction of war-caused devastation, with the postwar prosperity of both the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan seemingly evidence of this. Similarly, one might argue that the commitment to postwar reconstruction aid from the United States provided for economic demand and growth within that nation. The further fault with the abovementioned thesis is the identification of economic stimulus as necessarily of a military nature, rather than concomitant with any massive commitment in public expenditure. In this regard, it is quite useful to make comparison between the postdepression economic recoveries of the United States and Nazi Germany. The massive public expenditure on military equipment and munitions, during times of war or peace, might be directed equally to any number of useful and creative public enterprises, with education and medicine as obvious possibilities. War, therefore, per se, must be held to be irrelevant to industrial and economic development.

It is possible, internationally, to identify quite a clear nexus between war and international economic dislocation, especially so within the economic history of the twentieth century. The 1914-1918 conflict engendered both the artificial expansion of American industry, and the financial indebtedness of Europe to the United States.¹⁵ The manufacture of consumer durables during the twenties tended to utilize this industrial capacity in the United States, although there was obviously only a finite demand for such items. Thus, it might be argued plausibly that war-induced factors made the subsequent economic collapse of the United States and the world an inevitability. It seems also that the situation has repeated itself somewhat in recent modern history, with the massive investment of United States military resources in the Vietnam War. At one time there were over one half of a million United States personnel in Vietnam itself, together with massive and unprecedented technological support. The cessation of this commitment in the seventies could not have failed to have impact upon the industrial demand in the most influential free-market economy in the world, and thus upon the world itself. The economic effects of the cessation of military commitment is not usually assessed within modern history, despite the rather obvious international repercussions, especially in the situation of military involvement by a super-power.

The final and possibly most obvious aspect of relevance of this Semester Unit to peace education is in the area of massive and ever-increasing military expenditure throughout the world.¹⁶ It is not too difficult to array a range of rather horrific descriptions of the magnitude of this expenditure, although it is sufficient for our purposes here to state that the estimated global arms expenditure for 1985 amounts to one trillion dollars. The economic ramifications of such military expenditure are, however, perhaps not so well publicized; and the extent of this expenditure and attendant industrial commitment is an indication of the entrenchment of militarism within the social structures of both super-powers. One effect of this so-called military-industrial complex is that arms expenditure and arms exports are often an indicator of economic growth, and the technological investment in military research and development itself tends to ensure that a nation cannot afford to cease such investment. The technological advancement of military investment means, therefore, that it gains a momentum and life of its own, despite the best of political and diplomatic intentions for the [46/47] limitation of such expenditure. The current armaments race itself is now by no means limited to the super-powers, although the super-powers and the respective alliances still dominate expenditure. Third World and Middle Eastern nations are now seeking increasingly to assert independence and status through military security, a development which obviously diverts funds from urgent programmes for economic development, and which also exacerbates an already critical Third World debt. The military expenditure by the industrially-developed world can be seen quite validly as a diversion of resources from, the poor, resources upon which the poor of the world have a legitimate and moral claim.¹⁷ The influence of military expenditure is, therefore, a subtle yet dominant aspect of all postwar economic history.

Semester Units, V, VI, and VIII are entitled *Asia and Australia in World Affairs, Transformation in Modern East Asia and Modern Australia*, with a further Semester Unit *Colonialism and Independence in Modern South and South East Asia* yet to be introduced within Queensland Schools. These Semester Units work also upon the pattern whereby the initial Unit is expanded upon in subsequent Units, and whereby some of the Units are, therefore, incompatible with others. All the Semester Units within this series might be said to concentrate upon regional Asian history, including pre-contact history, colonization, de-colonization and modernization. The Units do contain a number of depth-studies of various nations within the region, and in this respect one possible danger is the concentration on geopolitical rather than thematic issues, such as the overall European conquest of Asia. Yet, the course itself does focus attention upon international relations and the issues of alignment and neutralism which confront the nation-states of the region. The further advantage of this course is the contextualization of Australian history within the Asian context, and the subsequent extent to which Australians share the challenges of neutralism and alignment also confronting other regional nation-states.

