

PEACE EDUCATION AND ITS ROLE IN THE EFL CLASSROOM

Donna J. McInnis and Barbara J. Wells

INTRODUCTION

In recent years the global community has witnessed startling and long-awaited power shifts, conflict resolutions, peace treaties, and ethnic breakthroughs. The termination of the Cold War offered the promise of a new agenda. However, the euphoria experienced as a result of these historic changes was short-lived and gave way to a new wave of worldwide intolerance and disorder. The old familiar power struggles and conflict areas have merely been replaced with new and more volatile ones. The nineties have brought about a resurgence of ethnic hatred, random violence, religious fanaticism and factionalism.

The nuclear age has opened a Pandora's box of greed, fear, and lust for power. Problems of this era are not national problems, they are international problems. When for the first time in history humanity has the potential to annihilate the planet, passive acceptance of the status quo threatens our very existence. Aggressive patterns of behavior rooted in ignorance, fueled by fear and exacerbated by rapid technological advancement perpetuate the cycle of war and its far reaching effects. The ongoing struggle for power and the use of violence to achieve it threatens the existence of the planet and the life forms it sustains.

Changing these destructive patterns of behavior is the primary responsibility of the caregivers and educators of youth. Insight into the peace process and the essential qualities of a peacemaker can be modeled and taught in a classroom situation. "Peace is the major, global survival issue of our times. The scope and depth of the field of peace education must be made equal to the task of meeting this challenge" (Reardon, 1988a, p.24).

Peace education is gradually being integrated into the general education system, primarily in Europe and more recently in North America. There is a very obvious place for peace education internationally in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom. The purpose of this paper is to provide a definition of peace education and to discuss the various forms it may take within the field of EFL.

PEACE EDUCATION DEFINED

The scope of peace education is so broad as to elude the confines of any one succinct definition and can best be understood in terms of its goals and themes. One of the purposes of this paper is to delimit the concept of peace education as the analysis of conflict. Peace education may be viewed as a process. This process aims to develop in human beings empathy, understanding and a global consciousness empowered to take action.

A primary goal is to develop new ways of thinking which will in turn lead to altered modes of behavior. The process of achieving this goal evolves in the following three stages:

1. awareness
2. assessment
3. action

The first stage focuses on knowledge: knowledge of self, knowledge of others and knowledge of the world and its problems. Knowledge of self is a lifelong growth process which in a young person is still relatively undeveloped. As self-awareness grows so does the capacity for empathy and tolerance. Knowledge of others is important in terms of cross-cultural understanding, values clarification and positive human interaction. This knowledge nurtures the development of cooperation, tolerance and respect for human rights. Peace education also seeks to expand knowledge of the world in the light of interdependency, cross-cultural communication, and world citizenship for the development of global responsibility. This awareness component of peace education continues to grow and evolve throughout the maturation process.

The second stage is assessment. The accumulation of objective knowledge alone denies the essence of peace education. The ability to organize, evaluate and critique information is a pre-requisite to peace-making. The area of assessment focuses on the development of analytical and critical thinking skills. Human beings must possess the cognitive skills necessary to make objective and informed decisions about complex issues.

The third stage is the impetus to take action. Responses to unique and complex problems require a highly developed imagination. A peaceful world is dependent upon the ability to envision creative solutions and the motivation to act upon them. These three steps of awareness, assessment and action suggest a framework upon which to base a peace education curriculum.

Many themes fall under the rubric of peace education. For the purpose of clarity they have been grouped into six major areas. The first category is the affective aspect of peace education which includes feelings, empathy, self-esteem, trust, cooperation, communication, the capacity to help others in need and the ability to confront fear. The second area is multi-cultural understanding. This incorporates the concepts of tolerance, diversity, and a non-ethnocentric perception. Human Rights is the third area. This area embraces the ideals of justice, fairness, equity and innate human dignity. Conflict and conflict resolution comprise the fourth area. Conflict, ranging from the playground fist fight to a world war; and resolution, including negotiation, tolerance of ambiguity and commitment to non-violence. Global issues is the fifth group. This includes world order, interdependence, ecological balance, and global responsibility. The final area is the capacity for a positive vision of the future based on creative imagery (Winter, 1986; Reardon, 1988a; Reardon, 1988b; Ashworth, 1990; Fine, 1990; Jacobs, 1990).

