

Molloy College DigitalCommons@Molloy

Faculty Works: Education

2017

Global Conflicts Shattered World Peace: John Dewey's Influence on Peace Educators and Practitioners

Audrey Cohan Ed.D

Molloy College, acohan@molloy.edu

Charles F. Howlett Ph.D.

Molloy College, chowlett@molloy.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.molloy.edu/edu_fac

 Part of the [Other Education Commons](#)

[DigitalCommons@Molloy Feedback](#)

Recommended Citation

Cohan, Audrey Ed.D and Howlett, Charles F. Ph.D., "Global Conflicts Shattered World Peace: John Dewey's Influence on Peace Educators and Practitioners" (2017). *Faculty Works: Education*. 28.

https://digitalcommons.molloy.edu/edu_fac/28

This Peer-Reviewed Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Molloy. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Works: Education by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Molloy. For more information, please contact tochter@molloy.edu, thasin@molloy.edu.

GLOBAL CONFLICTS SHATTERED WORLD PEACE: JOHN DEWEY'S INFLUENCE ON PEACE EDUCATORS AND PRACTITIONERS

Audrey Cohan and Charles F. Howlett

ABSTRACT

The need to build an awareness of peace and of peace education is often a message that is difficult to share with the larger society. John Dewey, an acclaimed American philosopher and intellectual, used his public platform to espouse his ideas on democracy and peace as a resolution to global discord during the years preceding and during World Wars I and II. Although Dewey did shift his perspective as global conflicts shattered his hope for world peace, he persevered in his missive of democracy and tolerance, especially through his writing and lectures. Dewey strongly believed that democratic societies are best suited to preserve peace and societal harmony. His reasoning was premised on his own understanding of democracy as a way of life, not as a political process. This paper examines Dewey's ideas on peace education and his influence during the interwar years as well as during World War II. It also discusses how his ideas have been applied to contemporary approaches to peace education as seen through the lens of present-day practitioners. Through these historical milestones, Dewey's philosophical support for peace education wavered when he faced the perpetual dilemma of what to do when the values of peace are in direct conflict with justice, decency, humanity, understanding, and cooperation. Yet, aspects of his ideas on how to teach peace—focused on building democratic communities—can still be seen in classrooms today.

DEWEY'S PERSPECTIVE ON PEACE IN THE FACE OF TWO WORLD WARS

As scholars revisit the profound words of John Dewey (1859–1952), an acclaimed American philosopher and intellectual, the impact of his writings is often discussed within the context of peacebuilding. Although Dewey supported American military involvement in World War I, he did so with caution. His main objective was to establish a lasting peace based on the principles President Woodrow Wilson put forth as part of

his Fourteen Points. Dewey supported it as a “war to end all wars” and “to make the world safe for democracy.” During World War I, Dewey used his pragmatic philosophy to try to influence both leaders and laymen regarding the possibilities of world peace, through American military participation, in order to defeat the evils of autocracy. By no means a militarist or war enthusiast, his efforts were misconstrued and he was not able to share his inherent message of democracy as an instrument for peace. In the short time span between the two World Wars, Dewey wrote prolifically in an effort to further persuade world leaders on his philosophical position regarding peace and the values of tolerance. During this fifteen-year time span, he unhappily changed his viewpoints about war and conflict, recognizing that peace may never be achieved on the global level. However, his thinking shifted as he noted that peace education—couched within a peacebuilding emphasis—was a genuine possibility when focused on schools. In fact, many historians remember Dewey for his impact on schools and classrooms rather than his impact on politics and his call for peace among nations.

It should be noted that Dewey’s initial interest in teaching about peace was sparked in the spring of 1917 by an interdisciplinary war issues course at Columbia University. The war issues course opened up new vistas for Dewey. It convinced him that the method of intelligence—a process whereby thought is socially organized, cooperative, experimental, and concerned with the solution of concrete problems as attested to in experience—was capable of incorporating different disciplines into an organic conception of society. Such a process, he pointed out, would thus allow people to identify causal relationships or patterns of events, conditions, and behaviors that produce violent conflict and from such recognition to devise strategies for preventing them. He believed the sterile or philistine academic approach had to give way to a more comprehensive, all-encompassing effort toward interdisciplinary cooperation. Moreover, since Dewey equated peace with democracy and argued that a democratic society was inherently compatible with human cooperation and understanding, the course added to his initial disposition that in order to work on the international system itself, major changes in our domestic institutions would also have to occur. Perhaps the basic point made in this lecture series was that the outdated proposition upholding the doctrine of the nation-state, as a guarded and sacred institution, remained the major barrier to world peace. A powerful nation-state was a threat to democracy, as evidenced by the German experience. The key to conflict control, in his opinion, was to deflate the emotions and values attached to nationalism and substitute in their place a world order based on international law and governmental organization. Clearly, the course offered him the initiative and desire to see to it that education would focus all its attention and energies on the individual as the eventual creator of worldwide social change.

More specifically, Dewey considered teaching about world peace as a process of learning to understand and appreciate all cultures, races, and ethnicities, mutually arrived at and cooperatively agreed upon. It would also extend the concept of

nationality—a current cultural and political obstacle—to a transnational awareness that relied upon social justice in order to promote global harmony. Through his work with teachers and schools, and in the message of his public and scholarly writings, Dewey addressed conflict resolution and tolerance programs in schools. His concept of encouraging cultural appreciation for all races and cultures as a way to bridge the sinister aspects of uniformed nationalism was seen by many at the time as responding to the shifting geopolitical balance of power. Understanding Dewey's thinking in the ever-changing tide of world events between World War I and World War II helps to provide a context for why Dewey wanted to share his desire for peace with children. Equally important, it would be during World War II that, with hindsight, Dewey began to regret that little had been done to promote peace education programs in the nation's schools. What he always looked for was a grassroots movement for peace through educating children, not one based on military victory or led by political officials. The future political leaders, the school-children, should be shaped by an educational program that uses subjects such as history, geography, and economics for building peaceful cultures. World War II brought that idea into sharper focus for Dewey.

Throughout the course of World War II, Dewey concentrated his efforts on bringing Americans to accept a more tolerant attitude toward those who opposed the consensual mode of thought. He already had prepped himself for such an occurrence in an editorial he wrote for the American Association of University Professors in December of 1939. "Recollections of the events of the last war," he wrote, "forcibly remind us that our institutions of higher learning are not immune to war hysteria. They tell us that the atmosphere created by war enables interested parties to use this hysteria for their own ends, by means of suppression of free inquiry and free expression."¹ His prescription now was to be prepared:

It is more or less of a commonplace today to refer many of the present troubles of the world to the defects of the Versailles treaty. These defects had . . . *their* cause. Failure of educated men and women, including those in universities, was a part of this cause. Let us make sure that we do not share again in this guilt, especially as in our case it is more of an act of treachery to our supreme end than it is in the case of others.²

Dewey would follow up these thoughts in *The American Teacher*. Just as he had implored college professors to uphold the principle of academic freedom, he now warned the nation's teachers to keep in mind that "the primary loyalty of democracy at the present time is to communication" based upon free speech, free publication, and free assembly. "[T]he essence of democracy," he advised, "is above all the freedom to develop intelligence; intelligence consisting of judgment as to what facts are relevant to action and how they are relevant to things to be done, and a corresponding alertness in the quest for such facts." No longer was he urging the public to heed his advice, as he did in his World War I call to arms, "In Time

of National Hesitation.” Instead, he wanted to remind his readers that “In theory, democracy has always professed belief in the potentialities of every human being, and all the need for providing conditions that will enable these potentialities to come to realization.” What teachers must bear in mind are not only the evils of totalitarianism but also those forces which would corrupt the democratic way of life through war. Very tellingly, he observed that

Our anti-democratic heritage of Negro slavery has left us with habits of intolerance toward the colored race—habits which belie profession of democratic loyalty. The very tenets of religion have been employed to foster anti-Semitism. There are still many, too many, persons who feel free to cultivate and express racial prejudices as if they were within their personal rights, not recognizing how the attitude of intolerance infects, perhaps fatally as the example of Germany so surely proves, the basic humanities without which democracy is but a name.

Democratic loyalty, he forcefully maintained, “is the will to transform passive toleration into active cooperation.” Fraternity, the willingness to work together, “is the essence of cooperation” and “has never been widely practiced, and this failure is a large factor in producing the present state of the world.”³ Taking this complex idea of cooperation and making it accessible to teachers and students was one of Dewey’s greatest challenges. His philosophical writings were not easily translated for the classroom—and yet cooperation was the core of his thinking regarding peace education.

It was during World War II, a war Dewey half-heartedly supported despite the horrors of Nazi and Japanese atrocities, that he produced some of his most reflective pieces regarding the importance of peace as an instrument of social justice. He had been well aware of the sinister effects of hyperpatriotism during the previous world war, marked by growing domestic intolerance and the drive for conformity. What bothered him now, as before, was how little opportunity was provided in the field of education to teach students about their public role in a democracy. Dewey strongly believed that democratic societies are best suited to preserving peace and societal harmony. His reasoning was premised on his own understanding of democracy as a way of life, not as a political process. In this respect, the public, when educated to appreciate the benefits of international harmony, can check elected officials, the power brokers, and those who consider patriotic values a necessary component of militarism.