An overview of Australian history is of significant though perhaps not obvious relevance to peace education, essentially through the underscoring of the role of conquest and colonization within our own heritage, and the extent to which the development of Australia was itself linked to world imperialism.¹⁸ Clearly, there are currently diverse modes of interpretation of Australian pre-history and history, although students should be cognizant of the view interpreting Australia as a continent conquered through military force by the Europeans.¹⁹ Indeed, it may only be the totality of the European conquest and consequent settlement which has prevented or delayed the de-colonization of the Australian continent; although one may argue equally that this is precisely the challenge which now confronts Australia in regard to the United States. Certainly, the concept of European invasion is preferable to the more traditional conception of the settlement of *terra nullius*, a continent supposedly devoid of indigenous inhabitants. Possible a third mode of explanation would be to see Australian pre-history and history in terms of migration, with the

initial migrations some forty millenia ago, and more recently migrations within the past two centuries. Such a mode of historical explanation for our own history tends to allow for greater multi-cultural and multi-racial understanding of our own identity, and thus for greater peaceful co-existence amongst all Australians.

Obviously, European imperialism in South and South East Asia is of much importance within these Semester Units, and the notion of imperialism [47/48] is itself of much relevance to the challenge of peace education. One problem is that imperialism and colonialism tend to remain philosophical constructions, obfuscated by the historical situation that much European colonization within Asia and the Pacific was actuated by altruistic motives. The reality, however, remains that the colonization process itself was one of coercion and violence, whether actual or potential, and this violence and conquest remains the context from which modern Asia has emerged. The importance of this for Asian history might be found within colonial theory, and especially within the notion of acculturation, suggesting that dominant traits of colonizers tend to be adopted by the colonized, as the symbol or token of power. It is perhaps difficult for us as European Australians to accept that the dominant cultural traits of Europeans accepted within Asia include domination and coercion, and that the violence within modern Asian history, therefore, can be ascribed substantially to the European heritage. Indeed, war and warfare have been directly influential in the course of both Asian and Pacific history this century, through both the conflicts of 1914-1918 and 1939-1945; and it is reasonable to assert that the experience of global warfare has itself worked to acculturate Asia and the Pacific into violence and coercion.

The relevance of these Semester Units to peace education is perhaps also evident in discussion of Australian foreign policy in recent times. Recent modern history has demonstrated the domination of Australian foreign policy by the fear of invasion and the quest for security, and this security has been sought through military deterrence, and also through developmental aid to neighbouring nations. Each of these areas is of relevance to peace education. Military deterrence is contentious, inasmuch as one might question the notion of conventional military defence, especially within the emergence of methods of non-violent defence this century. The current military alliance with the United States itself is also contentious, in both conventional and nuclear weaponry. One might question whether armed neutrality is a more effective programme for peace.²⁰ Developmental aid as an instrument of foreign policy must be seen as highly questionable, and even dysfunctional, especially as the aid in such a situation tends to engender technical and certainly cultural dependency. The alternative to such aid is obviously a movement towards more just access to world markets for Third World nations.

It does seem, finally, quite reasonable within these Semester Units, and especially within Semester Units V and VIII, to contrast the militarist and pacifist traditions and attitudes within Australian society throughout this century. Such traditions clearly impinge upon Australian foreign policy, and are also clearly relevant to the issue of peace education. The various militarist and pacifist influences within Australian society would include the churches, the unions, political parties, the armed services, and the RSL. It would be also quite valid in this regard to examine the nature of the current peace movement in Australia itself. There are historical issues wherein militarism and pacificism have become important, and these would include the Australian involvement in the 1914-1918 and 1939-1945 conflicts, the conscription debates, Australian involvement in the Vietnam War, and the current debate on Australian strategic alignment or non-alignment. Such discussion might include also the varieties of pacificism, such as absolute and relative pacifism, the implications of such outlooks for Australian foreign policy in the future.