Reardon (1988a) differentiates between education for negative peace and education for positive peace. Education for negative peace is defined as education about wars, arms races and violent conflicts. The goal of negative peace education focuses on the reduction of organized violence and the avoidance of war. Education for positive peace incorporates development education, human rights education and environmental education. The goals of positive peace include the elimination of economic oppression, the

realization of a full range of human rights and the broadening of positive human potential. Although the concept of peace as discussed in this paper embraces the ideals of both negative and positive peace the emphasis is primarily on the concerns of positive peace.

The principles of peace education may best be summed up in the LINGUAPAX Kiev Declaration which was created during an international meeting held in the former USSR in 1987. Contributors to this document include UNESCO officials and language experts from fifteen European countries. It is based on a number of key international documents including *Recommendation Concerning Education for International Understanding, Cooperation & Peace, and Education Relating to Human Rights & Fundamental Freedoms* (UNESCO, 1974). The major points are as follows:

1. an international dimension and global perspective at all levels of education
2. understanding and respect for all peoples, their cultures, civilizations, values and ways of life.
3. awareness of the increasing global interdependence between peoples and nations
4. abilities to communicate with others
5. awareness of the rights and duties of individuals, social groups and nations towards each other
6. understanding of the necessity for international solidarity and cooperation
7. readiness on the part of the individual to participate in solving the problems of his/her community, country and the world at large (Cates, 1993)

In the following section we will attempt to translate these ideals into the EFL classroom.

PEACE EDUCATION AND EFL

A RECENT HISTORY

For the past several decades, peace education concepts have gradually been incorporated into the field of EFL. Carl Rogers, an American psychologist who has greatly influenced the teaching professions, may be considered the first renowned promoter of the ideals of peace education into the field of general education. Following Rogers is Earl Stevick (1990), credited with the popularity of the humanistic approach in the language classroom. Humanistic education emphasizes the development of human values, self-awareness, sensitivity and self esteem in a learning-centered environment. Also associated with humanism is Moscovitz (1978) who promoted a climate of caring and sharing in the foreign language classroom.

Two important pedagogic methodologies were developed reflecting this trend towards humanistic education. The Silent Way, developed by Gattegno (1976) in the early 1970's focuses on learner empowerment. The teacher's role is primarily non-verbal while the learner is involved in problem solving and discovery. The Community Language Learning method (CLL), an application of counseling learning theory developed by Curran (1976), is based on communication and the emotional and psychological well-being of the learner. These movements paved the way for communicative language teaching which focuses on communicative as opposed to grammatical competence and the interdependence of language and communication. This trend heralded an awareness of the importance of pragmatics and appropriacy in language learning.

Communicative language teaching and humanistic education also gave rise to the learner-centered movement in education. Rogers (1983) refers to this as the person-centered approach. Specifically in language teaching, this involves the peace-oriented collaboration of learners and teachers working towards a shared goal. This approach emphasizes flexibility, ongoing reassessment and respect for the wants and needs of the learner (Nunan, 1988).

Peace education has also influenced the field of teacher training. Edge (1992) for example, advocates the concept of cooperative development, a framework for teachers to grow as a person and a professional with the support of a colleague. His technique incorporates self-awareness, experiential understanding and the empowerment of self and others.

Several methods currently popular in EFL classrooms are particularly conducive to developing the concepts of peace education. These include discussion, debate, simulations, role-play, brainstorming, games, and group problem-solving activities. These activities in particular may provide the arena in which to develop the self-awareness, the interpersonal skills and the creativity crucial to a peace-oriented perspective.

This gradual integration of peace ideals into pedagogic theory, methodology, pedagogic tasks and teacher training, implies a natural relationship between the field of peace education and the field of EFL. The classroom as world order microcosm facilitates the coalescence of peace and language learning, and allows the EFL teacher to address holistic education.

