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Introduction

*Man sieht hier erst, wo ein Mensch überall getroffen werden kann.*
*(Im Westen nichts Neues p. 220) Roger Johansson*

In his grandiose literary master piece, *War and Peace*, Leo Tolstoy describes the war both out of the values and identities of the mid-nineteenth century tsar aristocrats, and the reality of war, as the mass slaughter of Borodino the 7 September, 1812. Tolstoy gives us an entry to the inner life and thoughts, and how war affects people’s lives, by following the life stories of five aristocratic families in the shadow of the Napoleon war in Russia. (Tolstoy [1869] 2005) What does war mean?

“The enemy held there fire, increasing the sense of that, menacing, mysterious and intangible dividing line that exists between two warring armies. ‘One step across that dividing line, so like the one between the living and the dead, and you enter an unknown world of suffering and death.” *(Tolstoy 2005 p 151)*

Sixty years later, in the aftermath of the First World War, Erich Maria Remarque puts words on the experiences of a whole generation who had experienced the horrors and mass death in the trenches of Flanders. *(Remarque 1929)* How does war affect the humanity and the concept of civilization? *(Elias [1938] 1994; Bauman 1994)*

Wir haben alles Gefühl für einander verloren, wir kennen uns kaum noch, wenn das Bild des andern in unseren gejagten Blick fällt. Wir sind gefühllose Tote, die durch einen Trick, einen gefährlichen Zauber noch laufen und töten können. Ein junger Franzose bleibt zurück, er wird erreicht, hebt die Hände, in einer hat er noch den Revolver— man weiß nicht, will er schießen oder sich ergeben—; ein Spatenschlag spaltet ihm das Gesicht. Ein zweiter sieht es und versucht, weiter zu flüchten; ein Bajonett zischt ihm in den Rücken. Er springt hoch, und die Arme ausgebreitet, den Mund schreiend weit offen, taumelt er davon, in seinem Rücken schwankt das Bajonett. *(Remarque 1984 p 111)*

Behind one of the daily headlines of today, "For troops with brain trauma, a long journey back", we can read about the physical effects, and the medical reality of the ongoing war in Afghanistan. *(USA Today 2010)*

The question of War and Peace has been essential for mankind, and how we relate to and understand the question, has also related to the question of how we understand ourselves, our identity and to the ruling values of our present time.

We hope the booklet can offer support and guidance to PhD supervisors on research issues connected with citizenship, citizenship education and identities. The booklet with its cross-disciplinary approach can hopefully give examples from the field of War and Peace and widening the exchange of ideas and raise questions within
the field. The authors represent different countries and disciplines – educational sciences, social psychology and history – will discuss war and peace in the light of citizenship; highlight different problems and put different questions on the agenda.

Luigi Cajani discusses war and peace, and from a historical perspective, he gives a provoking example on war education and values of the late nineteenth century: “If pupils do not become citizens conscious of their duties and soldiers who love their guns, teachers will have wasted their time”.

Sigrun Adalbjarnardottir puts the challenging question, if and how we can prepare young people to create more peaceful ”worlds”; creating peaceable classrooms that may eventually be transferred to the wider community and society.

Penelope Harnett discusses, in her contribution, research about peace education from a perspective of the school curriculum, and from experiences in Northern Ireland she will also argue for exploring teachers’ own beliefs and teaching approaches.

From the perspective of a social psychologist Márta Fülöp argues that peace education directed to the individual in itself, without understanding the complex interaction between the individual, the group and the society with its historical, political, economical, cultural, religious characteristics has just limited effect.

Roger Johansson discusses in “Voices today from the eighties - constructing peaceful citizens”, the reaction on the ”Star Wars” in Europe in the eighties and how it could be understood from a tradition of peace education in Sweden.
War Education

Luigi Cajani

*If pupils do not become citizens conscious of their duties and soldiers who love their guns, teachers will have wasted their time* (Lavisse, 1885).

