

cult task. Most of those who favour the introduction of peace education materials into school curricula prefer the 'infusion model'. They maintain that creating a special subject called 'peace' is not appropriate; rather, they suggest that information about nuclear issues and conflict resolution be infused into existing curricula. A course in English literature, for example, might include the study of Bertrand Russell's writings; a course on science and technology might include the study of nuclear weapons; a course on religion and society might examine the concept of the 'just war'.

Inherent in this approach is the risk that topics which are highly complex, such as the study of nuclear weapons or arms control, cannot be covered adequately if they fill a relatively minor portion of a full curriculum. Those who favour the 'infusion model' of peace education suggest that this dilemma can be overcome by providing adequate in-service programmes for teachers, as well as teaching aids such as audio-visual materials, background papers, and bibliographies.

Peace education usually involves more than teaching facts and figures relating to the arms race. It also involves the teaching of skills, such as conflict resolution and critical reading; attitudes, such as cultural tolerance; and values, such as a commitment to world citizenship and non-violence. On the surface, the tenets of peace education do not appear to contradict Canadian provincial government statements regarding the objectives of education in general. The Ministry of Education in Ontario (1984) cites "a sense of personal responsibility in society at the local, national, and international level, of the development of esteem for the customs, cultures, and beliefs of a wide variety of societal groups and the development of values related to personal, ethical or religious groups and to the common welfare of society."⁶

The Ministry of Education in Alberta (1983) urges "the development of knowledge, skills, and attitudes at the appropriate local, national and international level; understanding of an active citizenship capable of informed decision making, and the development of a sense of purpose in life as a Canadian citizen and as an integral member of human society."⁷

Such statements imply that the inclusion of educational materials pertaining to war and peace, cultural understanding, and world citizenship is a non-controversial issue. That is not the case however. Dozens of school boards across Canada have set up task forces and committees to examine the issues raised by peace education, soliciting the advice of parents and specialists.⁸ When controversy results, it turns on two central issues. The first is the question of balance and political bias, centring on

the content of peace education material. The second issue concerns methodology and the underlying goals of peace education.

PEACE EDUCATION/PEACE POLITICS

In a paper entitled 'Peace Studies: A Critical Survey', British authors Caroline Cox and Roger Scruton argue that peace education curriculum materials are not 'balanced' and that they advocate political views that are "damaging to the national interests . . . and favourable to the Soviets".⁹ In reviewing peace studies in British schools, for example, they state that most of the material criticizes the British government and rarely mentions anything about the Soviet Union except to state that Soviet people want peace as much as anybody else. Cox and Scruton suggest that education be restricted to subjects in which there is "a communicable body of knowledge," such as mathematics, science, or geography, because young people do not possess the experience or cognitive ability to distinguish education from indoctrination.

Peace educators say in reply that the present educational system is not 'balanced' because textbooks tend to promote nationalism. In a 1981 review of peace research over a twenty year period, Hakan Wiberg cited studies suggesting that the discipline of history as taught in the US, for example, is far from neutral.¹⁰ The studies indicated that history texts glamorize war and the national leaders who participate in them, and rarely make any reference to the human, social, and cultural costs of war, or to the possibility of non-violent alternatives for resolving conflict.

Peace education advocates say that, by referring to credible sources and soliciting the advice of experts, ministry officials responsible for curricula can ensure that peace education materials present a *variety* of viewpoints and do not make unsubstantiated claims. Thus, the issue of balance should not pose insurmountable problems.

John Mack, a psychiatrist at Harvard University, suggests that it is a 'balanced treatment' which those who resist peace education fear.¹¹ With regard to teaching students about the Soviet Union, "such instruction might include, together with available facts about the Soviet political system, some account of how the Soviet leadership and people see the nuclear danger, *their* view of security, and *their* fears of US and Chinese military power." Mack concludes that opposition to peace education stems from the desire to "resist educational materials that stimulate questions about the basic assumptions of the society as a whole."