IMPLEMENTATION

There are numerous ways to incorporate peace education into the EFL curriculum. Reardon (1988b, xxii) describes these in terms of two general approaches. The first is to introduce new peace-related content. The second is to infuse aspects of peace education into the existing curriculum. Both approaches are applicable to the EFL classroom. The method of implementation depends on the commitment of the teacher and the support proffered by the academic administration. The commitment to peace education and its ensuing role in an EFL program follows a continuum ranging from weak to strong.

Inherent Components

An EFL classroom offers the opportunity for peace education in its most basic form: peaceful interactions among human beings. In this arena the

basic problems of human relationships are confronted on a daily basis. Conflict, prejudice, intolerance, competition, and in some classrooms even violence are present within the four walls of the EFL classroom. A teacher has the opportunity to begin promoting basic humanistic attitudes towards interpersonal relations regardless of the curriculum, the methodology, the administration, the textbook, time limitations, or the level of the students

Albeit in its most diluted form, peace education is an organic component of foreign language teaching. By definition, language is a primary tool for communication. Teaching foreign language facilitates communication across cultures. It enhances the potential for dialogue, an established tool for social and political change. The skill to express oneself clearly has a strong impact on the construction and promotion of peace (Reardon, 1988b, p. 21). Language is the key to negotiation. Communication is crucial to the solution of many global difficulties. Language teachers are communication specialists (Larson, 1990, p.21). We can foster world peace by helping students create shared words and images which allow people to communicate (MacLeash, 1945).

Due to the profound connection between language and identity, the foreign language classroom is also a natural environment for the development of a positive self-concept. Feelings of self-worth can be enhanced through positive learning experiences. Recent trends in EFL to be discussed below confirm a movement towards humanistic education which dignifies and empowers the learner. A positive self-image translates into the development of positive relationships, which in turn contributes to peace.

Current methodologies in the communicative classroom tend to develop and nurture the skills of imagination, invention and design. Role-play, simulation, brainstorming, schematic mapping, and story-telling are just a few examples of activities commonly employed as creative language acquisition techniques which serve to exercise these skills. The encouragement of creative capabilities empowers the learner for future envisioning, a key aspect of peace education.

The concepts of positive relationships, communication, self-esteem and imagination discussed above illustrate the inherent existence of peace education ideals in the EFL classroom. Independent of content, the approach is indirect. However, from these concepts a number of content based

curricula might evolve. A conversation class, specifically one that explores socio-pragmatic appropriacy is part of a peace education program in that it is opening channels of communication. Employing one of the more humanistic language teaching approaches, a course might easily be devoted to empowerment and self-esteem. A course promoting a theme of creative dramatics would foster the development of imagination and creativity.

Multi-cultural Understanding

The next area to be addressed is multi-cultural understanding which already possesses a strong foothold in the field of EFL. Since Sapir and Whorf's groundwork done in the early part of this century there has been a plethora of experts supporting the concept that language and culture are inseparable.

The teaching of culture is of greater importance when a language is taught outside the language community (Lewald, 1968). Dewey (1897) viewed language as a social instrument. It therefore seems counter-productive to divorce it from the social structure in which it is used. Language taught in isolation runs the risk of producing learners who create grammatically perfect structures totally devoid of communicative value. An understanding of Austin's (1962) work on speech acts, particularly perlocutionary force, draws attention to the communicative effect of an utterance beyond its grammatical accuracy. Recent trends in language teaching have highlighted the goals of socio-pragmatic as well as structural fluency. Pragmatic failure is a major source of cross-cultural misunderstanding (Thomas, 1983).

Knowledge of culture is fundamental to communicative appropriacy. Effective communication in context relies on some understanding of not only linguistic structure but also the political, social, religious and economic aspects of the cultures in which that language is spoken. According to Seelye (1993, p.10), "learning a language in isolation of its cultural roots prevents one from becoming socialized into its *contextual* use.... It is this 'foreign' context - linguistic and cultural - that provides the key to understanding other peoples."