One could hardly expect that these words would be addressed today to an audience of teachers in a State of the European Union. In fact, they were written more than a century ago by Ernest Lavisse, one of the most prominent French historians of his time and author of very successful history textbooks. The social and political context was then quite different from today: a war with a neighbouring country was always at stake, and the new techniques of warfare required a great mass of soldiers, which lead to the diffusion of enforced conscription, with the exception of Great Britain, which based its military power above all on the fleet. In a climate of nationalism and militarism young men had to be prepared for the eventuality of an imminent war. When Lavisse wrote these words, France was under the shock of the defeat endured by the hand of Prussia in the 1870-71 war and nurtured a strong revanchism. Schools were directly mobilized not only at the ideological level, but also in practice, with the establishment in 1882 of the *bataillons scolaires*, under the joint supervision of the three ministries of Education, War and Internal Affairs. The *bataillons scolaires* were intended for the pre-military training of pupils from the age of 12. Pupils equipped with uniforms and dummy rifles were trained by retired soldiers or, if not available, by teachers, and performed weekly parades through the town streets, and especially participated in the celebrations of July 14th. When they were aged 14, they also undertook shooting exercises. After the initial enthusiasm, the *bataillons scolaires* were not very successful: they met the negative attitude of the Catholic Church, which saw a conflict with catechism attendance, because the exercises generally took place on Sunday, and also the military authorities were not convinced of the efficacy of the training. In addition there were heavy costs, which were at the charge of the communes: thus the experiment was abandoned after ten years (Spivak, 2007).

Quite successful, on the contrary were the experiences during that period in Great Britain with the establishment first of the Boys’ Brigade and later of the Boy Scouts, which were not imposed from above and directly connected with school, but organised from the bottom on a voluntary basis. The Boys’ Brigade founded in 1883 by William Alexander Smith, was an expression of a particular climate of Christian militarism which had developed during the Victorian era. Smith wanted to revive the declining practice of the Sunday School by coupling it with an intensive pre-military training for boys between 12 and 17. In fact, the core activities were the weekly drill parade in uniform with dummy rifles and the Sunday Bible class. The
Presbyterian Church in Scotland and the Church of England supported this movement, which by the turn of the century had just short of 45,000 members in the United Kingdom and had spread in the British colonies and in the USA (where it totaled about 28,000 members) (Bailey, 1983; Wilkinson, 1969).

The Boy Scouts were founded in 1908 by Robert Baden-Powell, a career army officer who during the Second Anglo-Boer war distinguished himself in the defense of Mafeking, where he employed young boys as scouts in support activities. On the basis of this experience Baden-Powell published in 1908 the book *Scouting for boys*, asserting the necessity of being prepared to defend the nation and the empire against other states. The new movements had many military men as patrons, but unlike the Boys' Brigade had no direct connection with a particular church, even if a general appreciation of religion was stated. The success was huge and immediate: in 1911 there were more than 100,000 members in the United Kingdom alone, and 250,000 including overseas sections, the largest being in the US, Chile and Argentina. At the outbreak of the First World War Baden-Powell mobilized the Boy Scouts for auxiliary service on the home front, doing tasks such as guarding against sabotage, air raid warnings, messenger services organizing relief measures and first aid stations (Wilkinson, 1969).

Fascist dictatorship placed special attention to the moral, social and physical education of youth of both sexes, with a special emphasis on pre-military training for boys. In Italy in 1926 the Opera Nazionale Balilla was created complementary to school. In fact, from the very beginning school transmitted militaristic values: the primers were filled with pictures of Italian soldiers and of weapons, with narratives on the victories in the First World War and in the war against Abyssinia, and with exhortations to fight for the Fatherland (Cajani, 2007). All other young people's organisations, including the Boy Scouts, were forbidden, with the only exception of the Gioventù Italiana di Azione Cattolica, dependent on the Catholic Church, as a consequence of the Concordato, the treaty between the Italian State and the Vatican. In Germany the Nazi Party created the Hitlerjugend already in 1926, and in 1933, when it took power, it forbade all other youth organisations. The Hitlerjugend thus became a mass organisation, rapidly covering the great majority of German youth. During the Second World War its members were widely employed in auxiliary services and also enlisted in a division of their own, the 12th SS Panzer Division "Hitlerjugend" (Horn, 1979).