Equally important, the reason elected officials resort to appeals to military supremacy and self-defense is because they are the byproducts of an educational system that has touted the virtue of nationalism as a basic component of patriotic allegiance to one’s country. Very often leaders of nations look at the concept of peace as the end product of war rather than as a cultural process that instills in formative minds the real value of justice and cooperation. In what many consider

Dewey's best argument on behalf of peace education in schools, written only five years after the close of World War I, "The School as a Means of Developing a Social Consciousness and Social Ideals in Children," he noted,

The obvious thing is in connection with international and interracial questions, not merely as we look abroad in our relationships to other political units, but as we ourselves, within ourselves, are international and interracial. We must realize that whatever breeds hostility and division without is bound to react and produce hostility and division within. There is very great danger that some people will develop this idea in a very narrow nationalistic spirit, that they will make a fetish out of patriotism by diverting it from its true and proper meaning of devotion to the common weal and think of it as a spirit of suspicion, jealousy, antagonism towards others, that spirit of evil from which all of the world today is suffering . . .⁴

What led to this observation was the sad reality that governing officials demand from their schools' patriotic conformity and nationalistic pride. Students are given little opportunity to question the real self-interests of the nation-state. Even though Dewey believed that social institutions such as the home, local government, and church, rather than the school, were the basic forces in shaping minds, he did not agree with the opinion of more conservative-minded educators that the school must passively accommodate itself to external exigencies. He envisioned the school as a conduit for energetic change. He argued that the school could indeed become a dynamic rather than a reflexive agency—one that would search out and reinforce concrete patterns to ameliorate society.

Clearly, Dewey's interwar lectures and articles related to world peace contained valuable ideas for promoting the importance of peace education, despite the onset of another global conflagration. Careful examination of what he wrote and said during that time period reveals he established five fundamental principles through which to teach peace to schoolchildren: (1) building a democratic community; (2) teaching cooperation; (3) creating an environment based upon moral sensitivity; (4) promoting critical thinking; and (5) empowering self-esteem to challenge established modes of national behavior. These principles were the basis for creating a trusting environment, one, Dewey urged, that would enable schoolchildren to be critical thinkers when constantly exposed to patriotic virtues rather than paying homage to past military conflicts as portrayed in social studies textbooks. These principles are also the ingredients of Dewey's definition for establishing a viable peace education program.

Dewey's publications during this period also took into account his instrumentalist technique for conceiving means and ends with respect to war and peace. He continuously addressed the dichotomy of means between politics and power, on one hand, and those of education, on another. All of his arguments were based upon building the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for democratic citizenship. When it came to politics and power as the means for war, Dewey argued,

societies are conditioned to accept violence, physical strength, manliness, aggressive competition, and political oppression. With peace as the goal, societies exist by feeling safe, participate and negotiate in problem-solving, are willing to make the right moral choices in the name of humanity, and, above all, encourage social and economic justice within the context of community.

With respect to education, moreover, Dewey's instrumentalism (as a brand of pragmatism) and progressive theories further highlighted the disparity between the two ends: war and peace. In terms of war, education teaches people to accept selfish behavior, promote authoritarian methods of rule, ignore moralistic reasons for good behavior, encourage coercion in the name of patriotic conformity, and comply with patterns of structural violence. In contrast, education for peace fosters responsibility, openness, innovation, self-motivation, cooperative behavior, and barrier-free opportunities to pursue individual interests for the common good.

One of the most critical aspects in creating an effective peace education program was Dewey's firm commitment not to intellectualize the subject. Establishing a peaceful world order would never be accomplished by simply providing information and developing intellectual virtues. What he suggested, on the contrary, is that one of the most important responsibilities for schools is to foster moral self-discipline and humanistic self-fulfillment. The lesson he himself learned from the past war was how effective schools were in promoting a singular patriotism. The final grade, however, was a failure. Teachers did not communicate to their students that the ultimate goal was not the rightness of America's involvement in the war, but rather the establishment of a global community rejecting the resort to armed conflict. "From the standpoint of . . . education, a large portion of current material of instruction," Dewey stated, "is simply aside from the mark. The specialist in any one of the traditional lines is as likely to fall for social bunk even in its extreme forms of economic and nationalistic propaganda as the unschooled person; in fact his credulity is the more dangerous because he is so much more vociferous in its proclamation and so much more dogmatic in its assertion." It is no wonder, he continued, that "Our schools send out men meeting the exigencies of contemporary life clothed in the chain-armor of antiquity, and priding themselves on the awkwardness of their movements as evidences of deep-wrought, time-tested convictions." Is it any wonder that pupils "are ripe to be gulled, or that their attitude is one which merely perpetuates existing confusion, ignorance, prejudice and credulity."⁵

Dewey's reconstructionist perspective acknowledged that society can transform itself while at the same time enabling each individual to realize his or her full potentiality in the process of change. According to Dewey, ". . . while our educational leaders are talking of culture, the development of personality, etc. as the end and aim of education, the great majority of those who pass under the tuition of the school regard it only as a narrowly practical tool with which to get bread and butter enough to eke out a restricted life." Such a philistine outlook had to

be discarded and dramatically revamped. The aim of education had to be conceived in a less exclusive way. "If we were to introduce into educational processes the activities which appeal to those whose dominant interest is to do and make," he said, "we should find the hold of the school upon its members to be more vital, more prolonged, containing more of culture." Education was more than a process of adjustment. It was a creative encounter between man and his environment that called for innovation and reform.⁶

It is clear that the rise of fascist dictatorships had been spawned by the missteps of the victorious Allies at Versailles in 1919 and the inability to develop effective peace education programs, which could have transcended reliance on arbitration, sovereign state control, and power politics in favor of a more inclusive role for public participation. Although democratic societies encourage participation through the electoral process, the basic political system remains in the hands of those currently in power. Developing an educational program geared solely for the concept of democratic world politics, he felt, would have negated the traditional acceptance of national sovereignty that has been at the root of military conflicts in the past. What Dewey so ardently attempted to accomplish after World War I was to infuse his educational theories and political commentaries with a moral outlook in order for "trans-boundary voluntary associations . . . [to] unite as international publics [and] assist in shaping a more inclusive world politics, not leaving it to states alone."⁷ In actuality, Dewey's educational vision turned out to be a precursor to the growing importance of nongovernmental organizations dedicated to peace evident in the world today. Many of these nongovernmental organizations relied on Dewey's view of liberal internationalism when addressing the role of peace education as an instrument of reform.

Equally important, it was during World War II that Dewey acknowledged the fact that establishing lasting peace is the work of education and not politics, since the only response of elected officials can be to keep their nation out of war rather than preventing it from occurring. Innovation and reform as part of the learning experience for children, as Dewey called for it, was once again sacrificed. The current world crisis of the early 1940s certainly reinforced his feelings that the public, at large, learned very little from the previous war. The present democratic society, a society based on openness and tolerance, had lost its way because military victory at all costs became the order of the day. Similar to World War I, concerned citizens who questioned the government's role in time of war were quickly labeled disloyal and subjected to intense pressure to conform. Had an effective peace education program been created between the World Wars then a more tolerant environment might very well have been established.

Dewey's writings during World War II (he presented fewer speeches because of his age and physical health) reflected his growing concern for domestic tolerance and peace education. He saw for himself that civil liberties were being readily sacrificed. Moreover, his earlier admonitions to college professors and teachers alike regarding the true value of democratic loyalty and fraternity had fallen on unsympathetic ears

after Pearl Harbor. Most importantly, Dewey hoped that the displacement experience of Japanese-Americans, the herding of hundreds of conscientious objectors into public service camps characterized by strict regimentation and unconscionable medical experimentation, and the increased, constant surveillance of civilians by the Federal Bureau of Investigation would alert Americans to the insidious ultranationalism that they were experiencing. Furthermore, he predicted that these policies would leave Americans bitter and alter the attitudes of future generations—as borne out by the anti-Communist witch hunts of the late 1940s and early 1950s. Dewey was convinced that the current period of reactionary conservatism and ultranationalism was far more dangerous than that of the 1920s, and that it was more imperative than ever to foster the goals of community, cooperation, sensitivity, critical thinking, and self-esteem as the basic components for nurturing peace education programs, especially in light of the development of the atomic bomb.

DEWEY'S LEAD ON PEACE EDUCATION

Despite his own personal disappointment with the turn of events in the first half of the twentieth century—two world wars and the appearance of the Cold War arms race—Dewey's acknowledgment that it was up to educators to make peace a lasting reality did not fall on deaf ears. Indeed, many peace education programs and educators have followed Dewey's lead since the conclusion of World War II when tackling the military, corporate, economic, and political influences on society's understanding of war and peace as well as the cultural construction of masculinity shaping prevailing attitudes about war. The violent authoritarianism that erupted in the wake of the First World War and led to the second global conflagration was the primary reason Dewey called upon future educators to develop modes of instruction, curriculum, and school life as the basis for teaching peace. In fact, according to a definition supplied by a number of European educators, peace education can be defined as a program that promotes the “knowledge, values, attitudes, and skills conducive to peace and non-violence, and to an active commitment to the building of a cooperative and caring democratic society. It is targeted toward empowerment of an individual and the promotion of social well-being through the protection of human dignity of all; the promotion of social justice, equality, civil responsibility and solidarity; and the accepting of a dynamic global perspective, by utilizing the concepts and practices of peaceful conflict-resolution and non-violence.”⁷⁸

For example, the noted American peace educator Ian Harris has pointed out that there exists a dependent relationship between peace activists, peace researchers, and peace educators. The activists put into play various strategies to promote peace; the researchers evaluate those strategies and propose alternatives; and the educators teach about peace strategies to ensure people understand the causes of violence and methods to reduce it. Peace educators, in particular, strive to provide insights on how to transform a culture of violence into a culture of peace and justice. They

try to build consensus about which peace strategies work best to remedy problems caused by the use of violence, especially in terms of armaments and warfare. This instrumentalist activity of “learning by doing” is carried out by ordinary citizens—inspired by educators and their pedagogical principles—and not elected leaders.