In this regard, the native speaking EFL teacher has a distinct advantage. Even though a teacher might choose not to address the issues of culture directly, students in the classroom are exposed to the subliminal cues of the teacher's native culture. Some examples include facial expression, personal habits, body language, innuendo, humor, and eye contact. The teacher who belongs to the same language community as the students has the advantage of a more objective outlook on the culture in question, but also faces several challenges. One aspect to be addressed specifically concerning the languages of English, Spanish, French, Portuguese and recently Russian to name a few, is the question of which culture to teach. Another challenge may be the teacher's own limitations regarding the target culture. All language teachers are, by definition, proficient in the structure of the language. In regards to appropriate speech acts, rules of conversation, topic appropriacy, proxemics, kinesics, and humor, non-native teachers may experience insecurity, intimidation, and discomfort (Seelye, 1993). These emotional obstacles may undermine the confidence to include what might be considered the very basics of peace education in a foreign language curriculum. These are issues which merit further investigation and contemplation in the future.

Cross-cultural communication is commonly offered as a content based course within the foreign language curriculum. Nostrand (1966) proposed that teachers focus on two goals in teaching across cultures: communication and understanding. The potential to facilitate communication is the essence of any language instruction. The concept of understanding presents a more difficult challenge.

Cross-cultural understanding might be viewed in several inter-connecting stages. Knowledge provides the foundation. This includes not only knowledge of foreign cultures but also increased awareness of the learner's own culture. This awareness may be revealed as a raising of consciousness regarding cultural diversity which in turn leads to the critical ability to compare and contrast specific cultural characteristics. Self-awareness extends to include the concept of cultural captivity. It is important for students to understand that we operate within the confines of training, socialization, and tradition. Though crucial to survival, stepping outside this realm demands a clear perspective on the individual frame of reference and

its inherent bias (Smith and Otero, 1989). This accumulation of knowledge can replace the pre-existing ideas held regarding other cultures which often amount to prejudice, stereotypes, and myths. This is a subsequent stage, where true understanding can develop from facts rather than fiction. Armed with the knowledge of a mosaic of diverse cultures and an awareness of how one's own culture fits in leads to the development of respect and tolerance. Cross-cultural perspectives which are based on respect and tolerance as opposed to prejudice and ethnocentrism contribute to open communication. Communication in turn facilitates conflict resolution, which in turn contributes to the attainment of justice and human rights. An understanding of diverse cultures and multiple value systems is crucial to the understanding of the true nature of human conflict.

Critical Thinking and Empowerment

In addition to cross-cultural issues, the peace education movement and the field of EFL place high value on the skill of critical thinking. This skill incorporates defining problems, collecting and analyzing data, developing alternative solutions, selecting appropriate responses, and developing and defending a position. Students who can experience cooperation with others as well as the opportunity to persuade others can develop into informed and effective citizens (Current Issues, p. 5). The infusion of knowledge or information is meaningless if not supported by the skills of critical analysis and independent judgment. It is unfair as an educator to supply information without also supplying the skills to process and critique that information. Though valued more highly in some cultures than others, the ability to make responsible decisions based on examination and evidence of conflicting viewpoints is integral to the ability to solve the complex global problems facing present and future generations.

Not only through the pervasiveness of the mass-media but also unavoidable in the routines of daily life, young people continuously face conflicts surrounding the basic issues of rights and justice. How might someone react to these experiences?

We can either look at these circumstances and events in bewilderment, not understanding why someone might protest, plead for justice, or call on us for help, or we can try to make some sense of it all. (Shiman 1993, p.1)

Without the cognitive skills to "make some sense", there are several foreseeable consequences. In the cross-cultural picture, the lack of critical analysis and independent opinion may present the false impression of ignorance or apathy. In addition, those who lack critical judgment surrender power to those who claim to have it, thus becoming totally dependent on their views, judgments and solutions (Shiman, 1993, p.1). This dependency denies a human being of the innate capability to take action. A crucial aspect of the critical thinking process is the issue of empowerment.