The educational horizon changed after the Second World War, with the rise of antimilitarism and pacifism. Actually these attitudes had already taken hold after the First World War, especially in France and Great Britain, as a consequence of the awful experiences on the battlefields. Consequently, the Boys' Brigade and the Boy Scouts underwent a deep transformation in the direction of internationalism.
During a meeting in 1929 with 30,000 boy scouts from 42 states Baden-Powell proclaimed:

“We alone have the universal ear of the young. Let us set about teaching that the highest virtues are friendliness and good-will. And there will be no more war” (Wilkinson, 1969, 16-17).

The definitive diffusion of antimilitarism and pacifism in Western societies not only originated from the horrors of the Second World War and the strive for peace which animated the projects of the European Union, but was also strengthened by the dreadful climate of the Cold War and of its conflicts. One finds meaningful expressions of this mood above all among young people in many songs, like Quand un soldat by Francis Lemarque (1953) and Le Déserteur by Boris Vian (1954), both recorded during the French Indochina War (and therefore censored by the French government). Later in Italy, Fabrizio de André recorded La ballata dell’erode (1961) and La guerra di Piero (1964), and in Germany Franz-Josef Degenhardt wrote and performed Befragung eines Kriegsdienstverweigerers (1966). In 1964 the Canadian singer Buffy Sainte-Marie recorded the Universal Soldier, which became most famous through the cover of the Scottish singer Donovan’s (1967), and Bob Dylan’s Masters of War (1963) and became the hymn of the protest against the Vietnam War. The times were really a-changing.
Peace Education; identifying possible lines of enquiries for research.

Penelope Harnett

As the papers in this publication indicate, the notion of peace education can be researched from a wide range of perspectives across a variety of different disciplines. In this paper, I draw attention to some possible lines of enquiry for researching peace education within the school curriculum through looking at curriculum policy; resources and the perspectives of both teachers and pupils.

Defining peace education within the curriculum

Whilst governments may be supportive of peace education, it is not always easy to find reference to the term, peace education in government publications. Research needs to take into account both overt and implicit references. Documentary analysis of education policy and curriculum texts may raise questions as to the place and status of peace education within national systems of education as well as indicating forms of curriculum organisation where it might be taught. In England for example, the aims of the curriculum make no specific mention to peace education, but it could be argued that the curriculum’s three stated aims to enable children to become;

- Successful learners
- Confident individuals
- Responsible citizens

incorporate elements of peace education.

Similarly, values underpinning the English National Curriculum, such as the promotion of;

- personal development,
- equality of opportunity,
- economic wellbeing,
- a healthy and just democracy
- and of a sustainable future,

may also provide opportunities for developing an understanding of peace education. The Programmes of Study for individual subjects such as history, geography and citizenship also offer instances where young people can learn about conflict resolution and interrogate a range of perspectives concerning different events and issues (QCDA, 2007).

Researching how peace education is framed within policy and the curriculum thus may be a fruitful area to research and may also provide interesting opportunities for comparative studies.
Researching resources for peace education

Researching resources used to promote peace education may also offer interesting lines of enquiry. What sorts of resources are available? How are they developed and used? In terms of peace education, history, geography and humanities text books may play a significant role as they provide information about both contemporary conflicts and those conflicts set in the past. Values are integral to textbook creation; what authors choose to select and omit from their texts gives those topics which are included a quasi – official status, and implies that topics which are excluded are of less significance (Apple, 1993, Smart, (2010). Consequently textbook analysis may have much to contribute in ascertaining perspectives on peace education and its importance.

Comparative history textbook research suggests that national perspectives are dominant within many textbook accounts. For example, Foster and Nicholls’ (2005) study of textbooks relating to the second world war found stark differences in national portrayals, which appeared to be influenced by nationalistic bias, differing cultural and geopolitical perspectives, and the socio-political agendas of contemporary societies’. Ways in which ‘other people’ are represented/not represented in textbooks may reinforce prejudice and promote stereotypes. Alternatively, texts which seek to provide a variety of perspectives and opinions about events may enable children to develop their awareness of social diversity and their ability to take on other people’s viewpoints – both attributes which are important in peace education. Such texts are valued by organisations such as Euroclio, the European Association of History Educators which has actively supported projects to publish history textbooks to promote reconciliation in Europe (Euroclio 2007; Euroclio 2010).