What Harris also stresses is that Dewey's philosophy of education was directly responsible for helping to develop the field of peace education and its allied discipline, peace studies. Dewey's idea that schools should be a form of community life conducive to creating appropriate dispositions, especially social and democratic ones, became the building block upon which present day peace educators ply their trade. They have extended Dewey's idea of “schools as an embryonic community life” in which “the school introduces and trains each child . . . into membership within such a little community, saturating him with the spirit of service, and providing him with the instruments of effective self-direction, which shall have the deepest and best guarantee of a larger society . . . which is harmonious,” and consciously connected it to the global stage.⁹ It is the transpositional nature of Dewey's thinking about communities, and how they need to expand beyond a narrow nationalistic perspective, which has captured the attention of peace practitioners.

In addition to Harris's observation, it is worth noting that Dewey's pioneering role in this regard led to the promotion of the interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary nature of peace education as it is taught today. His efforts were an amalgam, incorporating traditional disciplines in the humanities and social sciences. What he developed in terms of his instrumentalist philosophy, especially in the aftermath of World War I, was for teachers to examine certain subjects in order to educate students about the importance of peace and ways that nations could address the insidious problem of nationalistic self-preservation. In so doing, his pedagogical strategy was to explore carefully ingrained cultural prejudices and see how “learning by doing” could bridge the gap between unquestioned patriotic loyalty and transnational understanding through the incorporation of lessons dealing with geography, culture, history, and language.

Moreover, Dewey's influence on educators teaching peace included his insistence that the ultimate object of schools is to encourage students to familiarize themselves with social problems, especially the causes and effects of violence. Education should be designed to assist people in their understanding of the environment in order to control it. The idea of building a better society through the schools is central to Dewey's reconstructionist perspective. For instance, the laboratory school Dewey and his wife established in Chicago in the 1890s created a classroom in which model learners selected, organized, and directed their own social experiences. Dewey was able to create a microcosm of society within the classroom to practice his ideas. “Education,” Dewey wrote in his magnum opus, “is that reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience.”¹⁰

What Dewey meant here is that education has the innate power to reconstruct society by fostering within individuals the ability to think reflectively in order to build a just and equitable social foundation devoid of violence. Knowledge and action creates a viable equation that can reshape the environment. According to Dewey, isolating the curriculum from life experiences renders it powerless when it comes to building an environment based on the absence of military conflict. The model of how to live cooperatively and in harmony became one of his lasting contributions to the formation and development of the discipline of peace education in the second half of the twentieth century.

Many remember, furthermore, Dewey for his position within the progressivist educational movement. Dewey himself often shared that reformers within the progressive movement sought to enact educational change with the goal of reconstructing society, but sometimes without the theoretical base to support such change. In *Schools of Tomorrow*, Dewey envisioned an innovative curriculum created around the lives of the students and recognized the vital role of the community: "To the educator for whom the problems of democracy are at all real, the vital necessity appears to be that of making the connection between the child and his environment as complete and intelligent as possible, both for the welfare of the child and for the sake of the community."¹¹ With grants from the Sloan Foundation, experimental schools, similar to Dewey's laboratory school, were established throughout the nation.

Although there did not exist a field of peace studies or peace education as a separate discipline during his lifetime, nor did he establish a model classroom with conflict resolution techniques many are familiar with today, Dewey nonetheless blended academic objectivity with moral preferences for social justice and global awareness. His instrumentalism—employing value-centric ideas and moral choices—provided a new pathway along which educators have been able to develop alternative teaching strategies necessary for resolving conflicts in a nonviolent manner. In many ways, the profound lesson Dewey imparted to future educators is that ". . . all education which develops power to share effectively in social life is moral."¹² Perhaps unknowingly at the time, Dewey was responsible for raising expectations for peace by calling upon educators "to provide alternatives to the status quo in personal and social relations, in the conduct of economic and political affairs, and in the nature of international affairs."¹³

Peace educator Harris also explains how Dewey's initial ideas are applied to current teaching strategies and practices. Critical to a comprehensive understanding of Dewey's instrumentalist approach is his belief that war is a plague against society. Therefore, any peace education effort must be applied to a certain context, a set of circumstances that give rise to the violence and related strategies used to reduce the violence. Whether an advocacy for peace movement arises or not depends upon spiritual agency, whereby various people who share a concern about a form of violence become peace educators as they endeavor to educate others about injustice. A sort of zeitgeist in the culture urges people to get involved in reducing the threat of violence.

In seeking to contribute to worldwide efforts to promote cooperation—Harris defines peace as “a concept which motivates the imagination, connotes more than the cessation of war. It implies human beings working together to resolve conflicts, respect standards of justice, satisfy basic needs, and honor human rights”—peace educators have incorporated the Deweyan theoretical model and developed their own pedagogy to be used in classroom practices designed to resolve conflicts. “According to the principles of peace pedagogy,” Harris maintains, “pupils can learn how to bring peace to the world not only by studying issues of war and peace but also by learning certain skills, behaviors, and dispositions from the classroom climate, which is established by the way a teacher structures his or her lessons.”¹⁴

Such an application, moreover, gives added credence to Dewey's overall approach to the study of war and peace. In this respect, the field of peace studies serves as an appendage to educators who apply the concepts derived from an examination of peace and war issues in classroom settings. Critical to an understanding of what peace education and peace studies involve is the notion that replacing the war system, as educator David P. Barash points out, entails a definite awareness that “it is nonetheless associated with establishment values, if only because war has long been a dominate theme in the behavior of nations.” What Dewey attempted to introduce is the recognition that any consideration related to a culture of nationalistic intolerance must be replaced by a culture of social justice. The current practice of peace education and peace studies is based on the principle of social change. As peace researchers R. B. J. Walker and Saul H. Mendlovitz observe,

As soon as the simple distinction between war and peace is abandoned, thinking about peace necessarily becomes integrated into much broader currents of political thought and practice. Indeed, it hardly seems possible to think seriously about political life in the modern world without some understanding of the way the characteristic forms of contemporary violence challenge so many of our inherited assumptions about what it means to be human, and how we ought to act towards each other. Peace is neither a technical policy problem, nor an easy utopian aspiration. It is a challenge both to prevailing structures of power and to our understanding of what it now means to engage in political life Not only is it necessary to treat peace as more than just the absence of war, and to refuse to separate peace from injustice, it is also necessary to understand the pursuit of peace as part of a widespread if often inchoate attempt to generate new forms of political practice in the face of fundamental historical change.¹⁵

Furthermore, in tracing the history of peace education in the United States, the work of Dewey is central to the peace educators who followed, and subsequently carried out, his original idea. The key element in developing ways to teach peace, and not just talking about it, derives directly from Dewey's progressive experimental ideas related to curriculum and pedagogical practices. According to education

scholars Susan F. Semel and Alan R. Sadovnik, “Dewey proposed that children learn both individually and in groups. He believed that children should start their mode of inquiry by posing questions about what they want to know. This particular pedagogical strategy was referred to as problem solving or inquiry method.”¹⁶ As such, one of the more inquiry-based topics for discussion, and one that children need to examine and often ask about during times of international tension, is that of war and peace. The Deweyan model was the basis for developing current practices in peace education and peace studies programs. Svi Shapiro added to the context of critical pedagogy for peace education by noting that “Educating for peace is always a holistic process.” This entails a “less violent, more cooperative, and caring mode of existence” which requires “the broad development of all out potentialities.”¹⁷ Exploring ways of settling conflicts domestically and internationally is at the heart of these programs.

ADAPTING DEWEY’S INSTRUMENTALISM FOR PEACE EDUCATION

Who were the future peace educators in both traditional and nontraditional settings that have adopted Dewey’s instrumentalist ideas and applied them in their own efforts to build an environment based on cooperation, not violence? How have they sought to implement Dewey’s call for world citizenship? One particular peace educator deserves mention.

