

Mack may be exaggerating however. Arguments over 'balance' tend to obscure a more central dilemma concerning the content of peace education. Although Cox and Scruton would like to see any reference to the arms race removed from school curricula, most critics do not resist the *questioning* of basic assumptions about authority and national security. What they do fear is that opening the door to peace education invites the temptation to advocate particular *solutions* to world conflict.

In the effort to achieve a balanced approach to peace and security issues, proponents of peace education say that it is important to include the study of non-governmental approaches to conflict resolution, in addition to the approaches taken by governments and international organizations such as the United Nations. Some critics worry that teaching *about* the peace movement is the same thing as advocating student protest against the arms race. While that is not true, there have been instances when the distinction has been blurred and the resulting controversy has created problems for both school officials and peace education groups.¹²

Another issue that may be contentious is the view held by some peace education advocates, that the study of conflict resolution can be simplified and made accessible to young people by drawing parallels between conflict that takes place at an international level, and conflict at a community or even family level. Although it can be argued that similar patterns of behaviour function at many levels of human relations, people involved in negotiating an international dispute have to deal with many more factors and complications than people negotiating a family dispute. In addition, negotiations at the international level take place between sovereign states, while negotiations *within* a state are subject to laws and norms governing the behaviour of its citizens, and to some extent determining the pattern and results of the negotiations. It is one thing to teach conflict resolution skills on an interpersonal level, and another thing to suggest that the same skills can be applied successfully by negotiators of an arms control agreement, or by parties to a regional war. Some peace education materials fail to make that distinction clear.¹³

'TEACHING FOR PEACE'

Concern about content is only one aspect of the peace education controversy; there is also a debate over methodology. Inherent in the pedagogical approach known as 'educating *for* peace' is the view that the present educational system, with its emphasis on grades, standardized testing, and competi-

tion, reinforces values which are antithetical to this concept of 'peace' and which inhibit the ability of students to learn effectively. Robin Burns of La Trobe University in Australia, suggests that students in Western society are confronted with "a picture of dual morality."¹⁴ "In theory, values like fairness, trustworthiness, truth and solidarity are maintained. In practice, we educate according to the morality of achievement, competition, envy and individualistic assertion. What is thus learned, is hypocrisy." Burns and others, describe the prevailing culture as a 'culture of violence' and argue that the most important role of peace educators is to counteract that culture.¹⁵ They suggest that filling students' minds with content alone is not enough, and that educational structures and methods must be changed to encourage 'peaceful' behaviour. The method of teaching for peace includes encouraging students to discuss openly their fears concerning the prospect of nuclear war, as well as encouraging them to feel they can 'make a difference' by organizing extra-curricular events like forums, conferences, and student exchanges.

Peace education groups in Canada conduct training workshops for teachers which include instruction on mediation and conflict resolution, on 'non-competitive dialogue', and on creating a classroom atmosphere which is conducive to cooperative behaviour.¹⁷ Although peace education is a relatively new phenomenon, the objectives of peace educators, including the move towards a more 'democratic' classroom setting, away from standardized testing and individual competitiveness, sound very much like those of the 'alternative education movement' that reached its zenith in the early 1970's.¹⁸ And one of the reasons for a resurgence of interest in alternative teaching methods can be traced to the evolution of peace research and peace studies. The concept of 'structural violence' and the notion that peace is more than the absence of war leads many educators to conclude that peace is not possible without critically analyzing various social institutions, including the formal education system.

CONCLUSION

As long as there is conflict and war there will be ample justification for researching 'peace', however it is defined and understood. Arguments over definitions and approaches are not unique to the field of peace research. Virtually every social science and inter-disciplinary field is subject to dispute and such dilemmas serve a positive function; that is, they compel researchers to continue to assess and re-define the field, with a view to developing a more clearly delineated focus.