

**EDUCATION
FOR PEACE AND
DISARMAMENT**

TOWARD



A LIVING

WORLD

DOUGLAS SLOAN, Editor

Education for Peace and Disarmament: Toward a Living World

DOUGLAS SLOAN, Editor

Teachers College, Columbia University



Teachers College, Columbia University
New York and London 1983

Published by Teachers College Press, 1234 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, N.Y.
10027

Copyright © 1982, 1983 by Teachers College, Columbia University

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission from the publisher.

Grateful acknowledgment is made for permission to reprint the following material:

Page 28. Poem by Alia Johnson, "Why We Should Drop the Bombs." Reprinted by permission of *Evolutionary Blues*, Box 40187, San Francisco, CA 94140.

Page 29. Excerpt from "Speak, You Also," in *Paul Celan: Poems*, translated by Michael Hamburger. Copyright © 1980 by Michael Hamburger. Reprinted by permission of PERSEA BOOKS, INC., 225 Lafayette Street, New York, NY 10012, CARCANET PRESS, Manchester, England and Michael Hamburger.

Pages 211 and 214. Poetry from *Modern Arab Poets*, translated and edited by Issa J. Boullata. © Three Continents Press, Washington, D.C. Reprinted by permission of Three Continents Press, Inc., and Heinemann Educational Books.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Main entry under title:

Education for peace and disarmament.

Includes index.

1. Atomic weapons and disarmament—Study and teaching—United States—Addresses, essays, lectures. 2. Peace—Study and teaching—United States—Addresses, essays, lectures. I. Sloan, Douglas.

JX1974.7.E28 1983 327.1'74'07073 83-14469

ISBN 0-8077-2747-4

Manufactured in the United States of America

88 87 86 85 84 83 1 2 3 4 5 6

Contents

DOUGLAS SLOAN	1	<i>Preface: Toward an Education for a Living World</i>
A CALL TO TEACH AND LEARN		
ROBERT JAY LIFTON	15	<i>Beyond Nuclear Numbing</i>
RICHARD J. BARNET	30	<i>Teaching Peace</i>
SEYMOUR MELMAN	38	<i>Teaching about Reversing the Arms Race</i>
GENE SHARP	50	<i>Investigating New Options in Conflict and Defense</i>
RANDALL FORSBERG	65	<i>A Nuclear Freeze and a Noninterventionary Conventional Policy</i>
ROBERT K. MUSIL	79	<i>Teaching in a Nuclear Age</i>
MICHAEL N. NAGLER	102	<i>Education as a Five-Letter Word</i>
MICHAEL J. CAREY	115	<i>The Schools and Civil Defense: The Fifties Revisited</i>
MAXINE GREENE	128	<i>Education and Disarmament</i>
BETTY REARDON	137	<i>Disarmament Education as World Order Inquiry</i>
JOHN M. BROUGHTON	152	<i>The Peace Movement Threat</i>
MARTA K. ZAHAYKEVICH		
VOICES FROM EUROPE		
PETER ABBS	174	<i>Teachers, Ethical Imagination, and World Disarmament</i>
ADRIAN NĂSTASE	184	<i>Education for Disarmament: A Topical Necessity</i>
ACTION AND EXPERIMENTS		
ELISE BOULDING	192	<i>The U.S. Academy of Peace</i> <i>Testimony for the U.S. Senate by Elise Boulding on a U.S. National Peace Academy</i>
SAM TOTTEN	199	<i>Activist Educators</i>

HAIM GORDON JAN DEMAREST	210	<i>Buberian Learning Groups: The Quest for Responsibility in Education for Peace</i>
RIFFAT HASSAN	226	<i>Response to “Buberian Learning Groups: The Quest for Responsibility in Education for Peace” by Haim Gordon and Jan Demarest</i>
KIMBERLY HUSELID GLASS	232	<i>Peace—In and Out of Our Homes: A Report on a Workshop</i>
BETTY REARDON	237	<i>Response: Needs in Peace Education Development Identified by Glass</i>
TWO SCENARIOS		
WILLARD J. JACOBSON	240	<i>The Last Day of Civilization</i>
BETTY REARDON	255	<i>The First Day of Hope</i>
AFFIRMATION		
RENÉ DUBOS	266	<i>Education for the Celebration of Life: Optimism Despite It All</i>
	277	CONTRIBUTORS
	281	INDEX