Dr. H. B. Danesh, founder and president of the International Education for Peace Institute in Canada, relies heavily on Dewey’s instrumentalism. According to Danesh, in his book *Education for Peace Reader*, “the primary requisite for effective ‘peace-based’ education is unity-based worldview.” His worldview concept, a derivative of Dewey’s concept of ethical criteria for social reform, is based on two allied concepts. The first is power-based: “the most ancient and common worldview” perceived “that the world is a dangerous place and to ensure one’s . . . survival and security one needs to have power” and “is conducive to authoritarian and dictatorial forms of relationships, governance, and institutional organization.” The second worldview concept is identity-based and evolved at the time of World War I, which “in many respects was the beginning of the end for the authoritarian, power-based worldview held by the European countries.” What transpired was the beginning “of a highly competitive, identity-based period among the European nations and later between Europe and the rest of the World.” The development of social philosophy at this time was concerned with the school as a social institution and highlighted concepts such as freedom, peace, human rights, equity, and justice: “The United States was ahead of Europe in adopting an identity-based worldview by the time of World War I since it had abolished slavery, ended its conflict with the Native-Americans, and began providing women and African Americans a greater measure of social equality.”¹⁸

Where Dewey made an impact in terms of modeling future peace education efforts, Danesh points out, was in initiating a unity-based worldview. Dewey's contributions came by way of his willingness to challenge both the power-based and identity-based teaching in education, which often fosters acceptance of militarism and nationalistic virtues above all else. Danesh's Deweyan approach to peace thus examines the moral/spiritual aspects of nonsupremacy of nation-states and individuals. As he notes,

. . . the education system, the school curricula and pedagogical practices were still quite authoritarian [in the World War I period], demanded strong conformity and, in the process, discouraged individuation, creativity, and universality. John Dewey was acutely aware of these facts and his focus on teaching of geography and history and promotion of internationalism, and in a certain way, his support of the war, all may seem as his attempts to help the students to develop their worldviews toward peace. Likewise, Dewey's focus on moral and ethical issues is related to his interest in peace-based education. Peace is essentially a moral/spiritual state with social and political expressions. Therefore, peace education requires attention to moral and spiritual issues. However, the majority of peace educators tend to approach moral/spiritual issues within the parameters of power-based and dichotomous worldviews based on supremacy of one religion over another. This was particularly so during the decades Dewey was active in his work. Therefore, it is not surprising that his focus on moral issues caused considerable antagonism on the part of various religious authorities/groups.

What Danesh, in particular, and other peace educators have recognized is that Dewey's work in addressing the field of international relations as a means for global appreciation was predicated upon a deconstructionist view of singular-minded patriotism. Dewey's initial philosophy had failed during World War I since it was limited to promoting patriotic citizens in a democratic society; after the war he realized that a unity-based patriotism was necessary for students to appreciate the wider world in which they lived. Dewey's contribution to the study of peace consisted in advocating "a transnational perspective in which the best attributes of all societies came together to form a broader ideological base for the world."¹⁹

The trends in peace education that emerged since the 1960s and continue in the present possess elements of Dewey's principle belief that moral idealism must be coupled with social intelligence in order to change ingrained cultural habits. This belief was premised on the evolution of ideas in an environmental context. The connection between what Dewey wrote in his *Ethics* and the evolution of peace education/studies is remarkable:

As we have had occasion to observe, each community tends to approve that which is in line with what it prizes in practice. Theoretical approvals that run counter to strong social tendencies tend to become purely nominal.

In theory and in verbal instruction our present society is the heir of a great idealistic tradition. Through religion and from other sources, love of neighbor, exact equity, kindness of action and judgment, are taught and in theory accepted. The structure of society, however, puts emphasis upon other qualities. "Business" absorbs a large part of the life of most persons and business is conducted upon the basis of ruthless competition for private gain. National life is organized on the basis of exclusiveness and tends to generate suspicion, fear, often hatred, of other peoples. The world is divided into classes and races, and, in spite of acceptance of an opposed theory, the standards of valuation are based on the class, race, color, with which one identified oneself. The convictions that obtain in personal morality are negated on a large scale in collective conduct, and for this reason are weakened even in their strictly personal application. They cannot be made good in practice except as they are extended to include the remaking of the social environment, economic, political, international.²⁰

Moral development and educational practice thus necessitate awareness to objective conditions.

TWO KEY WOMEN SUPPORTING DEWEY'S IDEAS ON PEACE

Encapsulating the above approaches, while also reinforcing the Deweyan model for establishing a culture of peace, was the critical work introduced by peace educator Elise Boulding. She believed very strongly in the power of education to build cultures of peace. Like Comenius, the Moravian reformer and educator of the seventeenth century, Harris proudly points out, Elise Boulding maintained that education is the key to mutual understanding. She subscribed to Dewey's premise that education can be a powerful influence in shaping the environment. In a seminal essay, "The Child and Non-Violent Social Change," she noted with conviction that,

The child who becomes an altruist, and activist, and a nonviolent shaper of the future is then one who feels autonomous, competent, confident about her own future and the future of society, able to cope with stress, relates warmly to others and feels responsibility for them even when they are not directly dependent on her. She has had many opportunities to solve problems and play out different social roles in the past and her successes have been recognized and rewarded; she has been exposed to a wide variety of events, accumulated a fair amount of knowledge, and has a cognitively complex view of the world. She has been inspired by adult role models, but also nurtured and helped by her own peers. In terms of our model she has had optimal opportunities to develop each of her capacities, cognitive, emotional and intuitive, during her maturing years; her predispositions for bonding, for altruism, for play, for creating alternatives have more than counter-balanced her predispositions for aggression. Her social spaces

have been filled with challenges she could meet, role models which have provided rich sources of complex learnings about possible social behavior, and positive reinforcement for her attempts to make constructive changes around her.²¹

Boulding also embraced and helped create the feminist perspective on micropeace in human relations. A devout Quaker and active member of the Women's International for Peace and Freedom during her lifetime, she challenged conventional views that women were merely passive actors on the domestic and global stage. Women find peacemaking in daily activities, in caretaking, and in connecting with others, she insisted, and are at the forefront of peacemaking because of their nurturing qualities. Peace is more than the absence of war and needs to be taught at home, in the marketplace, and in the international arena.

To a considerable extent, Boulding extended Dewey's efforts regarding peace education by challenging the "realist" position in international politics based on balance of power diplomacy. Although Dewey's educational theory encouraged a peaceful world order, it did not offer a vision of what it could be like without war and conflict. Thus, an important aspect of Boulding's educational work for peace was in helping her students imagine a future without war in which she took the lead role as a demonstrator.²²

One of Boulding's more popular workshops, therefore, invited participants to imagine a 200-year present that went back one hundred years and forward one hundred years. For the first one hundred years, she invited participants to connect with the various peace forces and movements that were struggling to achieve peace. Next, she would ask people to imagine the future they would like to see 100 years ahead, and ask them to decide what would have to happen in fifty years to reach those goals, forty years, thirty years, twenty years, ten years, and back to the current day. What steps should be taken immediately to reach these goals? In order to create a society at peace it is necessary to envision a society at peace, a task that is often hard for people who are mired in structural violence, and ethnic and religious warfare. Once the fantasized world has been imagined, participants would have to brainstorm steps that can be taken to achieve that world. The experience of imagining steps they could take would give workshop attendees hope that they could make a contribution to stopping the pain and anguish caused by violent behavior. Boulding's concept reinforced Dewey's reconstructivist philosophy, which was premised on an inquiry-based approach—a process examining a problem by actively manipulating the environment through hypothesis testing and then visualizing a way to modify the environment with new ideas to further human action. She said of these workshops going back in the past,

One of the things that astonished me as I began reading about the first half of this period—the end of the last century and the early part of this one—was what a vibrant movement there was in peace education. Teachers and

community workers in Europe, Asia, and the Americas were just discovering a new way to teach. There was also the vibrancy and excitement of the movement for international law and for arbitration and dispute resolution.²³

Whereas Elise Boulding was one of the most influential female peace educators of her time, the contributions of Teachers College Professor Emerita Betty Reardon should not be overlooked as well. Perhaps even more so than Boulding, Reardon's peace education pedagogy had been firmly based on Dewey's views. In a similar vein to Dewey's five principles as the building blocks for peace education in overcoming nationalistic prejudices, she defines it this way: "Learning that attempts to comprehend and reduce the multiple forms of violence (physical, structural, institutional and cultural) used as instruments for the advancement or maintenance of cultural, social or religious beliefs and practices or of political, economic, or ideological institutions." Expanding upon Dewey's earlier views on the teaching of nationalism, Reardon roundly criticized the way history was taught to schoolchildren. Sadly, "history at the secondary level emphasizes wars, and only rarely the story of avoided wars or of events in which there has been peaceful resolution of conflict." She had raised a critical issue and went on to confess that secondary school social studies texts ". . . reinforce the attitude that war is inevitable, to be expected as a continuous part of human experience, and that there are few if any alternatives to war for playing out international competition in the pursuit of national goals."²⁴ Her published views were not ignored and reflected the need for further reinforcement in the form of teacher preparation and curriculum development.

In 1982, in an effort to call attention to the threat of nuclear war and in conjunction with the Freeze Movement of that period, the first International Institute on Peace Education (IPE) was held at Teachers College, Columbia University. It was organized by Betty Reardon, along with Teachers College faculty colleagues Willard Jacobsen and Douglas Sloan in cooperation with United Ministries in Education. Professors attending this institute, working in different fields and disciplines, came together to apply their collective knowledge, wisdom, and experience in an effort to address the troubling problem of nuclear proliferation. The first IPE experience examined the practical and theoretical contributions of education to world order and total disarmament, both nuclear and conventional. In doing so, it addressed the political and personal dimensions of the task of disarmament, inquiring into worldviews, beliefs, and attitudes that design and sustain and a highly militarized system of global security. The IPE led to the development of courses and curricula in peace studies for teacher education preparation at the elementary and secondary school levels, as well as nonformal education programs such as workshops, institutes, and conferences.²⁵ The number of educational programs established throughout the world to teach the history of conflict, racism, bullying, and other manifestations of intolerance are an outgrowth of these early peace advocacy groups. Many of these programs are situated in museums and community centers advocating respect for every human being.