Semester Unit IX is entitled *Imperialism and Racial Conflicts and Compromises*, [48/49] and deals, rather self-evidently, with the issues of imperialism and racism in our time, though also with the issues of anti-imperialism and anti-racism. This Semester Unit seems of particular relevance to peace education, with aspects of development education, social justice education, multicultural, international and disarmament education all inherent within the course content. The course includes examination of the various theories of imperialism, the new imperialism of the nineteenth century, Australian imperialism within the Pacific region, and postwar United States and Soviet imperialism. The segment in race relations includes depth-studies on both multi-racial societies throughout the world, and on social issues within race relations, such as the relationship between race and distribution of global resources. Race and ethnicity are undeniably of increasing importance in an understanding of the contemporary world and of recent modern history, and also of importance for understanding the prospects for world peace. It is interesting to note that much subject-matter within this Semester Unit is covered also elsewhere within the Syllabus, although not within the conceptual approach within this Unit. Imperialism and racism do serve as useful categories of coercive domination, one on grounds of nationality, and the other on the grounds of race. There are boundaries of territoriality and behaviour which are enforced by tacit or actual violence within our world. The two areas of imperialism and

racism are, thus, usefully indicative of both actual and potential violence within our world; and peace can be attained only through the understanding and resolution of these areas of conflict.

The further aspect of this Semester Unit relevant to peace education is the identification of the United States and Soviet neo-imperialism within the postwar period.²¹ Recent geopolitical history has been dominated by international intervention by the super-powers, including United States intervention in South East Asia, Western Europe, the Pacific, Central and South America, and including Soviet intervention in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and Africa. The issue of super-power neo-imperialism impinges directly upon the issue of nuclear weaponry, and the various theories of nuclear deterrence and mutually-assured destruction.²² Any assessment of superpower imperialism must concede that the nuclear policy of these nations has been, thus far, at least nominally successful in preventing global warfare. However, as Orwell pointed out quite perspicaciously in 1984, the cost is that in the postwar period warfare has been concentrated in the marginal areas between the great super-powers, and it is these marginal or boundary nations which have suffered the most damage. Certainly, the super-powers and the respective NATO and Warsaw Pact alliances now possess the preponderance of nuclear weaponry. However, the danger of nuclearism is now becoming obvious through the proportions of the arms race itself, and the according increasing attractiveness of the so-called first strike capability. The size of the nuclear stock-pile is also of concern, due to the inevitable danger of misunderstanding during times of super-power confrontation, and of the accidental discharge of nuclear weapons. The attractiveness of the first-strike capability grows stronger with the general feeling of the inevitability of nuclear warfare. The danger is that this attitude of the inevitability of warfare itself engenders what might be called a July 1914 mentality amongst the nuclear powers, through which the super-power striking first is perceived to be the one most likely to survive. The so-called preemptive strike is becoming ominously more attractive, and, unfortunately, history tends to demonstrate that survival tends to be a more dominant concern than morality in relations between nations. One final point within this [49/50] Semester Unit is the relevance of neo-imperialism to the propaganda war between the super-powers. Information tends to be the currency of the post-industrial society, and, in recent modern history, both super-powers have attempted to manoeuvre the other power into seeming the more militaristic and expansionist.

Semester Unit X is entitled *The Historical Background to Contemporary Society*, and the rationale of this Unit is that it should serve as the culmination of the previous two years of modern history study. Essentially, the Semester Unit achieves this through the examination of recent social history, with a range of core-topics, from population through to politics. One recurrent theme throughout these core-topics is that of modernization, and the political, economic and cultural challenges associated with the modernization process. Relevant issues to this would include the extent to which the modernization process might be also deemed a process of Europeanization, the extent to which the modern life-style is necessarily a western one, and the extent to which non-western and non-modern life-styles are less competitive and less hierarchical. The issue of life-style is examined itself within a number of the core-topics of this Semester Unit, and the competitiveness and co-operativeness of any life-style is of obvious relevance to the issues of conflict resolution and non-violence within peace education.