PREFACE

Toward an Education for a Living World

The totality, the finality, and the growing imminence of nuclear extinction are by now apparent to all who have eyes to see and the will to look. This collection of articles represents one attempt to seek ways whereby educators and education can join with others to avert the catastrophe of nuclear war, and to undo the forces that drive us toward it.

This attempt also grows out of the twofold conviction that the peace movement in general and education for peace in particular must not allow themselves to be impelled solely by fear, but must be grounded in a primary and positive vision of the fully human; and that, so grounded, education for peace is not a peripheral matter but lies at the heart of the educational venture. Before the enormity of the nuclear threat one reaction is simply paralysis and stupefaction; another is indifference born of fear (including that cool, academic nonchalance, which hides a deep despair and cynicism). Another reaction is panic; and, unfortunately, a large element of the peace movement appears still to be built primarily on fear, and an even larger element is constantly tempted to rely on fear as its main mode of persuasion. Obviously, in perilous times an unflinching ability to see what is in store for us, if we do not turn ourselves around, is absolutely essential. But if we are to take the necessary steps without faltering, there must be something to turn toward, and an awareness of the energies available for the turning. A movement built solely on fear is destined to founder, and in doing so may help bring about the very thing it fears most. As the great Russian philosopher Nikolai Berdyaev wrote:

War is possible only in a certain psychological atmosphere and this psychological atmosphere is created in a variety of ways, sometimes in unnoticed ways. Even an atmosphere of fear of war can be favourable to war. Fear never leads to any good.¹

The primary task of education for peace is, therefore, to reveal and tap the reality of those energies and impulses that make possible the full human capacity for a meaningful and life-enhancing existence. But this is what education in its inner essence has always been about, which is why an adequate understanding of education for peace is not something secondary to the real tasks of education, like, for instance, adding on to the rest of the

curriculum a special course called “peace studies” (though it certainly may require at least that), but is integral to education in its deepest and fullest sense. However important the secondary tasks of education may be, and until now they have usually received primary emphasis, we can no longer avoid recognizing how terribly and truly deadly it is to ignore the heart of the matter.

However, we can be more specific still about the integral connection between education and the movement for peace. In the first place, the basic aim of educators is to provide for the healthy growth and development of children, and to create a culture worthy to receive them. The threat to the children that they should never grow up, and that in the interim the preparations for their destruction should impoverish and corrupt the world in which they now live, strikes at the foundation of the educational vocation.

In the second place, efforts for peace are intimately connected with education because they involve the ways in which we attempt to know and understand reality. And our ways of knowing directly affect the way we relate to the world and, hence, the kind of world we create for ourselves through our institutions, our technologies, and our conceptions of reality. The world we apprehend and live in is structured by our consciousness. It is here that education and the peace movement have the most to do with each other, and it is here that, so far, both have done the least.

The dominant modern view of how we know, of what we can know, and, therefore, of what life and the world and their potentialities hold for us has been shaped by the positivist assertion (in its various modern forms) that all knowledge is acquired only through “the positive data of science,” which has meant, in effect, only through that which can be counted, measured, and weighed. The central positivist claim is that science provides our only way of knowing and our only source of genuine knowledge. This claim has its corollaries, namely, (1) that all problems are scientific and technological problems, including all human problems, which are to be cast exclusively in scientific and technological terms and dealt with accordingly; and (2) that quantitative science provides an adequate, all-embracing picture of the world—the so-called scientific and technological world view, a mechanistic, quantitative world in which there is no place for normative values, ethics, final causes, meaning, and above all qualities and the feelings, sensations, consciousness, and intangible, inner webs of relationships in which qualities inhere. The world that thus can be known and the world that results is one in which the only consideration is quantity—power.