At Teachers College, as a result of the influence of Reardon, the academic program in International Educational Development offers a degree concentration in peace education for graduate students at both the masters and doctoral levels. This concentration focuses on addressing direct and structural violence through the transformation of pedagogy, curriculum, and policy related to education in both formal and nonformal contexts. Through the concentration, graduate students are provided with a conceptual understanding of issues related to peace and human rights, as well as practical skills in curriculum development. Both masters and doctoral students are required to take two core courses in peace education and, in addition, can select courses related to peace, security, conflict resolution, human rights, and global justice offered throughout the College and within other programs at Columbia University, Jewish Theological Seminary, and Union Theological Seminary.²⁶ Although there are other academic institutions which offer peace studies programs, Teachers College provides a unique program emphasizing the pedagogical dimensions of peace education.

The peace education concentration initiated its formal establishment with the appearance of a special issue of the *Teachers College Record*. The special issue provided Reardon with another opportunity to reiterate her own definition of *disarmament education*. In her view, peace education must encourage “the promotion of general and complete disarmament.” It should also imply that there is no vehicle potentially more productive toward the pedagogic end of nurturing the creative human imagination than articulating visions of a better world, describing ways in which a culturally diverse but unified human species might live in a world in which violence went counter to both norms and expectations. In addition, and in a rather optimistic vein, she offered her own vision of a new world order to conclude this special issue. Reardon effectively penned a futuristic look at what civilization might look forward to in the year 1990. Her essay, “The First Day of Hope,” was remarkably similar to Edward Bellamy’s late nineteenth century utopian novel, *Looking Backward*. In this case, however, Reardon glanced ahead, not back, envisioning what could be rather than what had already come to be.²⁷

Reardon was prolific, penning both articles and curricula on peace education for public schools and institutes. Clearly, “Social violence and warfare can be described as a form of pathology, a disease,” she added that same year in a small pamphlet entitled *Militarism, Security and Peace Education*. “Few people would be satisfied with simply treating the symptoms of a severely debilitating or life-threatening disease,” she continued. “Yet, we continue to respond to most forms of violence by preparing for the continued incidence of social violence and the repeated outbreak of warfare, rather than trying to eliminate their causes.” Security through disarmament and “peace with honor” constitute an acceptable political strategy, and peace education must explore the differing notions of peace and how to achieve a permanent state of security.²⁸

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, Reardon continued to expand and refine her definitions of peace education and human rights. Equally important, she was

most adept at developing curriculum materials in peace education, especially for schools—one of her greatest contributions to the field. In terms of preparing teaching aids, she rhetorically asked herself: What are the basic facts the public and parents needed to know in order to understand the problems of peace and justice?

In an undated letter (presumably in the early 1980s) addressed to members of the Consortium on Peace, Research, Education and Development, Reardon promulgated her most comprehensive “Learning Objectives for Peace Making.” In this missive, she listed the following assumptions: “commitment to global normative criteria, standards of behavior conducive to peace and justice; and ethical decision making skills, the capacity to make policy choices which will contribute to peace and justice.” These criteria were followed by a list of twenty-four people-related and problem-related objectives for generating peace, which included “appreciation of human diversity and affirmation of strengths and positive characteristics in self and others;” “sense of responsibility for the welfare of self and society;” “commitment to the equal value of persons and the fulfillment of universal human rights;” “capacity to face change and conflict in a direct and constructural manner;” “capacity to accommodate to differences;” and “build[ing] cooperative relationships with others who are culturally or ideologically different from us,” “knowledge of the major causes of injustice, violence and war,” “knowledge of basic universal human needs and various ways of meeting them devised by different human cultures and political systems,” “knowledge of persons who have made contributions to peace and justice in all parts of the world,” “knowledge of the interrelationships between disarmament, development and human rights,” and “knowledge of past, present and proposed future efforts to achieve peace and justice.”²⁹ In sum, this ambitious list addressed the dynamics needed to understand factors shaping human conflict and diverse cultures, including interpersonal, intergroup, interstate, and international justice, as well as oppression and injustice.

EXAMPLES OF GLOBAL PEACE EDUCATION

Other scholars and students studying Dewey’s impact on the discipline of peace education, furthermore, have offered their own perspectives. In one case study—involving an examination of early childhood education and a sustainable peace in Sri Lanka—Claudia Gabriela Canales Gallardo noted in her thesis that “John Dewey and Maria Montessori’s approaches to education are reviewed and integrated into a comprehensive framework for peace education.” Singling out Dewey’s concept of education for public interest, she stated that “for Dewey public interest is neither a claim, opinion, belief, nor a standpoint, position, or platform; rather, public interest constitutes a living, dynamic process that revolves around a concern for the very next moment of associated human life.” More importantly, she adds, “Dewey’s closing sentence to his book *Democracy and Education: Interest in learning from*

all the contacts and encounters in life is the essential public interest' touches upon the significance in Dewey's philosophy of an education in and for [the] public. As this study is grounded in Dewey's philosophy, it follows that *'Interest in learning from all the contacts and encounters in life is the essential of peace education.'*³⁰

Another peace educator and scholar, James Page from Southern Cross University, Australia, remarks in his work *Peace Education: Exploring Ethical and Philosophical Foundations* that "the role of John Dewey as a peace advocate is not well celebrated . . . Dewey's personal commitment to peace can be illustrated through his commitment to education for democracy, through his opposition to military education on campus, and also through his involvement in the 1920s campaign to outlaw war, culminating in the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928." In exploring the notion of habit, which Dewey undertook in his 1922 work *Human Nature and Conduct*, Page offers an interesting insight in which he observes that "Dewey describes habit/virtue as something we do which is worthwhile in itself and where he refers to the social nature of morality." For Page, the essential question in terms of Dewey's peace education contributions is, "Can peace, what we might describe as the action of interacting harmoniously and co-operatively with others, be regarded as a habit, and one which may be encouraged through education? Such interaction does comply with the conditions of morality as suggested by Dewey."³¹

Page also provided additional commentary regarding Dewey and peace education worthy of our attention. "A central concern is how education can assist in preventing a recurrence of armed conflict," Page noted. What concerned him, however, is not Dewey's contributions to the subject, but "that the task of teaching peace education is very reliant upon the initiative and commitment of the individual teacher or school, and as such the teacher or school is often at risk." The "Deweyan program involves challenging existing nationalistic perspectives, and when there can be immense pressures upon teachers to teach in accordance with a particular nationalistic paradigm, even in supposedly liberal-democratic societies." What must happen, Page asserted, is that the "peace education initiatives of John Dewey" must rest upon "commitments of states to peace education, in order to safeguard teachers." More importantly, "Dewey was resolutely anti-imperialist in his outlook, and a political-propagandist view of democracy would have been repugnant to him . . . [H]e tended to describe democracy at times in almost metaphysical terms, such as constituting associated living and conjoint communicated experience." Although Dewey's critics would argue that his disciples are incapable of defining what exactly a useful world would be like, Page defended Dewey when he insisted that "we know from the life work of Dewey that it would be a world free from violence. It was an important aspect of the work of education to create such a world."³²

One final example of Dewey's influence on peace education and those who teach it deserves our attention. In many respects, Ian Harris and Mary Lee Morrison continue to give scholarly and professional respectability to the field itself.

Their theories of application to conflict resolution and community-building through nonviolent measures relies heavily on Dewey's instrumentalist approach to social transformation; their goal, like Dewey's, is to encourage students and adults to learn what peace really means. Both educators, one a retired professor of education at the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee (Harris), the other the founder and director of Pax Educare, the Connecticut Center for Peace Education (Morrison), collaborated to produce a model publication succinctly and effectively describing the field of peace education. It is a well-conceived narrative, not a textbook, and now in its third edition. Both educators have taught the subject—one in a traditional college setting, the other in a private, peace sponsored program—and both have conducted numerous workshops at home and abroad on the importance of education as an instrument for peace. It is their book, however, that not only explains the importance of this burgeoning field of peace education, but also demonstrates why Dewey's progressive education theories continue to shape this discipline.

According to Harris and Morrison, "Peace education involves students and educators in a commitment to create a more just and peaceful world order." But what does this really mean? Peace education, in their view, is a "type of education (adaptable to all ages and all sorts of settings)" that provides "citizens with information about current policies, sharpens their ability to analyze current states of affairs, encourages commitment to various spheres of individual concern and endeavor—politics, public affairs, trade union activities, social and cultural life—and strives to promote free will necessary to make personal choices about policy."³³ As for peace educators, their role is to "point current and future citizens towards practical steps they might take to resolve conflicts in their own lives, as well as to become more effective actors in political systems."³⁴

CURRICULUMS AND PROGRAMS SUPPORTING PEACE IN A DEWEYAN FASHION

Although Dewey never established his own peace education program, disciples of his views have certainly done so, and Harris and Morrison are no exception. "Peace Education," they assert in the image of Dewey, "is currently considered to be both a philosophy and a process involving skills, including listening, reflection, problem-solving, cooperation, and conflict resolution. The process involves empowering people with the skills, attitudes and knowledge to create a safe world and build a sustainable environment."³⁵ Clearly, what they write embraced Dewey's notion of "learning by doing." Harris and Morrison also noted that "the pursuit of peace does not strive for an idealized state of human existence with no aggression or conflict. It strives . . . for the means and for justice where human beings are treated with the dignity afforded them by their human rights."³⁶ Once more, we are reminded of the words Dewey wrote in *The Journal of Social Forces* in the early 1920s, when he

called upon schools to create feelings of respect and friendliness among the peoples of the world.³⁷ Peace educators like Harris and Morrison believe that their mission is to explain the roots of violence and to come up with alternatives to combat it. There are many more committed peace advocates *today* than we can imagine. They refuse to be constrained by the weight of patriotic conformity and educational mandates.