The term [empowerment] was initially popularized by the well-known Brazilian educator Paolo Freire (1970), whose writings and lectures have stirred the souls of many a teacher to embark on the mission of liberating those who are imprisoned by "banking" forms of education that attempt to pour knowledge into the supposedly passive, empty vessels of students' minds. Instead, we are commissioned to empower learners -- politically, economically, socially, and morally -- to become critical thinkers, equipped with problem-solving strategies, poised to challenge those forces in society that would keep them passive. (Brown 1991, p. 248)

Trends in humanistic language teaching are very much in line with the peace education emphasis on critical thinking and empowerment. Recently, an introduction to critical thinking skills and the language employed to communicate ideas and opinions is included in most EFL beginner texts. More advanced texts focus almost entirely on these skills. This analytical approach to information cannot be divorced from either the language or the culture of the major English speaking communities.

Empowerment in the language classroom is multi-leveled, incorporating both input in the learning process and personal control as a cross-cultural communicator. Proponents of humanistic education also place emphasis on autonomous learning and learner empowerment for effective language acquisition. Increased learning takes place when a learner is intrinsically motivated by personal involvement in pedagogic choices. Learners develop confidence and self-esteem when allowed to take responsibility for their own development as a language learner. The ability to communicate in another language empowers a learner politically, socially, and intellectually. Peace is dependent not so much on the people in political power, but on the numbers of people who are able to transcend the language barriers and pave the way for open communication.

CONTENT-BASED CURRICULUM

Certain issues within the peace education network lend themselves to a content-based curriculum. These themes have been grouped into the following five categories: war and violence; conflict resolution and peace; human rights, justice, prejudice and discrimination; values clarification and global citizenship. Although the ideal comprehensive peace education curriculum would involve all of the above issues, the limitations of the EFL classroom often preclude this possibility. Which issues, and the depth in which they are addressed depends upon a number of variables including learner needs and objectives, the length of the course and the level of the students involved. Any issues may be taught as separate elements within a comprehensive course in peace education, one or more issues may be isolated and infused into an established curriculum or one specific issue may be developed into an entire course.

War permeates global history. Rapid technological advancement has provided increased physical comfort, economic opportunity and potential for leisure activity; however, these advancements have spawned new and more violent conflicts making wars more lethal than at any time in the history of mankind. The increased incidence of war is but one outgrowth of an increase in all forms of violence both forceful and structural. Forceful

violence encompasses war and crime, while structural violence refers to the inequities of poverty, racism and human rights violations (Matriano & Reardon, 1976).

The ability to resolve conflict requires specific training. Most people, including those who allow conflicts to escalate into war, are unfamiliar with modes of communication which bring about resolution of conflict. It is the role of education to demonstrate that violence is not a solution: that a real solution is one in which both sides win. Education also has the potential to break the cycle of ever increasing violence. Peace connotes the absence of violence in any form. Education systems which embrace peace education have the power to compensate for societies which not only study but glorify violence.

We are confronted daily with issues of rights, equality, and justice. Throughout the world individuals and groups are struggling for self-determination; personal, political or religious freedom; respect, tolerance and freedom from persecution; economic equity; and adequate food and housing. The belief that every individual, by virtue of one's humanity, is entitled to certain human rights is a fairly new one. It is within the Universal Declaration of Human Rights drafted by the UN in 1948 that the foundation of modern thinking on human rights can be found. Attitudes about human rights differ greatly among nations. The declaration states that all human beings are entitled to dignity and possess natural political, social, and economic rights such as freedom of speech, assembly and a decent standard of living. It is an educator's responsibility not only to impart information about these issues but also to help the students isolate and identify violations. It is a natural progression to then examine how the violations are addressed nationally and globally. A further step is to challenge the students to prioritize the issues and suggest creative solutions.

Conflicting values are the source of most discord witnessed throughout the world. The above discussion of culture, war, conflict and human rights implies the need for a set of universal human values. Reflecting ongoing efforts of the United Nations, the core of these values may be expressed as the recognition of the dignity and respect for human life and the ecosystem which sustains it. Though this assumption may be considered controversial, some rudimentary universal guideline is imperative to the advancement of

peace education. The recent buzzwords "human family" and "global village" become meaningless within an infrastructure rife with conflicting values. The attractiveness of cultural diversity works only on a superficial level. Any threat to the value system lurking just beneath the surface can bring efforts for open communication to a grinding halt. In terms of education, rather than imposing one specific value system, the humanistic approach would allow the students to make their own evaluation of existing value systems. By understanding and appreciating other values and principles they will be better able to identify and clarify their own (Shiman, 1993, p.1).