True, it has become *au courant* in some philosophical circles to maintain that positivism is now at last being overcome; and increasingly fewer and fewer people show any desire to be regarded as positivists. Nevertheless, there remains everywhere more than a little of what Owen Barfield has humorously called RUP, “the residue of unresolved positivism,” and in certain important areas, including those dominant in modern education (to say nothing of the military, the government, the

corporate world, and the scientific establishment itself, despite some notable exceptions within the last), this residue is more on the order of a pervasive, conglomerated mass. That this is the case, and what it means, what momentously destructive consequences it has had for human beings and human community, why it is immediately relevant to the human search for justice and peace and for a living and livable world, become apparent with a little reflection.

As positivism, often without the name, has battened its hold on the modern mind, we have witnessed a steady, unremitting shrinking and narrowing of reason to its lowest, most elemental dimensions. For convenience sake, we may call it, as others have (though this is not an entirely satisfactory designation), technical reason. It is a reason skilled at calculation, but with no sense for beauty; a reason adept at taking things apart, but oblivious to the intangible and undergirding connections of the whole; a reason skilled in the perfecting of means, but void of meaning; a reason enamored of process, but bereft of purpose; a reason highly developed in efficiency, but dead to the richness of experience; a reason devoted to problems and programs, but without vision; a reason that while it is fragmenting, also drives to reassemble the parts it has created in homogenous, interlocking, closed, collective unities. It is the cultivation of this narrow reason that much of modern education has taken as its sole reason for being. That this technical reason is but the shadow of rationality in its fullest sense, there is in the modern world little inkling.

This technical reason, when set in the context of a larger, more capacious rationality, is of utmost importance and usefulness. But when allowed to define and determine the rational, technical reason by itself is ultimately destructive. An exclusive emphasis on technical reason strengthens the hands of those who control science and technology. Political, economic, and military centralization is the constant trend where only technical reason is recognized. The reductionism of technical reason parcels out knowledge in discrete, compartmentalized domains, which offer themselves to capture by powerful vested economic and political interests having no concern for the interrelatedness of knowledge or of nature or of human community. Nature is subjected to unrelieved dismantling and spoliation. Human community rooted in commitments to time, place, and persons is eroded and torn apart in the name of modernization and development. Considered public policy disappears in the tumult of interest-group politics. Crucial political, moral, and cultural issues and choices go unattended, and are decided by default, or by technological imperatives. And the further consolidation of social control in the hands of the already politically, economically, and technologically powerful proceeds apace. A purely quantitative, technical reason knows only power (by definition) and is, therefore, not neutral, but has a special affinity for power and for the powerful.

At the same time, often in panicky and fear-stricken reaction to the

desolations wrought by a narrowed, fragmented, and fragmenting technical reason, there well up on every side all manner of dark, surging, destructive passions that pour out in dogmatisms, fundamentalisms, political ideologies, mass enthusiasms of every sort. When irrational passion and technical reason join forces, we begin to recognize familiar central characteristics of our modern situation: a highly refined, disciplined technical reason attuned only to its own imperatives and driven by irrational forces impervious or hostile to genuine human needs and concerns. In such a situation, calls for greater reason, when only technical reason is recognized and allowed, can only make matters worse; and attempts to restrain and redirect technical reason by placing it in the service of irrational commitments are usually worse yet. What is needed is a recovery of the breadth and depth of rationality in its fullness, a rationality that encompasses and can reconcile and reenliven the powers of both our calculative, technical reason and our deepest, most humane feelings and commitments.

One way to speak of this larger rationality is to speak of imagination and an education of imagination. It should be obvious that imagination here is not meant in the trivial sense of much modern education that loves to speak of “the creative imagination” but is really referring to the exercise of fancy as a necessary but essentially separate and minor prelude to technical logic and reason. In modern education the notion of imagination has become as thinned and fragmented as reason itself. We are here using imagination—and, perhaps, some such expression as Insight-Imagination might be more satisfactory—to refer to the activity of the whole person in knowing. Often a false contrast is made between rational thinking and irrational will, when the real contrast should be made between rational thinking and irrational thinking, rational feeling and irrational feeling, rational will and irrational will. In all knowing the whole person—the thinking, feeling, willing, valuing person—is involved. To ignore the feeling and willing capacities, and the development of all our sensitivities and sensibilities as potentially organs of cognition, is to restrict unduly the possibilities of knowledge, and to make all our thinking vulnerable to dead, habitual, and even brutal and psychotic impulses and energies. Must we not begin to seek ways to generate within ourselves, and to bring into our thinking, dynamic, living impulses and energies that can inform thinking and open up to it living and life-giving dimensions of reality?