The initial core-topic is that of population, and one immediate issue with this is the current growth rate of global population, and the attendant economic and social problems. One contentious issue is the actual nature of the population crisis. Certainly, the population problem is most visible within the Third World, with the growth rates much higher there than in the industrially-developed world. Yet closer analysis reveals that what is meant by the population problem really refers to the limited resources available to support an increasing global population. Thus, the real problem might be interpreted as the disproportionate consumption of global resources by the industrially-developed world, rather than necessarily the Third World population increase as such. Similarly, the solution of the population crisis involves moderation of consumption by the developed world, in addition to any efforts to limit the population explosion in the Third World. Military expenditure is also of importance itself for the population issue, inasmuch as population pressures are a substantial cause in the demand for military expenditure. Such military power is used both in the suppression of internal dissent, especially with such dissent often advocating a more equitable distribution of resources, and for the pursuance of an expansionist foreign policy, as either diversion of attention from internal problems, or for actual increase of resources available to an expanding national population. Indeed, it is interesting to see the demand for territory as a historical response to population growth, with the classic example of the eastward and westward expansion of Europe within the modern era. These expansionist movements have found articulation within the doctrines of Manifest Destiny in the nineteenth century, and Lebensraum in the twentieth century. It is also interesting to note how military success has established the legitimacy of these claims, namely, with the success of the United States in the Indian Wars, and the failure of the German campaign against Soviet Russia during 1941-1945. Yet the tragic irony is that military expenditure is also a totally cost-ineffective

means of responding to population problems. Only a fraction of the global military expenditure would make possible global developmental and, most importantly, birth control education programmes.²⁴

The relevance of military expenditure to the population issue is to be [50/51] found also in the actual and passive genocide which such global expenditure and commitment now threatens. The prospects of actual genocide are perhaps most obvious, with no dearth of publicity in even the popular media on the destructive potential of thermo-nuclear war. The devastation of urban centres would be followed by longer-term radioactive fall-out, and climatic changes especially the so-called nuclear winter, lasting for many years after any exchange.²⁵ The possible extinction of humanity would be accompanied by widespread extinction of flora and fauna, leaving what some have described as a kingdom of ants and grass. There is also a more subtle relevance of military expenditure to the population issue, namely, through what might be achieved with only a slight diversion of current military expenditure to social and economic needs. The scandal of this situation becomes even more accentuated when one compares the high-technological sophistication of satellite and missile weaponry, and the increasingly desperate poverty of the majority of the global population. Discussion of the global military expenditure as a scandal against the poor does, pertinently, raise some questions of humanitarian responsibility, although it does seem reasonable to assume at least some philanthropic or theophilanthropic foundation within education. Education is an activity, by definition, undertaken for the betterment of others, and, logically, this philosophy should be also reflected within the curriculum content of educational programmes.

Industrialization is the core-topic within this Unit which, superficially, bears the least connection with the aims of peace education, although this is not the case on closer examination. At the outset, it is important to identify the extent to which European industrialization was-dependent upon non-European markets and raw materials, and that such markets and materials were attained, substantially, through military conquest. Thus, it can be validly argued that the industrially-developed world has attained its status through military means, and, also, that a moral imperative exists for the developed world for a redressing of this historical imbalance. Industrialization is also important for peace education through the impetus and influence of military research and development, already alluded to in the discussion on Semester IV. Within both free-market and centrally-planned economies, the capital and personnel commitment to military industries remains so vast that a government soon finds itself committed to such industries, and accordingly committed to a high defence budget. The growth of high-technology weaponry and of armament exports, in both developed and developing nations, exacerbates this situation. Both industrialization and the subsequent core-topic of urbanization introduce the student to the notion of the mass society. This is mentioned specifically within the Syllabus itself, although it is difficult to know how much depth is required in such study. Certainly, network analysis can do much to clarify the changes within the urbanization and industrialization processes, essentially indicating how tribal or community sanctions tend to be replaced by legal ones. The mass society is also evidenced by the evolution of mass warfare in recent times, and it is useful in this regard to compare the style and nature of warfare in small-scale and mass societies. It is undoubtedly naive and mistaken to identify non-literate tribal societies as necessarily peaceful ones, and in many regards tribal societies are arguably more violent. However, within the tribal society violence tends to be ritualistic, and related to the dominant social reality of kinship. Contrastingly, violence in modern society tends to be reactive, reflecting the disintegration of community support and identity within the mass society. This can be illustrated in sociogramatic form within network theory, with the replacement of multiplex [51/52] relationships with uniplex ones. Thus, the potential for both individual and mass violence is increased within the modern society.