One of the more enduring legacies Dewey did promote, therefore, was to argue that teaching about peace did not mean simply focusing on the causes of war and alternatives to it. Rather, it was a more engaging attempt to use education to focus on globalization and citizenship as one planetary community. As Harris and Morrison point out, “peace education is more generic, attempting to draw out of people their natural inclinations to live in peace.”³⁸ Dewey’s writings reflected that, albeit sometimes indirectly, or perhaps even covertly, in order to convey his message and prevent those who would criticize the teaching of peace as subversive and unpatriotic.

That Dewey’s ideas on the subject of globalization and citizenship as an important component of peaceful coexistence remain alive, moreover, can be attested to when, during the academic year 2009–2010, faculty members at Teachers College attended a yearlong seminar devoted to the topic, “Rethinking Globalization, Education, and Citizenship.” The principal author of the seminar’s findings, David T. Hansen, noted from the outset that “In forming the seminar, I . . . had in mind what, in retrospect, could be called existential and ethical considerations. I mean ‘existential’ in the sense of drawing together colleagues who appreciate (if not in so many words) what John Dewey called the aleatory nature of the human condition: its fundamental unpredictability and vulnerability, and yet also its invitational quality that beckons human creativity. Dewey turned to the poet John Keats for help in describing the ability to embrace this fusion of humble realism and imaginative action.” In this instance, the seminar participants were seeking not to reach conclusions but “to articulate questions, ideas, and practices that might be helpful to people interested in the nexus of globalization, education, and citizenship.” It was an exploratory venture into the ethical dimensions of human understanding and cooperation—the very basis of Dewey’s concept of democratic sharing.³⁹

Two important revelations were reported by Hansen. First, seminar participants agreed that “We have much to learn, still, about the ways in which people near and far are able to experience life educationally: that is, to find a scene of learning rather than solely of existing, producing, and consuming. Our discussions returned again and again to the fact that such learning depends not on the number of degrees one possesses but rather on the degree of awareness, responsiveness, and connectedness that animates one’s dealings with self and others.” This is certainly an aspect of Dewey’s approach to transformative experience. Second, and perhaps more importantly, was the theme of “reconceiving citizenship,” a core element in Dewey’s approach to international problems—a definite extension of his concept of global democracy. It seems as if the seminar participants came full circle when addressing Dewey’s “the public and

its problems.” According to Hansen, “New ways of speaking, of conducting oneself, and of being public all have consequences for others. They show others ways of being and acting; they give others faith that such ways are indeed possible.” Fundamentally, Dewey’s “common faith” in the average person reappears as the seminar illuminated “how it is that people feel, in countless ways, an unlicensed and unofficial sense of belonging together, in figurative terms, people say: We are citizens of the human relationships we have come to form from within and across our differences. In time, such bottom-up initiative can come to influence official modes of citizenship, just as lived experiences of education can come to penetrate formal schooling, as indeed they do in every instance where a teacher or students acts upon his or her ‘outside’ knowledge.”⁴⁰

This notion has also been supported by other academicians in the field. Dale T. Snauwaert, a professor of educational theory and social foundations of education at the University of Toledo, points out that, “As John Dewey put it: ‘Democracy . . . means a way of living together in which mutual and free consultation rule instead of force’” Many of the principles related to democracy and public reason, which Dewey advocated in *Democracy and Education* among other works, Snauwaert noted, have had a direct bearing on the current practice of peace education. In his article he also highlights the point that Dewey always talked about the duty of civility and global responsibility. “A peace education for global responsibility, consistent with the values and principles of a democratic ethical framework,” according to Snauwaert, “seeks to develop a deep, critically reflective understanding of a democratic ethical framework, skills, understandings and dispositions of public deliberation necessary for democratic deliberation, and the internal moral resources necessary for civic responsibility within and across the borders of a democratic society.”⁴¹

Furthermore, Snauwaert extends Dewey’s analysis of educational philosophy as the premise for an effective and cooperative democratic society by insisting that “education is a *normative* enterprise . . . driven by fundamental social values as well as the imperatives of social justice.” Once again, referencing Dewey’s *Democracy and Education* and the *Child and the Curriculum*, he writes that “Educational reflection and deliberation . . . required a normative frame of reference. Human beings interpret and understand experience, including values and moral and political principles, through frames of reference. We think, choose and value within context of frameworks of discourse and understanding.” That said, where Dewey’s theories remain pertinent with respect to peace education and democratic principles grounded in philosophical rationale are easily captured by Snauwaert: “Democracy is an appealing and powerful normative frame of reference. As Dewey suggested: ‘. . . unless education has some frame of reference it is bound to be aimless, lacking a unified objective. The necessity for a frame of reference must be admitted. There exists in our country such a frame of reference. It is called democracy.’ At the heart of democracy are values of moral equality and liberty, understood as an equal right to self-determination.” Moreover, Snauwaert continues, “Self-determination

requires that there should be careful reflection upon and rational deliberation concerning social values and, in turn, the imperatives of justice John Dewey suggests: 'Democracy also means voluntary choice, based on intelligence that is the outcome of free association and communication with others. It means a way of living together in which mutual and free consultation rule instead of force'⁴²

Also building on Snauwaert's analysis is the view of sociologist Moses Chikwe at the University of California at Los Angeles. In "Civic Education and Global Citizenship: A Deweyan Perspective," Chikwe maintains that "civic education does hold the promise of expanding the narrow goal of traditional citizenship to the global perspective, due to the organized capacity of civic education and schooling in general in communicating the civic ideals." The relevancy of Dewey's work concerns his "articulation of the public." For Chikwe, Dewey's present-day contribution would be in helping educators expand "the traditional notion and understanding of civic education which is nationalistic in orientation to the more globalized understanding." Dewey's rationale for establishing schools was "to well educate every member of the society for the success of democracy." In terms of peace education, Chikwe continues, schools are laboratories "of social settlements where individuals gather to not only share ideas but ideas that are incarnated in human form. The human interaction among students helps to build up future community among them, a society where each will learn to be both responsible for himself/herself and responsive to others. Dewey placed a permanent stress on this formation of community among students and teachers in the process of education or inquiry." This notion of communal interaction, which Dewey addressed in *The Public and its Problems*, fits nicely into Chikwe's call for rethinking "the meaning of citizenship through civic education." Peace educators are constantly drawing upon Dewey's theories for inspiration and direction in their own work as this article demonstrates. "Education for Dewey," Chikwe fittingly observes, "was central for the forming and shaping of a democratic nation by forming in the citizen-subject the moral responsibility of living with others and contributing to the upkeep of the nation. He already signaled to the role of education in forming in everyone the idea of global citizenship by inviting us to look beyond the frontier of the nation. Hence in educating the young we are not just to be concerned with the national spirit but the entire human community (global village)."⁴³

The notion of "experiential learning," as it relates to community-based problems, is another important contribution Dewey made to current practices in peace education. A number of scholars have recognized this contribution, thus reaffirming Dewey's continuing influence in the field of peace studies. For example, Aline Stomfay-Stitz makes an astute observation in pointing out that "the effective use of experience as an integral part of education, in order to empower learners and promote the common good" enhances one's ability to address matters like "cross-cultural awareness and personal growth." Dewey's earlier notion of school-as-community has been redeployed by current peace educators willing to link community development with experiential learning as a means for improving daily living conditions. During

the 1980s, for instance, community-based organizations witnessed numerous citizens educating “others in the concepts of peace education and activism . . . and shared concrete strategies for bringing about change.” The renewed interest in experiential learning for American education, which was ushered in at the dawn of a new century, Stomfay-Stitz argues, “was complementary to the philosophy of John Dewey, especially as articulated in his *Experience and Education* (1938). Dewey’s learning-by-doing concept has since been enhanced by several decades of research, including Jean Piaget’s and Maria Montessori’s, on how children and young people learn best.”⁴⁴

Stomfay-Stitz’s observation is supported by Ed Brantmeier, a professor at James Madison University. Brantmeier has been actively engaged in teaching peace education for a number of years and, like his peers, reminds us of the importance of Dewey’s earlier interest in education as an instrument for real-world understanding. “John Dewey’s real world, experiential education,” Brantmeier states, “moved learning from the abstract into the realm of the ‘lived curriculum’ by investigating the sometimes messy problems of life. This cooperative, democratic approach considered schools/education as vehicles for social transformation via embodied forms of learning.” What makes Dewey’s theories relevant, Brantmeier adds, is that “congruent with some aspects of peace education, this problem-based learning of Dewey requires exploration of real world issues to forge real world solutions. Peace education, aimed at alleviating various forms of violence (direct, cultural, structural), inherently has been responsive to different forms of violence expressed in situated historic contexts and has morphed and changed with pressing issues of humanity and the planet.” Dewey’s continuing influence, Brantmeier insists, is this: “True to evolution, adaptive intelligence to changing environmental circumstances has kept peace education alive and well through changing times. Problem-based learning invites deep learning given that it moves toward Bloom’s higher levels of thinking—application, evaluation, synthesis. It is this type of higher order, complex, and applied thinking that will continue to evolve the field of peace education . . .”⁴⁵