Einstein’s statement that the bomb has changed everything except our mode of thinking is more and more quoted, and with good reason. But it is then, in most instances, casually dropped, and other matters taken up. The radicalness of what Einstein there says is almost never taken note of, or pursued further. He says that the only way to avert “unparalleled catastrophe” is to change our mode of thinking. To change our mode of thinking! Unless we assume that Einstein was merely tossing off a felicitous expression, must we not ask seriously what this means, and then attend to it urgently and with all our

efforts and abilities? Whatever else it may imply, it cannot mean continuing on our present positivist, technicist path to catastrophe. In this light the task of developing an adequate education of Insight-Imagination is central to the peace movement and to every effort for a living world.

It is here that a dilemma confronts the peace movement. Events are moving quickly, and the looming threat of destruction requires action so immediate that we cannot wait upon a fundamental transformation of human nature and thinking to deal with them. At the same time, however, the potential for nuclear war is now with us, humanly speaking, forever. The knowledge of the bomb is available and can never be put back in the bottle. This evident fact is frequently hurled at the peace movement by its opponents as though it discredited the efforts for peace, rather than making them all the more urgent and necessary. So education faces a dual task: a short-term one of marshaling all available forces to turn the present situation around, and a long-range, permanent task of forming those structures of consciousness and of society that alone can make possible a just and sustainable peace. Both tasks are necessary and must be carried out simultaneously: the first making breathing room for the second, and the second more and more informing and strengthening the first. The difficulties in such a tension-filled undertaking are manifold; the necessity for it is inescapable.

In this light we can begin to sketch out in a most preliminary and incomplete way what to the editor seem to be some of the main dimensions of education for peace, knowing that some contributors to this issue might well disagree, and that all would probably draw a somewhat different picture.

The most immediate task of the peace movement requires the *relentless questioning and unmasking of officialdom*. It is at this point that the question most often posed to the peace movement must be faced. What about the Soviet Union? It will not do for the movement to focus its criticism only on Western governments, which, to their credit, are still relatively open and accessible to such criticism. Nor will its ultimate aims be served for the peace movement to soft-pedal the unattractiveness and brutishness of the Soviet state, sentimentally hoping that it will change for the better of its own accord. The peace movement has much to do in learning how to extend its growing international reach into the Soviet Union with the same effectiveness it is beginning to experience in the West. At the same time, however, the peace movement cannot permit Western governments self-righteously to cast the Soviet Union as the sole villain and only embodiment of evil in the world. And, above all, the peace movement in the West must be relentless in exposing the efforts of its own governments to generate fear among their people in order to gain their unquestioning compliance with official policies, all the more so as these policies contemplate the incineration of hundreds of millions of people. Not only does a successful playing on fear allow folly and criminality to go unchallenged, it elicits similar responses and hardening on the other side; and it locks out of consideration any recognition of real change,

possibilities for change, elements of flexibility and even of self-interested realism on the other side, which can be the essential starting point for mutual relaxation of tensions all around.