Imperative to an understanding of human relationships *on* the earth and human relationships *with* the earth is the field of global education. Environmental education focuses on recognizing the interdependency of both human and other life forms. The links of mutual dependency between nations and between species have become stronger and more critical as the 20th century draws to a close. Many problems once national now affect whole continents if not the entire globe.

Global education may be approached in the same three stages applied to peace education in general: awareness, assessment, and action. Raising well informed citizens is only the first step. Global citizens today must be capable of critically analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating issues facing an increasingly interdependent world (Reardon, 1988a; Perspectives on Peace 1990; Current Issues, 1994). This analysis is an opportunity for the students to reflect on what global concerns mean for them personally, and how what is going on outside their sphere of experience affects their present and future (Lavdis, Santoro & Wasowski, 1993; Shiman, 1993). Based on analysis of the issues, an informed opinion can be developed and a position taken. Active citizenship implies objectivity but not neutrality. A global perspective must begin with a problem and follow through to a solution. Without an awareness and acceptance of differences in cultures and values, and a concerned response to socially significant world issues, the benefits of education are seriously limited (Lavdis, Santoro & Wasowski, 1993 p.v).

One universal source of global information is the United Nations. According to Reardon (1988b), the United Nations has not been given adequate attention for its contribution to peace education. This unique organization is a potential source for knowledge of global issues,

perspective on global problems and ideas for global citizenship (World Concerns and the United Nations, 1983). The scope of the UN's worldwide efforts include peace, education, health, the environment, development, poverty and hunger. Model United Nations (MUN) conferences now taking place in about 25 countries are an excellent example of the vast potential of the United Nations. These conferences take the form of a role-play, modeled after a UN general assembly, in which the learners become ambassadors representing various foreign countries. They address a chosen topic through speech, debate and discussion concluding with written resolutions (Henry, 1993). In Kyoto for example, 87 students participated as ambassadors from 41 countries debating in English the rights of indigenous peoples (Japan Times, 1994).

Global Issues are often selected as an appropriate and timely focus in a content based EFL curriculum. The results have been very successful (Reardon, 1988; Cates, 1990; Starkey, 1990; Brown, 1991; Sueda & Sakamaki, 1993; Henry, 1993). Due to the intrinsic relevance of global education, the effect on the learner is multi-faceted. The learners display increased interest and excitement, higher motivation levels, improved attendance and greater participation (Swenson and Cline, 1993; Yoshimura, 1993). English as the universal language of communication is the language most conducive for learning about the world (Yoshimura, 1993).

TEACHER/LEARNER ROLES

As a global microcosm, the EFL classroom is a perfect arena for promoting peace. If the nationality of the teacher differs from that of the learner, there is automatic exchange on the levels of values, culture, and world view. With multi-cultural learners this opportunity is magnified. The learning environment includes physical elements, emotional elements and cognitive elements. It is within the confines of these components, supported by a commitment to human dignity, that the concept of peace potential may be elucidated.

With or without peace education content, a teacher has the opportunity to be a model for peace in the classroom. What does this mean? First and

foremost within the human interaction in the EFL classroom, the teacher can be an effective communicator. The teacher can be a model of self awareness, objectivity, lack of prejudice, and respect for human dignity. As conflicts arise naturally within the classroom, the learners may be encouraged to acknowledge the problem and to unite in efforts to create a solution. Successful conflict resolution in the EFL classroom may serve as an example for conflict resolution on a broader scale. Outside the classroom as well, a teacher has a responsibility as a professional communicator to be a contributor to peace in the community.