The core-topic on the family within the Semester Unit is important through the clarification of changes in individual allegiances engendered through the modernization process, and, indeed, this core-topic might be seen as an alternate social perspective on the rise of nationalism. It does seem reasonable to summarize this core-topic in that the family no longer claims allegiance, as in former eras, and that this allegiance is now claimed by the national, or international, community. The relevance to peace education here is the potential for conflict within such a shift in allegiance. In the society where individual allegiance is ascribed essentially to the family, the potential for conflict tends to be inter-familial or inter-tribal. The modernization process, however, means that the potential for violence is now on a national and international scale. Perhaps a final aspect of relevance within this core-topic is the examination of intra-familial violence within the modern family structures, including both actual and psychological violence. One might well question whether a truly peaceful society requires that the individual have more support than that offered by the nuclear family alone. Certainly, peace education can be held validly to include the issues of peaceful living at all levels, including the microcosmic level of the family.²⁶

The core-topic on education within the Unit centres upon the massive and global public investment in mass education over recent times, in both industrially-developed and developing nations. One useful values-oriented issue within the

topic is the undercurrent assumption within any educational enterprise, namely, that such investment will benefit the individual and the community. This, consequently, introduces the issues of what constitutes individual and social progress, and the extent to which formal education has achieved these aims over the past two centuries. Such considerations are also obviously central to both peace education, and for education-for-peace. It would seem obvious that individual and social progress in our world is dependent upon co-operation and understanding, and it does seem valid to examine the extent to which formal and mass education is educating students towards co-operation and understanding, rather than merely towards formal assessment, and towards credentialism. The topic also allows scope for the social history of education, with the dominance of technical and scientific training, and the relative demise of the liberal arts. The core-topics of both family and education do tend to be of most interest to students themselves, reflecting the desires of students for marital and academic success. Essentially, both of these topics offer the opportunity to examine the life-style of the individual, and for the student to examine his or her own life-style and aspirations.

Within this Semester Unit there are three core-topics which might be categorized within cultural history: religion, philosophy, and art and literature. For peace education the initial relevance of these topics is to identify the massive breakdown of confidence and optimism within western culture this century, due substantially to the experience of mass warfare. This Angst obviously continues into the nuclear age, and the concept of psychic numbing is one central notion to any cultural history of the modern era.²⁸ One positive element of recent cultural history is that the reaction against warfare is growing more articulate, certainly in religious expression.²⁹ The core-topic of morality within this Unit should be properly considered [52/53] as an element of social history, yet in this area the demoralization of mass warfare can be also identified. The engagement in mass warfare and in organized genocide by peoples espousing to be civilized and moral has in itself substantially undermined conventional morality.³⁰ One might also question, within this topic, why morality is defined most often in terms of personal rather than social ethics.

The final core-topic listed within this Semester Unit is that of political organizations, and the Syllabus notes do intimate that the focus should be upon western parliamentary democracy. Yet it would seem quite valid within this core-topic to devote attention to the diverse interpretations of democracy, especially between liberal-capitalist theory and socialist-communist theory. It would seem also quite useful to outline the philosophical distinction between positive and negative freedom; between the freedom of choice, and freedom from want. The relevance of this to peace education is that our understanding of democracy tends to be conditioned culturally through living within a liberal-capitalist society. International understanding demands that we gain an appreciation of the alternate perspective on democratic organization, especially when such ideological differences are held to be so important in the confrontation between the super-powers.

Thus we have outlined the elements of the Queensland Modern History Syllabus which might be considered as essential to peace education. The advantages of such an approach of peace education through the history curriculum might be described as threefold: the advantages of educational practicability, educational suitability, and social legitimacy.

The overwhelming advantage does seem to be what might be termed educational practicability. At any time within Queensland there are currently some ten thousand secondary students studying the Senior Syllabus we have already discussed.³¹ Thus the possibilities for peace education are, already in existence within Queensland, a factor certainly significant in view of the attitude of the current Queensland Government towards peace education.³² The introduction of a separate peace studies course would be quite feasible within some Schools in Queensland at the present time, although such a course would tend to be introduced within schools and amongst students where there be already a strong emphasis on peace and social justice issues. A further problem with the introduction of an autonomous peace studies unit is that the student would tend to be talking and writing about that which he is already concerned about, assuming that such a course would be a voluntary one. This in itself can engender a sense of powerlessness and even cynicism. The most feasible proposition does seem to be that of peace education through the existing curriculum, in this case through history teaching. The above discussion, of course, assumes that peace studies would be an academic programme. Any programme dealing with the issues of more peaceful inter-personal relationships would be obviously useful, although one might argue that this too should be introduced through the school curriculum.