A second reproach made to the peace movement is that, however well-intentioned its efforts, they endanger the mutual deterrence that has, it is claimed, prevented nuclear war for nearly four decades. But it is by no means clear that deterrence has worked: Rather, under cover of the doctrine of deterrence, the arms race has continued unabated. From only a handful of nuclear weapons in 1945 there are now approximately 50,000 in the world, and the United States and Russia alone are adding to this total three to five new bombs daily.² Arms-control agreements worked out in the context of a presumed deterrence doctrine have done little to stem this growth of destructive potential (and many knowledgeable analysts argue that each new arms-control agreement, while probably better than nothing, has served to ratify the desires of the military services, and of their scientific and technical weapons experts, for deployment of the next, new generation of weapons).³ If these weapons go off in an exchange, then deterrence will have proved not to have worked; on the contrary, it will have been the flawed concept that actually led to disaster.⁴ And all of this is to say nothing of the continued proliferation of nuclear weapons among nations that may or may not be concerned with deterrence at all.⁵

But it is now becoming clear that deterrence as such cannot even be said to be the policy of the two major superpowers. If it were, either nation could be satisfied with a relatively small number of weapons. On this point, Spurgeon M. Keeny, Jr., and Wolfgang K. H. Panovsky have written: "A devastating attack on the urban societies of the United States and Soviet Union would in fact require only a very small fraction of the more than 50,000 nuclear weapons currently in the arsenals of the two superpowers. . . . An exchange of a few thousand of these weapons could kill most of the urban population and destroy most of the industry of both sides."⁶ Theodore Draper, commenting on their statement, has added that "no one has ever disputed what President Carter said in 1979 about 'just one of our relatively innumerable Poseidon submarines . . . that it carries enough warheads to destroy every large and medium-size city in the Soviet Union.'"⁷ Clearly, a policy of minimum deterrence has long been abandoned.

What is most disturbing in this light has been an actual U.S. policy that has shown itself increasingly bellicose and insensitive to the dangers of nuclear war. President Reagan, while rattling the nuclear keys, has worked on the fears of Americans by belaboring Soviet strength in land-based ICBMs while ignoring U.S. and NATO superiority in submarine-based and airborne weapons. Plans were adopted to deploy a whole new generation of utterly destabilizing weapons—the MX missile, the Trident submarine and Trident II missiles, Pershing II missiles, cruise missiles, and the Mark 12-A Re-entry Vehicle. These are by all accounts destabilizing weapons, which only heighten

insecurity by increasing pressures on the Soviets to adopt preemptive first-strike policies. Moreover, the new missiles for deployment in Europe have a three- to six-minute time span from launch to impact, the reality of which can compel the Soviets to adopt a launch-on-warning system, further increasing the possibilities of accidental nuclear exchange. (And with the scores of acknowledged U.S. computer errors that have already threatened accidental nuclear exchange, it is most disquieting, as several persons have observed, to contemplate the Soviets on a launch-on-warning system having to depend on their own more technologically backward computers.⁸)

President Reagan's "zero option" and START proposals would not halt the deployment of any of these weapons, and it seems little wonder that Edward Muskie called START a "secret agenda for sidetracking disarmament."⁹ Even these proposals, including the president's "interim proposal" for the Geneva negotiations on intermediate-range weapons, appear to have been prompted partially in response to public demands for some signs of genuine U.S. efforts to seek arms control. Still, little evidence is forthcoming—indeed, there is much to the contrary—to suggest that the administration has yet to develop and pursue a serious arms control policy.¹⁰

Moreover, the administration has been reinforcing the impression that the United States is adopting first-strike policies by its actual steps to reactivate civil defense (with all its absurdities), to rejuvenate attention to ballistic missile defense, to develop silo-busting and earth-burrowing warheads, to improve so-called C³I (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) measures, and, amidst all the patriotic ballyhoo of a Fourth of July, to celebrate the conquest of space, and of the space program, by the military and the extension of its war preparations into earth orbit via space satellite.¹¹ It is true; the administration has not referred publicly to the policy set forth in a Department of Defense document released in 1982 of being able to conduct "protracted nuclear war" with the intention of "prevailing."¹² Neither, however, has it ever publicly repudiated such a policy, and one can only suppose that this policy continues to guide the administration's strategic planning.

Increasingly, the conclusion presses: The ability to project U.S. military power into Third World countries and other places of tension at will, backed up by the threat and use, if necessary, of nuclear weapons, has become more important to our policymakers than avoiding a nuclear war. Is it too little to ask them what could possibly justify such policy? To ensure uninterrupted supplies of oil from the Middle East, perhaps?¹³ That an oil cut-off would be humanly and socially wrenching and tragic, especially given the energy extravagance of present American society, ought never to be denied. But it would not be the end of the world, which, if they are not altered, present military policies to secure those oil lines very probably, and literally, could be.