Jing Lin, at the University of Maryland, extends the analysis further. In present-day terms, she reminds readers that “Our school [curricula] are still pitching people as antagonistic forces, rather than as human beings who have so much in common that we can work together and solve our problems by appealing to the good nature in us.” As Dewey argued in the 1920s and 1930s, Lin insists that “our schools are ignoring the simultaneous development of our students’ emotional, moral, spiritual and ecological intelligences.” Dewey’s concept of school as community, nurturing interdependent cooperation, continues to be neglected as part of “students’ holistic development.” All of those “attributes and qualities such as sympathy, compassion, care, respect, love, [and] forgiveness,” which Dewey identified as components of intelligence and learning, Lin insists, “are glaringly missing in our education. Our curriculum teaches war rather than peace Our schools pay scant attention to teaching students to be richly literate of each other’s culture, beliefs, religions and traditions.” Her compelling arguments

in favor of peace education in the 21st century are remarkably similar to those Dewey offered in his 1923 article in *Journal of Social Forces* and after.⁴⁶

CONFRONTING THE AGE-OLD PROBLEM OF NATIONALISM

Ultimately, in terms of assessing Dewey's contribution to thinking about peace education, as seen through a twenty-first century lens, it is necessary to consider what he said about the generic meaning of nationalism in the aftermath of World War I and the obligation teachers must uphold as to how to address it. No one knew better than Dewey that the nationalistic furor of the war period had turned schools into seminaries of patriotism and that it caused many educators to question their given role as moral and social agents of compassion and understanding.

The issue of national sovereignty still remains the most significant obstacle to peace. The late, distinguished historian Merle Curti, who taught at Teachers College only a few years after Dewey had retired from active teaching, noted that it was the esteemed philosopher,

... who gave systematic philosophical expression to the belief that the more exclusive types of nationalism and patriotism were no longer adequate instruments to test plans for the solution of pressing problems. He recognized the past services of even the narrower, more chauvinistic patriotism in forcing men out of limited sectionalisms into larger social units and in creating loyalty to a state which subordinated petty and selfish interests; but he pointed out that this type of nationalism and patriotism now stood in the way of continuing the same process by setting up a dislike of all who did not find themselves within the charmed national circle

... The task now was to develop the desirable aspects of nationalism, that is, those that served as the friend, not the foe, of the international society that come into being. Only such constructive patriotism would enable people to prevent self-seeking politicians from cleverly playing on the emotion of national loyalty and the ignorance of other lands to advance their own interests

... Thus he deplored the tendency to insist on nation-wide conformity to conventional ideas of national loyalty and patriotism. Desirable and necessary though unity in crisis was, it could best be obtained, Dewey held, through intelligence and education, rather than through fear, compulsion, and violence. Such short cuts to the desired end could only, he urged, breed bitter hatreds.⁴⁷

Whatever the case might be, it is apparent that every citizen on this globe must be ready to tackle, as previously noted in the words of Curti, "the perpetual dilemma of what to do when the values of peace are in apparent conflict with decency, humanity, and justice."⁴⁸ For peace educators that remains the ultimate challenge.

CONCLUSION

Given the current intimidation from terrorism and the threat of nuclear annihilation, therefore, Dewey's position and his message appear all the more imperative. Of course, there are still some unanswered questions peace educators are asking as to how Dewey would have carried them out in today's troubled world; questions arise in Dewey's most famous work, *Democracy and Education*: what defines the "working disposition of the mind" necessary for establishing peace?; what exactly "binds people together in cooperative pursuits . . . apart from geographical limitations"?; how can education change the "provisional character of national sovereignty"? Dewey was absolutely right in bringing these questions to readers' attention. But his lack of guidance on how to pursue his wishes, for fear of creating fixed ends, left room for a variety of interpretations depending on how one defines disposition of mind, cooperative pursuits, and provisional character.

Nonetheless, educational programs at all levels have social justice as the cornerstones of their mission statements. However, peace and peacebuilding initiatives are still not sustained components of the educational process as Dewey had hoped. They exist, as noted above, but are too few and far apart given the insistence upon governments' continued reliance on protecting the sanctity of national self-defense. What would Dewey say about how the global population has entered the twenty-first century? It seems clear that conflict is again building and that civil wars, terrorist attacks on major cities and historical beacons, and destabilization of key economies will continue to have an impact on the next and future generations. Now, more than ever, it is time to make peace education part of the everyday school curriculum in order to finally establish Dewey's vision of world citizenship.

NOTES

Nota Bene: The present work is based in very small part upon our recent book published by Southern Illinois University Press, *John Dewey, America's Peace-Minded Educator*.

1. John Dewey, "Higher Learning and War," *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1953*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston, vol. 14, 1939–1941 (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1988), 273.
2. *Ibid.*, 274.
3. John Dewey, "The Basic Values and Loyalties of Democracy," *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1953*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston, vol. 14, 1939–1941 (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1988), 275–77.
4. John Dewey, "The School as a Means of Developing a Social Consciousness and Social Ideals in Children," *Journal of Social Forces* 1, no. 5 (1923), 515.
5. John Dewey, "Education as Politics," *Character and Events: Popular Essays in Social and Political Philosophy*, ed. Joseph Ratner, vol. II (New York: Henry Holt, 1929), 776–81.
6. John Dewey, *The School and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1899), 28.
7. Molly Cochran, "Pragmatism and International Relations: A Story of Closure and Opening," *European Journal of Pragmatism and American Philosophy* 4, no. 1 (2012), 145, accessed January 23, 2014, http://lnx.journalofpragmatism.eu/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/8_cochran.pdf.

8. EURED, *The EURED Teacher Training Programme. Curriculum of a European Peace Education Course* (Klagenfurt, Austria: EURED, 2002), 10.

9. See, Charles F. Howlett and Ian Harris, *Books, Not Bombs: Teaching Peace since the Dawn of the Republic* (Charlotte, NC: Information Age, 2010), 202; quoted in William Frankena, *Three Historical Philosophies of Education: Aristotle, Kant, and Dewey* (Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1965), 180. Nel Noddings's work, moreover, continues to examine the ongoing relationship between democracy and education. In her most recent work, she continuously draws upon Dewey's *Democracy and Education* in order to show how education is the basis of a democratic society and how it helps offer a pathway to establishing a better world in which cooperation, understanding, and interdependence are at the heart of democracy. Similarly to what Dewey argued almost one hundred years ago, Noddings believes that twenty-first century education should be based on cooperation, not the age-old dogmatic alternative of competition. See Nel Noddings, *Education and Democracy in the 21st Century* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2013), *passim*; Noddings, "War, Critical Thinking and Self-Understanding," *Phi Delta Kappan* 85, no. 7 (March 2004), 489–95.

10. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1916), 4–5. This notion is conveyed throughout the work. Dewey's social philosophy was closely connected to the idea that one had to work within the system in order to reform it. The realist in him recognized that wars were part of the international order. The idealist in him opted for solutions to that issue by searching for possibilities—alternatives—for abolishing a culture of violence. Peace educators operate from that very condition Dewey formulated when describing how social change was possible through intelligent choices. According to one Dewey scholar, "In order for one to reconstruct experience, to make practice more intelligent than it would otherwise be, experience or practice must be transformable. This is possible because our interactions are not only satisfying; they are also unsatisfying. Life is a mixed affair. But by being intelligent we can reshape situations so that they become consummatory rather than slack or incomplete. If life contained no satisfactions that could be extended or reproduced [no war, for example] or if we lacked the ability to modify situations, Dewey's experience-remaking model would be unrealistic. As it is, his reconstructive model of intelligence is situated in his biological understanding of experience-existence. We are organisms engaged in constant interactions with our environments. Some of these interactions are more desirable, and some less or even distinctly undesirable. Through intelligized behavior we can adjust our situations as necessary, thus enlarging the desirable in our lives." See Michael Eldridge, *Transforming Experience: John Dewey's Cultural Instrumentalism* (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 1998), 39–40.

11. John and Evelyn Dewey, *Schools of Tomorrow* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1915), 208.

12. *Ibid.*, 121–23.

13. *Ibid.*, 177–79. According to educator Aline Stomfay-Stitz, during the early decades of the twentieth century "two prominent Americans . . . contributed significantly to the formation of peace education principles: Jane Addams and John Dewey . . . Dewey, the noted educational leader and philosopher, envisioned the school as an agent of social change and outlined these goals in many of his writings. However, limited attention has been paid to his concern for the economic, social, and political causes of war or to his support for world citizenship." See Stomfay-Stitz, "A History of Peace Education in the United States of America," in *Encyclopedia of Peace Education*, ed. Monisha Bajaj (New York: Information Age, 2008), 2.

14. Ian Harris, "Principles of Peace Pedagogy," *Peace & Change* 15, no. 3 (July 1990), 255. In this article, Harris also pointed out that in 1988 the Oregon State Board of Education mandated peace education in its schools, and other school districts, such as those of Berkeley, CA, Milwaukee, WI, and Cambridge, MA, passed resolutions endorsing peace studies. Independently,

teachers in other districts began teaching their own peace lessons. Part of this reform movement, moreover, was designed to reduce school violence through conflict resolution programs.