Promoting peace education in the classroom; teachers’ attitudes

The implementation of peace education within schools is dependant on teachers’ own knowledge and beliefs. Shulman’s work defining teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge (1986) and subsequent studies by other researchers have noted the influence of teachers’ beliefs and values on their curriculum planning and decision making in the classroom. Peace education is likely to be controversial and many teachers may have concerns about teaching it; it may be that content conflicts with teachers’ own beliefs or that they worry about the effects of their teaching and raising controversial issues in the classroom.

In their study of secondary history teachers in Northern Ireland, a country only recently emerging from civil conflict, Kitson and McCully’s (2005) characterization of teachers as: avoiders, containers, and risk takers is of particular relevance for peace education. The ‘avoider teacher’ avoids controversy of any kind in the classroom; children are entitled to their own opinions and have to draw their own conclusions
from lessons taught at school. 'Container teachers’ might teach more controversial issues through looking at people’s different perspectives and different interpretations of events, In contrast, 'risk taker teachers’ make deliberate decisions to engage in controversial issues within the classroom. They deal with contemporary issues and encourage students to view different interpretations of the past as problematic and controversial.

Many teachers may require support in teaching challenging issues concerned with peace and conflict. For example, a recent large scale survey conducted in the UK revealed that many teachers found Holocaust education a difficult and complicated subject to teach and sought specialist professional development in this area (Holocaust Education Development Programme, 2009). Similar concerns in teaching controversial and sensitive issues in history were noted in the TEACH Report (DfES, 2007).

In terms of peace education, interesting questions to explore may be teachers' own beliefs; why they choose to teach about peace education; the challenges which they meet in their teaching and particular learning and teaching approaches which they employ.

**Children's views concerning peace education**

Children and young people are constantly confronted with images of both peace and conflict in a range of contexts including books, cartoons, adverts, films, promotional videos and the news. Schools may provide fora for young people to discuss their experiences and to explore their understanding of specific issues. In terms of their future lives, studies suggest that children are concerned for the future of their world and for the opportunities for all peoples to live in peace (Holden, 2006).

Schools may provide alternative versions of events to those which children might hear at home. In their study of children in Northern Ireland Barton and McCully (2005) note that children would listen to differing accounts of the conflict, although in the end their views might not change significantly from those they had already formed through family associations and experiences outside school. Similarly, young people in Palestine and Israel were interested to learn of different historical interpretations of past conflicts from Israeli and Palestinian historians, although they were reluctant to accept each others' versions completely (Adwan and Bar-On; 2007).

Researching children’s views may thus provide further perspectives on peace education and moreover, provide data on which educational intervention programmes may be based.
Fostering the Roots of Peace

Sigrún Adalbjarnardóttir

Around the world, individuals and nations consistently call for a more peaceful and just world (e.g., United Nations). Hardly a day passes without some event reminding us what a challenge it is to respect each other’s attitudes and feelings, and solve conflicts together. We can observe our shortcomings at various levels of interaction. On the macro level, for instance, we see the lack of consensus on political issues; taken to extremes, this can lead to wars between nations, ethnic groups, and religious populations. On the micro level we experience interpersonal conflicts among colleagues, in friendships, within families, and in peer relationships. Some we manage to resolve well, others less well.

A challenging question is how we can best prepare young people to create more peaceful “worlds” at these micro and macro levels. The answers are plentiful. Below the focus is on what I view as basis for such attempts within education: to cultivate a respectful, caring, and just community where mutual trust, shared responsibility, solidarity, and successful conflict resolutions are fostered.

Perspective-taking ability and conflict resolution

As reflected in both international educational institutions (e.g., European Commission, 2009) and national educational laws and curricula in democratic countries, schools are required to foster each student’s cognitive, social, emotional, and ethical growth, including their civic awareness and self-efficacy for their own wellbeing and that of society.