Also, in facing its immediate tasks, the peace movement finds itself constantly having to deal with the question of national security, and the

meaning of real national security.¹⁴ What contributes most to real national security: the continued amassing of nuclear weapons that threaten all life, or the creation of a strong, democratic society at home, the protection of the environment and the preservation of scarce resources—ground water, topsoil, our rivers and lakes, the building of community, the provision of meaningful livelihoods, adequate housing and medical care, and so forth? Government leaders speak of waging “a war of economic attrition” against Russia. The first image that comes to mind is Verdun, in which both sides embarked on a battle of “attrition” with the purpose of bleeding white the army of the other, only as each was drawn deeper into the conflict to discover that its own life’s blood was hemorrhaging away. Military expenditures already seriously sap the economic health of both the United States and Soviet Union.¹⁵ And the president’s proposed \$1.5 trillion military budget threatens to undercut the quality of American life even more severely. Jobs, housing, industrial productivity, medical research and facilities, the environment, agriculture, transit, education, and cultural health generally are being sacrificed to the build-up of arms that offer not greater security but ever more insecurity for the nation’s and the world’s peoples.¹⁶ Furthermore, the administration’s assault on the democratic rights and safeguards of its own citizenry—in its attempts for example, to unleash anew the CIA and to attack the Freedom of Information Act—undercuts the substance of that which is most precious to the West and ultimately is the source of its real security.

There is, finally, the haunting moral question that refuses to go away: What could possibly justify this or any nation’s use of nuclear weapons against another’s unarmed population of hundreds of millions of innocents, men, women, and children? Every attempt at justification sounds like a parody of Swiftian satire. If the only possible moral answer must be, “Nothing can justify it,” can there be any moral grounds for building and possessing nuclear weapons, since doing so implies readiness to use them? The questions have yet to be faced forthrightly with all that they entail and all their devilish complexities made plain. Doing so, and helping the American and world’s peoples do so, is one of the unavoidable tasks of the peace movement and peace education. It will require a greater moral and spiritual strength than is now apparent. In this light the work of such persons as Gene Sharp in investigating new options in conflict and defense (as represented in his article in this issue) assumes particular importance.

In his testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 13, 1982, the Noble Laureate physicist Hans Bethe said that two principles are essential to grasp:

—Our strategic forces are, if anything, superior to the Soviets;

—Our national security, and that of our allies, is most threatened by the grotesque size and continuing growth of both nuclear arsenals.¹⁷

From this vantage, real national security demands that alternatives to the present weapons build-up be given serious study and consideration. Among such alternatives are a return to minimum deterrence, a nuclear freeze, a comprehensive test ban, the establishment of nuclear-free zones, a no-first-use policy by the West, and the various proposals for bilateral arms reductions put forward or supported by serious and knowledgeable persons such as George Kennan, Jerome Wiesner, McGeorge Bundy, Hans Bethe, Admiral Noel Gaylor, and others. Not that there may not be problems with each proposal, or that all would prove acceptable, but serious proposals put forward by serious and knowledgeable persons deserve better than to be peremptorily rejected out-of-hand as has been the official response to date.¹⁸ The short-term task of the peace movement, then, is urgent and itself many-sided and complex. It involves the relentless questioning of officialdom and of its myths and deceptions, and a demand that alternatives to the present path be seriously engaged.

The long-term tasks are just as important, and require immediate, simultaneous attention with the short-term. If it is to achieve its aims, it seems especially crucial to long-term peace and disarmament education that it extend its international outreach, in order that peace and disarmament education might both have the effectiveness it seeks and truly represent a global perspective. This is a difficult but urgent undertaking (one not made easier by the current falling off of cultural—and especially of academic—interchange between the United States and Russia). Peace and disarmament education must also recognize and take advantage of the educational functions of many different agencies and institutions: religious groups, schools, professional organizations, citizens' groups, the media, and a growing cadre of enlightened Wall Street leaders and their investors. The powers that be also recognize the educational potential of this diversity of agencies and can be expected to intensify efforts to draw them into an interlocking, total system of propaganda, surveillance, information control, and behavioral conditioning and reinforcement. The struggle between the truly educational and the pseudo-educational, propagandistic use of public institutions will turn in important part on having essential clarity about the difference between education and propaganda.