15. David P. Barash, *Introduction to Peace Studies* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1991), 26–7.

16. Susan F. Semel and Alan R. Sadovnik, “The Contemporary Small-School Movement: Lessons from the History of Progressive Education,” *Teachers College Record* 110, no. 9, 1717–44, accessed May 19, 2010, <http://www.tcrecord.org>, ID number: 15166. One should also consult Aliene Stomfay-Stitz, *Peace Education in America, 1828–1990: Sourcebook for Education and Research* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1993), *passim*.

17. Svi Shapiro, “Towards a Critical Pedagogy of Peace Education,” *Kultura-Społeczeństwo-Edukacja* 7, no. 1 (2015), 7–20.

18. H. B. Danesh to C.F. Howlett, January 22, 2013; See, also, Danesh, *Education for Peace Reader* (Victoria, Canada: EFP Press, 2011), *passim*.

19. *Ibid.*

20. John Dewey, *Ethics*, in *The Later Works 1925–1953*, ed. Jo Ann Boydston, vol. 7 (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1988), 259–60.

21. Quoted in Ian M. Harris and Mary Lee Morrison, *Peace Education*, 2nd ed. (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2003), 210–211. A third edition was published in 2013.

22. Elise and Kenneth Boulding, *The Future: Images and Processes* (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 1995), *passim*.

23. Elise Boulding, “Toward a Culture of Peace in the Twenty-First Century,” *Social Alternatives* 15, no. 3 (1996), 38.

24. Betty Reardon, “Obstacles to Disarmament in Education,” *Bulletin of Peace Proposals* 10, no. 4 (1979), 364–67; “Peace Education: A Review and Projection,” in *Routledge International Companion to Education*, eds. Bob Moon, Sally Brown, and Miriam Ben-Peretz (New York: Routledge, 2000), 401.

25. Howlett and Harris, *Books, Not Bombs*, 179–80.

26. Consult the International Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution, Teachers College, Columbia University at <http://iccr.tc.columbia.edu/>.

27. Betty Reardon, “Disarmament Education as World Order Security,” *Teachers College Record* 84, no. 1 (1982), 137–51.

28. Betty Reardon, *Militarism, Security and Peace Education: A Guide for Concerned Citizens* (Valley Forge, PA: United Ministries in Education, 1982), 16–17, 38–40.

29. Quoted from the Betty Reardon Papers, MSS-226, The Ward M. Canaday Center for Special Collections, University of Toledo; also: https://www.utoledo.edu/library/canaday/HTML_findingaids/MSS-226.html. Fittingly, Reardon’s pioneering work at Teachers College is continuing with the efforts of Monisha Bajaj. Bajaj, now at the University of San Francisco, has focused her teaching and research interests on peace and human rights education, along with educational policies and practices both in the United States and abroad. She has developed a curriculum on peace and human rights for UNESCO as well as non-governmental organizations. According to Bajaj, “Peace education is generally defined as educational policy, planning, pedagogy, and practice that can provide learners . . . with the skills and values to work toward comprehensive peace. Comprehensive peace includes the oft-discussed domains of both ‘negative’ and ‘positive’ peace that . . . comprise the abolition of direct or physical violence, and structural violence constituted by systematic inequalities that deprive individuals of their basic human rights. The areas of human rights education, development education, environmental education, disarmament education, and conflict resolution education are often included in a broader understanding of the multifaceted approaches

of peace education. Despite different approaches, the holistic aim of peace education can be summarized as the achievement of 'all human rights for all people(s)'. See Monisha Bajaj, ed., *Encyclopedia of Peace Education* (Charlotte, NC: Information Age, 2008), 1–2.

30. Claudia Gabriela and Canales Gallardo, "Early Childhood Education: Towards Sustainable Peace in Sri Lanka," (master's thesis, Graduate Institute of Peace Studies, Kyung Hee University, South Korea, 2009), 27.

31. James Page, *Peace Education: Exploring Ethical and Philosophical Foundations* (Charlotte, NC: Information Age, 2008), 43–44.

32. *Ibid.*, 77–78. For additional commentary related to Dewey's latent influence on the peace educator practitioners, consult Barbara Thayer-Bacon, "Maria Montessori, John Dewey, and William H. Kilpatrick," *Education and Culture* 28, no. 1 (2012), 3–20; Jacob Ritter, "Sacred Cultures of Peace and Justice: An Integrated Model for Peace Learning" (unpublished paper, Peace and Justice Studies Conference, Elizabethtown, PA, 2007); and Jing Lin, Edward J. Brantmeier, and Christa Bruhn, eds., *Transforming Education for Peace* (Charlotte, NC: Information Age, 2008), *passim*.

33. Harris and Morrison, *Peace Education*, 4.

34. *Ibid.*, 4–5.

35. *Ibid.*, 9.

36. *Ibid.*, 13.

37. Howlett and Harris, *Books, Not Bombs*, 27–33; Stomfay-Stitz, *Peace Education in America, 1828–1990*, chapter 1 and pp. 284–315.

38. Harris and Morrison, *Peace Education*, 80.

39. David T. Hansen, "Introduction: Rethinking Globalization, Education, and Citizenship," *Teachers College Record* 113, no. 6 (2011), 1135–53, accessed March 4, 2013, <http://www.tcrecord.org>, ID number: 16135.

40. *Ibid.*

41. Dale T. Snauwaert, "Democracy, Public Reason and Peace Education," *Global Campaign for Peace Education Newsletter* 88 (November 2011), accessed March 20, 2013. <http://www.peace-ed-campaign.org/newsletter/achives/88>.

42. Dale T. Snauwaert, "The Importance of Philosophy for Education in a Democratic Society," *In Factis Pax* 6, no. 2 (2012), 73–84.

43. Moses Chikwe, "Civic Education and Global Citizenship: A Deweyan Perspective," *In Factis Pax* 6, no. 1 (2012), 1–25. In *The Public and Its Problems*, Dewey sought to define what a good state is: "When a state is a good state . . . it renders the desirable associations solidier and more coherent; indirectly it clarifies their aims and purges their activities. It places a discount upon injurious groupings and renders their tenure of life precarious. In performing these services, it gives the individual members of valued associations greater liberty and security It enables individual members to count with reasonable certainty upon what others will do, and thus facilitate mutually helpful cooperations. It creates respect for others and for one's self. A measure of the goodness of a state is the degree in which it relieves individuals from the waste of negative struggle and needless conflict and confers upon him positive assurance and reinforcement in what he undertakes But this recognition cannot be legitimately converted into the monopolistic absorption of all associations into The State, nor of all social values into political value Nor can the liberating and confirming results of public action be construed to yield a wholesale idealization of states in contrast with other associations. For state activity is often injurious to the latter. One of the chief occupations of states has been the waging of war and the suppression of dissentient minorities" (71–73).

44. Stomfay-Stitz, *Peace Education in America, 1828–1990*, 326.
45. Edward Brantmeier to Charles F. Howlett, April 4, 2013.
46. Jing Lin, “Constructing A Global Ethic of Universal Love, Forgiveness, and Reconciliation: The Role of Peace Education in the Twenty-First Century,” in *Transforming Education for Peace*, eds. Jin Lin, Edward J. Brantmeier & Christa Bruhan (Charlotte, NC: Information Age, 2008), 308–309.
47. Merle Curti, *The Roots of American Loyalty* (New York: Atheneum, 1968), 217–18.
48. Quoted in Charles F. Howlett, “Merle Curti and the Significance of Peace Research in American History,” *Peace & Change* 25, no. 4 (October 2000), 454.

SELECTED DEWEY WRITINGS

- Dewey, John. *Correspondence of John Dewey, 1871–1952*. Vol. 3, 1–2 of 17, electronic edition, Charlottesville, VA: Intalex, 1996. Dewey’s correspondence and public works are also located at the Morris Library, Southern Illinois University.
- . *The School and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1899.
- . *Democracy and Education*. New York: Macmillan, 1916.
- . “In a Time of National Hesitation,” *Seven Arts II* (1917), 4–6.
- . *The Public and Its Problems*. New York: Henry Holt, 1927.
- . “Force, Violence, and Law.” In *Characters and Events: Popular Essays in Social and Political Philosophy*, edited by Joseph Ratner. Vol. II. New York: Henry Holt, 1929, 636–41.
- . “Conscience and Compulsion” In *Characters and Events: Popular Essays in Social and Political Philosophy*, edited by Joseph Ratner. Vol. II. New York: Henry Holt, 1929, 576–80.
- . “Education as Politics.” In *Character and Events: Popular Essays in Social and Political Philosophy*, edited by Joseph Ratner. Vol. II. New York: Henry Holt, 1929, 776–81.
- . “The School as a Means of Developing a Social Consciousness and Social Ideals in Children.” *Journal of Social Forces* 1, no. 5 (1923), 513–17.
- . “Higher Learning and War.” In *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1953*, edited by Jo Ann Boydston. Vol. 14, 1939–1941. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1988, 273–74.
- . “The Basic Values and Loyalties of Democracy,” *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925–1953*, edited by Jo Ann Boydston. Vol. 14, 1939–1941. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1988, 275–277.
- and Evelyn Dewey. *Schools of Tomorrow*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1915.

Audrey Cohan is a professor of education and interim dean of natural sciences at Molloy College.

Charles F. Howlett is professor of education emeritus at Molloy College.