The further advantages of peace education through the modern history curriculum would seem to include those of educational suitability and social legitimacy. Educational suitability refers to the nature of modern history, and especially the Queensland Senior Modern History Syllabus, and the extent to which this is amenable to peace education. The Syllabus itself does contain much emphasis on social issues and on personal values clarification, both

crucial within peace education. It is possible, indeed, to identify [53/54] aspects of international education, disarmament education, multiculturalism, social justice and development education all within the themes and issues of this Syllabus itself. Again, this means that the potential for peace education within Queensland secondary education is already in existence. Social legitimacy refers to the extent that history is perceived to deal with the realities of human existence, and the extent to which that which is concrete and actual gains legitimacy in our world. Peace education through history, therefore, can be a means of attaining such social legitimacy, and, through this, of communicating the importance of peace and disarmament issues to the outside community.

The future of peace education is indeed an open one. Obviously, throughout all such discussion on peace education, the crucial point is the mobilization and conscientization of individual teachers. Without this, it remains fatuous to speak of peace education through the modern history curriculum, or through any other aspect of secondary education. Mention of the future is obviously of special significance, inasmuch as the realities prompting peace education suggest there might not be a future. This prospect of futurelessness for humankind is both an unthinkable, and, yet, important one. Indeed, it is perhaps pertinent at this point to remember that all education works upon the assumption that there will be a future; and that not merely survival is possible, but actually betterment, both for individuals and society. Peace education is, therefore, of relevance to all educationalists and teachers, and, perhaps, here in Queensland, peace education through modern history is one tangible beginning.

References

1. Crittle, J. and Johnston, B. 'A Hitch-hiker's Guide to the Holocaust', in *Radical Education Dossier*, 19, 1983, pp. 15-18.
2. Montessori, M. *Education and Peace*, Chicago: Regnery, 1972.
3. Whitehall, J. 'Peace Studies in the Classroom', in *Quadrant*, Number 197, Vol. 28, Nos. 1-2, January/February 1984, pp. 81-86. Even this is a very cursory and denigrating account of the impact of the peace movement within education in Australia.
4. Bailey, D. 'Bringing Teachers Together to Talk Peace', *Queensland Teachers Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 17, November, 1984, pp. 12,13. This gives a useful outline of the ATF symposium on peace education.
5. Most States (excepting Queensland) have departmental initiatives within peace studies. Excellent material has been prepared by the Freemantle Peace Education Project, and the NSW Peace Studies Curriculum Group.
6. Feith, H. 'Peace Research at Universities and Colleges: Where are we Now?', in *Peace Studies*, No. 4, July, 1984, pp. 25,26.
7. Hutton, D. 'Educating for Peace in Queensland Schools', in *Queensland Teachers Professional Magazine*, October, 1984, pp. 31-34, and espec. p. 32.

[54/55]

8. Letham, V. 'Peace Education or Education for Peace', in *Peace Studies*, August, 1984, pp. 20-24. Reference is made also to the Final Document. of the World Congress on Disarmament Education, 1980, available from UNESCO in Paris, suggesting that peace education, ultimately, is about living more peaceably.
9. For instance, D. Hutton sees peace education as feasible through Citizenship Education, albeit through a specifically designed peace studies programme; Hutton, D. 'Studying Peace Through War', *Radical Education Dossier* 19, 1983, pp. 19-20.
10. Board of Secondary School Studies, Queensland, Draft Senior Syllabus in Modern History, Units I to X, Brisbane, 1982-1984.
11. Connell, W.F. in the lecture 'Curriculum for Peace Education', summarized in *Radical Education Dossier* 19, 1983, p. 23, suggesting that the idea of nationalism itself needs disarming in the quest for world peace.
12. Samuel, G. 'Peaceful Pedagogy', in *Radical Education Dossier* 19, 1983, pp. 29-31, suggesting that peace education needs to centre upon a critique of capitalism.
13. All information on military expenditure within this discussion, and throughout this paper, is from the 1984 Report of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Washington, D.C.
14. Berger, P. *Pyramids of Sacrifice*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977. This is an articulate expression of the view that our interpretation of capitalistic and communist economies is ultimately subjective, and even fideistic in nature.
15. Thomson, D. *Europe since Napoleon*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967, especially pp. 600-612 for the economic dislocation caused by World War One.
16. Russett, B. 'Why Do Arms Races Occur?', in *Towards Nuclear Disarmament and Global Security*, ed. B.H. Weston, Colorado: Westview, 1984, pp. 69-90, and especially p. 77 ff. for discussion on the military-industrial nexus.