The long-term tasks of peace and disarmament education have basically two dimensions or orientations: those concerned, on the one hand, with the structures of society and, on the other, with the structures of consciousness.¹⁹ Most peace and disarmament education has been primarily concerned with the first, with the structures of society—the institutions, the procedures and norms of institutional relationships, and the means of governance and regulation of them. There is a long and, in many respects, richly sophisticated tradition of studies, methods of analysis, and actual teaching and curricular practices that clusters around this pole of peace and disarmament education.

Space here permits only a summary glance, and an incomplete one at that,

at some of the main areas of study in this regard.²⁰ Connected with peace and disarmament education has been the growing interest in global education and global community studies, although these do not always include specific focus on the problems of war itself. Of increasing importance has been the field known as "World Order Studies," which, largely through the work of the Institute for World Order, has attempted to develop a method of envisaging and assessing various workable alternatives to the present international systems, and to explore concrete ways for their realization. The little peace and disarmament education that actually takes place in many academic settings has often been associated with traditional strategic studies and studies in international relations and world politics. In the university these last approaches frequently run counter, or at least stand in ambiguous relationship, to peace and disarmament education, since much in strategic and international studies has been oriented toward bolstering the present system and even uncritically supporting specific national strategic policies. Another area of concern, more radical in some ways, has included those peace studies that have focused on nonviolent means of resistance, civil disobedience, and conflict resolution; the full weight of resources available in this approach of long standing has yet to be brought to bear on peace and disarmament education in other areas. Similarly, there is need for greater historical awareness and understanding in every field of peace and disarmament education.

Of particular importance is the urging by almost all persons deeply involved in peace and disarmament education that problems of war and peace be studied in connection with other related issues, such as economic development, the economic aspects of the arms race, social justice, human rights, ecological balance, and conceptions of a just world order. The interrelations among military spending, economic development, and human rights are fundamental and demand analysis and understanding. A peace not grounded in a just political and economic order, and impervious to ecological destruction, is unsustainable, and for the exploited, famished, and the oppressed is no peace at all.

Despite a long tradition, peace and disarmament education still remains on the edge of most educational undertakings today. Teacher education has been almost totally remiss in dealing with peace and disarmament education of any sort. As a result, many teachers first encounter peace and disarmament education as something peripheral to that which they have themselves been taught are the proper concerns of education. It is of crucial importance to demonstrate that peace and disarmament education has a fundamental place at the center of all education. Otherwise it will continue to be largely regarded as a side issue, or will be rendered innocuous by being relegated to specially insulated peace studies compartments in the curriculum.

Concern with the structures of society has received much more systematic and sustained attention among those involved in peace and disarmament education than has concern with what we have here called the structures of

consciousness—with our ways of thinking and with the changes necessary in our ways of thinking. To be sure, peace education evinces a growing interest in the values, attitudes, and transformations of behavior deemed necessary for the full realization of just and peaceful social structures. In most cases, however, this growing interest in values, for example, does not begin to touch the deeper questions—ethical, epistemological, ontological—raised by the need for a fundamental change in our thinking. The thinking characteristic of the peace movement, and of most peace education, still tends to leave intact the modern dualistic split between subject and object, inside and outside, between institutions and attitudes, knowledge and values, and, consequently, reveals itself to contain more than “a residue of unresolved positivism.” Even those who speak most about the need for global awareness and global relationships often do so (as Broughton and Zahaykevich argue in their article in this issue) in fundamentally positivist terms, cloaking in ostensibly organic, qualitative metaphors what remain essentially mechanistic, quantitative modes of thought and action. To the extent that this is done, unknowingly and with the best of intentions, all the greater are the dangers. It can only be self-defeating, and may redound with even more tragic consequences, for the peace movement to perpetuate the same ways of thinking, and conceptions and perceptions of reality, that shape the institutions and actions it wishes to change.