Decades ago Carl Rogers warned that it is in the development of human relationships, not technology, which will guarantee survival of the planet. His ideas may be summed up as follows:

The answer to most of our problems lies not in technology but in relationships. What really matters is trust in ourselves and others, in communication, in how we handle our feelings and conflicts, in how we find meaning in our lives. In the twentieth century we have learned an enormous amount about how to get along with ourselves and with others. Put that knowledge to work and we may yet save the planet. Disregard it, as we focus our lives and fortunes on the next technological quick fix, and we may not survive. (Kirschenbaum & Henderson, 1989, p.xvi)

A CALL TO ACTION

Overwhelmed by the complexity of global problems today, upcoming generations are consumed by concern, anxiety and a sense of powerlessness. These feelings breed apathy. Apathy is probably the greatest contributor to the downward spiral of human society and the earth which sustains it. It is up to the educator to provide guidance, encouragement and hope. The disillusionment of youth must be replaced with the confidence that solutions are possible and that the individual can make a difference. Confidence brings about empowerment. Empowerment ignites action. Individual

learners, like seeds within their communities, are the foundation for the kinds of grassroots movements which can transform global destiny.

A comprehensive approach to peace education is incomplete without a prescriptive component. The awareness and the analysis of peace-threatening issues leads directly to action. Beyond preparing the students merely to cope with the relentless eruption of conflicts and crises, peace education seeks to draw out a commitment to action, change or resolution. It is important that the students are able to actually envision the absence of violence and the achievement of peace. In peace education there lies the basic assumption that most global problems are humanly derived and can be overcome by human intervention. Students should be educated to clearly understand their own place in global structure and to make their own creative decisions regarding what to do or how to act for change (Reardon 1988a, p. 27). Informed, committed and motivated people give credence to the belief that "...in the last decade of the 20th century, there is an opportunity to reshape the world" (Segal 1993, p. 2).

CONCLUSION

Peace is similar to education, personal growth, and maturation in that it is a process which involves discovery, guidance and development. Because it seeks to fulfill human potential, the goal of peace education parallels other educational goals. As individual human beings explore their individual capacity, so then may the entire human species explore their collective capacity to make peace a reality. Language learning is also an ongoing process which is best accomplished in a humanistic environment. The language teaching classroom is a microcosm of society where mutual respect, tolerance and cooperation are the supporting framework for pedagogic goals.

Comprehensive peace education is a lifelong, continuous process. It operates at all levels and in all spheres of learning, and includes all fields of relevant knowledge (Reardon 1988a, p.74). At the moment, EFL is playing only a peripheral role in the education for peace. It seems logical however that language teaching, which incorporates humanism, communication,

awareness, and cultural understanding enter the forefront of the peace education movement. Timing is crucial. In the introduction to his collection of Carl Roger's works, Kirschenbaum offers the following warning:

At this point, how the world decides to handle its human problems - crime, drugs, intergroup and international conflict, to name a few - will determine whether there will be societies or even a world in which person-centered approaches can survive. (Kirschenbaum & Henderson, 1989, p.xvi)

This paper has marked an attempt to reveal the compatibility of the two fields of peace education and EFL. Over the latter part of this century, gradual progress has been made to wed these disciplines. The process has been smooth and natural. It now lies within the power of individuals, administrators, curriculum designers or the teachers themselves to explore the ways and degree in which language learners may be further exposed to the ideals of the peace education movement. This union allows a language teacher to reach beyond the improvement of communication skills of students in a second language. It empowers a language classroom environment to generate human beings who can contribute to the peace-making of the future.

REFERENCES

- Ashworth, M. (1990). TESOL peace education. *TESOL Newsletter*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 4.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How To Do Things With Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brooks, E. and L. Fox. (1995). *Making Peace: a reading writing thinking text on global community*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Brown, H.D. (1991). TESOL at 25: What are the issues? *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 245-259.
- Brumfit, C. and K. Johnson (eds.). (1979). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cates, K. (1990). Teaching for a better world: Global issues in language education. *The Language Teacher*, Vol. 14, No. 5, 3-5.
- Cates, K. (1993). LINGUAPAX, language teaching and global education. *The Language Teacher*, Vol. 17, No. 5, 3-4.