17. Excellent material on the nexus between arms expenditure and global poverty is available from the Australian Council for Overseas Aid, Canberra. Refer also to Suter, K. 'Living in a Warfare State', in *Radical Education Dossier* 19, 1983, pp. 4-6.
18. McFarlane, B. 'Australia's Role in World Capitalism', in *Australian Capitalism: Towards a Socialist Critique*, ed. J. Playford and D. Kirsner, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972, pp. 32-64, and especially p. 48; McFarlane suggests the development of Australia was through capital extracted by England from her colonial- empire.
19. Reynolds, H. *The Other Side of the Frontier*, Ringwood, Penguin, 1982.
20. Martin, D. *Armed Neutrality for Australia*, Melbourne: Dale, 1984.

[55/56]

21. Chomsky, N., Steele, J., and Gittings, J. *Super-powers in Collision*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982, and also Vigor, P.H. *The Soviet View of War, Peace, and Neutrality*, London: RKP, 1975.
22. Krass, A. 'Deterrence and Its Contradictions', in *Towards Nuclear Disarmament and Global Security*, pp. 209-215.
23. Lifton, R. and Falk, R. *Indefensible Weapons: The Political and Moral Case Against Nuclear Weapons*, N.Y.: Basic, 1982.
24. The Australian Council for Overseas Aid, Canberra.
25. Pittock, A.B. 'Nuclear Winter: Its Implications for Australia and New Zealand', *Peace Dossier* 11, Melbourne: Victorian Association for Peace Studies, November, 1984, and Report to the UN Security Council, 'Effect of the Use of Nuclear Weapons', in *Towards Nuclear Disarmament and Global Security*, pp. 29-56, and especially pp. 45-47.
26. Lifton, R.J. and Falk, R.A. 'Obtain the Possible: Demand the Impossible in *Towards Nuclear Disarmament and Global Security*, pp. 687-703, and especially p. 699.
27. This is a common theme within most cultural histories. Refer to Barth, K. *The Humanity of God*, London: Collins, 1956, p. 6, for the effect of World War One on contemporary theology, or Barraclough, G. *An Introduction to Contemporary History*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967, pp. 242, 243, and 255, for the effect of the War upon literature.
28. Lifton, R.J. *The Broken Connection*, N.Y.: Simon and Schuster, 1-979, pp. 8,9, and 369-381; also 'Beyond Psychic Numbing: A Call to Awareness', in *Towards Nuclear Disarmament and Global Security*, pp. 111-122.
29. Pope John Paul II, *Encyclical Redemptor Hominis*, Article 16 'Progress or Threat', Melbourne: ACTS, 1979, pp. 28-32. Similar forceful condemnations of militarism and the arms race have come from the World Council of Churches. The Australian Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace is also currently preparing a statement on peace and disarmament. For a recent and well-balanced treatment of peace issues see Williams, R. *The Truce of God*, London: Fount, 1983, especially pp. 105-121.
30. Bonhoeffer, D. *Letter and Papers from Prison*, London: SCM, 1971, especially p. 5. This is perhaps one of the most striking statements from an ethicist against conventional morality, made the more poignant by his subsequent death at the hands of the Nazis.
31. Statistics from the Board of Secondary School Studies, Brisbane.
32. Fien, J. 'Peace Education: Countering the Critics', in *Radical Education Dossier* 23, 1984, pp. 19-22, also Page, J. 'Education and Politics in Queensland', *Queensland Teachers Magazine*, October, 1984, p. 34.

[end 56].