One basic ability underlying these competencies is perspective-taking: the developmental ability to put oneself in the shoes of others; to differentiate between various perspectives, and to coordinate them (Selman, 2003).

This ability is a base for (a) our cognitive competence, which enables us to differentiate between various knowledge or facts and connect and coordinate them; (b) our interpersonal competence, how we treat each other and solve interpersonal conflicts; (c) our moral or ethical thoughts about what is right or wrong; and (d) our ability to understand our own and others’ feelings. In this light perspective-taking is a base for our civic awareness about human rights, and our responsibility and influence as citizens (Adalbjarnardóttir, 2010). Accordingly, in education, including peace education, I see perspective-taking ability as a core competence we must foster. For example, students could be provided with special opportunities to develop this ability as we help them discuss matters of opinion and solve conflicts peacefully, and they experience mutual respect and care, trust and solidarity.

This special emphasis can be seen in some peace education programs (e.g., Brion-Meisels, Brion-Meisels, & Hoffman, 2007; Peace First,
For years I have been running a research and intervention program with these aims: SEG, or Fostering Students’ Social and Emotional Growth (Adalbjarnardottir, 1993, 2010). One important focus of SEG is encouraging elementary school children to discuss their own and others’ interpersonal conflict situations from different points of view and to find solutions. In one of the SEG studies, the students’ thought levels (in hypothetical school dilemmas with teachers and peers) and their action levels in real-life situations at school were analysed according to their perspective-taking ability: egocentric/impulsive, unilateral/one-way, reciprocal/two-way, and mutual/collaborative. The findings were promising: students who took part in the intervention program showed more progress in their perspective-taking ability than students in a control group. They more often considered both participants’ perspectives when solving interpersonal conflicts, both in thought and in action in real-life situations.

This approach, of encouraging students to explore issues from various points of view, is obviously cross-disciplinary. Many disciplines—social studies, history, ethics, science, literature, civic studies—provide opportunities for discussion around issues concerning their community, society, or the world (e.g., environmental or religious issues). They provide opportunities for arguments, debate, consensus, and conflict resolution in a respectful and peaceful way.

Thought and action

A challenging question in this context is whether there is a relationship between people’s thinking and their actions. In his well-known theory of moral development, Kohlberg (1984) hypothesized that people who showed more mature moral thinking would be likely to show more moral action. He offered several examples for this argument from interviews such as with Vietnam-era US soldiers involved in the My Lai massacre. One soldier said he felt he had been doing the right thing as he had lost friends: “I lost a damn good buddy” (tit-for-tat thinking). Another said he had fired and “missed on purpose”. In the interview he focused on respect for the human life of those at My Lai just as for American people and questioned the legitimacy of the action. Kohlberg (1984, pp. 564-568) felt the soldiers’ different views on human rights and related actions showed hints for his hypothesis.

Interestingly, in addition to the findings in the SEG study mentioned above (Adalbjarnardóttir, 1993) the developmental level of students’ interpersonal thought was positively related to their developmental level of action, suggesting that the reasoning processes they use in the context of conflict resolution may extend to real-life settings.
Moreover, in exploring the relationship between students’ change in thought level and change in action level over the school year those who showed more improvement in thought level while negotiating conflicts also showed more progress in real-life negotiation situations. This finding should have promise for those working to create peaceable communities.

However, the relationship between thought and action is not simple. For example, why do some people act immorally even though they have good moral knowledge and understanding? Theorists like Blasi (1983) point out that it is not enough to refer to traits. We should look for personal motivation and “the sense of personal responsibility and the dynamism of self-consistency” (p. 178). Others call this focus on self a “moral identity” and add the importance of situational factors in relation to moral intentions and actions (Aquino et al., 2009). Clearly, it is not enough just to know. A person’s motivation, and the way she makes sense of her knowledge and connects it to her own life, seems to be an important link between her knowledge and action—an element to take into account in educating for peace.