- Curran, C. (1976). *Counseling-Learning in Second Languages*. Apple River, IL: Apple River Press.
- Current Issues*. (1994). Alexandria, VA: Close Up Publishing.
- Dewey, J. (1897). My pedagogic creed. *The School Journal*, Vol. 54, 77-80. Reprinted in K.I. Gezi and J.E. Meyers (eds.), *Teaching in American Culture*. New York: Holt, 1968, 408-411.
- Edge, J. (1992). *Cooperative Development*. Essex, England: Longman.
- Fine, L. (1990). Resolving conflict creatively: Peace education concepts in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Newsletter*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 19.
- Gattegno, C. (1976). *Teaching Foreign Languages in Schools: The Silent Way*. New York: Educational Solutions.
- Henry, J. (1993) The "Model United Nations": A language learning simulation for global awareness. *The Language Teacher*, Vol 17, No. 5, 45-47.
- Jacobs, G. (1990). ESOL and international education. *TESOL Newsletter*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 27.
- Japan Times* (1994) Students act out U.N. roles as they mull global issues, 20 November, 3.
- Kirschenbaum, H. and V. Henderson (eds.). (1989) *The Carl Rogers Reader*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Larson, D. (1990). TESOL's role in global understanding: A possible agenda. *TESOL Newsletter*, Vol 24, No. 1, 21.
- Lavdis, D., J. Santoro and J. Wasowski. (1993). *Contemporary Issues*. Dubuque, IA: The Center for Learning.
- Lewald, H.E. (1968). A tentative outline in the knowledge, understanding, and teaching of cultures pertaining to the target language. *Modern Language Journal*, Vol 52, 301-309.
- MacLeish, A. (1945). *Can We Educate for World Peace?* Radio broadcast regarding the creation of UNESCO. Excerpts in *The Courier*, 1985, Vol. 38, 27.
- Matriano, E., and B. Reardon. (1976). *A global community perspective on education for development*. Paper presented at Global Education Working Group, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Moskowitz, G. (1978). *Caring and Sharing in the Foreign Language Class*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Nostrand, H.L. (1966). Describing and teaching the sociocultural context of a foreign language and literature, pp 1-25 in A. Valdman, (ed.), *Trends in Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nunan, D. (1988). *The Learner-Centered Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perspectives on Peace: A resource for teaching peace and security issues*. (1990). Alexandria, VA: Close Up Foundation.
- Reardon, B. (1988a). *Comprehensive Peace Education: Educating for global responsibility*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Reardon, B. (1988b). *Educating for Global Responsibility: Teacher-designed curricula for peace education, K-12*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Richards, J. and T. Rogers. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Rogers, C. (1983). *Freedom to Learn for the 80's*. Columbus, OH: Charles Merrill.
- Sargent, T. (1993). Conflict resolution in the Communicative classroom. *The Language Teacher*, Vol. 17, No. 5, 25-26.

- Seeyle, H. (1993). *Teaching Culture: Strategies for Intercultural Communication 3rd ed.* Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Segal, G. (1993). *The World Affairs Companion*. NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Sherr, M.L. (1986). Education for peaceful and just relations. *The Education Digest*, Vol. 52, 20-23.
- Shiman, D. (1993). *Teaching Human Rights*. Denver, CO: Center for Teaching International Relations, University of Denver.
- Smith, G. and G. Otero. (1989). *Teaching about Cultural Awareness*. Denver: Center for Teaching International Relations, University of Denver.
- Starkey, H. (1990). Foreign languages and the global citizen. *The Language Teacher*, Vol 14, No. 5, 23-24.
- Stevick, E. (1990) *Humanism in Education*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Sueda, K. and N. Sakamaki. (1993). Report of a one-semester global education program. *The Language Teacher*, Vol. 17, No. 5, 29-33.
- Swenson, T. and B. Cline. (1993). Global issues in a content-based curriculum. *The Language Teacher*, Vol. 17, No. 5, 27-28.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 91-112.
- Winter, M. (1986). Nuclear education update. *The Education Digest*, Vol. 51, 30-32.
- World Concerns and the United Nations*. (1983). NY: United Nations
- Yoshimura, M. (1993). Teaching global issues to children. *The Language Teacher*, Vol 17, No. 5, 11-15.