What might be some of the elements of a change in our ways of thinking that would at least begin to break the hold of positivism and of the narrow conception of reason, and of human possibilities, that has us in its grip?

A change in our way of thinking would, if nothing else, recognize and reorient itself, in method and substance, around the *reality of qualities*. Nothing would be more radical for our thinking than to see that qualities are not only subjective but also objective, and even more constitutive of reality than quantity. Power and might could no longer make claim to being the ultimate reality. Those scientific and technological world views that depict the universe as a dead, lifeless mechanism would be seen for the absurdities they are. Science would be forced to develop methods and concepts adequate to the realities of life, quality, and consciousness, rather than dealing with these, as now, exclusively in terms of the quantitative and inanimate (still the fundamental conceptual basis of even the so-called life-sciences). Or, failing this, the strict limits of quantitative science would be clearly apparent, and appropriately circumscribed. The qualitative enhancement of life and of culture would become more important than their quantitative manipulation and control.

A change in our mode of thinking could once again reinstate a recognition of *the fullness of the human reality*. The irreducibility of the central human problems would be recognized as essential to human dignity. The central human problems are not computable, and are, therefore, not amenable to technological solutions without a loss of the essentially human. We could also begin to come to grips with the deep, destructive impulses of the human

psyche, to which a purely technical reason is as oblivious as it is to the sources of genuine creativeness. The persistence of a narrow reason within the peace movement does not enable it to recognize, much less to bring to light and deal with, the dark and deadly proclivities of the human heart. Nikolai Berdyaev has noted how war always presupposes the arousal of *erotic* conditions of love and hate. War seduces, it lures and beckons, hence the frisson of excitement that one detects even or, perhaps, especially in the attempts to portray its hideousness: War tempts with promises “to get us off the hook”; to enable us to surrender our human tasks and responsibilities; to obliterate the memory of past deeds, debts, and failures; to taste reality kept from us by the everyday routine of the OK world; to have the ultimate joy of a final paroxysm of sadism and resentment at the claims of existence, of the Other, and of all the others. A grasp of the fullness of the human being would be a first step in beginning to deal with the depths of our human involvement in war. But it would also enable us to begin to recover a healing awareness of the equally real beauty and higher potential of the human being, starting particularly with a renewed sense, almost lost in the modern world, of the beauty and nobility of the human form itself. That human beings would docilely hand over to a machine, to the silicon chips in a launch-on-warning system, the responsibility for their own final destruction is testimony to how complete has been our loss of any grasp of the full human reality. (And in this regard, we may very well ask of those educators who now try to outdo one another in recommending the adoption of computers in education just how they plan to do this without fostering further the illusions that all human problems are computable and human beings are justified in abdicating to the machine.)

A sense of the truly human would also help to restore a *respect for language*. That which is most unique about the human being is grasped primarily in language, and in the deeply human and numinous meanings expressed in language. Human commitments, community, and meaning all turn on a respect for language. Many observers have noted that the abuse and misuse of language is integral to government and military preparations for war. The lack of respect for language is nowhere more evident than in the use by officialdom of misleading language to describe nuclear weapons and nuclear strategy. Sanitized, detached, and deceptive phrases—“a wider menu” of “nuclear options,” “preemptive deterrence,” “surgically clean strikes,” and so forth—seek to conceal and make palatable instrumentalities of death and destruction.²¹ While the misuse of language reaches its heights in the current utterances of officialdom, the way for it has long been eased and prepared by those theories of language, often given the highest academic standing and sanction, that see words not as the bearers of intrinsic meanings, but only as signs to be manipulated at will; that see words not as meaning-laden symbols with their own integrity, but as one-dimensional labels useful for any arbitrary functional purpose. As Wendell Berry has eloquently shown, the degeneration of language and the degeneration of the human being and of human community go hand in hand.²²