**A vision**

Promoting social awareness, with a focus on perspective-taking ability and conflict resolution skills, is an important approach in creating peaceable classrooms and school communities that may eventually translate to the wider community and society. Respectful, caring, and just school communities should provide a base for meaningful experiences about human rights, shared responsibility, and solidarity. As such they should be able to foster young people’s civic awareness as one step in our ongoing walk toward a more peaceful world.
Psychologists have been interested in psychological aspects of war and peace since the beginning of modern psychology. ‘War and Peace’ are traditional topics in social psychology, but they are discussed under the heading conflict and conflict resolution. The field of conflict resolution is a broad discipline that has built knowledge out of several components, combining not only social psychology, but also politics, sociology, economics and historical experiences. It is a real interdisciplinary endeavour.

Psychology provides different levels of explanations to the contrasting phenomena of war and peace and there is a kind of confusion about at what level intervention can be or should be made. There have been many individual level explanations to war, for instance that it is the result of the desire for power, or the inborn need to fight, or the lack of empathy or conflict resolution skills, therefore in case there is an adequate socialisation of the individual then war can be avoided. But war and peace are not interpersonal but inter-group and inter-institutional affairs and the behaviour of groups follow different laws than the behaviour of individuals. To influence the behaviour of the individual is a hard enough task, but to influence the behaviour of groups and nations is even more difficult.

LeShan (2002) in his book ‘The Psychology of War’ points out that there is wide disagreement among researchers in the social sciences on the subject of war and its causes. While there are many trials using the accumulated knowledge of social sciences in the field of conflict resolution to prevent war, and there are millions of programmes attempting to put this practical knowledge into practice the result is not very convincing. The world is not peaceful.

William Zartman (1997) a world renowned expert of conflict resolution in the USA wrote in the introduction of the book ‘Peacemaking in international conflict. Methods and techniques’ that “On the edge of millennium, the methods of conflict have been more brutal and the methods of conflict resolution more sophisticated than ever before, leaving a tremendous gap between reality and theory that remains to be filled.” p. 3.

According to Coleman (2000) at the time of writing his chapter to ‘The Handbook of Conflict Resolution’ 25 percent of the wars (conflicts with more than one thousand deaths per year) had persisted for more than two decades. He called these conflicts ‘intractable conflicts’. These are the result of ‘malignant social processes’ (Deutsch, 1985), they are about values central to identity, they are pervasive, there is a kind of hopelessness about the potential for constructive resolution, the primary objective of the parties involved is to harm one another and there is a resistance of resolution. Once conflicts reach this level of destructiveness it is very hard to avert them.
Obviously, there can be many explanations to the regrettable fact that intractable conflicts leading to wars are still abundant. One line of argument can be that most of the conflict resolution techniques, peace education etc. aim to reach the individual and try to inculcate the necessary values, attitudes, competencies that scientific research showed to be needed in order to be able to solve conflicts successfully (i.e. Deutsch, 1993). However, all social psychologists know how much power the situation has in determining the individual’s behaviour irrespective of his/her personal values etc. For instance Darley and Bateson’s (1973) famous study applying the parable of the Good Samaritan demonstrated that values, morals, being taught to be sensitive of the needs of others and intellectual knowledge and understanding are not enough to influence helping behaviour under certain situational conditions. They found that even a theology student in hurry (situational variable: time constraint) is likely to keep going and not offering help to someone who is sitting slumped in a doorway clearly being in a very bad health condition. Ironically, this happens even if the student is hurrying to speak about the parable of the Good Samaritan. It was found that several occasions the seminary student literally stepped over the victim as he hurried on his way to give the talk. The same seminary students, when not in a hurry, were willing to provide help to the person.

Zimbardo (2007) in his book ‘The Lucifer effect’ also calls the attention to the strength of the situational forces in contrast to individual characteristics (values, level of morality, personality, ability to solve conflicts etc.) in violent actions, abuses and cruelty, basically questioning what all the efforts put into teaching conflict resolution techniques can achieve. He uses the metaphor of the ‘bad barrel’ (situational conditions) in which ‘good apples’ (normal, moral beings, with potentially wonderful conflict resolution skills) transform into ‘bad apples’ (evil ones). When he conducted the famous prison experiment in 1971 he understood only the power of the direct situational forces, but by now he understands the role of the System, the political, economic, religious, historic and cultural matrix that define the Situation and gives it legitimate or illegitimate existence. To be able to understand and explain human behaviour towards war or peace it is necessary to recognize the extent and limits of personal, situational and systemic power.

According to LeShan (2002) peace education programmes are not very effective, because at present there is more belief, passion and dedication in this field of peace psychology than actual organized systematic research. Peace psychology as a distinct area of psychology did not begin to emerge clearly until the latter half of the twentieth century. The very first college textbook on peace psychology ‘Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology for the 21st Century’ (edited by Christie et al.) was published only in 2001.
To solve destructive conflicts it is not enough to carry out a multilevel analysis but Coleman (2000) emphasizes that given the complexity of intractable conflict, analysis and intervention must be embedded in a multidisciplinary framework. Social psychology, just like political science, economics, history, law, and so on, is only one lens through which to see these types of conflicts, therefore the only way to solve these conflicts is a multimodal and multidisciplinary intervention. Ignoring this complexity can be ineffective or can have disastrous effects.
Voices today from the eighties – constructing peaceful citizens

Roger Johansson

One important aspect of Citizenship and Citizenship Education is to prepare learners for the future. In the following discussion, I focus on Peace Education in the broad and interesting context of international research, through analysing the interactions in Swedish schools in the 1980s alongside the widespread discourse which mobilised peace and disarmament in Europe.

The focus on the 1980s is two fold; the decade starts with Ronald Reagan’s preparation for “Star wars” and the NATO stationing of missiles in Europe, and ends with the fall of the Berlin wall, and the dissolution of the Cold war. The time is characterized by a growing insight and a new kind of mass mobilization to stop and refuse to participate in the new enormous re-armament, in Sweden and in Europe. (Teachers for peace, 2002) Although, there has been a long tradition of peace education in Swedish schools, the mass mobilization in the eighties was something new.

In the aftermath of World War I the curricula of the elementary school in 1919 points out fostering peace as one of the main goals for the subject of history (Curricula 1919). Twenty five years later, in the aftermath of the Second World War, UNESCO stated that war was a consequence of old habits and traditions. “Since war begins in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed.” These habits and ideas were now to be challenged. Such thoughts had a great impact on the development of peace education in the Swedish schools and the Swedish National Board of Education. (Bjerstedt 1985) How were these thoughts put into practice in the Swedish classroom and in Teachers’ education collage? (Andersson/Johansson 2009)

But something was going on in the 1980s. The question of peace and disarmament was rallying different groups in Sweden in a way the question had not done before. Fear of warfare and the willingness to do something affected people in general. Examples of occupational groups for peace were; Teachers for peace, Librarians for Peace, Engineers for Peace, Film makers for peace, Journalists for peace, Women for peace, Policemen for peace, Social workers for peace, Doctors for peace, Priests for peace, Nurses for peace. On a European level Generals for peace were founded by some NATO generals, just to give some examples.

In a study of Swedish history textbooks it is possible to interpret discourses and narratives of Sweden as a peaceful country (Tham 1955). In the late 1970s it is not only the absence of violence which defines peace, but the desire for a fair world order as a precondition for establishing peace (Andersson/Johansson 2009). Teachers were not the only ones involved, more than 80 programs were produced by the National Swedish radio and the Education radio broadcasting
during the 1980s, with titles as; “Learn for peace – further education in peace education” (SvT – program).

Something new was developing, seminars were organized, the National Agency for Education and teacher Education colleges were soon involved through their R&D (Research and Development departments) and new textbooks were written by organisations such as Teachers for Peace. (Thelin1986; Teachers’ instructions1987).

Six interviews
Six teachers were interviewed in Sweden in October 2009 about their experiences of Peace Education in the 1980s. They all had different experiences; within Teacher Education, in the National board of Education, as director of studies for the department of Research and Development, teaching pedagogy at a college for teacher education, teaching in public schools such issues as democracy, peace – and environmental Education. Some were also authors of textbooks. I would like to sum up the interviews within three key concepts that – in my opinion – emphasize the most important message within the Peace Education movement of the eighties:

● Experiences of an unjust and illegitimate world order and fear of a full scale nuclear war – a modern Armageddon.

● Action and willingness to act.

● To begin the peace work by working with yourself and your own values.

One of the teachers expressed this using a slogan of the time: “To find the global in the local and local in the global.”(Conference video 2009) That is why new textbooks were needed and produced.

Some important questions were raised to help understand the process of shifting values within the cold war area. Informants were asked;

Why, when and what made you interested in peace issues?

Viveka – I got involved in the Peace march to Paris in 1981. The Swedish Prime minister, Olof Palme, went to Paris and met us there; trying to stop the NATO stationing missiles in Europe, and that raised the hope of a nuclear free Nordic zone.

Vilgot – For me it was Education in Internationalisation. I also had the feeling of hope when I participated in a parade together with one million people of different nationalities, during the second UN conference for disarmament. That was a powerful experience!

Maja – For me it was the 1968 student movement during my university studies in Sociology in Lund; solidarity with Vietnam and the Third world was at the very centre of the discussions.

Göte – For me it was 1982. This was the year when the resistance started against the NATO stationing of missiles in Europe. I was a history teacher. I had experienced the aftermath of the Second
World War and for me the question of war and peace was a question of destiny – the outcome of a nuclear war would be disastrous for mankind.

Ulla-Karin – For me it was hearing of the liberation theology in South America, and global questions of survival, and the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa.

Which were the most important questions within the field of peace education and were there any reactions from opponents?

Vilgot - For me it was; the Third world-problems, Human rights and Peace questions. That was also the subject in my professional development courses for teachers. – Once man asked me if I was a KGB-agent.

Lena – I went to Israel and became interested in Peace issues and continued to study Peace and Conflict at the University in Sweden.

Göte – The governmental report U-68 – on the new organisation of Universities and higher education – also included special funding to develop and increase internationalisation. Internationalisation groups were formed at the universities trying to implement questions of understanding and solidarity in the education. The key words were “Knowledge – Emotion – Action.”

Ulla-Karin - The most important questions are about democracy and children’s participation. How teachers interact with children in the classroom and together try to find answers to these fundamental questions for humanity. In Malmö we have children with experiences of war. Everything must end in actions where children experience that they can do something.

Vilgot – Within my work for the National board of Education there were limits for Peace Education and publications in relation to the military which you couldn’t cross; you couldn’t act for pacifism

Lena – A critical question you must ask is of course how much burden you can impose on the children? I have been emphasizing more and more the importance of knowledge and interaction between people. Questions about our survival and questions about peace interact with each other. Can we talk about common values?

Fostering peace or preparedness for the future?

In a paper for members of Teachers against Nuclear Weapons 1985, we can read the following under the headline “Fostering for peace...”

“It is important that you yourself take a standpoint. If you think that we are born evil or good. What kind of model or example do you aspire to for children? As a fosterer/ you are led by your own basic values...”

Many of the articles at this time are about how to expand your own knowledge and the importance of being aware of your own values.
The increased interest in questions of survival, deriving from the threat of a nuclear war, also served as starting points for university courses and for action research in public schools, in Teacher Education and in the Universities in Sweden.

This article argues that there are continuous traditions within Peace Education in Swedish schools and also that in the aftermath of the Vietnam War, and the stationing of missiles in Europe, the “Star Wars” highlighted deep existential questions of survival. The classrooms became a mirror, and reflected the values of the outside world. New kinds of textbooks were produced emphasizing the children as carriers of a hope for a better world and the importance of action, to do something to be prepared for the future.
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The Children’s Identity and Citizenship in Europe (CiCe) Academic Network links 28 European states and some 80 universities and college departments which are engaged in educating students about how children and young people learn about and understand their society, their identity and citizenship.

A cross-disciplinary group, we include lecturers in social psychology, pedagogy, psychology, sociology and curriculum studies, and those who educate various professions such as teachers, social pedagogues, psychologists, early childhood workers and youth workers.